

Rating Scale	Very Good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory	Reviewer Guidance:
Rating explanation	The report can be used with high level of confidence and is considered a good example.	The report can be used with certain degree of confidence.	Partially meets requirements with some missing elements. The report can be used with caution.	Misses out the minimum quality standards.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall reports are rated against a 4-point scale (Very Good, Good, Fair and Unsatisfactory), which is an aggregated rating of eight parameters.</li> <li>- Each overarching parameter is rated against a 4-point scale (Fully, Mostly, Partially and Not at all).</li> <li>- Parameters such as evaluation methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations are given more weight.</li> <li>- <b>Executive feedback</b> - provide summary of the extent to which the report meets or fails to meet the criteria provided under each parameter. Please also include suggestion on how to improve future evaluation practice. The overall review, rating, and the executive feedback will be provided to the evaluation commissioning office.</li> </ul>

Parameter Weight (%)	1: Object and context	5	5: Conclusions and lessons learned	20	Are weightings equal to 100%?  OK
	2: Purpose and scope	5	6: Recommendations	15	
	3: Methodology	15	7: Gender Equality and Human Rights (UN-SWAP)	10	
	4: Findings	20	8: Presentation	10	

PART I: REPORT DETAILS					
Report title	Evaluation of Joint Program on Rural Women Economic Empowerment (RWEE)	Geographical Coverage	National		
Sequence number	10	Evaluators	Filimon Hadaro H/Rahel Jigi	Year	2018
Region	Eastern and Southern	Country(ies)	Ethiopia	Type of intervention evaluated	Joint
Portfolio Budget (USD)	USD 3,198,256	Evaluation Budget (USD)	N/A	Reviewer	Claudia Marcondes
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Women's access to			Review Date	01 January 2020

PART II: THE EIGHT KEY PARAMETERS					
SECTION 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION (weight 5%)	RATING	Good			
Does the report present a clear and full description of the 'object' of the evaluation?	67%	Executive Feedback on Section 1			
1.1 The report clearly specify the object of the evaluation, and provides clear and complete description of the intervention's logic or theory of change, intended beneficiaries by type and by geographic location(s) as well as resources from all sources including humans and budgets, and modalities.	Fully	Good overview of the intervention, its context and rationale is included. Information about the needs it attempts to address, the activities undertaken (in line with the ToC and/or goals and objectives), the key stakeholders/partners as well as resources, are useful for the reader to understand the analysis provided in the findings section. Add some information on the role of partners and stakeholders as well as details to situate the project as to its implementation stage.			
1.2 The context includes factors that have a direct bearing on the object of the evaluation: social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional. This also includes explanation of the contextual gender equality and human rights issues, roles, attitudes and relations.	Fully				
1.3 The key stakeholders involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described.	Mostly				
1.4 The report identifies the implementation status of the object, including its phase of implementation and any significant changes (e.g. plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time and explains the implications of those changes for the evaluation.	Not at all				
SECTION 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)	RATING	Very Good			
Are the evaluation purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?	100%	Executive Feedback on Section 2			
2.1 Purpose, objectives and use of evaluation: The evaluation report provides clear explanation of the purpose and the objectives of the evaluation including the intended use and users of the evaluation and how the information will be used.	Fully	The Purpose, objectives and use of evaluation are clearly outlined. Information about the evaluation scope (incl. geographic coverage) are also included showing the rationale for the evaluation coverage.			
2.2 Evaluation Scope: The evaluation report provides clear description of the scope of the evaluation, including justification of what the evaluation covers and did not cover (thematically, geographically etc) as well as the reasons for this scope (eg., specifications by the ToRs, lack of access to particular geographic areas for political or safety reasons at the time of the evaluation, lack of data/evidence on particular elements of the intervention).	Fully				
SECTION 3 : METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)	RATING	Very Good			
Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and appropriate, and the rationale for the methodological choice justified?	100%	Executive Feedback on Section 3			
3.1 Methodology: The report specifies and provides complete description of a relevant design and sets of methods including the chosen evaluation criteria, questions, and performance standards. The methods employed are appropriate for analyzing gender and rights issues identified in the evaluation scope.	Fully	The report contains a good overview of the methodology with details of the sampling strategy used. Descriptions of data collection, analysis and triangulation are included, along with identification of a few limitations. Some details are provided in the Annex (List of KIs, Evaluation questions & Data sources). The number of people consulted seems appropriate for the scope of the evaluation. The methods seem appropriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results. The JP evaluation applied UN Women standards on ethics, compliance with human rights and gender issues, according to the report, with references to ensuring the confidentiality of the responses and privacy of the participants. The causes and effects of gender inequality were considered in designing the data collection tools.			
3.2 Data collection, analysis and sampling: The report clearly describes the methods for the data sources, rationale for their selection, data collection and analysis methods. The report includes discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure data accuracy and overcome data limitations.	Fully				
3.3 Stakeholders Consultation: The evaluation report gives a complete description of stakeholder's consultation process in the evaluation, including the rationale for selecting the particular level and activities for consultation.	Fully				
3.4 Limitations: The report presents clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias.	Fully				
3.5 Ethics: The evaluation report includes a discussion of the extent to which the evaluation design included ethical safeguards and mechanisms and measures that were implemented to ensure that the evaluation process conformed with relevant ethical standards including but not limited to informed consent, non-maleficence, beneficence, and justice.	Fully				
SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)	Rating	Very Good			
Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?	100%	Executive Feedback on Section 4			
4.1 The evaluation report findings provide sufficient levels of high quality evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation questions and criteria.	Fully	Findings systematically address the evaluation questions and criteria. Findings are presented with clarity and logic, and are properly grounded on evidence. Outputs and indicators are assessed individually, supported by detailed information and explanations of causal factors. Overall, findings are well substantiated, and show that analysis is grounded on multiple lines of evidence.			
4.2 Findings are clearly supported by and respond to the evidence presented, reflecting systematic and appropriate analysis and interpretation of the data; they are free from subjective judgements made.	Fully				
4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.	Fully				
4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g. avoid ambiguities).	Fully				
SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)	Rating	Very Good			
Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?	85%	Executive Feedback on Section 5			
5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.	Fully	Conclusions are well formulated and are directly connected to the findings, providing clear responses to the evaluation questions and a balance of identified strengths and weaknesses. Suggest that they are broadened to go beyond the findings, providing more explanations and insights. It is important to show that are properly grounded on the evidence and represent a range of views. A good set of lessons is included.			
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Mostly				
5.3 Conclusions present strengths and weaknesses of the object (policy, programmes, project's or other intervention) being evaluated, based on the evidence presented and taking due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders.	Fully				
5.4 Lessons Learned: When presented, the lessons learned section stems logically from the findings, presents an analysis of how they can be applied to different contexts and/or different sectors, and takes into account evidential limitations such as generalizing from single point observations.	Mostly				
SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	Rating	Good			
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	70%	Executive Feedback on Section 6			
6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Fully	Recommendations flow from findings and conclusion. They are well articulated, contain prioritization and/or classification information and are directed to specific agencies. They are also actionable but could contain a more details about suggestions on how they should be implemented. Suggest to also add a description of the process undertaken and/or consultations held for their formulation.			
6.2 The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	Not at all				
6.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g. reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up) and actionable.	Mostly				

6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Fully	
<b>SECTION 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS (weight 15%)</b>	Score	<b>Meets Requirements</b>
<b>Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? Note: this section will be rated according to UN SWAP standards.</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 7</b>
7.1 GEWE is integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEWE related data will be collected.	Fully integrated (3)	GEEW is included in the evaluation scope and evaluation questions related to gender/HR are included. Cross-cutting issues (GE/HR) were included as a standalone criteria. The methodology uses mixed data collection methods, which seem appropriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results. The report refers to ensuring the confidentiality of the responses and privacy of the participants and to the consideration of causes and effects of gender inequality in the design of the data collection tools. The evaluation applied UN Women standards on ethics, compliance with human rights and gender issues. The background section provides explanations to the gender issues the JP is to address. The evaluation assesses gender related outcomes and findings include gender perspective. GEEW aspects also included in conclusions and recommendations.
7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated (3)	
7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated (3)	
<b>SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)</b>	Rating	<b>Very Good</b>
<b>Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 8</b>
8.1 Report is logically structured, well written and presented with clarity and coherence (e.g. the structure and presentation is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and subtitles; context, purpose and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations) and written in an accessible language with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors.	Fully	The report reads well but it is a bit long (about 60 pages). Most key annexes are included (the ToRs, the evaluation questionnaires, the list of stakeholders interviewed, a complete evaluation matrix showing data sources and indicators). Needed basic information is included in the first pages of the report and the executive summary is complete but could also be shortened (14 pages).
8.2 The title page and opening pages provide key basic information on the name of evaluand, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluated object, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents -including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes-, list of acronyms/abbreviations, page numbers.	Fully	
8.3 The Executive Summary is a stand-alone section that includes an overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key findings, conclusions and recommendations. The Executive summary should be reasonably concise.	Mostly	
8.4 Annexes should include, when not present in the body of the report: Terms of Reference, Evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, list of site visits, data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires), list of documentary evidence. Other appropriate annexes could include: additional details on methodology, copy of the results chain, information about the evaluator(s).	Fully	
<b>Additional Information</b>		
Identify aspects of <b>good practice</b> of the evaluation	Case stories were documented about successful women in the districts chosen and provide an interesting add-on to the reading.	

PART III: THE OVERALL RATING			
Key Guiding Question	Total weighted score %	Overall Rating	Overall Comments
Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence?	89.49	Very Good	This is a very good evaluation report. It provides clear responses to the evaluation criteria, grounded on proper research, in-depth analysis and substantiation with good examples and details. The conclusions could provide more insights on the issues identified and a good set of recommendations is included.