

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 the Serbia National Action Plan for GE			Geographical Coverage	National
Sequence number	15	Evaluators	Anamaria Golem-Dzenita	Year	2019
Region	Europe and Central Asia	Country(ies)	Serbia	Type of intervention evaluated	Programme
Portfolio Budget (USD)		Evaluation Budget (USD)	N/A	Reviewer	Claudia Marcondes
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Gender response plans			Review Date	02 January 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?	33%	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 much information about the context and rationale for the intervention, as well as the ToC and/or goals and objectives. Suggest to summarize these and add a snapshot upfront in the report of the key activities undertaken, the key stakeholders/partners (and their role) as well as information about resources, and details about the intervention 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(ies) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described.	Not at all	
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	Good
Are the evaluation's 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 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. There is need to add more information to the evaluation scope, in addition to the descriptions of the evaluation criteria and questions, to include 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 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).	Partly	
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?	58%	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.	Mostly	The report contains a good description of the methodology, criteria, questions, lines of evidence, data analysis and triangulation and identification of a few limitations. The methods seem appropriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results and there are references to the application of key principles for gender-responsive evaluation but no details are provided. The number of people consulted seems appropriate for the scope of the evaluation but in lieu of more information about the project activities, the stakeholders involved and the geographical distribution, 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 informant, survey respondents and focus group discussions. There are 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.	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.	Mostly	
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?	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.	Partly	The findings seem to be grounded on evidence, are supported by detailed information and explanations of causal factors however, the analysis seem to focus on quantitative assessments at the outcome levels (goal and objectives), grounded on national surveys and other evidence (if available), which could raise issues related to the "attribution" of results, which is not clearly discussed. Descriptions of the completion of some National Action Plan (NAP) planned activities/government programmes (in line with objectives) are provided but the evaluation does not necessarily include qualitative assessments of their "contributions" to the outcomes, under the justification that precise indicators and/or baselines are not available. This could be partially justified by issues related to the alignment of activities with NAP with goals and objectives, and/or budget/resources limitations but the evaluation does not provide such justification upfront and/or include information about the activities and financial resources attached to NAP. Also, the evaluation uses a system to rate the criteria, but there are no explanations as to how the scores were assigned (based on the evaluator's view and/or stakeholders aggregate responses).
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.	Partly	
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?	87%	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 also provide good insights and there is a good balance between strengths and weaknesses but it is important to show that are properly grounded on the evidence and represent a range of views. A good set of well articulated and generalized lessons is included.
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Mostly	
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.	Fully	
SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	80%	Executive Feedback on Section 6
6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Fully	Recommendations flow from findings and conclusions. They are clearly articulated and specifically addressed to the Coordination Body for Gender Equality, but need to be prioritized. A description of the process undertaken and/or consultations held for their formulation is included.
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.	Fully	

6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Not at all	
SECTION 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS (weight 15%)		Meets Requirements
Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? Note: this section will be rated according to UN SWAP standards.	Score 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)	GEEW is fully integrated into the evaluation as appropriate. The evaluation objectives are gender-related. valuation questions relate to gender/HR are included. It also included all 3 gender-related NAP (National Action Plan for Gender Equality) priority areas. The methodology is satisfactory regarding gender-responsiveness. It uses mixed data collection methods, which seem appropriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results and there are references to the application of key principles for gender-responsive evaluation but no details are provided. There are no references to the sampling frame focusing on beneficiary/target groups and/or the use of confidentiality and separate interviews/ focus groups for men and women. But the report mentions the adherence to ethics or specific evaluation standards (eg UNEG Guidelines) during the evaluation design and conduct. There is need to add more information specifying how data and analysis methods integrated gender considerations. Gender analysis is satisfactorily reflected in the report. A background section explains the gender problematic. The report assesses gender related outcomes and findings analyze results related to implementation of gender initiatives but the descriptions of the completion of some National Action Plan (NAP) planned activities/government programmes (in line with objectives) are not necessarily accompanied by qualitative assessments of their "contributions" to the outcomes. No unanticipated effects were identified. GEEW aspects also included in conclusions and recommendations are geared to improvements to gender programme. While the criteria was fully met, the analysis in these sections are not strong
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%)		Good
Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?	Rating 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 (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.	Mostly	The report is well written and presented, with appropriate structure but it is too long (120+ pages) and should be shortened. The Findings section starts at page 50, which is often were most evaluations end. Only a few key annexes are included (list of interviewees and docs consulted). Suggest to also add the ToRs, the evaluation matrix and the evaluation questionnaires to the annex, to help to demonstrate the robustness of the work. Most needed basic information is included in the first pages of the report and the executive summary is concise. Suggest to include some information about the evaluation methodology in the Ex. Summary as well as lists of figures and tables.
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.	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.	Mostly	
8.4 Annexes should include, when not present in the body of the report: ToR, evaluation matrix, 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).	Partly	
Additional Information		
Identify aspects of <i>good practice</i> of the evaluation		

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?	68.96	Good	This is a good evaluation report, with in-depth assessments in line with the evaluation criteria. It is important to ground the analysis on the NAP planned activities and/or resources, to ensure the findings properly represent "contributions" and the results identified can be properly "attributed" to the NAP. Conclusions and recommendations are pertinent.