

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 four-point scale (Very Good, Good, Fair and Unsatisfactory), which is an aggregated rating of eight parameters. - Each overarching parameter is rated against a four-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 suggestions on how to improve future evaluation practice. The overall review, rating and executive feedback will be provided to the evaluation commissioning office.
Parameter Weight (%)	1: Object and context 2: Purpose, objectives and scope 3: Methodology 4: Findings 9: Disability Inclusion (bonus points)	5 5 15 20 5	5: Conclusions and lessons learned 6: Recommendations 7: Gender Equality and Human Rights (UN-SWAP) 8: Report presentation	20 15 10 10	Are weightings equal to 100% (excluding a DI criteria)? OK

PART I: REPORT DETAILS

Report title	Rwanda Joint Programme on Gender				Geographical Coverage	National
Sequence number	31	Evaluators	[Female]	[Male]	Year	2024
Region	Eastern and Southern Africa	Country(ies)	Rwanda		Type of intervention evaluated	Programme
Portfolio Budget (USD)		Evaluation Budget (USD)			Reviewer	C. Marcondes
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Women's access to	Women's leadership and	Prevent VAW&G		Review Date	29 December 2024

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
<p>1.1 The report clearly specifies the object of the evaluation, and provides a clear and complete description of the intervention's original logic (e.g. expected results chain or theory of change), timeframe, intended beneficiaries by type, geographic location(s) as well as the planned budget of the intervention.</p> <p><i>Note: Please address all aspects of this sub-criteria. If the project did not have a ToC, clearly outline the expected results of the intervention and how the activities were expected to lead to the results.</i></p>	Partly	<p>The intervention is clearly described, with information on the project and the ToC, and budget. Additional information on the project outcomes and outputs as well as activities and intended beneficiaries/local/external stakeholders should have been included. A logic model would have been useful to show the outcomes and outputs and all project components. Information about the stakeholders is included but more details about the role they had in the project should have been included. Consideration was given to the fact that information may have been provided in the Annex (which was not provided to the QA reviewer). Even though the context contains analysis in the project related areas, more information should have been included on the specific factors that have a direct bearing on the project, to enable the reader to understand why the project was needed. Information about the timeline for the project implementation is included.</p>
<p>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.</p> <p><i>Note: This section should be concise but sufficient to cover key contextual issue.</i></p>	Mostly	
<p>1.3 The key stakeholders involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(ies) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described.</p> <p><i>Note: Remember to include not only a list of partners but also a description of their main activities and/or the role they had in the implementation of the intervention in the body of report. Detailed description and stakeholder analysis can be provided in annexes.</i></p>	Partly	
<p>1.4 The report identifies any changes in the timeframe and/or implementation plans (e.g. original plans, strategies, logical frameworks), provides an explanation for these and for any implications these may have had regarding the evaluation.</p> <p><i>Note: Remember to identify the implementation status of the object, including its phase of implementation and any significant changes.</i></p>	Fully	
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
<p>2.1 Purpose, objectives and use of evaluation: The evaluation report provides a 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.</p>	Fully	<p>The purpose, objectives and use are well explained. The scope of evaluation are also clearly outlined.</p>
<p>2.2 Evaluation Scope: The evaluation report provides a clear description of the scope of the evaluation, including a description of the timeframe and outputs/outcomes covered, and not covered (thematically, geographically etc.) as well as the reasons for this scope (e.g. specifications by the ToR, 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).</p>	Fully	
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?	58%	Executive Feedback on Section 3
<p>3.1 Methodology: The report provides a complete description of the methods used for data collection and analysis, the chosen evaluation criteria and evaluation questions, and demonstrate that the methods chosen are appropriate to inform the responses to the criteria and questions.</p> <p><i>Note: An evaluation matrix containing the evaluation questions in each evaluation criteria, the indicators, the data sources and methods for data collection is useful to show these, but it is still important to include some explanations in the body of the document to clearly demonstrate that the methods are appropriate for triangulation. Remember to keep this section succinct and use annexes to provide detailed information.</i></p>	Mostly	<p>To be considered complete, the methodology description should have included information on each of the data collection methods used and their rationale, with enough details to demonstrate that these methods were appropriate to inform the evaluation criteria. Sampling is also generally described and the descriptions should have included enough information to demonstrate that the evaluation collected data on the universe of project participants, demonstrating that the coverage was complete. Consideration was given to the fact that the methods seem appropriate to provide responses to evaluation questions, since they are mixed, and this is appropriate for the triangulation analysis and assessments of CF/ID specific results. The</p>

<p>3.2 Data collection, analysis and sampling: The report clearly describes the tools used for data collection and the rationale for their selection as well as the sampling strategy and methods used for data analysis. The report includes discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, to guide the assessments of GE/HR specific results and to ensure data accuracy and completeness.</p> <p><i>Note: Please describe not only the types of data collection tools used (e.g. surveys, KIs, desk review) but also how the data was collected (where, when, who, how) and what steps were taken to analyze it. Remember to include a description of original sampling strategy and the extent to which it covers the range of stakeholders involved in the intervention, with a clear justification of the selection of the targeted sample. Use annexes to provide detailed description.</i></p>	Partly	<p>appropriate for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE/HR specific results. The stakeholders consultation is also described at high level and more information should have been included on the consultation process to fully demonstrate that the consultation was comprehensive and included representation of the various project activities. References to adherence to ethics and specific evaluation standards (e.g. UNEG guidelines) during the evaluation were included. Limitations are well described.</p>
<p>3.3 Stakeholders Consultation: The evaluation report gives a complete description of the stakeholder consultation process in the evaluation, including the rationale for selecting the particular level and activities for consultation.</p> <p><i>Note: Include a stakeholder mapping, showing that the consultation process was comprehensive to assure the reader that the selection of KIs and/or survey participants was appropriate and representative of the universe of project stakeholder (in line with descriptions under item 1.3 above). Use annexes to provide detailed description.</i></p>	Mostly	
<p>3.4 Limitations: The report presents a clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation and if/how these were mitigated (e.g. gaps in the evidence, biases due to limits in stakeholder consultations, etc.).</p>	Fully	
<p>3.5 Ethics: The evaluation report makes explicit references to the ethical obligations of the evaluators and shows evidence that data collection and tools adhered to these ethical principles, (e.g. mechanisms and measures were implemented to ensure that the evaluation process conformed to relevant ethical standards, including but not limited to, informed consent of participants, confidentiality and avoidance of harm considerations).</p> <p><i>Note: Mentioning/referencing UNEG standards in the report does not amount to sufficient evidence that the data was actually collected with sensitivity to ethics and discrimination. It is a good practice to provide a clear explanation as to how the evaluation adopted these, showing examples of tools and processes used were sensitive to ethical considerations (e.g. consent, confidentiality) and were not discriminatory against particular group's participation (i.e. were interviews or focus groups held in a location, at a time, in a setting, using language/translation, that is appropriate and respectful; and facilitates the participation of a full range of stakeholders). Use annexes to provide detailed description.</i></p>	Fully	

SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the findings well substantiated, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?	87%	Executive Feedback on Section 4
<p>4.1 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g. avoid ambiguities).</p> <p><i>Note: It is a good practice to clearly outline the findings in the report, preferably using a “set” of findings statements, with clear articulation and conciseness, followed by substantiation and full demonstration of the evidence used to formulate the findings' statements.</i></p>	Fully	<p>The findings are well organized in line with responses to the evaluation questions, and a set of finding statements contain clear and direct responses to them. The findings are consistently supported by a narrative, showing with examples, the evidence for the findings presented. The report systematically assesses the indicators and presents the survey results to back some findings with appropriate analysis. The cause-effects links should more clearly show the contributions of the activities (and the activities' description). Some outputs (mostly 1 and 2) should have included more explanations between the causes and effects of the intervention showing 'why' results were achieved or not and the effects these had, specially in terms of capacities built. More clear explanations of the situation before and after the intervention should have been included to more clearly show the "changes" and the project contributions to them.</p>
<p>4.2 The evaluation findings are well substantiated, and provide sufficient levels of high quality evidence to systematically ad-dress the evaluation questions and criteria.</p> <p><i>Note: Ensure the findings narrative are consistent with the findings statements and fully back the statement, showing the evidence and triangulation clearly.</i></p>	Fully	
<p>4.3 Findings reflect systematic and appropriate analysis and interpretation of the data; they are free from subjective judgments.</p> <p><i>Note: in addition to describing the implementation of activities and completion of outputs, include an analysis of their contributions towards the intervention outcomes.</i></p>	Fully	
<p>4.4 Are cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended results highlighted?</p> <p><i>Note: Remember to include information on both the cause/effect links and unintended results</i></p>	Partly	
SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)	Rating	Good
Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?	57%	Executive Feedback on Section 5
<p>5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.</p> <p><i>Note: Conclusions are not summaries of findings but they are formulated from the analysis and interpretation of the findings, giving meaning to them.</i></p>	Partly	<p>The conclusions section is summarized but clearly connected to the findings, however they should have contained summaries of the findings related to all the evaluation criteria. They contain a balance of strengths and weakness and provide good insights, beyond the findings but more discussions on the issues presented in the recommendations section should have been included. Good practices are identified throughout the report, but the Lessons need to be properly articulated as "lessons" showing what should or not be replicated and include some information about the project experience to show the rationale for the lesson.</p>
<p>5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings.</p> <p><i>Note: Conclusions should provide explanations for the findings and form the basis for recommending actions or decisions that are consistent with the conclusions.</i></p>	Mostly	
<p>5.3 Conclusions present the strengths and weaknesses of the object (policy, programmes, projects or other intervention) being evaluated, based on the evidence presented and taking due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders.</p>	Fully	
<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 gen-eralizing from single point observations.</p> <p><i>Note: The lessons learned from an evaluation comprise the new knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (initiative, context outcomes and even evaluation methods) that is applicable to and useful in other similar contexts. They should demonstrate the intervention experience and be generalized to enable applicability by other interventions.</i></p>	Partly	
SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	Rating	Good
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	70%	Executive Feedback on Section 6

6.1 Recommendations are well grounded on the evaluation, logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions . <i>Note: The recommendations should be complete in number and depth, reflecting the analysis in the findings and conclusions and address the issues identified earlier.</i>	Mostly	The Recommendations are pertinent and reference the findings, but the connections with some of them is not very clearly articulated, since the conclusions do not contain explanations showing why the recommendation is necessary. Most recommendations should have also contained action-oriented steps, with more detailed information about what is needed and how the recommendations should be implemented. There are references to the process and they were also prioritized.
6.2 The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders. <i>Note: Include a relevant explanation on the extent to which the evaluation participants were specifically consulted for the formulation of the recommendations and/or the level of participation of stakeholders in this evaluation stage.</i>	Fully	
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.	Fully	

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.	78%	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. <i>Note: Refer to the UNEG UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator Technical Note for guidance on this section.</i>	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	GEWE is satisfactorily integrated. There is no assessment of data on specific gender results, and gender was also not a stand-alone criterion, but the project focus is on gender and as such, GEWE related evaluation questions are included. The methodology was satisfactorily gender-responsive. The methodology used mixed data collection methods and there are references to ensuring gender-responsive approach, but more details on how this was integrated into the evaluation process and data collection tools should also have been provided. There are no references to the sampling strategies targeting women specifically and gender-disaggregated samples were not included. There are no references to confidentiality but the evaluation followed ethical guidelines. Gender analysis is fully reflected in the report. Background section, findings, conclusions and recommendations contain gender-related analysis, even though unanticipated effects were not clearly outlined.
7.2 A gender-responsive methodology , methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected. <i>Note: it is not enough to simply describe the methodology as “gender-responsive”, it is important to demonstrate that the data collection and analysis integrated gender considerations; that data was collected disaggregated by sex; that methods/tools were designed to enable GEWE assessments; and/or that processes employed (i.e. sampling, triangulation, validation) ensured inclusion and enabled data for GEWE analysis.</i>	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	
7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis. <i>Note: Please address all aspects of this sub-criterion.</i>	Fully integrated (3)	
SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)	Rating	Good
Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?	67%	Executive Feedback on Section 8
8.1 Report is logically structured, concise and of reasonable length, well written and presented with clarity and coherence (e.g. the structure and presentation is easy to identify and navigate (numbered sections, clear titles and subtitles, context, pur-pose and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations) and is written in accessible language with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors. <i>Note: Reasonable length for project/programme and CPE evaluations is about 40 pages (excluding Annexes 60 pages); and 50 pages for institutional and thematic evaluations (excluding Annexes 60 pages).</i>	Mostly	Report is complete, well presented, and logically structured. The report is too long (80+ pages) and should be shortened to about 40 pages to encourage evaluation use. Most key annexes are listed but presented in a separate volume and not presented for QA - therefore not rated. The opening pages are complete. To be considered a complete stand-alone section, the executive summary should have contained more information on the evaluation methodology as well as summaries of the key findings in all of the evaluation criteria along with key conclusions.
8.2 The title page and opening pages provide key basic information on the name of evaluators and, 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. <i>Note: Executive Summaries should be maximum 5-6 pages long.</i>	Mostly	
8.4 Annexes should be of reasonable length and include, when not present in the body of the report: ToR, 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). <i>Note: Annexes should be maximum 60 pages long.</i>	Partly	
Additional Information		
Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation <i>Note: This section is to be populated by the QA Reviewer only, based on the overall Evaluation Report. No need to identify specific elements related to this section.</i>	N/A	

[Piloting] SECTION 9: DISABILITY INCLUSION (weight: 5%) * The score for Section 9 will be ‘bonus points’ (5%), on top of the existing 100% weight. ** Assessment is based on the UN Disability Inclusion (For further details, please refer to Technical Notes on Entity Accountability Framework).		SCALE (No, Partially, Yes)	OVERALL ASSESSMENT for DISABILITY INCLUSION (Missing, Partial, Sufficient)
Does the evaluation include consideration of disability inclusion?			Partial
9.1 The evaluation questions include references to disability inclusion.		No	Qualitative Feedback (Please highlight any findings on disability inclusion): Disability inclusion is not among the evaluation questions. The methodology contains references to the inclusion of people with disabilities in the sample of KIs and the topic was covered in findings, but not in conclusions and recommendations.
9.2 The evaluation methodology includes references to disability inclusion.		Yes	
9.3 The Evaluation findings, conclusions and/or recommendations contain references to disability inclusion.		Partially	

PART III: THE OVERALL RATING			
Key Guiding Question	Total weighted score %	Overall Rating	Other reviewer's comments
Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence?	72.77	Good	This is a good evaluation report, with in-depth analysis covering all evaluation questions systematically. A more comprehensive set of conclusions presenting a better summary of the key findings along with a set of more action-oriented recommendations would have enhanced the overall ratings.