No. KEA 121 EVN 2014

To,
Dr. Narayana Raj. N,
#620, 6th Floor, Karnataka Housing Board,
High Rise Apartment,
Yelahanka New Town,
Bengaluru-560 065.

Sir,

Sub: Grading of final evaluation report on “The need and functioning of Malnad Area Development Board, Shimoga”-reg.

Ref: 1. Letter no. KEA 138 EVN 2014, dated: 04-09-2014 of the KEA.
2. Letter no. KEA 245 EVN 2016, dated: 22.03.2017 of the KEA.

****

I write and thank you for having provided inputs for improving the quality of the evaluation report of the study titled “Evaluation of the need and functioning of Malnad Area Development Board, Shimoga” The report was approved by the Technical Committee of Karnataka Evaluation Authority (KEA) in its 29th meeting held on 16th July 2016.

Herewith enclosed Chapter 2- Evaluation of reports commissioned by KEA (External Evaluation) and a blank form to grade the evaluation Report of Manual for Output Grading along with the copy of the final evaluation report. You are requested to go through the final report, rate it in the form appended and return to KEA within 4 days along with the final evaluation report.

Thanking you,

Yours faithfully

Encl: As above.

27/6/2017
# ANNEXURE-3 OF OUTPUT GRADING MANUAL

## GRADING OF EVALUATION REPORT

Name of the study: *Evaluation of the need and functioning of Malnad Area Development Board, Shimoga*

Receipt of final evaluation report: 07\textsuperscript{th} February 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SI No.</th>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Maximum Marks</th>
<th>Marks Assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Executive Summary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Introduction &amp; objectives</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Methodology and area of study</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hypothesis and limitations of the study</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Review of the literature</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Analysis and discussion</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Conclusions and recommendations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Importance of the study and limitations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Overall presentation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Relevance for policy implications</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Marks in figures: 72

Total Marks in words: *Seventy two only*

Grade: B

(Signature of Assessor)

Dr. Narayana Raj, N

\[\text{Noted}\]

\[\text{Chapman}\]

\[30/11/2017\]

\[Cm. (E)\]