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.	- 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 (%)						Are weightings equal to 100%?
1: Object and context	5		5: Conclusions and lessons learned	20		
2: Purpose and scope	5		6: Recommendations	15		**OK**
3: Methodology	15		7: Gender Equality and Human Rights (UN-SWAP)	10		
4: Findings	20		8: Presentation	10		

PART I: REPORT DETAILS

Report title	Final Evaluation of the Gender, Peace and Security Programme in Zimbabwe			Geographical Coverage	National
Sequence number		9	Evaluators	Godwin Hlatshw; Sithembile	Year	2019
Region	Eastern and Southern	Country(ies)	Zimbabwe	Type of intervention evaluated	Programme
Portfolio Budget (USD)	USD 2,501,038,70	Evaluation Budget (USD)	N/A	Reviewer	Claudia Marcondes
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Women's leadership in			Review Date	01 January 2020

PART II: THE EIGHT KEY PARAMETERS

SECTION 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION (weight 5%)	RATING	Good
Does the report present a clear and full description of the 'object' of the evaluation?	67%	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	The context and rationale for the intervention is well explained. In addition to describing objectives and expected results, add a description of the overall project, including the activities undertaken and their geographical distribution (in line with the ToC and/or goals and objectives). Also, in addition to listing the key stakeholders/partners provide some context information and their role in the project along with budget and resources information. This helps the reader to follow the analysis presented in the findings section. Add a logic model if possible and situate the project as to its implementation stage.
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.	Fully	
1.3 The **key stakeholders** involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described.	Mostly	
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.	Partly	

SECTION 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)	RATING	Very Good
Are the evaluation purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?	100%	Executive Feedback on Section 2
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.	Fully	The Purpose, objectives and use of evaluation are clearly outlined. There is also good information to the evaluation scope, including geographic coverage, establishing linkages between the evaluation scope and the project activities.
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).	Fully	

SECTION 3 : METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)	RATING	Very Good
Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and appropriate, and the rationale for the methodological choice justified?	100%	Executive Feedback on Section 3
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.	Fully	Good overview of the methodology is included with details about data collection, sampling strategy, analysis and triangulation and identification of a few limitations. The details in the Annex (List of KIIs, Evaluation questions & Data sources) help to demonstrate that the methods were appropriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE and HR specific results. The number of people consulted and their geographical distribution seem appropriate to represent the range of project activities. The evaluation discusses ethics and, according to the report, it was guided by UN Women Evaluation Policies and United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) guidelines on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in evaluation and the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for evaluation.
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.	Fully	
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.	Fully	
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.	Fully	
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	Fully	

SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)	Rating	Good
Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?	67%	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	There is an effort to address all evaluation questions and criteria and the findings are presented with clarity and logic, but they are not articulated as "findings" per se. While findings contain detailed information and explanations of causal factors, some need to be better substantiated, showing the evidence for certain statements. For example, percentages need to be accompanied by their sources and explanations. It is not enough to cite that "93.1% of the respondents attested that the GPS Programme was effective", but and explanations and source need to be provided, with clearer linkages to project activities and demonstration of how "change" took place. Some of the graphs also need better presentation and explanations regarding the scales used. It is important to demonstrate systematically that analysis is grounded on multiple lines of evidence.
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	
4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.	Mostly	
4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities).	Mostly	

SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)	Rating	Unsatisfactory
Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?	15%	Executive Feedback on Section 5
5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.	Partly	Conclusions are summarized in three paragraphs. Suggest to clearly articulate a set of conclusions, directly connected to the findings, providing clear responses to the evaluation questions. The conclusions should be properly substantiated (in line with better substantiated findings, as identified earlier) and provide good insights along with a balance of strengths and weaknesses identified. It is also important to show that represent a range of views. A few lessons are included but mostly reflect project weaknesses. It is key that they are properly articulated as such, in a generalized way as to enable their applicability in other contexts.
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Not at all	
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.	Not at all	
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.	Partly	

SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	Rating	Unsatisfactory
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	20%	Executive Feedback on Section 6
6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Partly	Recommendations relate to findings but are not clearly articulated with prioritization and/or classification. They should be prioritized, geared to specific agencies and clearly present what needs to be done, how it should be done and improvement is expected from them (what they are supposed to addressed). They should contain enough details to enable their implementation. Suggest to also add a description of the process undertaken and/or consultations held for their formulation.
6.2 The repor**t describes the process** followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	Not at all	
6.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g., reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up) and actionable.	Partly	
6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Not at all	

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)	GEEW is fully integrated in the evaluation scope. Even though an assessment of data on gender related results was not referred to, GEEW is included in the evaluation scope and evaluation questions related to gender/HR are included. Gender is not a standalone criteria but it is mainstreamed. The methodology was fully gender-responsive. The evaluation was guided by UN Women Evaluation Policies and United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) guidelines on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in evaluation and the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for evaluation, according to the report. Participants were disaggregated by relevant criteria of disadvantaged and advantaged groups depending on their gender or status such as women/men, class and location, to assess whether benefits and contributions were fairly distributed and to live up to the notion of 'leaving no one behind'. The evaluation used gender sensitive participatory methods for data collection and in developing case studies and harvesting Most Significant Change (MSC) stories. The report partially reflects gender analysis. The background section explains the gender problematique. The report assesses gender related outcomes and findings include gender perspective.However, the findings are not articulated as "findings" per se and some need to be better substantiated, showing the evidence for certain statements. No unanticipated effects were identified. Suggest to include GEEW aspects while formulating conclusions. Recommendations incorporate GEEW aspects related to UN Women's programming.
7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated (3)	
7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.	Partially integrated (1)	

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.	Mostly	The report structure and length are appropriate, but could be improved regarding clarity and coherence, specially in the Findings section, which is sometimes difficult for the reader to follow the arguments presented and transitions from one paragraph to another is not necessarily clear. Key Annexes are included (the ToRs, the evaluation questionnaires, list of people interviewed, a complete evaluation matrix showing data sources and indicators). This helps to show the robustness of the work undertaken. Most needed basic information is included in the first pages and the executive summary is complete and concise.
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	
8.3 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.	Fully	
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	
Additional Information		
Identify aspects of **good practice** of the evaluation		

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?	59.10	Fair	This report is well structured to address all evaluation criteria, but needs to be used with caution. The methodology and data collection seem appropriate and detailed information was gathered, as shown in the analysis. However, the findings section needs to better present this information, with clarity and coherence, properly demonstrating/substantiating the responses, providing sources to the statements made and clearly linking the results to project activities. A better, more comprehensive conclusion section is also needed along with more actionable recommendations.