

Independent Evaluation and Audit Services (IEAS)



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
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	Evaluation Of The Safe Cities Campaign #Noesdehombres			Geographical Coverage	National
Sequence number	3	Evaluators	3	Year	2018
Region	Latin Americas and Caribbean	Country(ies)	Mexico	Type of intervention evaluated	Programme
Portfolio Budget (USD)		Evaluation Budget (USD)	48,652.00	Reviewer	María José De León Pellecer
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Prevent VAW&G and expand access to services			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.	Mostly	1.1. The evaluation described the program "Safe Cities and Public Spaces for Women and Girls" and described the main objectives to prevent and eliminate sexual harassment and other forms of sexual violence against women in public spaces such as streets, transportation, parks and markets. The evaluation described the strategic lines of the program. The evaluation was focused on one of those strategies - the communication campaigns. This is the reason why the evaluation did not

<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>Partly</p>	<p>describe theory of change or the intervention logic of the Program overall.</p> <p>1.2. Partly. The evaluation mentioned that a full diagnostic of the context could be found in an external document - "Diagnostic on violence against women and girls in public transport in Mexico City" and in a footnote the link to the document could be found. Nevertheless, there was no other information related to the 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 were described in the evaluation report including the implementing partners, the communication partners and the 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 evaluation identifies that the campaign was completed at the time of the report publication.</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 document presented the purpose and objectives of the evaluation to analyze and measure the impact of the campaign, to determine the fulfillment of the objectives and provide information for decision-making for future campaigns or similar exercises.</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 presented a clear scope providing information about the geographic coverage and time frame or period that the evaluation covers. The evaluation emphasized that it only covers the period when the campaign was on the air. The report also mentioned that due to a budget limitations, the sample for the survey exceeds the acceptable sampling error.</p>
<p>SECTION 3 : METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)</p>	<p>RATING</p>	<p>Very Good</p>
<p>Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and appropriate, and the rationale for the methodological choice justified?</p>	<p>97%</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>	Fully	<p>3.1 The evaluation indicated that it followed the criteria established in the Evaluation Policy of UN Women (relevance, efficacy, efficiency, impact, sustainability and gender and human rights approach), which refers mainly to programmatic evaluations. There are no specific criteria focused on communication campaigns.</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>	Fully	<p>3.2 The evaluation provided an extensive description of each method and data collection tool used including: campaign coverage numbers and results, a pre and post survey, focus groups and interviews. In addition, they used secondary data of the statistics of sexual violence cases occurred during the period of the campaign.</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>	Mostly	<p>3.3. Mostly. The evaluation described in general terms, the stakeholders involved but information related the sample composition and stakeholders interviewed were not presented.</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>	Fully	<p>3.4 The evaluation presented a section of limitations, such as budget limitations to have an adequate sample with a reduced sampling error (the sampling error was 5.7%).</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>	Fully	<p>3.5 As part of the campaign evaluation management structure, UN Women established a Reference Group made up of experts in statistics/evaluations with a gender perspective and in violence against women and girls. The objective of the Reference Group was to support the entire evaluation process, guarantee the quality of the evaluation, give input to this report and disseminate results.</p>
<p>SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)</p>	Rating	Very Good
<p>Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?</p>	100%	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.</p>	Fully	<p>4.1 The findings were presented based on the information of the focus groups and survey, and were divided by each evaluation criteria.</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	4.2 Findings were clearly supported by evidence, for example in the relevance criteria, the evaluation indicates that according to the testimonies of the women and men interviewed and the analysis of social networks interactions, it can be said that the campaign increased awareness because it made visible, sexual harassment in public spaces in an effective and clear way.
4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.	Fully	4.3 The methodology used allowed the analysis of the factors leading to the achievement of the results. In this case, the adequate use of social media, the social experiments and the campaign messages were adequate to achieve increased awareness.
4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities).	Fully	4.4. The findings were presented based on the evaluation criteria and evaluation questions.
SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?	83%	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 followed the findings structure and triangulated quantitative and qualitative information.
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Mostly	5.2 Mostly. However, almost all the conclusions were only a summary 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.	Fully	5.3. The conclusions presented strengths and weakness of the implementation of the campaign. The conclusions presented the diverse information needed to understand the context of the conclusion.
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 The evaluation did not have a section specific for lessons learned, but the lessons learned were included as part of some of the conclusions.

SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	100%	Executive Feedback on Section 6
6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Fully	6.1 The recommendation followed the structure of the findings, based on the evaluation criteria and learning questions.
6.2 The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	Fully	6.2 The recommendations were validated with a specific reference group organized at the beginning of the evaluation for validation purposes.
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 such as the definition of specific and clear objectives to measure communication campaigns and ensured that there was no confusion or overlap between communication objectives and programmatic objectives because they responded to different purposes.
6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Fully	6.4 A value-add of this report is that besides the recommendations, they structured some actions with a specific plan to implement each recommendation with do's and don'ts in each phase of the campaign.
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.	100%	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 the information collected from the period of the implementation of the campaign, such as mass media reports, government reports and partners' reports, as well as data reported from the different communication channels. The evaluation objectives were designed to elicit information on what contributed to generating real

7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated (3)	changes in cultural practices related to sexual harassment, specifically in the behavior and attitudes of men and the gender and human rights approach. For example, as part of the effectiveness analysis, the evaluation assessed possible changes in behaviors, attitudes, knowledge and perceptions of the target audience of the campaign around sexual harassment or violence against women and their possible sanctions.
7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated (3)	<p>7.2 The evaluation applied diverse and mixed methodology (qualitative and quantitative), and used different analysis techniques for each of the project components. Surveys, focus groups and social media analysis were all used to collect information on outcomes. The information collected through the different techniques were triangulated in the findings section of the report. For example, when analyzing the reach of the campaign (quantitative data), the report also included qualitative comments from the target audience related to the awareness shifts in men related to sexual harassment on the streets. The evaluation also included interviews with women about the content of the campaign.</p> <p>7.3 The findings triangulated data collected from the survey and focus groups discussions and presented unexpected results. For example, the report shared common defensive arguments among men, which highlighted what made it difficult for them to feel empathy. Many men did not see themselves as victimizers nor did they identify with the men represented in the campaign. Some young men tended to adopt a passive and / or defensive attitude, while older men tended to be more receptive and reflective of the messages. The report provided specific recommendations to improve GEEW campaigns in the future, such as messages, content and planning.</p>
SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)	Rating	Very Good
Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?	90%	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 and presented in an attractive way using charts and

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	graphics to analyze trends. It also had creative use of the campaign images. 8.2 The title page and opening pages present a disclaimer and listed all the stakeholders involved during the campaign.
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 presented the evaluation purposes, scope, methodology and findings as a summary.
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)	Not at all	8.4 The evaluation report did not contain annexes.
Additional Information		
Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation	This is a very good example of an evaluation that involves men as part of the key stakeholders. The evaluation is also a good example of the adequate use of mixed methods.	

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?	93.91	Very Good	