

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



| 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. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 2: Purpose and scope 3: Methodology 4: Findings | 5 5 15 20 | 5: Conclusions and lessons learned 6: Recommendations 7: Gender Equality and Human Rights (UN-SWAP) 8: Presentation | 20 15 10 10 | <p><i>Are weightings equal to 100%?</i></p> <p>OK</p> |

PART I: REPORT DETAILS

| | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------------------|------------------|
| Report title | Securing Rights and Improving Livelihoods of Women (SRILW) evaluation | | | Geographical Coverage | National |
| Sequence number | 13 | Evaluators | 2 | Year | 2018 |
| Region | Arab States | Country(ies) | Egypt | Type of intervention evaluated | Project |
| Portfolio Budget (USD) | | Evaluation Budget (USD) | 64,000.00 | Reviewer | Zayid Douglas |
| Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply) | Women's leadership Women's access to Prevent VAW&G and | Global norms, policies and | | Review Date | 06 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? | 100% | Executive Feedback on Section 1 |

| | | |
|---|----------------------|---|
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Fully</p> | <p>1.1: The report stated that this is a utilization focused evaluation with a gender responsive approach designed to inform UN Women's future programming in women's political participation (WPP), women's economic empowerment (WEE), and ending violence against women (EVAW).</p> |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Fully</p> | <p>1.2: Most women (at least 70% of married women, and over 90% of single women) had experienced some form of harassment in the programming communities, and a high percentage of women participated in the informal employment sector. Full and productive employment is a path forward.</p> |
| <p>1.3 The key stakeholders involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described.</p> | <p>Fully</p> | <p>1.3: It was clearly articulated who the stakeholders were, and why they were selected to participate in the evaluation, i.e., they were past participants in the three program components (WPP, WEE, EVAW).</p> |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Fully</p> | <p>1.4 The action intended to empower women in Egyptian society, through WPP, WEE, EVAW. "The action consisted of a package of interventions featuring mutually reinforcing protection and empowerment measures designed to strengthen the position of Egyptian women in society and ensure their participation alongside men in post revolution development processes." - page 2. This was a summative evaluation where past UN Women programming had been carried out in the following Egyptian governorates - Cairo, Giza, Menia, Sohag, Assiut, Beni Suf and Beheira.</p> |
| <p>SECTION 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</p> | <p>RATING</p> | <p>Very Good</p> |
| <p>Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?</p> | <p>100%</p> | <p>Executive Feedback on Section 2</p> |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Fully</p> | <p>2.1 The purpose was to ensure accountability and document lessons learned. Furthermore, the evaluation sought to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, in addition to addressing the integration of gender equality and human rights, and identifying lessons learned and recommendations for the way forward, particularly around WPP, WFF, and EVAW.</p> |

| | | |
|---|--------|---|
| <p>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).</p> | Fully | <p>2.2 The evaluation was summative, addressing the 5 year implementation period from 2012- 2017, and covering those geographic areas where UN Women programming was implemented.</p> |
| <p>SECTION 3 : METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)</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> | 90% | Executive Feedback on Section 3 |
| <p>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.</p> | Fully | <p>3.1 The evaluation used a utilization and gender responsive approach - and an matrix that outlined the evaluation criteria, key questions, sub questions, and indicators.</p> |
| <p>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.</p> | Fully | <p>3.2 The evaluation utilized mixed methods and a variety of data different sources for triangulation. Focus group discussions (FGDs) were used to assess rights holders' perspective of UN Women contribution to project relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, whereas another set of FGDs were held with programme participants. IDIs were conducted with those actors engaged in programme implementation - representing different levels, and quantitative face-to-face surveys were conducted with programme participants - identified through stratified random sampling - in the social (EVAW) and economic (WEE) approaches.</p> |
| <p>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.</p> | Fully | <p>3.3 The evaluation used a utilization and gender responsive approach - the intended users (of its results) helped shaped the evaluation- its purpose & inform the development of its questions. Also it was noted that stakeholder mapping was conducted in order to identify evaluation participants - rights holders and duty bearers - and those questions asked of stakeholders were noted in the annex.</p> |
| <p>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.</p> | Partly | <p>3.4 Partly. The evaluation outlined limitations related to data collection. There were some scheduling challenges and some invitations (for rights holders) to participate came from supervisors - possibly resulting in biased responses (towards positive perceptions).</p> |

| | | |
|---|--------|---|
| <p>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 consent of participants, confidentiality and avoidance of harm considerations.</p> | Partly | 3.5 The evaluation made reference of UNEG guidelines during data collection - and briefly highlighted other ethical measures in place, e.g., securing informed consent prior to participation, informed participants of right to withdraw at any time, reiterating that confidentiality would be maintained and do not harm principles would be put in place. |
| <p>SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)</p> | Rating | Very Good |
| <p>Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?</p> | 77% | <p>Executive Feedback on Section 4</p> |
| <p>4.1 The evaluation report findings provide sufficient levels of high quality evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation questions and criteria.</p> | Fully | 4.1 The findings drew from diverse data sources and evidence for all evaluation criteria and key questions--from needs assessment, policy alignment, interview and focus group and primary and secondary data as relevant. |
| <p>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.</p> | Mostly | 4.2 The findings highlighted the significant success of the national ID program, which superceeded the goal by 200%. There were however a couple of findings that appeared to be grounded in subjectivity. For example there was not enough quality evidence from community and beneficiaries to support the claim that government and NGOs added significant value to on the ground implementations. |
| <p>4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.</p> | Mostly | 4.3 The report explored and identified factors in program design and implementation and how that affected beneficiaries and desired program outcomes. Throughout the report, the evaluators pulled out good practice examples highlighting outcomes and factors of success, such as with the "Knocking doors campaign". In addition, a gender analysis of the outcomes acheived at the individual, household and community level was also included. |
| <p>4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities).</p> | Mostly | 4.4 Findings were clearly and logically presented. |
| <p>SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)</p> | Rating | Fair |

| | | |
|--|----------------------|---|
| <p>Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?</p> | <p>47%</p> | <p>Executive Feedback on Section 5</p> |
| <p>5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.</p> | <p>Mostly</p> | <p>5.1 The conclusions were substantiated in a broad manner by evidence and are connected to findings.</p> |
| <p>5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings</p> | <p>Partly</p> | <p>5.2 The conclusions added considerations for programming that addressed the need for multisectoral collaboration.</p> |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Partly</p> | <p>5.3 The evaluation's conclusions took into the account the perspective of different stakeholders.</p> |
| <p>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.</p> | <p>Partly</p> | <p>5.4 The lessons learned section focused on promising practices and were a reflection of what could have been improved upon during implementation.</p> |
| <p>SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</p> | <p>Rating</p> | <p>Fair</p> |
| <p>Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?</p> | <p>40%</p> | <p>Executive Feedback on Section 6</p> |
| <p>6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.</p> | <p>Partly</p> | <p>6.1 The recommendations are grounded in the evaluation findings but in terms of the gender related change, little was mentioned.</p> <p>6.2 The report mentioned in the evaluation plan that the evaluation team would consult with stakeholders to review the draft recommendations after the evaluation had been</p> |

| | | |
|--|--------------------------|--|
| 6.2 The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders. | Mostly | <p>with stakeholders to review the draft recommendations after the evaluation had been completed. It was assumed that this took place even though a final deliverable was the powerpoint of finding/recommendations for the Evaluation Reference Group.</p> |
| 6.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g., reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up) and actionable. | Partly | <p>6.3 The recommendations provided could have been more specific and actionable in nature, for example, charging parties with responsibility for taking action forward, noting feasibility and level of urgency of recommendation. In addition recommendations related to programming and good design for the future were very light.</p> |
| 6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use. | Partly | <p>6.4 For the most part, recommendations are directed at the appropriate party for action.</p> |
| SECTION 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS (weight 15%) | Score | Meets Requirements |
| Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? Note: this section will be rated according to UN SWAP standards. | 78% | 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) | <p>7.1 Gender equality and human rights were incorporated into the evaluation criteria & key questions.</p> |
| 7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected. | Fully integrated (3) | <p>7.2 A gender-responsive methodology was employed where various groups of women including the most vulnerable were consulted.</p> |
| 7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis. | Partially integrated (1) | <p>7.3 The evaluation findings modestly reflect a gender analysis but the conclusions and recommendations could have gone further in this analysis.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%) | Rating | Very Good |
| Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented? | 87% | 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 | 8.1 The report is well-written and the sections are nicely organized. |
| 8.2 The title page and opening pages 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. | Fully | 8.2 The title page and first couple pages of the first chapter provide basic information around the report contents to come. |
| 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 | 8.3 The executive summary provides an overview of the evaluation, its intended audience, methodology, and so forth. However, the recommendations presented in the executive summary were not abridged from those in the actual recommendations. |
| 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). | Fully | 8.4 The annex includes the TOR, evaluation matrix, list of organizations interviewed and documents reviewed, research team member profiles, and the interview/FGD guides. |
| Additional Information | | |
| Identify aspects of <i>good practice</i> of the evaluation | The interspersing of qualitative data collected from the women participants throughout the report clearly captured different voices, assuring data triangulation. | |

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?

70.60

Good

| | | | |
|---|-------|------|--|
| Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence? | 70.60 | Good | |
|---|-------|------|--|