

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	Joint Programme On: Accelerating Progress Towards The Economic Empowerment Of Rural Women (Jp-Rwee)			Geographical Coverage	National
Sequence number	17	Evaluators	2	Year	2018
Region	Europe and Central Asia	Country(ies)	Kyrgyzstan	Type of intervention evaluated	Programme
Portfolio Budget (USD)	35,000,000	Evaluation Budget (USD)		Reviewer	Glaiza Veluz
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Women's leadership <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Women's access to			Review Date	06 February 2019

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.	Fully	1.1 It was clear that the final evaluation of the JP-RWEE program will assess programmatic and coordination aspects under the key criteria of relevance, effectiveness, impact, organizational efficiency, and sustainability. It was likewise discussed that the project has a budget of USD35 million, although it started with a budget of USD 375,000 and the remaining amount was mobilized. Through a table, the evaluation was able to inform the project intervention logic such as its outputs, outcomes, and

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	goals. 1.2 The report provided a contextual overview of the current situation of rural women in Kyrgyzstan. They also cited a 2015 study that showed how women were limited in their paid economic activity due to unpaid care work (by comparing free time spent by men and women). The report also highlighted the current status of the gender responsiveness of Kyrgyzstan policy environment and the current situation of women in political participation (which is rather low).
1.3 The key stakeholders involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described.	Mostly	1.3 There was no explicit discussion of stakeholders roles or a specific section for this criterion. However, in the process of explaining the program and the methodology they were able to explain the roles of most of the stakeholders.
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.	Not at all	1.4 There was no discussion if significant changes in implementation had effect on the way the evaluation was done.
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 The evaluation explains that the purpose of the evaluation is to assess the programmatic progress and performance of the program. across the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, impact, organizational efficiency and sustainability. The evaluation likewise was able to explain well the use of the evaluation (such as provision of insights for programming, refining approaches and knowledge management) and intended users such as policy makers, UN agencies in Kyrgyzstan, government, CSOs, donor communities, and beneficiaries.
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	2.2 Evaluation scope was well explained by noting that it will assess the lifetime of the programme (2014-2018) and specifying the 5 regions to be assessed . There were no reasons cited for the scope but such scope is aligned to the evaluation ToR
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 The evaluation criteria and questions were generally clear. The evaluation was clear likewise on its gender and rights methods. Specifically, the evaluation used the Women Empowerment in Agricultural Index (WEIA) tool to analyze the impact of the program. The evaluators also had a dedicated section outlining the efforts they made to ensure that the evaluation was human rights and gender responsive.
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 evaluation emphasized that it followed the Theory of Change approach and used mixed method analytical approaches to account for "complexity of gender relations and ensure participatory and inclusive process." It mentioned that triangulation was conducted in the course of the evaluation. The report described the rationale for using each data gathering tool (field visit, FGD, Phone Survey). It likewise explained the process that transpired in each data gathering technique. For example, they used tools such as "Change Man" and "Critical Cases" to flesh out impact level data from the project beneficiaries/rural women.

<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 There were various consultations conducted by the evaluators. The report explained that they consulted with the evaluation management group (EMG) and evaluation reference group (ERG) on the 33 evaluation questions for clarification - which led to grouping of the 33 evaluations into overarching key evaluation questions (illustrated through a table). They noted a theory of change workshop was held with the EMG. The purpose of this workshop was to clarify the Kyrgyzstan JP RWEE Theory of Change based on the existing Logical Framework and to assess how and at what stages of implementation the JP RWEE could have an impact on the different aspects of the Women Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI). Data validation workshops also took place with the EMG and ERG participants which contributed to interpretation of evaluation findings and arriving at evaluation conclusions and recommendations.</p> <p>3.4 The evaluation was quite weak on this aspect. There is a "Limitations" section but it was not mentioned how the limitations they highlighted were mitigated.</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>	Partly	<p>3.5. The report mentioned compliance with UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Code of Conduct and UN Women Evaluation Policy and guidelines. The evaluation section also had dedicated section for discussing how they adopted ethical considerations at the course of the evaluation. In their discussion of the FGD methodology, it was also mentioned how the evaluators addressed potentially biased dynamics of men and women groups to ensure smooth data gathering (e.g, by separating men and women in FGDs if necessary)</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>	Fully	
<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>100%</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>	Fully	<p>4.1 The findings were essentially strong with presentation of impact level, gender-transformative data which was backed up by findings per evaluation criteria.</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>	Fully	<p>4.2 The evaluators provided evidence backing up their findings. There were figures, quotes, charts, and tables as necessary, which also made the data presentation clearer.</p>
<p>4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.</p>	Fully	<p>4.3 The evaluators were able to explain the causes of their findings as applicable. An example is explaining why the project could "leave people behind". They explained the factors that facilitated increased income for the rural women who participated in the program. Such analysis is prevalent throughout the findings. Further, the evaluation also had analyzed some negative effects of the project together with reasoning.</p>
<p>4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities).</p>	Fully	<p>4.4. Each finding was presented with evidence and data explanations. Hence, the findings were always clear and elaborated.</p>
<p>SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)</p>	<p>Rating</p>	<p>Very Good</p>
<p>Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?</p>	<p>98%</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>	Fully	<p>5.1. Conclusions presentation was strong. There was a clear link between what was being concluded and the findings as it specifically shows which finding each conclusion was connected to.</p>
<p>5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings</p>	Fully	<p>5.2 As the evaluation presented detailed data in the findings, the conclusion became the synthesized version. The synthesis</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.	Fully	5.3 The conclusions elaborated further on the findings by synthesizing the strengths and weaknesses of the program intervention.
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.	Mostly	5.4 Lessons learned were based on the findings. Each lesson learned is presented per JP RWEE specific component and contains points of improvement, benefits of the participants, and current gains the program they can capitalize on (if to be continued). The explanation on "current gains" presents information, though not directly, on how the lessons learned can be applied.
SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	Rating	Good
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	63%	Executive Feedback on Section 6
6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Fully	6.1 The recommendations were derived from the findings and conclusions. It revolved around use of operational models under the WEIA domains, components of the JP-RWEE to be continued, stakeholders that need to be continually supported, and replicating current efforts.
6.2 The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	Mostly	6.2 The recommendations were noted to be a product of data validation workshops but there was no detailed description of the process of consultation.
6.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g., reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up) and actionable.	Mostly	6.3. The recommendations were clear and realistic and actionable - focusing on specific steps to be done if the program will be continued.
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.	100%	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 GEWE explicitly reflects criteria and questions. The framework used for analysis is gender responsive - the WEAL.
7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated (3)	7.2 The evaluation employed mixed methods to ensure that all voices of stakeholders are gathered. They used change map and critical stories tool to capture gender transformative impact from rural women.
7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated (3)	7.3 Key gender responsive output and outcomes were clearly explained and backed up by data in their findings, conclusions, and recommendations.
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 clearly written with sufficient evidence provided. The sequence is logical (e.g., criteria being assessed, followed by general finding, followed by data/details of the finding) which made the report very easy to understand and navigate. Language used was universal and if there was jargon or use of native language, it was properly translated or explained. There were minimal spelling errors.
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 Full information about the evaluators is found in Annex 4 of the report. Table of contents is comprehensive (page numbers, graphs, figures, abbreviations, etc.).

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 was concise, yet it was able to capture all the contents of the evaluation report.
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.	Fully	8.4 There is an annex that includes the data collection tools, the members of the EMG and ERG, profile of the evaluators, and the terms of reference.

Additional Information

Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation	The framework and data gathering techniques employed were able to capture impact level information. Among the tools they used were "Change Map," and "Critical Cases." Further, such data was well presented and findings backed by evidence. The report was well written - it seemed that it was narrating the story that took place with the JP RWEE intervention - both the good and the bad - which makes it very easy to read, but informative, scientific and technical at the same time.
--	---

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?	91.99	Very Good	