

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	Formative Evaluation of Community and National Level Actions for Promoting Gender Equality and Engaging		Geographical Coverage	Regional
Sequence number	2	Evaluators	SHUAA MARRI (Male)	Year
Region	Arab States	Country(ies)	LEBANON,	Type of intervention evaluated
Portfolio Budget (USD)	10,652,036.00	Evaluation Budget (USD)	N/A	Reviewer
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Prevent VAW&G and N/A			Review Date
				30 December 2019

PART II: THE EIGHT KEY PARAMETERS

SECTION 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION (weight 5%)	RATING	Very Good
Does the report present a clear and full description of the 'object' of the evaluation?	100%	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	Very good description of the intervention, its context and rationale, including intended beneficiaries and geographic location. Context is also well described including gender issues along with key stakeholders, with more detailed information provided in the Annex. While not specifically mentioned, the reader has a complete sense of the implementation status.
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.	Fully	
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.	Fully	
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 in line with the ToRs. There is also good description of the evaluation scope, geographic coverage, and linkages between the evaluation scope and the project activities. This provides the reader with confidence on its appropriateness.
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	
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 regarding data analysis and triangulation and identification of a few limitations. The details provided in the Annex (List of KIIs, Evaluation questions & Data sources) helps to show the robustness of the work. The methods seem appropriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results. A good number of people was consulted as appropriate for the scope of the evaluation, covering the geographical distribution of project activities. Good description of sampling strategy was provided along with references to adherence to ethics or specific evaluation standards (e.g. UNEG Guidelines) during the evaluation design and conduct.
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.	Fully	
SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?	83%	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	The findings address the evaluation questions and criteria set by the ToRs. The findings are presented with clarity and logic. Some findings could be better articulated to properly reflect the analysis in the paragraphs that follow (e.g. findings report overall achievements, while analysis only presents achievements in a few countries). For the most part, findings are well grounded on evidence from multiple sources and supported by detailed information. In certain cases, individual/anecdotal evidence is used but not necessarily accompanied by the evidence gathered through other data collection means. Ensure these are properly positioned and add more explanations of causal factors as needed (e.g. Finding 3).
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.	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?	93%	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. They provide excellent insights, are well substantiated and contain a good balance between strengths and weaknesses. Suggest to show that they are properly grounded on the evidence (with more explanations) and represent a range of views. A good set of lessons is also included. Ensure that all of them are properly articulated with explanations about what worked (or not) in the project implementation and that they are also generalized, so that they can be applied in other contexts.
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Fully	
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.	Mostly	
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 a process of consultation. They are aligned with findings and conclusion but are not clearly articulated with prioritization and/or classification. They should be prioritized, geared to specific agencies and clearly articulate what needs to be done, how it should be done and improvement is expected from them (what they are supposed to address). They should contain enough details to enable their implementation.
6.2 The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	Fully	
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.	Not at all	

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.	89%	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.	Fully integrated (3)	It is clear that GEEW was fully integrated in the evaluation scope. Even though an assessment of data on gender related results was not referred to, the evaluation scope integrates gender and evaluation questions related to gender/HR are included. Gender is also a standalone criteria. The methodology was satisfactory for GEEW assessments. The report contains a good overview of the methodology regarding data analysis and triangulation and identification of a few limitations. The methodology uses mixed data collection methods, the sampling frame refers to focus on beneficiary/target groups and the use of confidentiality and separate interviews/ focus groups for men and women. It also refers to the use of a gender-responsive approach in the evaluation process but more information is needed to show how these were implemented and the data and analysis methods used to integrate gender considerations. The report does not refer to the lack of indicators to measure gender progress. The details provided in the Annex (List of KIIs, Evaluation questions & Data sources) helps to show the robustness of the work. Good description of sampling strategy was provided along with references to adherence to ethics or specific evaluation standards (e.g UNEG Guidelines) during the evaluation design and conduct.
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.	Fully integrated (3)	
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 (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 structure and length are appropriate. Key annexes are included (the ToRs, the evaluation questionnaires, a complete evaluation matrix showing data sources and indicators, etc). showing the robustness of the work undertaken. The report is well written, with proper titles, headings and sections. Needed basic information is included in the first pages of the report and the executive summary is complete. Suggest to add a list of acronyms, as well as lists of tables, graphs and figures.
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.	Partly	
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: 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	
Additional Information		
Identify aspects of <i>good practice</i> of the evaluation	This reports includes a very good description of the sampling strategy used, clearly linked to the project activities, demonstrating proper distribution of stakeholders and geographic locations.	

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?	89.05	Very Good	This is a very well written and well researched evaluation report. It clearly addresses the expectations presented in the ToRs, presenting clear responses to the evaluation questions based on in-depth assessments. Improvements could be made to the recommendations section, by providing more actionable steps as highlighted earlier.