

**Independent Evaluation and Audit Services (IEAS)**  
**UN WOMEN Global Evaluation Quality Assessment and Rating**



| Rating Scale                | Very Good  | Good  | Fair   | Unsatisfactory                            | Reviewer Guidance :  |
|-----------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|
| <b>Rating explanation</b>   | 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> |
| <b>Parameter Weight (%)</b> | 1: Object and context<br>2: Purpose and scope<br>3: Methodology<br>4: Findings         | 5<br>5<br>15<br>20  | 5: Conclusions and lessons learned<br>6: Recommendations<br>7: Gender Equality and Human Rights (UN-SWAP)<br>8: Presentation | 20<br>15<br>10<br>10                      | <b>Are weightings equal to 100%?</b><br><b>OK</b>  |

**PART I: REPORT DETAILS**

|   |   |                                |                  |
|---|---|--------------------------------|------------------|
| <b>Report title</b>   | End Evaluation Of "Preventing And Responding To Violence Against Women And Girls In Ethiopia" Programme | <b>Geographical Coverage</b>   | National         |
| <b>Sequence number</b>                                      | 25  | <b>Evaluators</b>              | 20               |
| <b>Region</b>   | Eastern and Southern  | <b>Country(ies)</b>            | Ethiopia         |
| <b>Portfolio Budget (USD)</b>                               |   | <b>Evaluation Budget (USD)</b> | 50,000.00        |
| <b>Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)</b> | Prevent VAW&G and   | <b>Reviewer</b>                | Zayid Douglas    |
|   |   | <b>Review Date</b>             | 07 February 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? | 83%    | 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         | 1.1 Yes, the evaluation report starts with a brief overview of the two-year program (January 2015-December 2017) with a goal to provide women and girl survivors of violence in Ethiopia -Federal, Afar, Somali, Oromia, Amhara, and Dire Dawa - with access to justice and protection services. A basic theory of change (TOC) denoting inputs, outputs, outcomes, and an overarching goal that all "women and girls in Ethiopia live a life free from violence" is presented ; however no causal pathway is shown within the TOC. (p. 27) The initiative was supported by almost \$3 million USD in funding from the governments of Denmark, France and Ireland.   |
| 1.2 The <b>context</b> 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.                 | Partly        | 1.2 There is some reference made to the international or regional policy /legal frameworks promoting gender equality for which Ethiopia is a signatory. Gender inequality and unequal power dynamics are those factors cited that contribute to the existence of violence against women and girls (VAWG) in Ethiopia (p. 9). Furthermore, a couple (2 in number) demographics pertaining to the prevalence of VAWG are cited. More contextual information would have been appreciated to further ground the evaluation.  |
| 1.3 The <b>key stakeholders</b> involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described.   | Fully         | 1.3 Key stakeholders engaged in project implementation include representatives from UN agencies, the Ethiopian government including the Ministry of Women and Children Affairs (MoWCA), local government (Ethiopian Regional MoWCA offices and Bureaus of Justice), civil society , and development partners (e.g, Irish Aid).<br><br>1.4 The report notes that this project has since ended as this is a final evaluation. The TOC mentions that existence of a results framework but there was no M&E tracking/data collection during project implementation- as few M&E activities were organized. In turn, the evaluation team members resorted to creating and utilizing an outcomes framework to support their analysis (p. 26). |
| 1.4 The report identifies <b>the implementation status of the object</b> , 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         |  |
| <b>SECTION 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</b>  | <b>RATING</b> | <b>Very Good</b>   |
| <b>Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?</b>  | <b>100%</b>   | <b>Executive Feedback on Section 2</b>   |
| 2.1 <b>Purpose, objectives and use of evaluation:</b> 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         | 2.1 Yes, the evaluation report clearly notes the evaluation purpose- to assess the programme's performance and document evidence and lessons learned that will inform future programming, management and coordination. The evaluation objectives are to assess project relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability, identify lessons learned, and make recommendations for improving achievement of outcomes in future programming(p. 12). Time constraints meant there would no measure of programme impact and the primary users were noted in the evaluation plan  |

|  |        |   |
|--|--------|---|
| <p><b>2.2 Evaluation Scope:</b> 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).</p> | Fully  | <p>and provided input into the development of the evaluation. These were UN Women, Government of Ethiopia, development partners, implementing partners.</p> <p>2.2 Yes, the evaluation covered a 2.5 year period (2015-2017), appraised 3 program outcomes, and the field work was carried out at 5 sites of implementation that were selected with input from the Evaluation Reference Group, taking into account logistical and security considerations. Program impact was not measured due to time constraints.</p> |
| <p><b>SECTION 3 : METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)</b></p>   | RATING | Very Good   |
| <p>Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and appropriate, and the rationale for the methodological choice justified?</p>  | 100%   | Executive Feedback on Section 3   |
| <p><b>3.1 Methodology:</b> 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</p>  | Fully  | <p>3.1 The report noted the evaluation criteria, which falls under OECD/DAC criteria- relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. The report notes the key questions and indicators in the matrix.</p>  |
| <p><b>3.2 Data collection, analysis and sampling:</b> 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.</p>  | Fully  | <p>3.2 The report noted that the evaluation will use multiple methods (desk reviews, key stakeholder interviews, FGDs [with programme participants], observation data) and was discussion on why each method was used. For example, FGDs were an opportunity for the evaluation team to better understand "perceptions about the changes that UN Women's activities had had on them" (p. 15).</p>   |
| <p><b>3.3 Stakeholders Consultation:</b> 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.</p>   | Fully  | <p>3.3 The report annex included an overview that discusses stakeholder participation in shaping the evaluation - specifically its objectives and key questions.</p>  |
| <p><b>3.4 Limitations:</b> 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.</p>  | Fully  | <p>3.4 The evaluation noted this by making reference to selection and response bias, time constraints, language barriers (1 evaluation team member speaks Amharic), and other constraints.</p>  |
| <p><b>3.5 Ethics:</b> 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 consent of participants, confidentiality and avoidance of harm considerations.</p>  | Fully  | <p>3.5 The report included an explanation of risk management and ethics was presented in the annexes although this was discussed in the report body. There was discussion of sharing project information to prospective participants in local language prior to securing informed consent, along with deidentification of data (confidentiality), do no harm, adhering to UN Evaluation Guidelines.</p>   |
| <p><b>SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)</b></p>   | Rating | Good  |
| <p>Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?</p>   | 63%    | 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        | 4.1 - The report findings provide a fair amount of high quality evidence, aligning to each criteria and key question of interest.   |
| 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         | 4.2 - The findings definitively refer to the evidence presented, clearly linking to the emerging evidence, noting responsive/subsequent action.   |
| 4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.  | Not at all    | 4.3 - Causality could not be assessed during the evaluation as the results framework was not utilized during the project life - no tracking, monitoring of progress. Consequently, the evaluation team developed an outcomes framework for assessment, noting outcomes and outputs.   |
| 4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities).   | Mostly        | 4.4 - The findings are presented logically and coherently - introducing the reader to evidence and tying it to the relevant criteria and key question.  |
| <b>SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)</b>  | <b>Rating</b> | Very Good   |
| <b>Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?</b>   | <b>78%</b>    | <b>Executive Feedback on Section 5</b>  |
| 5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.  | Fully         | 5.1 - The conclusions presented are connected to evaluation findings.<br><br>5.2 To some degree conclusions added insight and analysis beyond the findings. This analysis was referenced in 1-2 of the conclusions presented.   |
| 5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings   | Mostly        | 5.3 - The project strengths and weaknesses were evaluated as part of this exercise. For example, there was mention of lack of coordination on EVAWG between UN agencies and partners (relevance) but a platform involving civil society -Network of Women's Shelters- highlights an effective example for capacity/good practice in responding to VAWG. |
| 5.3 Conclusions present <b>strengths and weaknesses</b> 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 To some degree, there were a couple lessons learned that were drawn from single data points (e.g., Women's Development Groups responding to VAWG- Women's Development Groups are a local action mechanism specific to Ethiopia).  |
| 5.4 <b>Lessons Learned:</b> 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. | Partly        |   |
| <b>SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</b>  | <b>Rating</b> | Very Good   |
| <b>Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?</b>  | <b>77%</b>    | <b>Executive Feedback on Section 6</b>  |

|  |                               |   |
|--|-------------------------------|---|
| 6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.  | Fully                         | 6.1 The recommendations follow the findings and conclusions.  |
| 6.2 The report <b>describes the process</b> followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.   | Fully                         | 6.2 There was a group of stakeholders -with guidance from UN Women - that were selected to discuss the evaluation objectives and associated questions with the evaluation team.(Section 6.3- no page number) For example, each stakeholder group had a role- UN Women advised, provided information on all evaluation objectives. |
| 6.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g., reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up) and actionable.  | Mostly                        | 6.3 While the recommendations are realistic and actionable, it would have been appropriate to have recommendations directed to each of the stakeholder groups, exclusive of programme participants. Recommendations were only directed to UN Women and donor partners.  |
| 6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.  | Partly                        | 6.4 The recommendations were not presented in order of priority, urgency, and lacked a "SMART"ness (specific,measurable,attainable,realistic,timely) quality.   |
| <b>SECTION 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS (weight 15%)</b>   | <b>Score</b>                  | <b>Meets 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>78%</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)          | 7.1 The GEWE is integrated into the evaluation criteria, and questions.   |
| 7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.   | Satisfactorily integrated (2) | 7.2 - The report noted use of a gender responsive methodology was used, collecting data from various sources & complemented with data triangulation.  |
| 7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.   | Satisfactorily integrated (2) |   |
| <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>97%</b>                    | <b>Executive Feedback on Section 8</b>  |
| 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                         | 8.1 The report has similar presentation to most UN Women commissioned reports.  |
| 8.2 <b>The title page and opening pages</b> provide key basic information on the name of evaluand, 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                        | 8.2 Mostly, it would have been beneficial to include subheaders in the table of contents- to help identify the corresponding findings, conclusions by reported criteria and key question.   |
| 8.3 The <b>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.  | Fully                         | 8.3 The executive summary presents an overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key findings, conclusions and recommendations.  |
|  |                               | 8.4 The report presents the Terms of Reference, evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, list   |

|  |       |  |
|--|-------|--|
| <p>8.4 <b>Annexes</b> 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).</p> | Fully | <p>of site visits, data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires), list of documentary evidence.</p> |
|--|-------|--|

**Additional Information**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>Identify aspects of <b>good practice</b> of the evaluation</p> | <p>-This evaluation presents risk management guidelines, noting their plans for mitigating harm encountered during data collection.<br/>-This evaluation's annexes also included the information sheet that was used to educate potential participants.</p> |
|---|---|



**PART III: THE OVERALL RATING**

| Key Guiding Question   | Total weighted score % | Overall Rating | Overall Comments |
|--|------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| <p>Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence?</p> | <p><b>81.44</b></p>    | <p>Good</p>    |                  |