Independent Review of EvalForward Community of Practice

Annex 10.
Matrix of feedback
from steering group
and changes to report

Heading/Sub-Heading or Issue	Feedback from Steering Committee Members	Changes/Response by Evaluation Team Lead
Overview of EvalForward	Change Story Highlights seem out of place so move to Section 3 with other Change Story elements. Details on EvalForward services needed. Phrase 'spotted a niche' sounds like a prejudgement	Four highlights integrated with existing Change Story Excerpts under related findings. Service details added. Amended to refer to design intending to respond to a potential gap.
Review Design and Implementation	Include Change Stories in description of evidence.	Change Stories added but with footnote about exclusion from primary analysis due to positive bias.
Change Story Excerpts	Bracket text in speech marks to indicate member speaking. Group thematically rather than under-related findings.	Have italicized but not speech marked as the text is a synthesized/edited note of a conversation rather than direct quotation. No change as this will add an additional structure to the Findings Section that appears confusing and reduces illustrative effect for findings that SC previously requested.
Findings and Conclusions	Separate conclusions into new sections. Detail on evidence and related Evaluation Questions needs presentation with findings or by cross-reference to Full Findings Annex	Separated out. Cross-referencing to Annex added to each finding.
Finding 1	RAG rating of Green could be Amber. Details of 2017 Needs Identified needs adding for context. Correlate online platform engagement trends to possible causal factors.	Criterion for this Evaluation Question means that it should stay as Green. Footnote on needs added. Correlation not possible as EF monitoring has logged such evidence.
Finding 4	Change categories are unfamiliar and could be linked to causal EvalForward services.	Not possible to describe causation as evidence relates to overall effect of being an EvalForward member. The literature reference and justification for use of change categories have been footnoted.
Findings 5, 11 and 12	General findings with little explicit content seem vague or cryptic.	Detail of findings on suggestions relating to these three topics has been added back in from the Annex.
Coherence findings	Mention after relevance findings and before effectiveness/impact findings.	The sequence of finding sections follows order previously agreed by the steering committee.
Recommendations	Ambition of EvalForward's purpose should be part of recommendations.	Covered by Rec 1.2 and 1.4 but direct references to purpose added.
Conclusion 3	Lack of clarity about term secondary benefits. Conclusion starts to make recommendations.	Clarified with footnote. Conclusion amended to stop at implications of associated findings.

Heading/Sub-Heading or Issue	Feedback from Steering Committee Members	Changes/Response by Evaluation Team Lead
Conclusion 4 and Recommendation 5	Lack of clarity about additional investment for increased management capacity. Conclusion starts to make recommendations.	Clarified to say management capacity (e.g. staff time). Conclusion amended to stop at implication of associated findings.
Simplified theory of change	Present simplified ToC before findings to guide the reader.	Simplified TOC moved before findings Section.