

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	Thematic Evaluation Of Women's Political Empowerment (Sn Outcome 1)			Geographical Coverage	National
Sequence number	11	Evaluators	1	Year	2018
Region	Europe and Central Asia	Country(ies)	Albania	Type of intervention evaluated	Programme
Portfolio Budget (USD)	1,500,000.00	Evaluation Budget (USD)		Reviewer	Glaiza Veluz
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Women's leadership			Review Date	03 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?	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 included a detailed overview of the object, clear theory of change, goals, and intentions of the project. Moreover, it explained the gender lens application on improving the political empowerment of women in select provinces of Albania. Furthermore, the evaluation notes the role of SIDA and funding amount of USD 1.5M, the contribution of two staff members, and multiple consultations helped inform and refine project implementation. The TOC and logic framework were clearly illustrated in a diagram to detail performance against project goals.
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	
1.3 The key stakeholders involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described.	Mostly	1.2 The report provided detail context on the purpose, value proposition of the WLPP program, which derived additional insight and context from consultations with the Central Elections Commission, Women members of parliament, local NGOs, and other key local and national actors. In support of UN Women Albania CO's gender equality and human rights work, the evaluation provided clear a clear explanation on how WLPP aligned with the UN development assistance and cooperation framework and the Strategic Notes 2012-2013, 2014-2016 and 2017-2021. The explanation is noted throughout the report.
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.	Partly	
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 objective and purpose of the evaluation were discussed at length and clearly noted when describing project outcomes. The purpose was to "provide findings, lessons learned, conclusions and recommendations to support accountability, learning, reflection and knowledge generation, as well as to inform strategic direction for the programme for the period 2019-2021." The objectives included assessing the relevance of the project strategy and framework, results, efficiency, potential for sustainability, strengths and weaknesses, lessons learned, and integration of gender and human rights in the project implementation.
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	
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?	82%	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 Evaluation criteria and objectives were clear and evaluation questions were shown in the Annex. However, there was no discussion of a gender responsive framework.
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.	Fully	3.2 The evaluation team explained justification of their sampling and how the data collection methods were utilized to ensure triangulation and validation. It also noted on that "Data triangulation was addressed by interviewing and surveying a range of stakeholders at different levels from a variety of institutions and reviewing a range of documents."
		3.3 It was noted that the evaluator consulted the IIN Women Albania CO IWIPP and

<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>It was noted that the evaluator consulted the UN Women Rwanda SO staff and management staff for the stakeholders to be included. But there was no discussion either on the deliberation process on who to or the overall the consultation activities.</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 There is a dedicated section for limitations which also explained how the evaluators addressed these limitations. Limitations revolved around difficulty in gathering stakeholders for data gathering, absence of complete project documents, and respondents' biases.</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>Mostly</p>	<p>3.5. It was noted that the evaluation complied with UNEG Ethical Guidelines and Code of Conduct for Evaluation. However, there was no extensive discussion on how ethics were considered in the whole evaluation process only on one section, "The rights of persons participating in the interview process were ensured through respect for confidentiality and the assurance of anonymity of all persons providing information and feedback throughout the data collection process. In order to minimize demands on time, efforts were made to customize and limit the number of questions asked of stakeholders to ensure relevance and efficiency in the interview process."</p>
<p>SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)</p>	<p>Rating</p>	<p>Very Good</p>
<p>Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?</p>	<p>77%</p>	<p>Executive Feedback on Section 4</p>
<p>4.1 The evaluation report findings provide sufficient levels of high quality evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation questions and criteria.</p>	<p>Mostly</p>	<p>4.1 The findings are backed up by data gathered from the study. Although most of the findings are output level. The evaluation team also noted that the lack of sufficient project documents hindered them in gathering impact level data.</p>
<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.</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>4.2 The data presentation was always objective as each finding was supported by the data they gathered.</p>

4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.	Partly	4.3 There was evidence provided to back up findings though majority of it lacked citing of causal factors on the achievement and non-achievement of results. There were times that analysis is linear, the evaluator quickly surmised that the increase in percentage of women's political participation from 2009 to 2017 is due to the program. Such finding could have been more solid if other factors have been assessed that could have contributed to women's political participation or there was a comparison group to validate this. 4.4 Findings were clearly written as each statement was supported by proper evidence. Its presentation was organized throughout each evaluation criteria. They were able to synthesize succinctly the large amount of data they gathered, and hence, the findings were very clear.
4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities).	Fully	
SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)	Rating	Good
Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?	58%	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 Not only were conclusions derived from the findings, these were all validated with the Evaluation Reference group.
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Partly	5.2 They had straightforward conclusions mainly derived from the findings. However, except for conclusion #2, the conclusion presented no additional insights. The conclusions appeared to be summarized version 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.	Not at all	5.3. The conclusion section was straightforward, but did not present weaknesses or strengths, and did not take a critical lens on the program outcomes, outputs, or activities.
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 Lessons learned are based on their findings and the evaluators have cited data to support statements as necessary. They have also added a section on "good practices" which informed additional learning from the program.
SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	Rating	Good
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	67%	Executive Feedback on Section 6
6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Fully	6.1 The evaluators arrived at recommendations mainly based from their findings and conclusions.

6.2 The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	Partly	6.2 It was noted that the recommendations were validated with the Evaluation Reference Group but there was no information process of consultation.
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 recommendation section provided was specific and actionable within the aspects of programming/implementation, further stakeholders and alliance building. The recommendations were also practical, taking into account possible hindrances to be considered by UN Women if recommendations will be pursued.
6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Not at all	6.4. The recommendations did not provide information on prioritization level though it noted that these are mostly directed to UN women being the commissioning entity of the evaluation work.
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.	67%	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.	Fully integrated (3)	7.1 The evaluation was able to sufficiently cover GEWE concerns on its criteria, questions, and scope of analysis.
7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	7.2 The evaluation had a good methodological design, yet it did not use a specific gender responsive framework.
7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.	Partially integrated (1)	7.3 The evaluation was able to present data clearly yet it focused on more on the output level and lacked findings on the actual impact of the program to grassroots women. They mentioned that project documents were insufficient and it was a challenge to reach out to large amount of stakeholders but there could have been other innovative means to reach out to the marginalized 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	Fully	8.1 The report has been organized logically and the writing was coherent and clear. The format used was also easy to understand and to navigate.
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 Timeframe, date of report, name of the evaluator, table of contents abbreviation, list of charts etc. are present but there was no information to the organizational affiliation of the evaluator but it is likely that the evaluator is an independent professional not affiliated with an organization

<p>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.</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>8.3 The Executive Summary is concise enough but was able to provide an overview of what the evaluation was all about, the design, findings, conclusions, and recommendations.</p>
<p>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).</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>8.4 Annexes are relevant such as the Evaluation Matrix, Evaluation Schedule, List of Identified Stakeholders, List of Documents Reviewed, Data Collection Tools: Guiding Questions for Key Informant Interviews, Guiding Questions for Focus Group Discussions, Survey, Evaluation Reference Group, TORs.</p>
<p>Additional Information</p>		
<p>Identify aspects of <i>good practice</i> of the evaluation</p>	<p>Good logical sequence of the report that can be easily navigated.</p>	

<p style="text-align: center;">PART III: THE OVERALL RATING</p>			
<p>Key Guiding Question</p>	<p>Total weighted score %</p>	<p>Overall Rating</p>	<p>Overall Comments</p>