

Evaluation title	Evaluation of Jordan WFP Country Strategic Plan 2020-2022	
Evaluation category and type	Centralized – CSPE	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Highly Satisfactory: 90%	
<p>Overall, the evaluation of the Jordan Country Strategic Plan (CSP) 2020-2022 is of high quality and can be used by decision makers with confidence to inform future CSP programming. The report is well written and generally accessible for the intended audience. The country context and CSP are well described, with Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE) dimensions effectively addressed. The evaluation purpose/rationale, objectives, users, stakeholders, and scope are clearly presented. The chosen methodology was appropriate for this evaluation as it captured a diverse range of stakeholders and included a gender-sensitive approach, mainstreaming GEWE and broader equity dimensions through specific evaluation sub-questions. The findings present strengths and weaknesses of the CSP, identify gaps and omissions, are balanced, and address the evaluation (sub-)questions fully, including presenting GEWE related findings. However, they do not sufficiently address how recommendations from past evaluations were considered. The linkages among the findings, conclusions, and recommendations are logical and clear overall. Some sub-recommendations could have been merged and reorganized somewhat to avoid repetition and ensure appropriate alignment with their corresponding main recommendations.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The summary evaluation report (SER) is well written in a concise and clear manner and contains all key information derived from the main report, including a brief introduction, findings, conclusions, and recommendations. Graphics are used effectively to complement the narrative. However, in addition to the main users, the SER could have identified the "other stakeholders" of the evaluation.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a comprehensive assessment of the relevant humanitarian and development context in Jordan, including mainstreaming of gender and equity dimensions through disaggregated data. The overview of the evaluation is well defined, references past assessments, presents the theory of change/line of sight/results framework, outlines the various transfer modalities, addresses GEWE dimensions, and the evolution over time of the CSP, including reflections on operational and strategic shifts from past programme cycles. However, the figures cited could have been more up-to-date and SDGs 2 and 17 could have been discussed more specifically.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation rationale, objectives, and scope are well articulated, including identifying the main stakeholders and users. Gender and equity dimensions are effectively mainstreamed through the evaluation objectives despite no specific evaluation objective related to these dimensions.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation used an appropriate and robust methodological design and mixed data collection methods to address the evaluation questions. Data sources are clearly stated and further information regarding the data collection methods is provided in the Annexes. The methodology mainstreams GEWE considerations throughout, including methods for the collection of disaggregated data. However, while the sample breakdown is summarized, a sampling rationale is not provided per se. The report also identifies methodological limitations, mitigation strategies, and ethical considerations. The monitoring data is assessed in relation to GEWE dimensions but does not go beyond these dimensions.</p>		

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The findings fully address all the evaluation questions and are supported by relevant primary and secondary data sources. They safeguard the anonymity of respondents, providing a balanced assessment, identifying gaps and omissions, and present inconsistencies, where relevant. The findings rigorously assess the delivery of planned and actual outcomes and WFP contributions while fully addressing GEWE dimensions and the International Humanitarian Principles given that refugee populations and other vulnerable groups were the primary beneficiaries of the CSP. However, the report frequently refers very generally to the data sources of evidence and would have benefited from being more specific with respect to the groups whose voices are being reported. Moreover, the findings could have explicitly assessed the unintended effects of the CSP, including in relation to gender equality and human rights.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The conclusions effectively connect findings across the four main evaluation questions and are presented at a higher, strategic level that goes beyond a mere synthesis of the findings. The conclusions reflect positive and negative findings, with no significant gaps or omissions and are useful from both a learning and accountability perspective. GEWE and other equity related dimensions are also reflected in the conclusions as are national development goals. However, the conclusions could have considered commenting on causal linkages with the SDGs and the logic of intervention of the CSP and its key assumptions.</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The recommendations stem logically from the findings and conclusions, are internally consistent and clearly take into consideration the WFP and Jordanian context. They are targeted, prioritized, and specify a timeframe for implementation. Specific GEWE and equity-related recommendations are included. However, the sub-recommendations are numerous with some repetition across the different main recommendations. Moreover, some sub-recommendations, for example those related to M&E, could have been merged and reorganized to ensure consistency with the main recommendations to which they are linked.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report is written in a clear and accessible manner, devoid of jargon and uses precise language. Sources are cited for all data and visual aids are effectively referenced in the report. Key messages are highlighted through boxes and bold text and relevant information is signposted. The only notable weaknesses are errors in the numbering of sub-recommendations and the length which slightly exceeds the maximum length requirement.</p>		

Integration of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE) considerations in the evaluation report based on the UN System-Wide Action Plan (UN-SWAP) Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) scorecard	
UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score	Meets requirements: 8 points
<p>GEWE dimensions are well integrated into the evaluation, including a dedicated evaluation sub-question and a few lines of inquiry related to GEWE. The methodology fully integrated GEWE dimensions through a gender-sensitive, mixed methods approach that allowed the collection and analysis of sex-disaggregated data, and the involvement of a diverse range of stakeholders, including the most vulnerable. GEWE dimensions are also reflected throughout the findings, conclusions, and recommendations. However, the sources for the evidence are frequently presented in a general manner such that it is not always clear to the reader which social groups' voices are concerned. Moreover, unintended effects in relation to GEWE dimensions could have been discussed in the findings.</p>	

Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels	
Highly Satisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level:</i> Evaluation users can rely on the credible and useful evaluation findings provided and can use the evaluation with a high degree of confidence for decision-making. The report is considered an excellent example.
	<i>Definition at criterion level:</i> The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.
Satisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level:</i> Evaluation users can rely on the quality and credible evaluation findings provided and can use it with confidence for decision-making.
	<i>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are no significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.
Partly Satisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level:</i> Evaluation users can rely on the evaluation findings provided and may use it for decision-making noting that there are some gaps/shortcomings in the information provided.
	<i>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are some significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.
Unsatisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level:</i> Evaluation users can use some of the learning from the evaluation, noting that there are significant gaps/ shortcomings in the evaluation findings provided. The report may still contribute to decision making but should be used with caution.
	<i>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are critical gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. Most of the required parameters are not met.