

**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>	Prise En Charge Adéquate Des Femmes Victimes De Violences Dans La Région De L'extrême Nord		<b>Geographical Coverage</b>	National	
<b>Sequence number</b>	30	<b>Evaluators</b>	1	<b>Year</b>	2018
<b>Region</b>	Western and Central	<b>Country(ies)</b>	Cameroon	<b>Type of intervention evaluated</b>	Programme
<b>Portfolio Budget (USD)</b>	1,170,000	<b>Evaluation Budget (USD)</b>	10,000.00	<b>Reviewer</b>	Benoist Conti
<b>Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)</b>	Prevent VAW&G and		<b>Review Date</b>	10 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%	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 1</b>

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.	Mostly	1.1 It's succinct, specifically messaging regarding budget and quick explanation of the object. There is not enough information to get a clear theory of change, understanding of resources and other pertinent information. However, the body of the report outlines the logic of the intervention on page 13. Objectives on p14. Specific section on gender.
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.	Fully	1.2 The context and introduction on pages 11 and 12 provide a good background and articulates the social, political and economic factors
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	1.3 Stakeholders are detailed in the project profile in an organized manner.
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.	Not at all	1.4 Not mentioned
<b>SECTION 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>Fair</b>
<b>Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 2</b>
2.1 <b>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.	Mostly	2.1 the evaluation provides a quite limited explanation of its purpose, but some points are mentioned: accountability, lessons, decision-making factors and considerations. They are a bit enigmatic and aren't clearly explained in details.
2.2 <b>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).	Not at all	2.2 Except for geographic coverage, the scope is confused with evaluation and criteria. So strictly speaking there is a very limited explanation of what the scope of the evaluation is intended to be and the related limitations
<b>SECTION 3 : METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>Very Good</b>
<b>Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and appropriate, and the rationale for the methodological choice justified?</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 3</b>
3.1 <b>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.	Fully	3.1 There is a detailed methodology on p17 that applies a gender lens, evaluation criteria and questions.
3.2 <b>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.	Fully	3.2 The rationale on data collection and sampling is present and mentions specificity of beneficiaries and geographical limitations. See also table on p19 3.3 The stakeholders are mentioned but not a clear approach on engaging or involvement with this group. No mention of institutional stakeholders for data collection.
3.3 <b>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.	Partly	3.4 Limitations mentioned, triangulation and adaptation to difficulties (geographical mainly)
3.4 <b>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.	Mostly	3.5 Not mentioned
3.5 <b>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.	Not at all	

SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?	83%	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.	Fully	4.1 The findings address diligently all questions
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.	Mostly	4.2 Examples were mentioned but information is lacking on the data collected and evidence supporting the conclusions.
4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.	Mostly	4.3 Some factors are singled out (cultural factor, management) but it's not consistent.
4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities).	Fully	4.4 Findings are clear.
SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)	Rating	Good
Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?	72%	Executive Feedback on Section 5
5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.	Fully	5.1 The conclusions follow, align with the key findings and are clearly connected.
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Mostly	5.2 There's some insight provided but it's too brief thus no communicating the impact.
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.	Partly	5.3 Too short to clearly note the strengths and weaknesses.
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.	Not at all	5.4 No lesson or insights specifically mentioned besides the conclusions. The evaluation did not mention best practices or specific points on how the project was led that could have been useful and help support the recommendations.
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.	Fully	6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from conclusions.
6.2 The report <b>describes the process</b> followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	Not at all	6.2 The process is not described.
6.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g., reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up) and actionable.	Partly	6.3 Recommendations are clear but could be made more actionable. They are associated with responsible entities but are not detailed enough
6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Partly	6.4 Prioritization is not clear
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

<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 There is no specific background section on gender but gender is part of the evaluation's objective as it is integrated in a few questions -Question 4 on Efficacite for example: Dans quelle mesure les phases de planification et de mise en œuvre se sont-elles-basées sur le respect des DH et l'EGS ? Pertinence Question 1: Est-ce que les activités du projet sont liées aux problèmes de genre identifiés en contexte humanitaire ? Question 3 is about women. Also there is a specific question on how GEEW was integrated in the subject of the evaluation: Question 7 : Dans quelle mesure les bénéfiques de l'intégration du genre dans la réponse humanitaire ainsi que l'autonomisation économique des cibles ont-ils eu un effet plus large (sur un plus grand nombre de personnes dans la région) ? There is also a specific set of questions related to GBV: Question 9. Les survivantes de Boko Haram, ont-elles reçu la prise en charge holistique adaptée à leurs besoins spécifiques ? Comment sont-elles après avoir reçu les services et quels sont les gaps (écarts) ? // Question 10. Comment apprécier la capacité opérationnelle du Gender Desk ? (Traitement des cas, complicité professionnelle avec la communauté...) etc.</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 methodology integrates the gender perspective: La méthodologie utilisée pour cette évaluation a respecté les critères du Comité d'aide au développement (CAD/OCDE) et les principes du Groupe de Coopération en Évaluation (ECG) ainsi que les normes d'évaluation d'ONU FEMMES et du Groupe des Nations Unies pour l'évaluation (GNUE) en intégrant les droits humains et l'égalité des sexes. Des spécificités et innovations apportées à la méthodologie sur l'évaluation sensible au genre ont permis que les questions du genre et de l'autonomisation des femmes, de l'égalité soient traitées de manière transversale et spécifique ainsi que l'exige la classification des rapports selon les critères du « UN-SWAP ». the methodology uses quant and qual approaches that suit gender studies specifically. A diverse range of data from a diversity of stakeholders is used(p.17). There is special attention to most vulnerable populations: Les enquêtes de terrain ont permis de collecter les données empiriques en tenant compte de la spécificité de la zone d'étude, de l'opérationnalité des outils méthodologiques, de l'échantillonnage et des procédés d'analyse. La zone d'étude couvre toute la Région de l'Extrême-Nord, avec un ancrage sur les sites d'occupation des communautés déplacées des localités de Maroua, Mokolo et Mora. L'échantillon de cette évaluation a été soigneusement sélectionné pour s'assurer qu'il sera représentatif de la population cible et des principales zones. L'échantillon a été sélectionné</p>

7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated (3)	representatif de la population cible, et des principaux acteurs. L'échantillon a été prélevé au hasard dans les zones de mise en œuvre, en fonction du type d'acteurs rencontré par la mission. Finally, ethical considerations are mentioned: security concerns mentioned a few times. 7.3 the evaluation has a specific section analysing the intervention on women. On page 1: various focus groups and sources to triangulate different groups mentioned. Overall effects in gender equality are addressed even though there is not much detail on unanticipated ones. Recommendation integrate gender (page 63 and onwards)
<b>SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Very Good
<b>Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 8</b>
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 Report is well-structured and presented and clearly understood. 8.2 Not fully because information on the organization is limited with little or no context. 8.3 Executive Summary is standalone. 8.4 No annexes.
8.2 <b>The title page and opening pages</b> 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 <b>Executive Summary</b> 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 <b>Annexes</b> 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).	Not at all	
<b>Additional Information</b>		
Identify aspects of <i>good practice</i> of the 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?	73.91	Good	