

**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	<p><i>Are weightings equal to 100%?</i></p> <p><b>OK</b></p>

**PART I: REPORT DETAILS**

<b>Report title</b>	Mid Term Evaluation Of The Programme: Overcoming Gender-Based Violence To Ensure Women's Full Enjoyment			<b>Geographical Coverage</b>	National
<b>Sequence number</b>	6	<b>Evaluators</b>	1	<b>Year</b>	2018
<b>Region</b>	Latin Americas and	<b>Country(ies)</b>	Colombia	<b>Type of intervention evaluated</b>	Project
<b>Portfolio Budget (USD)</b>	7,915,000.00	<b>Evaluation Budget (USD)</b>	22,000.00	<b>Reviewer</b>	María José De León Pellecer
<b>Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)</b>	Prevent VAW&G and			<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?	75%	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 The report explained the project in one specific section. The objectives, outcomes and outputs were described as well as the theory of change which is "to impact in the rates of violence against girls and women in Colombia an integrated, multisectorial and coordinated responses are required, taking into account the context of the country and the human rights".
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 The analysis of the context was focused on the legal and policy framework in Colombia around VAWG but relevant data related to violence against women was not presented. 1.3 All the partners involved were described.
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	1.4 The report mentioned that it was a mid-term evaluation of a project that started in 2014. It was not clear when the Project will be completed. The background mentioned that this was an USAID funded grant but the end date was not clear.
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.	Mostly	
SECTION 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)	RATING	Very Good
Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?	100%	Executive Feedback on Section 2

<p><b>2.1 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.</p>	Fully	<p>2.1 The report provided a clear explanation about the purposes of the evaluation such as the assessment of the relevance, efficiency and efficacy of the project. The report also mentioned that one of the main objectives of the evaluation was to produce a set of informative and communication tools that could be used to present lessons learned and achievements of the program to donors and other partners that have been involved in the program implementation.</p>
<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>2.2 Yes, there was an evaluation scope section that included information relating to the dates to develop the evaluation, the geographic coverage and the evaluation criteria.</p>
<p><b>SECTION 3 : METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)</b></p>	<p><b>RATING</b></p>	<p><b>Very Good</b></p>
<p><b>Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and appropriate, and the rationale for the methodological choice justified?</b></p>	<p><b>90%</b></p>	<p><b>Executive Feedback on Section 3</b></p>
<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 scope.</p>	Fully	<p>3.1. The methodology described the sets of methods chosen and also the evaluation criteria that were assessed. The evaluation used mixed methods in the methodology design using diverse quantitative and qualitative techniques.</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 All the data collection methods used and sampling were described. The evaluation used semi-structured interviews and focus groups. Also, within the data collection tools they used two thematic questionnaires, which were applied and designed by the members of the Gender Bureau of International Cooperation (MGCI).</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 Limitations were described in the methodology section. The evaluation methodology was designed to analyse the complexity of gender relations (as stated in the evaluation report) using the following structure of analysis (qualitative – quantitative – qualitative) but the evaluators faced limitations conducting the survey in the field so the quantitative approach was not conducted.</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 There is no reference to ethical considerations of the participants or in the data</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>	<p>Not at all</p>	<p>collection process in the report.</p>
<p><b>SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)</b></p>	<p><b>Rating</b></p>	<p><b>Very Good</b></p>
<p><b>Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?</b></p>	<p><b>80%</b></p>	<p><b>Executive Feedback on Section 4</b></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>	<p>Mostly</p>	<p>4.1 The evaluation report presented the findings with a high level of evidence, using triangulation of data. There was less quantitative evidence due to survey collection issues mentioned.</p>
<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>	<p>Mostly</p>	
<p>4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>4.2 Mostly, the findings under the criteria of efficiency and efficacy were presented with evidence. The criteria of relevance was not presented with enough evidence and information.</p> <p>4.3 The causal factors of leading to achievement were identified such as the coordination of stakeholders and the involvement of men during the project.</p>
<p>4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities).</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>4.4 The findings were presented using the evaluation criteria order.</p>
<p><b>SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)</b></p>	<p><b>Rating</b></p>	<p><b>Very Good</b></p>

<p><b>Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?</b></p>	<p>100%</p>	<p><b>Executive Feedback on Section 5</b></p>
<p>5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.</p>	<p>Fully</p>	
<p>5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>5.1 The conclusions were well-substantiated by evidence presented and were logically connected to the evaluation criteria.</p> <p>5.2 The conclusions went beyond the analysis presented in the findings. In some cases, additional information was provided.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>5.3 Conclusions presented strengths related to program implementation and also weaknesses such as the M&amp;E framework and system that needed to be improved.</p> <p>5.4 There was a specific section for lessons learned.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Fully</p>	
<p><b>SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</b></p>	<p>Rating</p>	<p>Very Good</p>
<p><b>Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?</b></p>	<p>87%</p>	<p><b>Executive Feedback on Section 6</b></p>
<p>6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>6.1 Recommendations were based on the findings and conclusions.</p> <p>6.2 Yes but partly, there was no clear evidence if the stakeholders' input were included in the recommendations.</p>

6.2 The report <b>describes the process</b> followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	Partly	6.3 The recommendations were realistic based the phase where the Project was (mid-term).
6.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g., reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up) and actionable.	Fully	6.4 Recommendations are clear and realistic, for example they are organized by strategic components such as programmatic, communications, planning, finance.
6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Fully	
<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.	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	7.1 The evaluation analyzed the results chains and indicators in one specific section of the findings with a critical analysis of the outputs, outcomes and the expected impact. Within this analysis, weaknesses were identified in the causal logic that connected to the design of the program and the ability to report results during implementation. The gender equality considerations were included in the objective because the main area of work of the program was gender empowerment to reduce gender based violence in Colombia. The evaluation did not mention a standalone criteria for gender rights or human rights and is not explicitly included in the findings section. But under the effectiveness criteria, the gender rights approach was included when analyzing the implementation of public policies within four public institutions, and the contributions of the program in the Colombian International Cooperation Roundtable for Gender. No specific questions were not included in the evaluation report.
7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	7.2. The evaluation methodology promoted a participative and inclusive evaluation process, including the voices and opinion of all the relevant stakeholders of the Program. A total of 91 people were consulted throughout the evaluation hence maintaining a balance
7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated (3)	

SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)	Rating	Very Good
Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?	97%	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 was well-structured, with organized sections and was easy to navigate. 8.2 Mostly all the information needed was in the title page. Information on all the evaluation team members was missed.
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.	Mostly	8.3 The executive summary was a stand-alone section and included all the relevant information. 8.4 There was a completed annex with monitoring matrix, TOR, and informants lists.
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 <i>good practice</i> of the evaluation	This evaluation presented a good example of an evaluation design with a GEWE approach. Within the data collection tools, they used two thematic questionnaires applied and designed by the members of the Gender Bureau of International Cooperation (MGCI).	

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?	88.69	Very Good	