



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.	- Overall reports are rated against a 4-point scale (Very Good, Good, Fair and Unsatisfactory), which is an aggregated rating of eight parameters. - Each overarching parameter is rated against a 4-point scale (Fully, Mostly, Partially and Not at all). - Parameters such as evaluation methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations are given more weight. - Executive feedback - 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.
Parameter Weight (%)	1: Object and context :5 2: Purpose and scope :5 3: Methodology :15 4: Findings :20	5: Conclusions and lessons learned :20 6: Recommendations :15 7: Gender Equality and Human Rights (UN-SWAP) :10 8: Presentation :10			Are weightings equal to 100%? OK

PART I: REPORT DETAILS

Report title	Mid-Term Evaluation: Enhancing Accountability for Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment in National Ref		Geographical Coverage	National	
Sequence number	16	Evaluators	Gheorghe Carase/Aleksandar	Year	2019
Region	Europe and Central Asia	Country(ies)	Ukraine	Type of intervention evaluated	Project
Portfolio Budget (USD)	\$ 5,524,239.00	Evaluation Budget (USD)	N/A	Reviewer	Claudia Marcondes
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Gender response plans	Women's leadership in peace,		Review Date	05 February 2020

PART II: THE EIGHT KEY PARAMETERS

SECTION 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION (weight 5%)	RATING	Fair
Does the report present a clear and full description of the 'object' of the evaluation?	25%	Executive Feedback on Section 1
1.1 The report clearly specifies the object of the evaluation, and provides a 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 human resources, budgets and modalities.	Partly	There is little information about the "object" upfront. The background and context section provide a good overview of the issues to be tackled by the project but it could provide more information about the "development" context in which the "project" was developed. The descriptions of the project, the ToC, the intended beneficiaries, the key partners and geographic locations are not included. Details about the implementation status should also have been included.
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.	Partly	
1.3 The key stakeholders involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(ies) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described.	Partly	
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's 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 a 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. Scope is also well described with proper justification of coverage, evaluation criteria and questions.
2.2 Evaluation Scope: The evaluation report provides a 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 ToR, 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	Good
Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and appropriate, and the rationale for the methodological choice justified?	67%	Executive Feedback on Section 3
3.1 Methodology: The report specifies and provides a complete description of the relevant design and sets of methods including the chosen evaluation criteria, questions, and performance standards. The methods employed are appropriate for analysing gender and human rights issues identified in the evaluation scope.	Fully	The report contains information about the methodology regarding data analysis and triangulation and identification of a few limitations. Some details are also provided in the Annex (List of KIIs, Evaluation questionnaires). The methods, criteria and questions seem appropriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results. The number of people consulted also seems appropriate. More information about the Sampling Strategy (the stakeholders involved and the geographical distribution of project activities), to enable the reader to have a clear sense of the extent to which the sampling strategy was appropriate. Suggest clearly outlining those, going beyond simply stating the coverage was appropriate, by providing more information about the rationale for the selection of key informants and site visits. References to adherence to ethics or specific evaluation standards (e.g. UNEG Guidelines) during the evaluation design and conduct are included.
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.	Partly	
3.3 Stakeholders Consultation: The evaluation report gives a complete description of the stakeholder consultation process in the evaluation, including the rationale for selecting the particular level and activities for consultation.	Partly	
3.4 Limitations: The report presents a 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, mechanisms and measures that were implemented to ensure that the evaluation process conformed to relevant ethical standards including but not limited to, informed consent of participants, confidentiality and	Fully	
SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)	Rating	Good
Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?	73%	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.	Mostly	Findings address most evaluation questions and criteria. Findings are well articulated and presented with clarity and logic. They are comprehensive, supported by detailed information and in-depth explanations of causal factors are provided in most cases. In some cases, there is need for more detailed analysis and further explanations, showing how the project contributed to the results, beyond describing that the achievement took place, but showing not only what was done and how was done and/or that the results are attributed to project activities. Suggest to also show evidence for the statements, to demonstrate systematically that analysis is grounded on multiple lines of evidence through citations and the use of sources. Also, ensure all graphs and figures are properly sourced.
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.	Mostly	
4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.	Mostly	
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?	83%	Executive Feedback on Section 5
5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.	Mostly	Only 5 conclusions are put forward, in line with each evaluation criteria. They are well formulated, provide good insights and present a good balance between strengths and weaknesses. Suggest broadening their scope to include a comprehensive set of conclusions in response to the evaluation questions in line with the findings. It is also important to show that are properly grounded on the evidence and represent a range of views. A good set of lessons is included but they need to be better articulated as "lessons" and properly generalize what worked/not worked well in the project experience, with a view to future application to other contexts.
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Fully	
5.3 Conclusions present the strengths and weaknesses of the object (policy, programmes, projects 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.	Partly	
SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	Rating	Good
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, 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 are in appropriate number and categorized. They clearly show connection to the specific findings and are prioritized. Ensure they are also fully directed to specific agencies responsible for implementation and that they also contain details to enable their implementation (not only what should be done, but also how it should be done). A description of the process undertaken and/or consultations held for their formulation should also be included.
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	
SECTION 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS (weight 15%)	Score	Meets Requirements
Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? Note: this section will be rated according to UN SWAP standards.	67%	Executive Feedback on Section 7
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.	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	GEEW is satisfactorily integrated. Even though there is no assessment of data on specific gender results, the evaluation scope integrates gender. The evaluation objectives relate to assessments of gender-related results, including the relevance of the approaches to development of gender responsive policies, accountability frameworks and gender responsive national reforms. Evaluation questions related to gender/HR are included but Gender is not a standalone criteria. Methodology is satisfactory regarding gender responsiveness. The report contains a good overview of the methodology regarding data analysis and triangulation and identification of limitations and mitigation strategies. The number of people consulted and sampling strategy seem appropriate for the scope of the evaluation. The methodology uses mixed data collection methods, the sampling frame refers to a gender breakdown, which are comprehensive and appropriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results. Also, references are included regarding adherence to ethics or specific evaluation standards (e.g. UNEG Guidelines) during the evaluation design and conduct. There is need to add more information specifying how data and analysis methods integrated gender considerations. There are no references to the lack of indicators to measure gender progress. The report satisfactorily reflects gender analysis. The background section contains some analysis of GEEW in the country. Findings include gender analysis related to the project outcome areas of intervention. Even though no unanticipated effects were identified, GEEW aspects are also included in the conclusions and recommendations.
7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	
7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	
SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)	Rating	Very Good
Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?	93%	Executive Feedback on Section 8
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 (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 is written in accessible language with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors.	Fully	The report structure and length are appropriate. Some key annexes are included (the ToRs, the evaluation questionnaires, lists of documents and people consulted). Suggest to also include an evaluation matrix to the Annex to help show how triangulation was done. Most needed basic information is included in the first pages of the report but lists of tables and graphs are missing. The executive summary is a stand-alone piece, complete and concise.
8.2 The title page and opening pages provide key basic information on the name of evaluator, 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.	Mostly	
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.	Fully	
8.4 Annexes should include, when not present in the body of the report: ToR, 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).	Mostly	
Additional Information		
Identify aspects of <i>good practice</i> of the evaluation	N/A	

PART III: THE OVERALL RATING			
Key Guiding Question	Total weighted score %	Overall Rating	Other reviewer's comments
Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence?	74.08	Good	This is a good evaluation report addressing most evaluation questions and overall evaluation criteria. The assessments are well substantiated and a good set of findings clearly articulating direct responses to the evaluation criteria are included. The conclusions and recommendations are also pertinent.