

**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 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	Are weightings equal to 100%? OK

**PART I: REPORT DETAILS**

<b>Report title</b>	Promote and strengthen the institutionalization of gender equality in the public policies, Morocco			<b>Geographical Coverage</b>	National
<b>Sequence number</b>	15	<b>Evaluators</b>	1	<b>Year</b>	2018
<b>Region</b>	Arab States	<b>Country(ies)</b>	Morocco	<b>Type of intervention evaluated</b>	Project
<b>Portfolio Budget (USD)</b>	514,993.54	<b>Evaluation Budget (USD)</b>		<b>Reviewer</b>	Benoit Conti
<b>Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)</b>	Women's leadership			<b>Review Date</b>	10 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?	92%	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.	Mostly	1.1 Mostly, there was a clear specification of evaluation objectives and of the project. Beneficiaries (women) were carefully mentioned by outcome area in the table. No geographic diversity was mentioned as it was a central project with the government. An abbreviated theory of change is mentioned, however it did not include the logic of the intervention. Rather this focused primarily on reviewing the main pillars of the project.
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.	Fully	1.2 There was an analysis of contextual progress on gender equality specifically in terms of local laws and election laws and a situation analysis of women in local affairs.
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 The DGCL's role is explained, as well as the interior ministry's role.
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	1.4 The project's implementation is presented as having four objectives and three extensions on the timeline. Evolution of the project occurred due to local elections and the consequences this had on the strategy is clearly outlined.
<b>SECTION 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>Good</b>
<b>Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?</b>	<b>50%</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.	Mostly	2.1 The evaluation is meant to help shape the second phase of the project. Four goals are identified, they are fairly generic: analysis of the project's results, measurement, best practices and recommendations.
2.2 <b>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).	Partly	2.2 The specific focus was placed on the scope of the evaluation. It is clear that the evaluation is a study of the results of cooperation with the interior minister and the DGCL and focused on clear objectives. The scope is defined by the period of time, but not much else is detailed.
<b>SECTION 3 : METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>Very Good</b>
<b>Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and appropriate, and the rationale for the methodological choice justified?</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 3</b>
3.1 <b>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 scope.	Fully	3.1 The methodological description is thorough, highlighting the steps from needs identification, data collection and results.
3.2 <b>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.	Fully	3.2 Data collection, analysis, sources and sampling are detailed. Triangulation is also a priority. A mixed methods approach is used.
3.3 <b>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.	Fully	3.3 Stakeholders' consultations are described by data collection method. A quick rationale is given to explain why each data collection method has been chosen for a specific source. The sampling discussion is well-informed.
3.4 <b>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.	Fully	3.4 Limitations are not discussed separately. There were 3 main limitation points focused on: hard-to-get local information, sampling and deliverable validation.
3.5 <b>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.	Mostly	3.5 Ethics considerations went slightly beyond informed consent, confidentiality and harm considerations: they included respect, explanation of research, and avoiding prejudice.

SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?	90%	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.	Fully	4.1 There is a full discussion of each evaluation question. However evidence is rather sparse.
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.	Mostly	4.2 It might be the choice of the evaluators to sometimes focus on the conceptual part of the findings, but overall points were justified in a fairly objective manner.
4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.	Fully	4.3 There is evidence provided to back up findings. Some findings lack descriptive factors that contributed to achievement of results but usually evidence and rationale were clearly presented.
4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities).	Fully	
SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?	80%	Executive Feedback on Section 5
5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.	Mostly	5.1 Conclusions are succinct and could have benefited from better linkages with findings. However the connection between evidence and conclusions is clear and present.
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Fully	5.2 Conclusions clearly go beyond findings in spirit. Each evaluation criteria has a summary paragraph taking a step back from the findings and providing an encompassing analysis of the criteria.
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	5.3 Strengths and weaknesses are presented alongside the narrative. It could have been helpful to expand more on the reasons why conclusions were arrived at (e.g., why strengthening capacity of the DGCL is the best options for example).
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.	Mostly	5.4 Appreciated the clarity and straightforwardness of the lessons. However they are not all action-oriented/practical for future implementation (3 out of 5).
SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	100%	Executive Feedback on Section 6
6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Fully	6.1 Overall, the line of thought underlying recommendations is clearly related to the findings and conclusions (see institutional strengthening of the UEG).
6.2 The report <b>describes the process</b> followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	Fully	6.2 The process is described. Recommendations have been validated by stakeholders.
6.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g., reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up) and actionable.	Fully	6.3 Overall recommendations are detailed and practical with very clear tasks and objectives outlined.
6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Fully	6.4 Recommendations are presented by order of priority to help improve the project in the second phase.
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.	89%	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)	7.1 Although the evaluation does not mention whether sufficient information was collected during the implementation period on gender equality. it does include a specific objective to

7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated (3)	<p>assess gender equality and HR. Also gender is well mainstreamed into evaluation criteria.</p> <p>7.2 Disaggregation by sex is mentioned in the data collection part of the methodology, a mixed-methods approach is used to evaluate GEEW. Although the full diversity of stakeholders consulted is hard to assess directly, the evaluation uses a participative approach. Finally, ethical standards were followed and groups were treated with integrity, respect and confidentiality.</p> <p>7.3 Gender analysis is reflected in various sections, specifically in the "context of gender equality and women's human rights" section and in the recommendations but is not consistently addressed throughout the report. Triangulation is achieved mainly in the collection of data. The findings take into consideration the various point of view. Given the nature of the project, quantitative data is not the main focus. No real mention of unanticipated effects of the intervention on gender equality and HR.</p>
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>	Very Good
<b>Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?</b>	<b>100%</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	<p>8.1 The report was particularly well structured and presented. The clarity and coherence are one of the main positive points of the report. Not only the train of thought, but also the reader's navigation through the document.</p> <p>8.2 All background information appears at the beginning of the evaluation.</p> <p>8.3 The executive summary is separated, concise and complete.</p> <p>8.4 All key documents are in Annexes.</p>
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.	Fully	
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	

<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
--	-------

**Additional Information**

<p>Identify aspects of <b>good practice</b> of the evaluation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The evaluation is particularly well presented. It goes diligently through all sections that the review grid contains which gives a complete understanding of the process and the thinking the evaluators went through.</li> <li>-The findings are embedded into the evaluation questions that are in turn categorized by evaluation criteria. This structure ensures consistency between criteria, questions, findings and evidence.</li> <li>-The use of results tables to display beneficiaries and other kind of information is helpful and goes faster to the point than long narratives</li> <li>-Analysis of findings and conclusions are a bit longer than in other reports and more nuanced. In the same vein, the recommendations detail the kind of actions that are possible and are targeted to specific stakeholders.</li> </ul>
---	---

**PART III: THE OVERALL RATING**

Key Guiding Question	Total weighted score %	Overall Rating	Overall Comments
<p><b>Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence?</b></p>	<p><b>89.46</b></p>	<p>Very Good</p>	