When two evaluations disagree

CEFR C2 | Unit 2: Evidence | Reading

Read the original text. You may underline evidence and reread as needed.

Name _____ Date _____

EVALUATION A
The mentoring scheme reports a completion rate of 84 percent among participants who attended at least four sessions. It describes this as evidence of effective support. The report does not include people who registered but attended fewer sessions, explaining that they did not receive enough mentoring to evaluate.

EVALUATION B
A second team calculates completion among everyone who registered and obtains 57 percent. Its commentary calls the scheme's headline misleading. It argues that a service must account for the people it fails to retain, including those who never reach the threshold used in Evaluation A.

The figures are not directly commensurable because their denominators differ. That does not make either question illegitimate. Evaluation A asks about completion after a defined level of participation; Evaluation B asks what happens across the full registered group. The disagreement becomes substantive when either answer is used to stand for the other.

Neither figure, on its own, establishes the scheme's causal effect. Participants who attend repeatedly may differ from those who leave, and there is no comparison showing what would have happened without mentoring. Equally, counting every registrant does not explain why some never attended. Work schedules, access difficulties and changing intentions remain possible explanations.

A synthesis should resist the invitation to split the difference and announce a compromise percentage. It should identify the distinct populations, assess the claim each calculation can support and request the missing retention information. Precision here depends on maintaining the disagreement long enough to understand it, rather than producing an apparently balanced number that answers neither question.

Original Ilmiya practice text. Scenarios and research examples are fictional.