

| 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 | UN Women Programme Eid Bi Eid I & II Final Evaluation | | | Geographical Coverage | National |
| Sequence number | 3 | Evaluators | Layla Moubayed ;Henrik | Year | 2019 |
| Region | Arab States | Country(ies) | Jordan | Type of intervention evaluated | Project |
| Portfolio Budget (USD) | 5,886,848.39 | 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 | 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 | There is good information about the intervention, its context and rationale. The ToC is also provided, along with information about the needs, the activities undertaken, the key stakeholders/partners and overall resources and situation regarding implementation stage. This is useful to guide the reader in the understanding of the analysis provided in the findings section. A logic model is provided in the Annex. |
| 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. Information about the evaluation scope, including thematic and geographic coverage are also provided with good linkages between the evaluation scope and the project activities |
| 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? | 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. Details on the methods and sampling strategy are provided, complemented by the information provided in the Annex. This provides the reader with confidence on the appropriateness of the methods used in the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results. The number of people consulted is comprehensive and the coverage is appropriate. There are also 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 | Fully | |
| SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%) | Rating | Very Good |
| Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence? | 90% | 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 findings are presented with clarity and logic and address all evaluation questions and criteria. Suggest to include analysis related to financial use of resources in the assessments of efficiency. Overall, they are properly grounded on evidence, well substantiated and supported by detailed information and explanations of causal factors. It is important to demonstrate systematically throughout the report 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. | Fully | |
| 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? | 68% | Executive Feedback on Section 5 |
| 5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings. | Fully | The report does not include a set of conclusions in a specific section, but these are included in line with each finding. Suggest highlighting these, by adding a section presenting a set of conclusions in response to the evaluation questions. Ensure these conclusions go beyond the findings and provide more insights and further explanations to the findings. It is also important to ensure they reflect the views of a diverse set of stakeholders. A good set of lessons are included, reflecting both project strengths and weaknesses, properly generalized. |
| 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. | Fully | |
| SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%) | Rating | Good |
| Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order? | 63% | Executive Feedback on Section 6 |
| 6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions. | Fully | Recommendations flow from findings and conclusion. They are clearly articulated with prioritization and/or classification. They generally specify the agencies responsible for the implementation, but more details are needed regarding "relevant responsible parties" and the specifics regarding what needs to be done, how it should be done, etc, with 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. | Mostly | |
| 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 100% | 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) | The report clearly shows integration of gender in its scope. The Purpose, objectives and use of evaluation are clearly outlined, refers to integration of gender mainstreaming, evaluation questions related to gender/HR are included and gender is a standalone criteria. There are no references to lack of indicators to measure gender progress. The methodology used was fully appropriate for gender responses. The report contains a good overview of the methodology regarding data analysis and triangulation and identification of a few limitations. Details on the methods and sampling strategy are provided, complemented by the information provided in the Annex. The sampling frame refers to focus on beneficiary/target groups and the use of confidentiality and separate interviews/ focus groups for men and women. The evaluation shows how data and analysis methods integrated gender considerations with descriptions of techniques and tools used. This provides the reader with confidence on the appropriateness of the methods used in the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results. The number of people consulted is comprehensive and the coverage is appropriate. There are also references to adherence to ethics or specific evaluation standards (e.g. UNEG Guidelines) during the evaluation design and conduct. The findings, conclusions and recommendations fully reflect gender analysis. The findings are presented with clarity and logic and address all evaluation questions and criteria. The report also assesses gender related outcomes and findings include gender perspective. A background section is also included to explain the gender problematic. No unanticipated effects were identified. The report does not include a set of conclusions in a specific section, but the conclusions are presented in line with each finding and as such GEEW aspects are also included in conclusions. Recommendations are geared to improvements to gender programme. |
| 7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected. | Fully integrated (3) | |
| 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? | Score 80% | 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 reads well but it is a bit long (about 59 pages). Some key annexes are included (the ToRs, the project logical framework, the evaluation questionnaires, a complete evaluation matrix showing data sources and indicators). Suggest to also include the evaluation questionnaires in the Annex. This helps to show the robustness of the work undertaken. Also, ensure all graphs and figures are legible and properly formatted (Logic Framework/Stakeholder analysis are not). Most needed basic information is included in the first pages of the report and the executive summary is complete and concise but it is important to include more information regarding the recommendations (currently presented in point form). Suggest to add a list of graphs and figures and a conclusions section. |
| 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. | 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: 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 good practice of the evaluation | This evaluation shows well how data and analysis methods integrated gender considerations and provides good overview of techniques and tools used. | |

| 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? | 84.16 | Good | This is a good evaluation report. It is well written and provides in-depth assessments in response to the evaluation questions and criteria. A good set of lessons is also included. The report could be improved with a good conclusions section and more details/actionable recommendations. |