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

PART I: REPORT DETAILS

Report title	Evaluación Del Proyecto "Mujeres Liderando El Desarrollo Inclusivo Sostenible De La Provincia De Loja"				**Geographical Coverage**	National
Sequence number	4	**Evaluators**	2	1	**Year**	2018
Region	Latin Americas and	**Country(ies)**	Ecuador		**Type of intervention evaluated**	Programme
Portfolio Budget (USD)	300,000	**Evaluation Budget (USD)**	10,504		**Reviewer**	María José De León Pellecer
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	**Women's leadership**	**Women's access to economic**	**Global norms,**		**Review Date**	05 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.	Fully	1.1 The evaluation report described the overall project (objectives, strategies, donors, implementing partners, activities and theory of change). 1.2 The context analysis directly related to the program. The objectives of the program were to strengthen national capacities, to increase more policies and services that promote women empowerment and increase and expand sustainable productive initiatives led by women such as access to products, services and markets. Because of this, the context described the current situation in the country related to economy, inequalities and income from a gender perspective. 1.3 The key stakeholders were described in the project description section. 1.4 Mostly. The evaluation report describes that the project was in its final stage of implementation and also described the modifications approved during the implementation.
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.	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?	**83%**	**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 The evaluation presents more than eight objectives and in two of them, the report mentioned that the evaluation intention is to identify lessons learned in the process and also know how the efforts will be sustainable at the local and national levels to inform future strategies related to economic empowerment of women.
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).	Mostly	2.2. Mostly. The evaluation report had a specific section for evaluation scope. This section described the geographic location and programmatic scope assessed. The reasons for this scope were not included in the report.
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?	**97%**	**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	3.1 One of the strengths of this evaluation is that the program was designed from its inception to measure impact. The evaluation used adequate methodologies to measure outcomes and impact, such as the use of a comparison group. The evaluation also used an integrated approach to human rights/gender equality and interculturality involving relevant stakeholders in the three phases of the evaluation process: preparation, field work and analysis.
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	3.2 The report explained in detail each data collection method used (survey, focus groups, interviews and case studies) and the rationale for each method. Each of those methods were selected with the objective to explore the changes in the main barriers identified such as: barriers to entry to the formal market; underemployment and concentration of women in the informal sector; low productivity; gender discrimination; unequal access for women and men to productive resources (land, credit, training) and inequality in decision making regarding the use and destination of family resources.
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	3.3 Mostly. The report provided an explanation about how the stakeholders were chosen for consultation. In the beginning stages, the evaluators developed a stakeholder mapping to identify all the organizations, institutions and participants that were relevant to the program and for the evaluation. Nevertheless, details relating who these stakeholders
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 consent of participants, confidentiality and avoidance of harm considerations.	Fully	were, were not provided. 3.4 The evaluation report had a specific section with limitations such as some variables in the baseline were not strong enough to use in the final evaluation and the databases of the baseline was incomplete. 3.5 The evaluation mentioned the UNEG standards relating to the use of consent information and safety of the participants during the evaluation.
SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)	**Rating**	**Very Good**
Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?	**93%**	**Executive Feedback on Section 4**
4.1The evaluation report findings provide sufficient levels of high quality evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation questions and criteria.	Fully	4.1 Report findings provided sufficient information organized by each evaluation criteria (efficacy, relevance, efficiency, sustainability and impact). The information from the survey was compared with the baseline results and information obtained through focus groups was also integrated in the analysis. Data has been disaggregated by regions. 4.2 Findings were triangulated with all the data collection methods used. The comparison between baseline and final evaluation provided an objective interpretation of data. 4.3 The use of adequate methodology has been a key factor to identify the contribution of the Project to the results. For example, the findings presented indicated that there was an increase in the number of beneficiaries who have initiated their accounting records for their business (40%) and this increase occurred as a result of the trainings. 4.4 Mostly, findings were clear and coherent. Some improvements were needed in how the results comparing baseline and final evaluation were presented. In some paragraphs it was not clear if there was a positive or negative change.
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.	Fully	
4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.	Fully	
4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities).	Mostly	

SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)	Rating	Fair
Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?	**37%**	**Executive Feedback on Section 5**
5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.	Partly	5.1 Conclusions were not aligned with the findings presented because the conclusions section only described in a very short summary how the project reached the objectives. This section did not provide enough evidence. 5.2 The conclusion didn't provide additional information beyond the findings. 5.3 The conclusion only presented in general terms the strengths and weaknesses. 5.4 There is a specific section of the evaluation with lessons learned presented as best practices, which allow for the identification of the most successful processes of the program to be highlighted.
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Partly	
5.3 Conclusions present **strengths and weaknesse**s 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.	Partly	
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.	Fully	
SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	**Rating**	Fair
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	**47%**	**Executive Feedback on Section 6**

6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Partly	6.1 Recommendations were only focused on one component of the project (trainings) and other . So they were not logically derived from the overall findings. 6.2 Recommendations were developed based on the consultation process with stakeholders. 6.3 Most of the recommendations were not clear enough in terms of context and terms used. For example, one of the recommendations stated that women should manage their own groups' credit but the recommendation did not elaborate how this could be done and what capacities the women's groups would need to do this. 6.4 Mostly all the recommendations follow a clear classification, but this section didn't address all the areas covered by the evaluation. For example, for the sustainability criteria, there isn't a specific recommendation that addresses how the Project could be more sustainable.
6.2 The repor**t describes the process** followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	Mostly	
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.	Mostly	
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. The evaluation noted that the project had a Logical Framework where the expected results, indicators and means of verification were recorded. The project defined two indicators of gaps in gender: a) global work load, which shows the total work, paid and unpaid (where domestic and care work is included); b) the gap in access to productive assets. Also, the evaluation had a specific objective to assess human rights and gender equality. Bottlenecks in terms of rights achievements were presented in the evaluation and the objectives; criteria and learning questions were adapted around these bottlenecks. Thus, the purpose of the evaluation was to assess whether the program contributed to the reduction of common bottlenecks such as difficulty accessing credit, products, supplies, services and markets, low empowerment and economic autonomy. Specific questions were developed to assess gender equality in the evaluation. The questions were distributed among all the criteria in the evaluation (effectiveness, sustainability, efficacy, impact and relevance).
7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated (3)	7.2 The evaluation used an integrated approach to human rights/gender equality/interculturality. A participatory approach to the data collection methods were used which involved stakeholders in the three phases of the evaluation process: preparatory phase, field work and analysis of the information. Evaluators collected qualitative information (using interviews, focus groups, stakeholder mapping and participant observation) and quantitative data (survey) through a participatory process.
7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	7.3 The evaluation had a specific section describing the background through an intersectional analysis related to the economic problems in the country and how these problems affect women's and girls' lives in diverse ways. The evaluation included in all the analysis, information provided from the stakeholders, the details related the bottlenecks identified by women that they faced when becoming more successful in their businesses and markets. For example, they indicated the difficulties faced in obtaining financial support from banks and how this affected the results of the project. Nevertheless, almost all the recommendations were focused on management and operational aspects of the project, such as coordination with different stakeholders, improvement of the M&E system and planning, not substantive GEEW issues.

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 is logically well structured and presented. 8.2 The title page and opening pages provided information about the evaluators and time frame of the evaluation. 8.3 The executive summary is a stand-alone section with information about the project, methodology and key findings. 8.4 The annexes are completed including the tools used.
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	The methodology of this evaluation is a good example of gender approach in evaluation design.	

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?	**75.13**	Good	