

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	Are weightings equal to 100%? OK

PART I: REPORT DETAILS

Report title	Final Evaluation Of The Joint Programme "Advancing And Sustaining Gender Equality Gains In Rwanda"		Geographical Coverage	National	
Sequence number	22	Evaluators	1	Year	2018
Region	Eastern and Southern	Country(ies)	Rwanda	Type of intervention evaluated	Programme
Portfolio Budget (USD)		Evaluation Budget (USD)	40,000.00	Reviewer	Zayid Douglas
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	10 February 2019	

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?	100%	Executive Feedback on Section 1

<p>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.</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>1.1 The evaluation included a clear theory of change and noted institutional/operational change preceding systematic and effective gender mainstreaming. The evaluation was designed to inform the development of UN Strategic Note for Rwanda, which guides program planning for years 2018-2023. It also focused on collecting information on results achieved, identifying lessons learned and making recommendations on the way forward for strategic and programmatic planning for gender equality and women's empowerment.</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>Fully</p>	<p>1.2 The context includes positive factors (e.g., Rwanda, globally) has highest proportion of women lawmakers in Parliament) and negative factors (e.g., high illiteracy for women, high prevalence of GBV- over 40% of Rwandan females have experienced some form of GBV) that can influence gender equality/human rights outcomes.</p>
<p>1.3 The key stakeholders involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described.</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>1.3 There are four levels of key stakeholders presented in the report. The first level involves those engaged in Programme funding, design, and technical oversight (UN, bilateral, and Rwandan National Gender Machinery); second involves implementers & coordinating agents (National Gender Ministry/partners); third involves civil society and local government; and the fourth level constitutes program beneficiaries.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>1.4 The Joint Programme was implemented for 3.25 years (from October 2013 to December 2016), and the summative evaluation was to inform future programming.</p>
<p>SECTION 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</p>	<p>RATING</p>	<p>Very Good</p>
<p>Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>Executive Feedback on Section 2</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>2.1 The evaluation report noted gains towards the achievements of project outputs and generated recommendations for future programming. The evaluation objectives are focused around the OECD/DAC criteria, assessing project relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. The primary users of the utilization-focused evaluation are UN Women management, other UN partner agencies. National Gender Machinery, among others.</p>
<p>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).</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>2.2 The evaluation covers the entire project life (October 2013 to December 2016) and the "bridge phase" - 2017-2018, and select districts where the Joint Programme was implemented were included.</p>

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?	63%	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 report noted the evaluation criteria and key questions used, as well as key performance indicators for assessing achievements of results.
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 The evaluation used mixed methods to collected data in various forms - desk review of program documentation; stakeholder consultations; key informant interviews (KII) with state, civil society, and INGO partners; and focus group discussions (FGD) with two women beneficiary groups were used to collect qualitative data. An online survey was used to collect quantitative data from UN and ministry level entities.
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.	Mostly	3.3 The stakeholder consultation process was carried out by the Evaluation Reference Group - a diverse group of stakeholders organized by the evaluation team - and was demonstrated at two points during data gathering - first, at project inception when the Group was consulted to build consensus on project purpose, objectives and scope and secondly, at the completion of the inception workshop, when they were consulted to validate the inception report findings.
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.	Mostly	3.4 The evaluation report appropriately noted limitations around data collection, e.g., primary data collection coincided with project kickoff shortening the data collection period, turnover among implementing staff limited opportunities for evaluation team members to gather information about project insights and learnings, and some of the performance indicators were not SMART.
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.	Partly	3.5 As with all UN sponsored evaluations, the evaluation adhered to UN Evaluation Group guidelines. However, specificity about securing informed consent, translating consent forms into the local language/language of data collection, and the right to withdraw were not noted in the main body of the report or in the annex. In the annex, there is an ethical code of conduct within the TOR that noted maintaining data anonymity and confidentiality.

SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?	93%	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	<p>4.1 The report organized its findings by key evaluation criteria and assessed the extent to which program results were achieved.</p> <p>4.2 Each performance indicator - noting target and the result's effects was assessed using a five-point scale.</p> <p>4.3 The report included the theory of change noted that gender mainstreaming must be preceded by organizational change.</p> <p>4.4 The findings were organized by evaluation criteria and then key question.</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.	Fully	
4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.	Mostly	
4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities).	Fully	
SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?	97%	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 Each conclusion was generated from at least one finding, suggesting that there were no disconnected findings.
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Fully	5.2 The report noted evidence from various sources/findings were incorporated into the construction of conclusions.
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 report conclusions noted both positive and negative aspects of the programme and do this by incorporating the various stakeholder sources. For example, the first conclusion brings together learnings collected from both UN Women staff and stakeholders representing the National Gender Machinery.
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.	Partly	5.4 Some of the lessons learned incorporated a variety of viewpoints but there were a couple of lessons learned that remained fixed on single sectors.
SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	77%	Executive Feedback on Section 6
6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Fully	6.1 The evaluation included a matrix with recommendations alongside the conclusions, and it is stated in the section's introduction that both are grounded in the evaluation findings.
6.2 The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	Mostly	6.2 The evaluation team made recommendations based on the emerging findings and were "subject to validation by the Programme Technical Committee and key stakeholders. The Programme Technical Committee was charged with review of the evaluation's inception, draft, and final report.

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 mostly clear and actionable with the responsible party noted. There were a couple of recommendations that were a bit ambitious in nature, given the proposed period of action (e.g., expansion of some economic development initiatives after a comprehensive assessment of poor women's needs had been conducted).
6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Mostly	6.4 In the report, the priority/urgency of the recommendation was noted. However, for all recommendations, the parties responsible for carrying out this work and the mechanisms for action (e.g. UN Strategic Note 2018-2023) were duly noted.
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.	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	7.1 The joint programme by design was guided by international agreements that in turn guided sustainable development endeavors in the country.
7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	7.2 The evaluation makes note of using a gender-responsive methodology. Data was collected primarily through qualitative means (focus group discussions [FGD], in-depth interviews), collecting information from beneficiaries, key stakeholders, and UN Women staff. Although the FGDs were carried out with program beneficiaries, the number of those interviewed constituted a small sample size.
7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated (3)	7.3 The evaluation/findings/conclusions/recommendations were generated from a gender analysis that included examination of the impact of a livelihoods intervention targeting married women. This particular analysis noted what needed to be considered when introducing a women's economic empowerment intervention.
SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)	Rating	Very Good

Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?	87%	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.	Mostly	8.1 The report is logically structured & presented following UN Women standards. 8.2 The title page & opening pages - includes acknowledgements- note key basic information for the evaluation - title page information, table of contents.
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	8.3 The Executive Summary is a standalone document that gives an outline of the purpose & use of the evaluation, methodology, findings, conclusions, and recommendations. 8.4 The report annexes feature a terms of reference, list of interviewees, documents reviewed, evaluation matrix, results framework, and data collection forms.
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 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	
Additional Information		
Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Overall, the evaluation provides a good overview of how work under the three UN Women mandates - normative, coordination, programmatic - has been carried out in this country. -This evaluation utilized a 6-point rating scale to measure program achievements, assessing key program indicators, to note progress made by the Joint Programme. -Each evaluation conclusion makes direct reference to those findings that sourced the evidence that contributed to its formulation. -In its annexes, this evaluation clearly spelled out the terms of reference under which the Evaluation Reference Group operated and provided more details about its ethical code of conduct. 	

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?	85.44	Very Good	