



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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Overall reports are rated against a 4-point scale (Very Good, Good, Fair and Unsatisfactory), which is an aggregated rating of eight parameters.</li> <li>- Each overarching parameter is rated against a 4-point scale (Fully, Mostly, Partially and Not at all).</li> <li>- Parameters such as evaluation methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations are given more weight.</li> <li>- <b>Executive feedback</b> - 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.</li> </ul>
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 of the EU supported EVAWG project "UNite to Fight Violence against Women in Georgia"	Geographical Coverage	National
Sequence number	12	Evaluators	Laurie Zivetz :Natia
Region	Europe and Central Asia	Country(ies)	Georgia
Portfolio Budget (USD)		Evaluation Budget (USD)	N/A
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Prevent VAW&G and	Reviewer	Claudia Marcondes
		Review Date	01 January 2020

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?	83%	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 1</b>
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.	Mostly	There is a good description of the project, its context and rationale. Information about the needs it attempts to address, the activities undertaken (in line with the ToC and/or goals and objectives), the key stakeholders/partners (and their role) are also provided. Suggest including information about the financial resources, to help the reader to have a sense of the magnitude of the intervention. Add a logic model if possible and situate the project as to its implementation stage upfront.
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.	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.	Mostly	
<b>SECTION 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>Good</b>
Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?	67%	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 2</b>
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 the body of the report (as opposed to only referencing the ToRs). Provide a description of the scope, including the activities, the timing and the geographic coverage of the evaluation. A good description of the evaluation scope is key to help the reader understand the evaluation coverage and be confident on its appropriateness to enable enough information for the assessments that follow.
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	
<b>SECTION 3 : METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>Good</b>
Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and appropriate, and the rationale for the methodological choice justified?	68%	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 3</b>
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	Methodology is too generally explained, with information about the lines of evidence, data analysis and triangulation and identification of a few limitations. The details provided in the Annex (List of KIIs, Evaluation matrix, etc) help to provide the reader with assurance that the methods were appropriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results. It is important to include more details about these, to show the methods and their appropriateness. The number of people consulted also seem adequate for the scope of the evaluation and the report refers to census sampling of KIIs, but more information on the sampling strategy could be included, to demonstrate that there is a good level of representation of KIIs in line with the range of project activities and their geographical distribution. Also, a discussion on ethics is included, with references to adherence to ethics or specific evaluation standards (e.g. UNEG Guidelines) and to steps taken to respect time, sensitivity and confidentiality of issues and informants. Suggest to also include details on these.
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.	Mostly	
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 avoidance	Mostly	
<b>SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Good</b>
Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?	50%	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 4</b>
4.1 The evaluation report findings provide sufficient levels of high quality evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation questions and criteria.	Partly	Findings are articulated around evaluation criteria but analysis does not necessarily follow evaluation questions. The assessment of effectiveness should be clearly articulated against project expected results (pp. 16). Suggest improving these by providing direct responses to the evaluation questions in a more clear and logical way. Also, all Findings should be supported by detailed information and explanations of causal factors, in addition to descriptions of activities undertaken, to show their contributions towards the expected results. The report also needs to demonstrate that all findings are properly substantiated, showing the evidence for the statements made through explanations and citations. It is important to demonstrate 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.	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).	Mostly	
<b>SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Fair</b>
Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?	37%	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 5</b>
5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.	Partly	Conclusions are too summarized and high level. They should contain well formulated set of responses to the evaluation questions/criteria, directly connected to the findings. The conclusions could have been better substantiated (in line with better substantiated findings, as identified earlier). Conclusions should also provide insights and a balance between strengths and weaknesses identified. It is important to show that also represent a range of views. A good lessons are included and are well articulated and generalized for future application.
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Partly	
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.	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.	Fully	
<b>SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Good</b>
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	60%	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 6</b>
6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Fully	Recommendations flow from findings and conclusion. They are prioritized and classified and are also directed to specific agencies for implementation. Most of them articulate what needs to be done but should also contain details/recommendations as to how it should be done and improvement is expected from them (what they are supposed to address). Suggest adding 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.	Partly	

6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Fully	
<b>SECTION 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS (weight 15%)</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Approaching Requirements</b>
<b>Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? Note: this section will be rated according to UN SWAP standards.</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 7</b>
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)	The evaluation scope fully included gender as appropriate for assessment related to VAW. Even if no references are made to assessment of existence of data on gender related results, GEEW is included in the evaluation scope and evaluation questions related to gender/HR are included. The methodology is partially gender-responsive. Methodology is too generally explained and there are no references to gender in the methodology and/or to the lack of indicators to measure gender progress. The methodology uses mixed data collection methods, but more information is needed on the sampling strategy to demonstrate that there is a good level of representation of KIs in line with the range of project activities and their geographical distribution (let alone gender-representation). Suggest providing information about the sampling frame, with references to data collection related to beneficiary/target groups. References to adherence to ethics or specific evaluation standards (e.g. UNEG Guidelines) are included along with steps taken to respect time, sensitivity and confidentiality of issues and informants. Gender analysis was partially reflected. A background section explains the gender problematique. The report tackles gender related outcomes and findings discuss implementation of gender initiatives but they could have provided more analysis of contributions, in addition to descriptions of activities. The findings do not necessarily include data analysis. GEEW aspects also included in conclusions and recommendations are geared to improvements to gender programme but similarly they need better substantiation and more in-depth 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)	
<b>SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Very Good</b>
<b>Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 8</b>
8.1 <b>Report is logically structured, well written and presented</b> 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 is generally well written and the structure and length are appropriate. Ensure all graphs, tables and figures contain source information. Key annexes are included (the ToRs, the evaluation questionnaires, list of interviewees, evaluation matrix showing evaluation questions and lines of evidence) which help to show the robustness of the work undertaken. Most needed basic information is included in the first pages of the report along with a list of tables/figures. The executive summary is complete and concise. Suggest to avoid presenting findings and recommendations using pointform, and instead, summarizing them and providing explanations and substantiation to each point.
8.2 <b>The title page and opening pages</b> 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 <b>The Executive Summary</b> 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 <b>Annexes</b> 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).	Fully	
<b>Additional Information</b>		
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?	58.30	Fair	This report contains a very general description of the methodology and the analysis in the findings section does not necessarily follow evaluation questions. The assessment of effectiveness should have been more clearly articulated against project expected results, providing direct responses to the evaluation questions. Findings also need to go beyond describing the activities and deliverables of the project, to include more in-depth analysis of contributions towards project outcomes.