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# Executive Summary

The executive summary contains a brief decsription about the main evaluation question, the project, methodology, findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learnt

# Background

The report includes a clear description of the project, its objectives, indicators and key activities

The report describes the organizational arrangements for implementing the project, including roles of donors and partners

Project logframe or theory of change of project is clearly referenced

The background section clearly refers to lessons learnt from previous Save the Children documents (evaluations, lessons learnt documents, donor reports, etc)

The background section clearly refers to external sources of relevant literature on the topic

# scope of Evaluation

Report explains why and for whom the evaluation is being conducted and how the results will be used

Report refers to OECD/DAC criteria and explains which criteria have been chosen and why (Relevance, effectiveness, effciency, impact, sustainability plus the additional three criteria of coverage, coherence and coordination). If either the OECD DAC criteria were not used or another framework was used, the report clearly states what was used

Report clearly identifies the key evaluation question/s as articulated in project proposal

Report clearly identifies all indicators mentioned in evaluation plan and ToR, if applicable

Report makes reference/comparison with baseline and/or midline studies if applicable

# Methodology

The report describes clearly the evaluation method and process, including study duration

The methodology section explains why this method was chosen over other options

The study design, sample size, selection of respondents/cases and instruments used are satisfactory

The methodology section discusses the validity (internal and external) and reliability of the data and information

The methodology section clearly discusses the limitations of the evaluation method and how each limitation was tackled to minimize bias

The methodology section explains how child participation was incorporated in the method. If child participation is not used, the report has clear justification for not doing so

Data triangulation is satisfactory

The methodology section mentions ethical review process of the study. If none, it explains why

Methodology respects contextual issues such as gender, age, ethnicity, religion, geographic location, cultural context, where applicable

The methodology identifies any possible ethical concerns of the chosen method and explains how they were tackled

The report clearly mentions ownership and storage responsibilities of the data/information collected

Report uses relevant MEAL data

# Main Findings

The evaluation findings answer the evaluation question

The findings follow clearly from the data analysis and shows clear line of evidence to support the conclusions

The findings are presented with relevant tables/figures/graphs, if applicable (if not applicable, score 3)

Relevance of findings for programming is clear

Attribution, contribution/confounding factors addressed sufficiently

Unintended and unexpected, positive or negative effects are identified, where relevant

# Conclusions and Recommendations

Any recommendations made follow logically from the findings and evidence presented in the report (if the evaluation ToR does not require recommendations, score 3)

For any recommendations made, end users are specified e.g. SC staff, SC leadership, other NGOs, Government (if not relevant, score 3)

Lessons learnt are relevant for the intended users

# SCI evaluation response plan

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Recommendation | Planned action | Timeline | Responsible |
| *[copied from above section]* | *Action that SCI decides to answer this recommendation. If nothing is being planned, then info why so.*  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
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## Project logframe

## Evaluation ToR
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