

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	Building capacity to Prevent Violence Against Women (BCPVAW)			Geographical Coverage	National
Sequence number	32	Evaluators	1	Year	2018
Region	Asia and the Pacific	Country(ies)	Bangladesh	Type of intervention evaluated	Project
Portfolio Budget (USD)	617,718.00	Evaluation Budget (USD)		Reviewer	Glaiza Veluz
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Prevent VAW&G and			Review Date	February 22nd, 2018

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?	75%	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 clearly identified the object and information on the beneficiaries. This project aimed to strengthen VAWG prevention and provide resources for women from four major universities in Bangladesh in Dhaka, Savar, Rajshahi, and Sylhet. To clearly outline the intentions, the evaluation included a logic framework detailing the goal, outputs/activities, and outcomes. Various resources were deployed and outreach conducted, including consultations with stakeholders as well as donor support (US\$ 617,718 from the Embassy of Sweden in Dhaka) for the project.
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 included background information and detailed the prevalence of gender-based violence in Bangladesh. Despite legislation, the evaluation made clear barriers for women in Bangladesh's mostly conservative/patriarchal society. The evaluation also cited studies and prevention mechanisms undertaken by universities and laws to mitigate gender-based violence. Furthermore, the report explained dismal of women's claims and challenges.
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 evaluation provided sufficient information on key stakeholders and their roles in support of the project. The project description section of the report detailed stakeholder engagement, including the role of UN Women, universities and the implementing agency in contributing to the implementation of the project.
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 The evaluation did not sufficiently explain the implementation status or subsequent changes because of project activities.
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 purpose, objectives, intentions, and users are well explained in this evaluation. It specified that the evaluation will focus on assessing the Outcome 2 of the project involving university mechanisms in preventing VAWG. To strengthen the purpose statement, the evaluation clearly detailed the key objectives in a separate section. The report duly noted intended users of VAWG project materials, including UN Women, development partners, UN Agencies, and CSOs to address knowledge gaps and strengthen understanding.
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 scope was succinctly explained with a dedicated section. The report noted that all project activities were evaluated, the duration of the project, and the target stakeholders. It also highlighted that only Component 2 will be evaluated in alignment with the 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?	85%	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>	<p>Mostly</p>	<p>3.1 The evaluation explained the methodology and rationale based on the key criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability. The project analysis included an assessment of the contribution and utilization-focused approach, which aligned to some elements of the gender-based framework.</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>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>3.2 The evaluation summarized data collection techniques in providing evidence, including use of surveys, in-depth interviews, FGD, and KII. The evaluators validated data by triangulating sources and assessed results in alignment with the human rights and gender equality principles. The evaluators approach provided visibility of project vulnerabilities in data gathering and key information gaps. Although the purpose and the justification for the use of data collection techniques were described in the evaluation, the rationale for data sampling was not fully explained.</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>	<p>Mostly</p>	<p>3.3 The report mentioned the composition of the evaluation reference group/stakeholders who were consulted to inform the project analysis. The evaluation process aligned with the key human rights and gender equality principles of transparency and participation of various stakeholder groups. The report included suggestions on strengthening the inclusion of women and historically vulnerable groups (i.e. ethnic or religious minorities) from university settings. The evaluation provided limited details of the consultation 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>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>3.4 The report described key limitations and interventions deployed to mitigate challenges, including the of issue of data sampling. The analysis suggests that the sampling approach was not representative of the whole country and other projects on VAWG, which may have affected the project outcome.</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>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>3.5 There was an explanation of ethical considerations, which led to greater adoption of considerations in the study.</p>
<p>SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)</p>	<p>Rating</p>	<p>Fair</p>
<p>Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?</p>	<p>33%</p>	<p>Executive Feedback on Section 4</p>

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 summarized findings with limited supportive information. The qualitative data provided some context but generally not enough information to ascertain the depth of performance outcomes. An example is noted in this excerpt, "Field survey revealed that a good number of female and male students had witnessed mental and physical violence on campus earlier. The interventions of the project played a vital role in increasing the knowledge, attitudes and practices of students and other stakeholders, which might play a critical role to prevent sexual harassment and to create a safe and violence free environment". The data presented was not organized or clearly noted to clearly report on data insights.
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 Given the lack of supportive data and information, some statements seemed be more subjective and lacking clear explanation. An example is noted in the report: "The SHCC of the University reportedly deals with more complaints than they ever had before. According to the SHCC of all four universities, JU was reported to have received 18 complaints, SUST 12, RU 10 and EWU 6 respectively in last four years and have been taken initiatives to solve the incidents. It is clear that under-reporting is still an issue, however, there has been an uptake in seeking the support of the University to handle complaints." In this particular example, it is not properly elaborated on why they see the figures as an uptake. There was no evidence provided to show the before and after statistics on the complaints.
4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.	Not at all	4.3 The evaluation did not clear explaining other externalities that contributed to project outcomes.
4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities).	Mostly	4.4 Although the findings were stated, it was still unclear how the evaluator arrived at this
SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)	Rating	Good
Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?	50%	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 were based on the findings, citing examples as necessary.
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Not at all	5.2 The conclusions reiterated in summary form the findings and did not add additional insights.
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.	Partly	5.3 The conclusions are summarized version of the findings, the challenges as per findings were reiterated, which at the very least showed the negative (and positive) aspects of the project
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	5.4 The lessons learned were derived from the findings. It was clear citing its limitations and the roles of the stakeholders in it. It cited possible challenges as need be based on the findings.
SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	Rating	Very Good

Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	87%	Executive Feedback on Section 6
6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Fully	6.1 The recommendations focused on future efforts for UN Women and key stakeholders to reinforce the gains and address the gaps of the project.
6.2 The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	Partly	6.2. There was limited information to clearly note consultation with stakeholders on key recommendations. There was no explicit discussion on stakeholder consultation with respect to the recommendations though stakeholders had to be consulted during the evaluation.
6.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g., reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up) and actionable.	Fully	6.3 The recommendations identified clear action steps in the report.
6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Fully	6.4 The report specifies that recommendation target is UN Women and under the key
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.	56%	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.	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	7.1 The scope and criteria satisfactorily addressed GEWE.
7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	7.2 The methodology was gender responsive, though there was no particular gender based framework used
7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.	Partially integrated (1)	7.3 The findings captured outcomes but was not very detailed on how it brought changes to women
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 format is logically organized and how it was written was easy to understand with comprehensible terms.
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 report includes a timeframes, date of report, location of evaluated project. It has a comprehensive table of contents and the evaluator's name is present with her organizational affiliation and email address,
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 and was able to provide sufficient overview of the content of the whole 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. Other appropriate annexes could include: additional details on methodology, copy of the results chain, information about the evaluator(s).	Fully	8.4 The report provided sufficient annexes to supplement the content of the report.
Additional Information		
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?	66.72	Good	