

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	Evaluation of Women's Employment Promotion Project (WEPP)			Geographical Coverage	National
Sequence number	14	Evaluators	3	Year	2018
Region	Arab States	Country(ies)	Egypt	Type of intervention evaluated	Project
Portfolio Budget (USD)		Evaluation Budget (USD)	6,987.00	Reviewer	Zayid Douglas
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Women's access to			Review Date	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?	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 evaluation focused on safe, secure workplaces in the agribusiness sector - focusing on supporting firms to work towards being gender inclusive through the promotion of equal work for equal value and employment opportunities and increased retention. The project outcomes and outputs as well as (international and domestic) partners, intended beneficiaries, and targets were clearly stated. This project was carried out in 3 governorates within Egypt.
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	1.2 The evaluation context includes those economic factors that affect employment, including women's high rate of underemployment, participation in the labor force in addition to cultural norms that act as barriers or facilitators to women's economic participation and socially prescribed roles, such as women as participants in the unpaid care economy.
1.3 The key stakeholders involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described.	Fully	1.3 The key stakeholders including women workers, men supervisors, UN Women staff, implementing partners, agribusiness firms and roles are described in the report (and annex).
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	1.4 The evaluation is final in orientation and took place during the last few months of a 2.5 year project.
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 There is a clear explanation of the evaluation, its purpose, which was to assess progress made towards outcomes, and "...support accountability, learning and knowledge generation, as well as decision-making".(p. 14). The intended users of the evaluation are noted up front and these include the donor (USAID), UN Women management staff, the main implementing partner- CARE (an INGO), junior implementers (local CBOs and

<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>agribusiness firms), as well as those engaged in the women's empowerment space.</p> <p>2.2 The evaluation assessed progress made in the gender equality space - particularly around increased safety, productivity, and awareness around gender equality. These were centered around programmes in 3 governorates in Egypt.</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>	95%	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 There is full description of the evaluation criteria and key questions in the report, aligned with the OECD/DAC criteria - focusing on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. In addition, gender equality and human rights is interwoven into each criteria, ensuring that the evaluation is carried out with a gendered/rights-based lens. The sub questions and indicator data are also noted in an evaluation matrix that is located in a report annex.</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 report provided an overview of the mixed methods utilized in data collection - quantitative face to face surveys targeting beneficiaries, in-depth interviews (IDI), and focus group discussions (FGD) with other stakeholders, which "allowed for quantitative measurement of the changes and effects of the intervention, as well as provided descriptive insights for analysing the results attained". Greater detail is provided in the evaluation matrix. To analyze the results in terms of its transformative nature, the evaluators used the Gender Results Effectiveness Scale (GRES).</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 In the annex there is a stakeholder analysis that notes which stakeholders participated, why (the purpose as why this group was consulted), the type of information gathered from this group, and those times at which they were consulted throughout the process.</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>	Mostly	<p>3.4 For the most part, yes. The evaluation notes the absence of baseline data from some sites and how this was mitigated (surveys allowed for collection of retrospective data for comparison) and the analysis involving the VSLA component, which focused on part of the the 3 part cycle, given the rollout of this component within the project timeline. It is not clear if any more limitations were experienced during the evaluation.</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>	Mostly	

SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)	Rating	Good
Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?	53%	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.	Partly	4.1 The report findings provided evidence to address the evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability). The lack of baseline or comparison group data led to difficulties in ascertaining the extent to which some outcomes were contributed to by the program.
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.	Partly	4.2 Due to limitations regarding missing baseline and partial launching of VSLA cycle, there was a lot of presentation around findings that were rooted in descriptive analysis. Nonetheless using the GRES as an analytical lens helped to take the findings to a deeper level.
4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.	Mostly	4.3 The project was focused on the employment and organizational influences related to women's participation in agribusiness, and factors of success were addressed in the evaluation. In addition the evaluation underscored the sustainability aspects of women friendly workplaces and in particular highlighted the gender responsive policies put in place by the program.
4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities).	Fully	4.4 The findings are presented in the order of evaluation criteria and key question and were logical and clear, weaving various evidence points together.
SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)	Rating	Good
Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?	65%	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 Although few in number, the conclusions were clearly drawn from the evaluation findings and acknowledged the respective evaluation criteria.
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Mostly	5.2 There were interconnections and higher level reflections on the evidence presented, suggesting future attention to targeting structural barriers that inhibit women's participation in paid employment (gendered norms & lack of women friendly environments). 5.3 Conclusions presented project strengths/weaknesses, using findings extracted from data that was gathered from diverse stakeholders.
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.	Mostly	5.4 While rooted in findings, the lessons learned were presented in a general tone, lacking specificity around project adaptation in different contexts.
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	Very Good
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	83%	Executive Feedback on Section 6
6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Mostly	6.1 For the most part the recommendations were clearly constructed post review of the findings but the nature in which they were presented appear to be illustrative. 6.2 There was a one sentence description of the recommendation development process in the report, stemming from the evidence and stakeholder feedback.
6.2 The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	Mostly	6.3 The recommendations were clear and actionable. The evaluators usefully split recommendations up by Stakeholders in the WEPP program, Agribusiness firms, and UN Women.

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 The recommendations were directed to the responsible party/stakeholder.
6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Fully	
SECTION 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS (weight 15%)	Score	Approaching Requirements
Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? Note: this section will be rated according to UN SWAP standards.	67%	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. GEEW was integrated through all evaluation criteria and key questions. 7.2 A gender responsive methodology, tools, and data analysis were used. Sex disaggregation of quantitative data was not appropriate given the small sample size for men.
7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Partially integrated (1)	7.3 The findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis but the conclusions could have been provided more detail.
7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	
SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)	Rating	Very Good

Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?	100%	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 logically structured and presented.
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 and opening pages presented key basic information.
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 summarizes the evaluation purpose, objectives, methods, findings, conclusions, and 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 evaluation report annexes present the terms of reference (TOR), stakeholder analysis, evaluation matrix, list of organizations/individuals consulted, evaluation team member biographies, list of project documentation reviewed, and interview guides used in data collection- in Arabic.
Additional Information		
Identify aspects of <i>good practice</i> of the evaluation	The stakeholder analysis used in this evaluation is presented in a format that future evaluations might wish to emulate. Noting who was active, how and when during the evaluation they contributed, was most useful. Data collection from men supervisors and their contributions around policy/practices supported the execution of this 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?	77.08	Good	