

4+1 Rating	Visualisation	● ● ● ●	● ● ● ●	● ● ● ●	● ● ● ●	● ● ● ●	● ● ● ●	● ● ● ●
	Section & Overall Rating	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Fair	Unsatisfactory	Missing	Not Rated	
	Weighting (Score)	4	3	2	1	0	0	
	Implication	Exceeds UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with a high degree of confidence	Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with confidence	Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports in some regards, but not all. Decision makers may continue to use the evaluation with caution, but substantive improvements are possible.	Does not sufficiently meet the UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports; and thus decision makers cannot rely on the evaluation.	Important aspects of the evaluation that are required by the UNICEF/UNEG standards were found to be absent and so the evaluation report is incomplete.	An aspect of the evaluation was not rated for a legitimate reason that does not undermine the quality of evaluation report.	

NOTE to Reviewers: complete the cells formatted in Yellow

Title of the Evaluation Report														Evaluation of the Child Rights Monitoring Systems in Kosovo (UNSCR 1244) 2009-2015													
Report sequence number														2016/001													
Region														Central & Eastern Europe, Commonwealth of Independent States RO													
Year of Report Completion														2016													
Country														Kosovo													
ToRs present														Yes													
Date of Review														7/13/2016													
Name of reviewer														ImpactReady (incl. Merits)													
Classification of Evaluation Report														UNICEF managed													
Management of Evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation decisions)														UNICEF managed													
SPOA Correspondence														Health													
SPOA Correspondence														HIV/AIDS													
SPOA Correspondence														WASH													
SPOA Correspondence														Nutrition													
SPOA Correspondence														Education													
SPOA Correspondence														Child protection													
SPOA Correspondence														Social inclusion													
SPOA Correspondence														Gender equality (cross-cutting)													
SPOA Correspondence														Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)													
Evaluation object														Programme													
Evaluation type														Summative and formative													
Evaluation strategy														Qualitative													
Evaluation design														Experimental													
Evaluation level														Impact													
Geographic Scope														National													
SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)														Rating													
Question 1.														Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?													
														22%													
														Partly													
														Clear and relevant description of intended beneficiaries by type (i.e. institutions/organisations; communities; individuals...), by geographic location(s) (i.e. urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods, town/cities, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation)													
														Partly													
														Description of the relative importance of the object to UNICEF (e.g. in terms of size, influence, or positioning)													
														No													
Question 2.														Is the context of the intervention clearly described?													
														100%													
														Yes													
														Clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention (policy, socio-economic, political, institutional, international factors relevant to the implementation of the intervention)													
														Yes													
														Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the target groups for the intervention													
														Yes													
														Explanation of how the context relates to the implementation of the intervention													
														Yes													

0.3333

0.3333

0

1

1

1

Question 3.	Is the results chain or logic well articulated?	83%						
	Clear and complete description of the intervention's intended results	Mostly		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Intervention logic presented as a coherent theory of change, logic chain or logic framework	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
Question 4.	Are key stakeholders and their contributions clearly identified?	67%						
	Identification of implementing agency(ies), development partners, primary duty bearers, secondary duty bearers, and rights holders	Mostly		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF	Mostly		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated

Executive Feedback on Section A		Overall rating for Section	Criteria/Rubric					
The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarising here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best		Fair	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Fair	Unsatisfactory	Missing	Not Rated
This provides a useful introduction to the object of the evaluation, context, and stakeholders. The context is the strongest section with evidence-based relevant data. The object of the evaluation could have been more clearly described in terms of activities and scope. Stakeholders could have been categorised better. A key gap is providing an understanding of the beneficiaries, who they are and targeting.		4	Includes all the elements described for all questions in a clear and comprehensive manner	Includes all the elements described in a clear and comprehensive manner	Includes the majority of the elements described in a clear manner OR Includes all the elements but lacks clarity	Omits most of the elements described and lacks clarity	The items should be present but are not	The items are not present for a valid reason (explain)
Additional comments for Section A (recommendations for improvement)		Weighting						
		0.05						

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)		Rating	If not rated, provide reasons here					
Question 5.	Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?	83%						
	Specific identification of how the evaluation is intended to be used and to what this use is expected to achieve	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Identification of appropriate primary intended users of the evaluation	Mostly		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
Question 6.	Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?	100%						
	Clear and complete description of what the evaluation seeks to achieve by the end of the process with reference to any changes made to the objectives included in the ToR	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Clear and relevant description of the scope of the evaluation: what will and will not be covered (thematically, chronologically, geographically with key terms defined), as well as the reasons for this scope (e.g., 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)	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated

Executive Feedback on Section B		Overall rating for Section	Criteria/Rubric					
The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarising here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements		Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Fair	Unsatisfactory	Missing	Not Rated
This is a strong section with clear understanding of the evaluations purpose, potential uses, objective (beyond the criteria) and scope. The detail of its uses is particularly strong, as is the list of objectives. Further thought could have been given to the categorisation of users.		4	Includes all the elements described for all questions in a clear and comprehensive manner	Includes all the elements described in a clear and comprehensive manner	Includes the majority of the elements described in a clear manner OR Includes all the elements but lacks clarity	Omits most of the elements described and lacks clarity	The items should be present but are not	The items are not present for a valid reason (explain)
Additional comments for Section B (recommendations for improvement)		Weighting						
		0.05						

SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)		Rating	If not rated, provide reasons here					
Question 7.	Does the evaluation provide a relevant list of evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation?	67%						
	UNICEF evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria. Not all OECD/DAC criteria are relevant to all evaluation objectives and scopes. Standard OECD DAC Criteria include: Relevance; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact. Evaluations should also consider equity, gender and human rights (these can be mainstreamed into other criteria). Humanitarian evaluations should consider Coverage; Connectedness; Coordination; Protection; Security.	Mostly		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Clear and relevant presentation of the evaluation framework including clear evaluation questions used to guide the evaluation	Not Rated		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
Question 8.	Does the report specify methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?	58%						
	Clear and complete description of a relevant design and set of methods that are suitable for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope	Mostly		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Clear and complete description of the data sources, rationale for their selection and sampling strategy. This should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or if not, provide reasons for this), how accuracy is ensured, and the extent to which data limitations are mitigated	Mostly		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis, including triangulation of multiple lines and levels of evidence (if relevant)?	Mostly		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias?	Partly		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
Question 9.	Are ethical issues and considerations described?	33%						
	The evaluation should be guided by the UNEG ethical standards for evaluation. As such, the evaluation report should include:							

0.6666
1

0.6666
0.6666

Section	Weighting (%)
Background	5
Purpose	5
Methods	15
Findings	20
Conclusions / Lessons	15
Recommendations	15
Structure	5
Executive Summary	5
TOTAL	100

0.6666

1

1

0.6666

0.6666

0.6666

0.6666

0.3333

	Explicit reference to the obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability)	Partly		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Description of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues described (respect for dignity and diversity, right to self-determination, fair representation, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups, confidentiality, and avoidance of harm)	Partly		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	ONLY FOR THOSE CASES WHERE THE EVALUATION INVOLVES INTERVIEWING CHILDREN: explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children	Not Rated		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated

0.3333

0.3333

***	Executive Feedback on Section C	Overall rating for Section	Criteria/Rubric					
	The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarising here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements.	Fair	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Fair	Unsatisfactory	Missing	Not Rated
	The evaluation framework is strong and should have been introduced and included in the main body of the report, rather than in an annex (at least in abbreviated form). Data methods are discussed and are refined to interviews with stakeholders and observation and a qualitative focus (as well as desk review) , rather than any significant quantitative data. More information should have been provided around ethical considerations and safeguards.		Includes all the elements described for all questions in a clear and comprehensive manner Provides additional relevant information that enables the reader to gain a better understanding of the evaluation framework, the evaluation methodology and ethical considerations, and how this is suitable for assessing the intervention	Includes all the elements described in a clear and comprehensive manner	Includes the majority of the elements described in a clear manner OR Includes all the elements but lacks clarity	Omits most of the elements described and lacks clarity	The items should be present but are not	The items are not present for a valid reason (explain)
	Additional comments for Section C (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting						
		0.15						

SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)	Rating	If not rated, provide reasons here
--	--------	------------------------------------

Question 10.	Do the findings clearly address all evaluation objectives and scope?	56%						
	Findings marshal sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation's questions and criteria	Mostly		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	If feasible and relevant to the purpose, cost analysis is clearly presented (how costs compare to similar interventions or standards, most efficient way to get expected results)-if not feasible, an explanation is provided	Mostly		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Reference to the intervention's results framework in the formulation of the findings	Partly		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
Question 11.	Are evaluation findings derived from the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of the best available, objective, reliable and valid data and by accurate quantitative and qualitative analysis of evidence.	83%						
	The evaluation clearly presents multiple lines (including multiple time series) and levels (output, outcome, and appropriate disaggregation) of credible evidence.	Mostly		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Findings are clearly supported by and respond to the evidence presented, including both positive and negative. Findings are based on clear performance indicators, standards, benchmarks, or other means of comparison.	Mostly		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Unexpected effects (positive and negative) are identified and analysed	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	The causal factors (contextual, organisational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. For theory-based evaluations, findings analyse the logical chain (progression -or not- from implementation to results).	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
Question 12.	Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?	33%						
	Clear and comprehensive assessment of the intervention's monitoring system (including completeness and appropriateness of results/performance framework -including vertical and horizontal logic; M&E tools and their usage)	Partly		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Clear and complete assessment of the use of monitoring data in decision making	Partly		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated

0.6666

0.6666

0.3333

0.6666

0.6666

1

1

0.3333

0.3333

***	Executive Feedback on Section D	Overall rating for Section	Criteria/Rubric					
	The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarising here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements.	Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Fair	Unsatisfactory	Missing	Not Rated
	All of the evaluation criteria are responded to in a logical manner. Findings are well written and dealt with in a methodical way to build up the bigger picture. There is a lack of monitoring data / system and so the focus is upon a theory of change. There is a need in parts for assertions to be explicitly linked to data/ evidence.		Includes all the elements described for all questions in a clear and comprehensive manner Provides additional relevant information that enables the reader to gain a better understanding of the implementation and results of the intervention, data and/or implementation gaps, of the way in which the analysis of the data leads to the findings, and/or of the effects of the contributions of key stakeholders	Includes all the elements described in a clear and comprehensive manner	Includes the majority of the elements described in a clear manner OR Includes all the elements but lacks clarity	Omits most of the elements described and lacks clarity	The items should be present but are not	The items are not present for a valid reason (explain)
	Additional comments for Section D (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting						
		0.2						

SECTION E: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 15%)	Rating	If not rated, provide reasons here
---	--------	------------------------------------

Question 13.	Do the conclusions present an objective overall assessment of the intervention?	78%						
	Clear and complete description of the strengths and weaknesses of the intervention that adds insight and analysis beyond the findings	Mostly		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Description of the foreseeable implications of the findings for the future of the intervention (if formative evaluation or if the implementation is expected to continue or have additional phase)	Mostly		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	The conclusions are derived appropriately from findings	Yes		Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
Question 14.	Are lessons learned correctly identified?	33%						

0.6666

0.6666

1

	Correctly identified lessons that stem 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.	Partly	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated	
***	Executive Feedback on Section E	Overall rating for Section	Criteria/Rubric					
	The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarising here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements	Fair	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Fair	Unsatisfactory	Missing	Not Rated
	The conclusions are well written and are directly drawn upon the findings. They discuss the sector as a whole, draw upon the contextual analysis, and also discuss and assess UNICEF's contribution. In the lessons, more could have been said regarding applicability outside of the Kosovo context.		Includes all the elements described for all questions in a clear and comprehensive manner Provides additional relevant information that enables the reader to gain a better understanding of the implementation and results of the intervention, data and/or implementation gaps, of the way in which the analysis of the data leads to the findings, and/or of the effects of the contributions of key stakeholders	Includes all the elements described in a clear and comprehensive manner	Includes the majority of the elements described in a clear manner OR Includes all the elements but lacks clarity	Omits most of the elements described and lacks clarity	The items should be present but are not	The items are not present for a valid reason (explain)
	Additional comments for Section E (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting						
		0.15						
SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)		Rating	If not rated, provide reasons here					
Question 15.	Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation? Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions	89%	Yes	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
	Recommendations are useful to primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention and provide realistic description of how they can be made operational in the context of the evaluation)	Yes	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated	
	Clear description of the process for developing recommendations, including a relevant explanation if the level of participation of stakeholders at this stage is not in proportion with the level of participation in the intervention and/or in the conduct of the evaluation	Mostly	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated	
Question 16.	Are recommendations clearly presented? Clear identification of target group for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations) Clear prioritisation and/or classification of recommendations to support use	33%	Partly	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
		Partly	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated	
***	Executive Feedback on Section F	Overall rating for Section	Criteria/Rubric					
	The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarising here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements	Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Fair	Unsatisfactory	Missing	Not Rated
	The recommendations are clear, logically derived from findings and conclusions. However they could benefit from refinement of target group for action (parts of UNICEF Partners?). In addition it is stated that there is equal prioritisation, but this does not seem pragmatic or helpful.		Includes all the elements described for all the questions in a clear and comprehensive manner Provides additional relevant information that enables the reader to gain a better understanding of how the recommendations are logically derived from the findings, and/or of the relevance and feasibility of the recommendations and/or of the criteria for prioritisation and/or of the reasons for targeting each recommendation to a particular group of action	Includes all the elements described in a clear and comprehensive manner	Includes the majority of the elements described in a clear manner OR Includes all the elements but lacks clarity	Omits most of the elements described and lacks clarity	The items should be present but are not	The items are not present for a valid reason (explain)
	Additional comments for Section F (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting						
		0.15						
SECTION G: EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)		Rating	If not rated, provide reasons here					
Question 17.	Does the evaluation report include all relevant information? Opening pages include: Name of evaluated object, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluated object, names and/or organisation(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organisation commissioning the evaluation, table of contents -including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes - list of acronyms/abbreviations, page numbers 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)	83%	Yes	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
		Mostly	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated	
Question 18.	Is the report logically structured? The structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles) Context, purpose and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations	100%	Yes	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
		Yes	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated	
***	Executive Feedback on Section G	Overall rating for Section	Criteria/Rubric					
	The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarising here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements	Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Fair	Unsatisfactory	Missing	Not Rated

0.3333

1

1

0.6666

0.3333

0.3333

1

0.6666

1

1

<p>The report is logically structured and easy to navigate. The opening pages provide all key information required. Annexes are useful although could benefit with more inclusion regarding data methods and analysis.</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Includes all the elements described in the criteria in a clear and comprehensive manner</p> <p>The information is presented in an innovative manner that enhances the navigability of the report, and/or the report provides additional relevant information that enables the reader to gain a better understanding of the intervention and the evaluation</p>	<p>Includes all the elements described in a clear and comprehensive manner</p>	<p>Includes the majority of the elements described in a clear manner</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Includes all the elements but lacks clarity</p>	<p>Omits most of the elements described and lacks clarity</p>	<p>The items should be present but are not</p>	<p>The items are not present for a valid reason (explain)</p>
--	----------	---	--	---	---	--	---

<p>Additional comments for Section G (recommendations for improvement)</p>	<p>Weighting 0.05</p>
---	---------------------------

SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)

Question	Rating	If not rated, provide reasons here
<p>Question 19. Did the evaluation design and style consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF's commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming, to gender equality, and to equity?</p>	<p>56%</p>	
<p>Reference and use of rights-based framework, and/or CRC, and/or CCC, and/or CEDAW and/or other rights related benchmarks in the design of the evaluation</p>	<p>Mostly</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Clear description of the level of participation of key stakeholders in the conduct of the evaluation, and description of the rationale for the chosen level of participation (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering)</p>	<p>Partly</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Stylistic evidence of the inclusion of these considerations can include: using human-rights language; gender-sensitive and child-sensitive writing; disaggregating data by gender, age and disability groups; disaggregating data by socially excluded groups.</p>	<p>Mostly</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Question 20. Does the evaluation assess the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addressed gender, equity & child rights?</p>	<p>42%</p>	
<p>Identification and assessment of the presence or absence of equity considerations in the design and implementation of the intervention</p>	<p>Mostly</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Identification and assessment of the presence or absence of gender in the design and implementation of the intervention</p>	<p>Partly</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Explicit analysis of the involvement in the object of right holders, duty bearers, and socially marginalised groups, and the differential benefits received by different groups of children</p>	<p>Partly</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Clear proportionality between the level of participation in the intervention and in the evaluation, or clear explanation of deviation from this principle (this may be related to specifications of the TORs, inaccessibility of stakeholders at the time of the evaluation, budgetary constraints, etc.)</p>	<p>Partly</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Question 21. Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?</p>	<p>Meets requirements</p>	
<p>Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards</p>	<p>8</p>	
<p>GEWE is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis and Indicators are designed in a way that ensures GEWE-related data will be collected</p>	<p>Partially integrated 1 point</p>	<p>Fully integrated 3 points</p>
<p>Evaluation Criteria and Evaluation Questions specifically address how GEWE has been integrated into the design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved.</p>	<p>Partially integrated 1 point</p>	<p>Fully integrated 3 points</p>
<p>A gender-responsive Evaluation Methodology, Methods and tools, and Data Analysis Techniques are selected.</p>	<p>Partially integrated 1 point</p>	<p>Fully integrated 3 points</p>
<p>The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation reflect a gender analysis</p>	<p>Partially integrated 1 point</p>	<p>Fully integrated 3 points</p>

<p>Executive Feedback on Section H</p>	<p>Overall rating for Section</p>	<p>Criteria/Rubric</p>
<p>The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarising here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements</p>	<p>Fair</p>	<p>Highly Satisfactory Satisfactory Fair Unsatisfactory Missing Not Rated</p>

<p>It is felt that given the nature of the object of the evaluation (child rights) it is surprising that the analysis did not draw upon rights based framework and language more. Gender is treated as a 'cross-cutting theme' and is not integral throughout although it is well analysed in the context section. It would be improved by ensuring that gender was considered throughout the report and evaluation criteria, and also - critically link gender to ethnicity - as per one of the objectives of the evaluation.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>Includes all the elements described in the criteria in a clear and comprehensive manner</p> <p>Provides additional relevant information that enables the reader to gain a better understanding of the intervention's M&E system and its usability in the evaluation, and/or of how the evaluation incorporates a human rights based framework, a gender equity perspective, and/or equity considerations, and/or of how the intervention incorporates human rights frameworks and/or of how the evaluation and/or the intervention incorporates participatory elements</p>	<p>Includes all the elements described in a clear and comprehensive manner</p>	<p>Includes the majority of the elements described in a clear manner</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Includes all the elements but lacks clarity</p>	<p>Omits most of the elements described and lacks clarity</p>	<p>The items should be present but are not</p>	<p>The items are not present for a valid reason (explain)</p>
--	----------	---	--	---	---	--	---

<p>Additional comments for Section H (recommendations for improvement)</p>	<p>Weighting 0.15</p>
---	---------------------------

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)

<p>Question 22. Can the executive summary inform decision-making?</p>	<p>89%</p>	
<p>An executive summary is provided that is of relevant conciseness and depth for primary intended users</p>	<p>Mostly</p>	<p>Yes</p>

0.6666
0.3333
0.6666
0.6666
0.3333
0.3333
0.3333

0.6666

	Includes all necessary elements (overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key findings, key conclusions, key recommendations) Includes all the necessary information to understand the intervention and the evaluation AND does not contain information not already included in the rest of the report	Yes	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated
		Yes	Yes	Mostly	Partly	No	Not Rated

1
1

***	Executive Feedback on Section 1	Overall rating for Section	Criteria/Rubric					
	The rater will briefly (3-5 sentences) assess top line issues for this section relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarising here how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet the criteria above (judgement). As relevant, the rater will highlight best	Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Fair	Unsatisfactory	Missing	Not Rated
	A good overview of the report, with key aspects / messages for senior management. However at 5 pages in length, it could have been written in a more concise way.	3	Includes all the elements described in the criteria in a clear and comprehensive manner Provides additional relevant information that enables the reader to gain a better understanding of the evaluation and its findings and recommendations	Includes all the elements described in a clear and comprehensive manner	Includes the majority of the elements described in a clear manner OR Includes all the elements but lacks clarity	Omits most of the elements described and lacks clarity	The items should be present but are not	The items are not present for a valid reason (explain)

Additional comments for Section 1 (recommendations for improvement)	Weighting
	0.05

Weighting checksum (should equal 1) 1

***	OVERALL SCORE (max=4, min=0)	2.5	Satisfactory
------------	-------------------------------------	-----	--------------