



UN Women GERAAS Executive Review Template

Title of the Evaluation Report	<i>Empowering Women in Rural and Informal Settings through Capacity Development'</i>		
Region	Asia and the Pacific	Country(ies)	India MCO
Overall Rating			
<p>Overall Feedback: Overall, the report rated as: Very Good. The reviewers made the following specific comments: <i>"This report is extremely strong in many regards. The findings section, in particular, stands out for including a strong mix of evidence and insightful analysis. This is made possible through the inclusion of dedicated quantitative and qualitative strands. Whilst the design itself could be clarified in terms of how these strands were combined to overcome the lack of a comparison group, this should not detract from a report that meets or far exceeds nearly all of the UNEG and UN SWAP criteria."</i></p> <p>The reviewers also noted some positive evaluation practices in the report. These included <i>"The attempt at explicitly using mixed methods combined through appreciate enquiry"</i></p>			Very Good
Terms of Reference included?	Yes	Executive Summary	Very Good
PARAMETER 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION			Very Good
<i>The context section at the beginning of the report is concise and focuses on institutional factors. However, within the findings section there are included boxes that provide much richer social, economic and political context that adds substantial value to the report.</i>			
PARAMETER 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE			Good
<i>The purpose, objectives and criteria are all discussed to UNEG standards, and the evaluation framework in the annexes is excellent. There is some room to strengthen the discussion of the scope of the evaluation around issues and (potentially) influencing factors that have been excluded from the evaluation. However, the report remains robust and addresses gender and human rights through the questions in the evaluation framework.</i>			
PARAMETER 3: METHODOLOGY			Good
<i>The clear use of mixed methods is an excellent feature of this evaluation. The report provides a good justification of the design and approaches used – and the evaluation framework specifies the tool used to answer each question. If the report could provide more detail on the way in which appreciative enquiry was used, and could explain how the lack of a comparison groups was overcome in relation to the quantitative aspect, then it could be rated Very Good.</i>			
PARAMETER 4: FINDINGS			Very Good
<i>The findings are systematic, full of data and analysis, and make strong use of the evidence. The report makes a compelling case for the evidence relating to each criterion, and mainstreams the discussion of human rights and gender issues. Underlying factors are also highlighted. The only potential for more information is in relation to unexpected results.</i>			
PARAMETER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED			Very Good
<i>Conclusions take the analysis of the findings deeper, and are well linked to the evidence. They answer all of the main evaluation questions to the extent possible.</i>			

PARAMETER 6: RECOMMENDATIONS	Good
<i>Recommendations are appropriate and are a sufficient number to be manageable. They are not all as clear as might be hoped for in regard to major findings issues such as the implications of extending the project (such as options for funding the extension). However, within the stated purpose of informing similar projects, they contain useful and relevant suggestions.</i>	
PARAMETER 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS	Meets Requirements
<i>The evaluation includes appropriate tools and approaches to capture gender issues, and mainstreams gender in the evaluation matrix. It would have been interesting to have expanded the gender analysis within the quantitative part of the evaluation to include data on intersectionality and whether any particular combinations of identities were favoured by the project design.</i>	
PARAMETER 8: THE REPORT STRUCTURE	Very Good
<i>The report is excellently structured according to UNEG standards.</i>	

In order to help strengthen future evaluation reports, the reviewers offered the following constructive suggestions:

- Whilst the information in the findings is very useful. Some of the socio economic and political context (especially around human rights and gender equality) might have been included in the introduction section in order to introduce the reader to these issues.
- The discussion of the scope might have been strengthened somewhat through identifying the issues that were excluded from being considered by the evaluation. For example, the issue of impact was not appropriate because of the early stage (the report deals with this by discussing emerging signs of impact).
- The attempt at mixed methods is a strong element of this evaluation. To achieve a fully mixed methods approach is challenging, however, some useful guidance is emerging on this. Many of the key issues are discussed in this blog post: http://betterevaluation.org/blog/mixed_methods_part1
- It would have been interesting to have included a specific discussion on unexpected results.
- It would have been interesting (but is not a requirement under UNEG) to have included any lessons from the project that might be applied outside of this context.
- It is appropriate to include a specific description of how the recommendations were developed – and who was involved in the process.
- IFPRI have made available a useful guide on integrating gender analysis in quantitative (as well as qualitative) evaluation: http://gaap.ifpri.info/files/2010/12/GAAP_Toolkit_Feb_14.pdf
- Including a couple of sentences in the executive summary on the limitations of the design and how these were overcome would further enhance at section.