



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	Evaluation of UNW's programme support (partnerships)			Geographical Coverage	National
Sequence number	1	Evaluators	Silvia Salinas Mulder	Year	2019
Region	Latin Americas and	Country(ies)	Bolivia	Type of intervention evaluated	Regional/Thematic
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	Women's leadership and		Review Date	29 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?	42%	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	Good contextual information is included but there is need to provide more clarity regarding the evaluation object, beyond definitions and context information about "alliances". Provide a snapshot of the various "projects" and/or activities and the key stakeholders participating in these as to enable the reader to have a clear sense of the "project" or "portfolio" of projects, their goal and the results expected from their implementation (upfront in the report). Also, add information about financial resources and stage of implementation of the various projects. This helps the reader understand the analysis provided in the findings section.
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.	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 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. Good level of information on the evaluation scope is included along with a proper justification for the use of the lines of evidence. 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	Very Good
Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and appropriate, and the rationale for the methodological choice justified?	88%	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.	Mostly	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 seems appropriate for the scope of the evaluation. More information about the "object" would help the reader to have a clearer sense of the appropriateness of these. Suggest to include the Annexes cited to show the work done. The methods seem 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.
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	Fully	
SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?	80%	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	The report provides good responses to most evaluation questions and criteria. The assessments of efficiency should include the identification of financial resources (both planned and the expended) with explanations about any variations. The findings are presented with clarity and are logically articulated. Suggest to add more clear linkages and specific details related to contributions to expected outcomes. It is very important to show those, in addition to referring to their existence. For the most part, however, the findings are supported by detailed information and explanations of causal factors and are well substantiated, showing 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.	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	Good
Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?	72%	Executive Feedback on Section 5
5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.	Mostly	The report includes only 3 conclusions. While they are well formulated and reflect proper judgements linked to the findings, but not all issues articulated have been fully explained in the findings section. Suggest establishing more clear connection to them, and articulating a set of conclusions providing clear responses to the evaluation questions and/or criteria. Conclusions should also represent a better balance between strengths and weaknesses. It is also important to show that are properly grounded on the evidence and represent a range of views. Lessons are not included. Suggest including those, presenting what worked and not worked well in the alliances experiences in a generalized way as to enable their applicability in other situations.
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.	Partly	
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	
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	50%	Executive Feedback on Section 6
6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Partly	Recommendations flow from the analysis in the findings and could be broadened to beyond the 3 conclusions to which they are linked. They are properly articulated with prioritization and/or classification but need more information regarding 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 include information about 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	
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.	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.	Fully integrated (3)	Yes, GEWE is fully integrated. Even though there is no assessment of data on specific gender results, the evaluation scope integrates gender and evaluation questions related to gender/HR are included. Gender is also 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 focus on targeting women as Key Informants and the use of confidentiality 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
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.	Partially integrated (1)	
SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)	Rating	Very Good
Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?	63%	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.	Mostly	The report reads well but it is too long (about 93 pages). The report cites a few Annexes but does not include them. Suggest adding the following Annexes: the ToRs, the evaluation questionnaires, a complete evaluation matrix showing data sources and indicators. This helps to show the robustness of the work undertaken. Most needed basic information is included in the first pages of the report and the structure is proper but could be adjusted to include a section describing the project upfront. A complete executive summary is included but more information could also be included regarding the intervention, and the evaluation methodology.
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).	Not at all	
Additional Information		
Identify aspects of good practice 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?	71.16	Good	This is a good evaluation report, providing good assessments in line with the evaluation questions. The focus is on evaluating "strategic alliances" as the evaluation "object". However, this is not a clearly defined programme or portfolio and a ToC was not in place to guide the assessments against results typically found in evaluations regarding criteria, specially effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability issues. Yet, this is a well researched, and well-written document, with solid analysis and findings grounded on the actual evidence gathered.