

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 Sweden Project: Women's Citizenship For Peace, Justice And Development			Geographical Coverage	National
Sequence number	5	Evaluators	1	Year	2018
Region	Latin Americas and	Country(ies)	Colombia	Type of intervention evaluated	Programme
Portfolio Budget (USD)	5,800,000.00	Evaluation Budget (USD)	16,000.00	Reviewer	María José De León Pellecer
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Women's leadership in			Review Date	06 February 2019

PART II: THE EIGHT KEY PARAMETERS

SECTION 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION (weight 5%)	RATING	Very Good
--	---------------	------------------

<p>Does the report present a clear and full description of the 'object' of the evaluation?</p>	<p>100%</p>	<p>Executive Feedback on Section 1</p>
<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 report described the general approach of the project, mentioning the objectives, outcomes and activities. There is also a reference regarding the theory of change and the report mentioned that this theory of change was the basis for the evaluation design. A value-add in this report is the analysis of the results chain of the program in terms of quality and pathways.</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 report presented data related to the context including information about the legal framework around the peacebuilding in Colombia, the gender related data about the war and gender related data regarding women participation in politics. All these topics were relevant for the program and the evaluation context.</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 All the stakeholders involved in the program implementation were described - donors, implementing partners and beneficiaries.</p> <p>1.4. The report described the implementation status of the program and the significant changes that occurred. For example, significant budget reductions that impacted one of the program components.</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>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>83%</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 report provided a clear explanation about the purposes of the evaluation, such as the assessment about the relevance, efficiency, efficacy and sustainability of the Program and the pathways of the theory of change. The report also mentioned that one of the main objectives of the evaluation was to produce a set of informative and communication tools that can be used to present</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>Mostly</p>	<p>lessons learned and achievements of the program to donors and other partners that have been involved in the program implementation.</p> <p>2.2 The report provided a description about the geographic coverage and the target population reached. There is no explanation about the reasons for the scope.</p>
<p>SECTION 3 : METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)</p>	<p>RATING</p>	<p>Fair</p>
<p>Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and appropriate, and the rationale for the methodological choice justified?</p>	<p>48%</p>	<p>Executive Feedback on Section 3</p>
<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>Partly</p>	<p>3.1 The report included a methodology section where it described the data sources, evaluation scope, data collection tools used, stakeholders involved and geographic scope. The evaluation only used a qualitative approach with 21 interviews conducted that included public officers and focus groups with beneficiaries and organizations. The methodology was weak considering that the intended scope of the evaluation was to measure the increase in participation of women to influence peace processes, conflict resolution, and transitional justice from a gender-based perspective and women’s rights. The methodology was not adequate to measure those quantifiable changes.</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>Mostly</p>	<p>3.2 The report described all the data collection methods used and the number of participants by each method. Nevertheless, the use of mixed methods was not included in this evaluation.</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>Fully</p>	<p>3.3 There is a specific section in the evaluation report describing the stakeholders consulted during the process of the evaluation.</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>Not at all</p>	<p>3.4 The report did not present any description of limitations.</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>Not at all</p>	<p>3.5 The evaluation did not mention ethical considerations, such as informed consent or what the evaluators did to protect the confidentiality of the data collected.</p>

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.	Mostly	<p>4.1 The findings provided evidence relating the criteria assessed. For example, in the criteria of efficiency, budget spending analysis was made to understand how the budget was distributed among program components and activities and the results achieved. However overall the data was not high quality due the methodology and data collection.</p> <p>4.2 The findings presented did not reflect the interpretation of the data collected during the field work. For example, there was no reference to women's testimonials or analysis of the information collected through focus groups or interviews. The information presented was more a summary of the program reports and other desk review documentation.</p> <p>4.3 The methodology used did not allow for identification of the factors that lead to achievement of results.</p> <p>4.4 The findings were presented based on the evaluation criteria used.</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.	Partly	
4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.	Partly	
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
d	73%	Executive Feedback on Section 5

5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.	Fully	
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Partly	5.1 The conclusions presented were based on the evaluation findings following the evaluation criteria structure. 5.2 The conclusions presented were a summary of the findings but not beyond 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.	Fully	5.3 The onclusions presented strengths and weaknesses of the program related to efficiency, impact, sustainability and coordination. 5.4 The report had a specific section of lessons learned presented in the form of best practices.
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	
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	
6.2 The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	Partly	6.1 Recommendations were derived from the findings and conclusions. 6.2 There was no clear process on how the recommendations came from the consultations with stakeholders. 6.3 Recommendations were clear and realistic. A value-add is that recommendations were

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 Recommendations were clear and realistic. A value-add is that recommendations were classified depending on whether they were related to the operational level or strategic level.
6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Fully	6.4 Categorization of recommendations as operational or strategic allowed a clear understanding about the relevance of each recommendation.
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.	Fully integrated (3)	7.1 The evaluation used information collected during the implementation of the Project for indicators at all levels (output, outcome and impact). One of the objectives was to assess the program design and implementation, and its level of effectiveness while identifying the limiting factors and good practices of the model. According to the results chain of the program, the level of outcomes and outputs were results specific related to gender equality and human rights such as the development of national and local initiatives that promote the active citizenship of women and the incorporation of their rights in processes of early recovery, conflict resolution and peace building and the increasing of national and local initiatives that guarantee the exercise and protection of women's rights within the framework of the strengthening of the rule of law, DDR processes and reconciliation.
7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	7.2 Yes but partly. The description of the methodology indicated that the evaluation was based on the theory of change of the project and highlighted that the evaluation manual "How to manage evaluations with a gender approach" and the "Program Evaluation Guide" were the main sources for mainstreaming the gender equality approach into the learning questions and criteria. The evaluation only used semi-structured interviews and focus

7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	<p>groups as qualitative methods. In addition, the evaluation used change stories as one of their main data collection tool in the field. There is no use of mixed methods so the gender analysis related gaps and increasing in participation were not measured.</p> <p>7.3 Yes, the evaluation included a section where relevant normative instruments and policies related to peacebuilding, disarmament policies and transitional justice policies at the country level were shared.</p>
SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)	Rating	Very Good
Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?	93%	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 was well written with clear sections and nice formats.
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 Title and pages provided basic information about the evaluation.
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 a stand alone section.
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).	Partly	8.4 Annexes included the TOR but did not include the data collection instruments or the list of documentary evidence.

Additional Information	
Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation	The evaluation had a good context analysis from a gender perspective. The report included a section about relevant normative instruments and policies related to peacebuilding, disarmament policies and transitional justice policies at the country level.



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?	72.52	Good	