

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	Final evaluation for the National Strategy for Women			Geographical Coverage	National
Sequence number	4	Evaluators	Etta van Sprang Abby	Year	2019
Region	Arab States	Country(ies)	Jordan	Type of intervention evaluated	Project
Portfolio Budget (USD)	N/A	Evaluation Budget (USD)	N/A	Reviewer	Claudia Marcondes
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Women's access to			Review Date	30 December 2019

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.	Partly	There is need for more information about the intervention, beyond a brief description of its context and rationale. Provide a description of the overall project/strategy, the activities undertaken and participating stakeholders, as well as an overview of their geographic distribution in the country. Also include information about resources allocated to the Strategy, to help the reader understand the analysis provided in the findings section. Add a logic model if possible and 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.	Mostly	
SECTION 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)	RATING	Good
Are the evaluation purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?	67%	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. There is need to add more information to the evaluation scope, including thematic and geographic coverage, establishing linkages between the evaluation scope and the project activities. A proper justification for the evaluation scope is key to provide 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).	Partly	
SECTION 3 : METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)	RATING	Fair
Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and appropriate, and the rationale for the methodological choice justified?	45%	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.	Partly	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 questions & Data sources). The methods seem appropriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results. However, the number of people consulted seems low for the scope of the evaluation and in lieu of more information about the Strategy (the stakeholders involved and the geographical distribution of project activities), it is difficult 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 stakeholder's consultation process in the evaluation, including the rationale for selecting the particular level and activities for consultation.	Mostly	
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.	Mostly	
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	Fully	
SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)	Rating	Good
Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?	53%	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	While there is an effort to address all evaluation questions and criteria, and the findings could be valid, they need to be better grounded on the evidence. The assessments should be based on more in-depth analysis of issues and circumstances and grounded on evidence. For example, in the Relevance section, the report links lack of awareness about the Strategy among beneficiaries to its inappropriateness to address their needs. While these could be linked, it is important to consider a range of opinions on the topic, show more analysis by drawing opinions on the issues the strategy attempts to address. Examples exist throughout other sections of similar analysis. It is key to also ensure the findings are supported by detailed information and explanations of causal factors are provided. Suggest to add in-depth assessments (as opposed to simple descriptions), limit the repetition of the same explanations and better construct the arguments. It is important to show systematically 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.	Mostly	
4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.	Partly	
4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities).	Partly	
SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)	Rating	Good
Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?	37%	Executive Feedback on Section 5
5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.	Partly	A set of conclusions was formulated, directly connected to the findings, providing clear responses to the evaluation questions. They are presented in a very summarized format (point form) and could have been better substantiated (in line with better substantiated findings, as identified earlier). While there is a good balance between strengths and weaknesses put forward, the conclusions should provide insights. It is important to show that are properly grounded on the evidence and represent a range of views. Also, include a set of lessons learned, properly articulating what worked well (or not) in the project experience. They should be generalized to enable their applicability in other contexts.
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Partly	
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.	Not at all	
SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	Rating	Fair
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	40%	Executive Feedback on Section 6
6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Mostly	Recommendations flow from findings and conclusions but are also presented in a summarized format (point form) and do not include prioritization and/or classification. They should be prioritized, geared to specific agencies and clear 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. 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.	Not at all	
SECTION 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS (weight 15%)	Score	Approaching Requirements
Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? Note: this section will be rated according to UN SWAP standards.	44%	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)	GEWE is satisfactorily integrated in the evaluation scope. The report shows some weaknesses regarding the full description of the scope and gender was not included a standalone criteria, but overall the evaluation includes dedicated evaluation questions related to gender/HR are included and all evaluation objectives related to Gender. The methodology was partially gender-responsive. There are little references to gender in the methodology section and the report does not comment on the lack of indicators to measure gender progress. The methodology uses mixed data collection methods, but the sampling frame does not refer to focus on beneficiary/target groups. There are references to confidentiality and ethical guidelines but more information is needed to show that data and analysis methods integrated gender considerations. The report partially reflects gender analysis. Analysis of gender issues is properly included in the background section. The findings refer to gender perspective but more in-depth assessments and analysis could be provided, specifically regarding GEWE. While there is an effort to address all evaluation questions and criteria, and the findings could be valid, they also need to be better grounded on the evidence. No unanticipated effects were identified. GEWE aspects also referenced in conclusions and recommendations but, while these are connected to the findings, they are presented in a very summarized format (point form), reflecting less comprehensive analysis.
7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Partially integrated (1)	
7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.	Partially integrated (1)	
SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)	Rating	Good
Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?	83%	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 length and structure are appropriate but the use of point form in sections such as conclusions and recommendations should be avoided as to ensure clear articulation and complete explanations of the points put forward. Several key annexes are included (list of stakeholders, the evaluation questionnaires, a complete evaluation matrix showing data sources and indicators). Suggest to also add the ToRs to the Annex and complete the list of stakeholders with the names of representatives consulted. Needed basic information is included in the first pages of the report and the executive summary is complete. Suggest to better articulate the recommendations in the Ex. Summary (avoid point form) to provide the reader with a complete understanding and proper justifications.
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.	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).	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	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?	50.19	Fair	While an attempt has been made by this evaluation to address all evaluation questions, the report needs to be used with caution. The assessments need more in-depth analysis of issues and should also be grounded on more solid evidence. The methodology seems appropriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments (of GE/HR specific results) but the number of people consulted seems low for the scope of the evaluation. In lieu of more information about the Strategy (the stakeholders involved and the geographical distribution of project activities), it is difficult to have a clear sense of the extent to which the sampling strategy was appropriate. A proper justification for the evaluation scope could have provided the reader with more confidence on the findings, conclusions and recommendations that flow from them.