

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 | Sustainability of the wasteland from a gender perspective | | | Geographical Coverage | National |
| Sequence number | 7 | Evaluators | 1 | Year | 2018 |
| Region | Latin Americas and | Country(ies) | Ecuador | Type of intervention evaluated | Project |
| Portfolio Budget (USD) | 238,949.00 | Evaluation Budget (USD) | 4,550.00 | Reviewer | María José De León Pellecer |
| Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply) | Women's leadership | Women's access to economic | | Review Date | 07 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? | 58% | 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. | Partly | 1.1 Partly, the report included a summary of the project and described the beneficiaries and geographic location, but it did not include the theory of change, results chain or strategies implemented. |
| 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. | Not at all | 1.2 The report did not describe the context in which the project was implemented. |
| 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 context analysis that the report had was in fact a description of the stakeholders involved. |
| 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 report explained the implementation phase of the 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 The report mentioned that the evaluation would be used for accountability and future planning processes. |
| 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 The evaluation report provided information about the type of evaluation (process evaluation) and the justification. It also mentioned the geographic scope. |
| SECTION 3 : METHODOLOGY (weight 15%) | RATING | Good |
| Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and appropriate, and the rationale for the methodological choice justified? | 60% | 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. | Mostly | 3.1 The methodology was described in the report as mixed-methods and the report explained the phases of the methodology implemented. Even though the report mentioned that a survey was done, information about the sampling, types of analysis and questions were not included. |
| 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. | Mostly | 3.2 Data collection methods used were included but further information about how they were implemented and the information analyzed was missing. |
| 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. | Fully | 3.3 All the stakeholders involved in all the evaluation phases were included and described in the report. |
| 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. | Not at all | 3.4 There are no limitations described in the report. |

| | | |
|--|---------------|---|
| 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. | Not at all | 3.5 No, ethical considerations were not included in the evaluation report. Aspects such as confidentiality of information, informed consent and respect of women's privacy were not mentioned in the document. |
| SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%) | Rating | Good |
| Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence? | 57% | 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 evaluation report presented the findings with somewhat varying levels of evidence. Quantitative data was provided but the qualitative information presented only included quotes about what people said and there was no comprehensive analysis. |
| 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 Quantitative analysis was included, but not at the same level as the qualitative information provided. |
| 4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. | Fully | 4.3 Yes, causal factors leading to achievement were analyzed such as managerial, organizational and operational. |
| 4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities). | Partly | 4.4. The findings were analyzed by project component so it was difficult to follow the criteria of evaluation each finding belonged to. |
| SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%) | Rating | Fair |
| Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence? | 38% | 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 Most of the conclusions were statements of three or four sentences and included information that was hard to understand. For example, one of the conclusions said, "There is still a lot of work left for women to play a role of spokespersons about the affectations suffered by the environment. " |
| 5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings | Partly | 5.2 Most of conclusions were only a very short summary of the findings. |
| 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 | 5.3 Because most of the conclusions were presented with lack of evidence, it was difficult to assess if the conclusions integrated the views of diverse stakeholders. |
| | | 5.4 There was no a specific section of lessons learned ,but some of them were included in the conclusions section. |

| | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| <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> | Partly | |
| <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>80%</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 recommendations were derived from the findings.</p> |
| <p>6.2 The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.</p> | <p>Not at all</p> | <p>6.2 Not at all. The report does not describe the process followed in developing recommendations such as the validation stage.</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>Fully</p> | <p>6.3 Recommendations were realistic and practical.</p> |
| <p>6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.</p> | <p>Fully</p> | <p>6.4 Recommendations were presented by groups such as the operational, strategic and institutional teams.</p> |
| <p>SECTION 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS (weight 15%)</p> | <p>Score</p> | <p>Approaching 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>44%</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>Satisfactorily integrated (2)</p> | <p>7.1 The objectives were vague and were not specific to GEEW outcomes. The three objectives were: To learn and improve the practice of UN Women and key partners; To collect evidence to provide adequate accountability for the donor; To inform the next work plan for continuous improvement (the objective is not specific improvement on what). Evaluation questions focused on results of the project, which targeted capacity building for women to become changemakers in their communities and participate in decision-making spaces that addressed environmental issues, as well as other spaces related to their aspirations and needs.</p> |
| <p>7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.</p> | <p>Partially integrated (1)</p> | <p>7.2 The evaluation mentioned a reference group with donors and partners that provided input on the methodology of the evaluation to mainstream the gender approach during the data collection process. The evaluators also used participatory techniques with women in the field, such as storytelling, socio dramas and workshops. The evaluation used a mixed methodology: including surveys with a confidence level of 95%, 14 interviews with government representatives at the local level and 11 interviews with women leaders and members of civil society organizations. No ethical considerations were included in the evaluation report. Aspects such as confidentiality of information, informed consent and the respect of women's privacy were not mentioned in the document.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| 7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis. | Partially integrated (1) | respect of women's privacy were not mentioned in the document. 7.3 The evaluation provided recommendations for actions to improve GEEW such as increasing the participation of boys and men in the themes of prevention of violence against women and sexual abuse. Also, it recommended involving men in topics related to the amount of work that women do to create more awareness in a patriarchal culture that expects that women to handle all the work related to the care of the family while at the same time, they have to work on business plans supported by the project. |
| SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%) | Rating | Good |
| Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented? | 63% | 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. | Partly | 8.1 The report structure was not clear and it was hard to follow based on the evaluation criteria and objectives. 8.2 The title page and opening pages did not have basic information about the evaluation timeframe or date of report. |
| 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. | Partly | 8.3 The executive summary was a stand-alone section with relevant information included. |
| 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 Almost all annexes were included but a list of documentary evidence was not presented nor were other details of the methodology such as the sample survey composition. |
| 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 | |
| Additional Information | | |
| Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation | In this evaluation the stakeholders involved were very good and extensively described. Other sections of the evaluation such as the methodology used, conclusions and recommendations should be used with caution because of the lack of a deeper analysis. | |

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? | 58.69 | Fair | |