

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	Un Women Rwanda Country Portfolio Evaluation 2014 - 2018			Geographical Coverage	National
Sequence number	23	Evaluators	1	Year	2018
Region	Eastern and Southern	Country(ies)	Rwanda	Type of intervention evaluated	CPE
Portfolio Budget (USD)	10,754,009	Evaluation Budget (USD)	40,000	Reviewer	Zayid Douglas
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Women's leadership Women's access to Prevent VAW&G and	Women's leadership in peace, Gender response plans and Global norms, policies and		Review Date	08 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

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 notes the evaluation object as the UN Strategic Note for Rwanda 2014-2018, its referen
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.	Fully	
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.	Fully	
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
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	2.1 Yes, the purpose of the report is to present findings from the UN Women country program evaluati
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?	90%	3.1 The evaluation criteria - guided by OECD/DAC- was noted relevancy, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability areas of criteria. In addition, there was a specific criterion on gender equality and human rights as well. The evaluation employed a mixed methods approach to answer the evaluation criteria and key questions. 3.2 The evaluation was informed by a desk review to help shape the design and planning (via the inception report); KIIs with UN Women Rwanda staff, UN agencies, representatives from GoR ministries and civil society, and donors; and IDIs with rights holders (programme participants). "A flexible, gender-responsive and human rights focused mixed method approach to the CPE was used to facilitate effective, respectful review that engages with respondents as partners". 3.3 Yes, some information was noted that stakeholders associated with the Evaluation Reference Group reviewed the project TOC, and participated in a validation workshop post-data collection, where they reviewed draft findings. 3.4 Yes, however there was limited information.The evaluators noted that there were delays in securing documentation for the desk review, and experienced time constraints
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	
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.	Mostly	
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.	Partly	

<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>	<p>Mostly</p>	<p>while carrying out the evaluation, hindering time spent with the ERG.</p> <p>3.5 Yes, the evaluation followed UN Evaluation Guidelines and included considerable detail about these guidelines were provided in the report. The team noted respect for confidentiality, do no harm principles, opportunities for redress among the key guidelines.</p>
<p>SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)</p>	<p>Rating</p>	<p>Very Good</p>
<p>Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?</p>	<p>80%</p>	<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>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>4.1 The report findings appear to be grounded in evidence that answer the key questions affiliated with the 5 criteria. These were gathered through different methods and triangulation of data ensured the voices of rights holders in addition to duty bearers were incorporated into the report.</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>Fully</p>	<p>4.2 The findings aligned with the evidence presented. For example, UN Women Rwanda had seconded a staff member to the GoR national statistics office to build capacity around the collection, analysis, and reporting of gender responsive data.</p>
<p>4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.</p>	<p>Not at all</p>	<p>4.3 There was a lack of an explicit TOC, suggestion that there is no or limited documentation of evidence, pathways of change for this evaluation.</p>
<p>4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities).</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>4.3 There was a lack of an explicit TOC, suggestion that there is no or limited documentation of evidence, pathways of change for this evaluation.</p>
<p>SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)</p>	<p>Rating</p>	<p>Good</p>
<p>Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?</p>	<p>52%</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>Partly</p>	<p>5.1. The conclusions presented in the evaluation report are unclear with limited detail and no clear reference to specific findings (unlike the presentation of findings in other evaluation reports).</p>
<p>5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings</p>	<p>Mostly</p>	<p>5.2 The conclusions add insight beyond the findings, thus laying a base for recommendations. For example, it was concluded that coordination is not adequately reflected in the current strategic note and in the next strategic note update, monitoring of</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>Mostly</p>	<p>5.2 The conclusions add insight beyond the findings, thus laying a base for recommendations. For example, it was concluded that coordination is not adequately reflected in the current strategic note and in the next strategic note update, monitoring of</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>reflected in the current strategic note and in the next strategic note update, monitoring of outputs & outcomes need to incorporate coordination (to support achievement of results).</p> <p>5.3 Yes - Conclusions present programme strengths and weaknesses, and incorporated different data sources to arrive at these conclusions.</p> <p>5.4- There were no lessons learned section presented within this report.</p>
<p>SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</p>	<p>Rating</p>	<p>Very Good</p>
<p>Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?</p>	<p>83%</p>	<p>Executive Feedback on Section 6</p>
<p>6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>6.1 The evaluation recommendations are rooted in both the findings and conclusions.</p>
<p>6.2 The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.</p>	<p>Mostly</p>	<p>6.2 The reported mentioned a summary of the validation meeting convened after data collection, where preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations were shared with the ERG who represent a wide swath of stakeholders.</p>
<p>6.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g., reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up) and actionable.</p>	<p>Mostly</p>	<p>6.3 It is clear who is to act on these recommendations, and the rationale for such recommendations is provided.</p>
<p>6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>6.4 - The reported recommendations note level of urgency/difficulty/impact and the responsible party for taking this forward.</p>
<p>SECTION 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS (weight 15%)</p>	<p>Score</p>	<p>Meets Requirements</p>
<p>Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? Note: this section will be rated according to UN SWAP standards.</p>	<p>89%</p>	<p>Executive Feedback on Section 7</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Fully integrated (3)</p>	<p>7.1 GEWE was integrated into the evaluation criteria and key questions, and there was focus on assessing gender equality and human rights.</p>
<p>7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.</p>	<p>Fully integrated (3)</p>	<p>7.2 The evaluation noted the selection of a gender responsive framework (Longwe Women's Empowerment Framework) along with a variety of methods - interviews, group discussions, contribution analysis, and a desk review.</p>
<p>7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.</p>	<p>Satisfactorily integrated (2)</p>	<p>7.3 The findings, conclusions, and recommendations derived from a gender analysis- all working towards social norms change that is rooted in a human rights based approach.</p>
<p>SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)</p>	<p>Rating</p>	<p>Very Good</p>

Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?	93%	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 structured and content is presented in typical UN report format (table of contents, executive summary, followed by background/context, evaluation purpose, methodology, findings, conclusions, lessons learned, recommendations).	
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	8.2 The report follows those guidelines for UN Women reports; however, the recommendations appear to be inadvertently omitted from this report's table of contents.	
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	8.3 The executive summary is a standalone section that features a condensed version of the background/context, evaluation purpose, findings, conclusions, lessons learned, 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).	Mostly	8.4 Mostly, the suggested documents are among those listed in the annexes; with the exception of the theory of change, which is available upon request from one of the authors. These annexes include tables for the contribution analysis and boundary analysis.	
Additional Information			
Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation	<p>-For this evaluation, stakeholder analysis presents a summary of stakeholders under each of the three UN Women mandates, aligned to a results framework area.</p> <p>-One annex highlights each boundary partner, with associated targets and expected outcomes.</p>		

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?	80.55	Good	