

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	<p><i>Are weightings equal to 100%?</i></p> <p>OK</p>

PART I: REPORT DETAILS

Report title	Cve Project Evaluation			Geographical Coverage	National
Sequence number	21	Evaluators	1	Year	2018
Region	Eastern and Southern	Country(ies)	Kenya	Type of intervention evaluated	Programme
Portfolio Budget (USD)	835,000.00	Evaluation Budget (USD)	20,000.00	Reviewer	María José De León Pellecer
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Women's leadership in			Review Date	09 February 2019

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

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.	Partly	1.1 Partly, the project was described in a short summary describing the objectives. 1.2 The report analyzed the context where the project was implemented. The document presented data related to extremism violence and the different forms of insecurity for women and girls. 1.3 Partly, the project description is not too extensive, thus the stakeholders were not described. 1.4 The report identifies that the evaluation is regarding a one year intervention but is not clear if this was a continued effort or only one year project.
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.	Partly	
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.	Mostly	
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 purpose of the evaluation was to determine the extent to which the 'Women's Active Participation in the Prevention and Response to Violent Extremism and Terrorism in Kenya' programme achieved its stated outcomes, documented lessons learned and good practices with the view to scaling up activities in future programming. Among the intended users: Relevant staff, including technical units and heads of units in participating UN-agencies, UN-agency headquarters, development partners, including donors and implementing partners. 2.2 The evaluation sought to answer a set of overarching questions and sub-questions. These criteria allowed the evaluation exercise to assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of the UN Women's Peace/CVE programme.
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	Fair

Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and appropriate, and the rationale for the methodological choice justified?	45%	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.	Partly	3.1 Partly, the report provided a description of the methodology and evaluation criteria. One of the weaknesses of this evaluation is that the methodology intended to measure impact in a one year intervention. Thus, the method and type of intervention were not the adequate to measure impact.
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.	Partly	3.2 Partly, there is an extensive section related to the data collection, analysis and sampling. These methods were suitable for the evaluation process given the desire to go deep and understand the implemented programme. KIIs were particularly suitable for respondents who had good knowledge of the subject matter of discussion while focus group discussions were good for observing dynamics of interaction in a group setting of about 6-8 people sharing common characteristics. Even though the evaluation report mentioned that this data collection tools were designed to measure impact, many did not.
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 list of partners and agencies interviewed were included in the annexes.
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 limitations were described such as the time and coordination issues with beneficiaries.
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.	Fully	3.5 The evaluator sought permission from respondents before engaging them in discussions and introduced herself and her objectives. She also ensured respondents of confidentiality in handling their data, including anonymity as necessary.
SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?	80%	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.	Partly	4.1 The evaluation report findings provided different levels of evidence, including quotes from beneficiaries, data from desk review and data collected from the KIIs and focus groups.
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 The findings were clearly supported by the data collected. The data have an appropriate analysis. 4.3 The one of the main causal factors analysed was the context, that is constantly changing thus affecting the sustainability of the results achieved.
4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.	Fully	4.4 The findings were organized based on evaluation criteria.
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?	57%	Executive Feedback on Section 5
5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.	Mostly	5.1 Mostly. Even though the conclusions were connected to evaluation findings, they were presented as a summary of the findings, but they are not substantiated. 5.2 Partly. Conclusions were just a summary of findings. 5.3 Yes, conclusions present strengths and weaknesses related the evaluation criteria. 5.4 Partly. There is not a specific lessons learned section, rather they were introduced in some of the conclusions.
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Partly	
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	
5.4 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	
SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	83%	Executive Feedback on Section 6
6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Fully	6.1 The 12 recommendations were derived from the findings. 6.2 The report mentioned that the recommendations were derived from the consultation of stakeholders and from the evaluation process. 6.3 The recommendations were clear and realistic. 6.4 The recommendations were organized based on the evaluation criteria.
6.2 The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	Fully	
6.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g., reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up) and actionable.	Mostly	
6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Mostly	
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 There were specific objectives to measure human rights and gender equality such as: "Assess the relevance of UN Women contribution to engaging women in preventing and countering violent extremist in Kenya and analyze how human rights approach and gender equality principles are integrated in the implementation of the project. The evaluation developed a standalone criterion on gender and human rights. The programme, was implemented within the framework of the Council Resolution 2242 in order to contribute to preventing and responding to growth of violent extremism in Kenya. Thus, a set of criteria was defined in the evaluation questions to respond to the three expected outcomes of the project. Also, the evaluation established learning questions such as: "To what extent have gender and human rights considerations been integrated into the project design and

7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	<p>implementation?" and "How has attention to integration of gender equality and human rights concerns advanced women's participation in preventing and countering violent extremism in Kenya?" Results framework and theory of change were not included as part of the analysis.</p> <p>7.2 The evaluation mentioned how the data collection methods were chosen based on an analysis of the target groups and context and also that were suitable for the evaluation process given the desire to go deep and understand the impact of the implemented programme. For example, the evaluation mentioned that KII is particularly suitable for respondents who have good knowledge of the subject matter for discussion while focus group discussions are good for observing dynamics of interaction in a group setting of about 6-8 people sharing common characteristics. This takes into consideration the gender perspective of the best tools to use with women's affected by violence. The methodology described several data collection tools such as interviews, focus groups and desks review. However, all of them were qualitative methods that were used in different phases. A quantitative approach was not used, which could be useful to triangulate information.</p>
7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated (3)	<p>7.3 The report analysis include findings, conclusions and recommendations to improve GEEW during the planning phase and implementation. There are specific recommendations for the criteria related to gender equality and human rights. For example, one of the recommendations is: "UN Women should strengthen its theory of change and engage the broader debate on gender equality into its Preventing/Countering Violent Extremism intervention in order to prevent the risk of enforcing women's stereotypical roles as mothers and custodians of their children and society and so better placed to prevent and counter VE. When women alongside men are empowered on their human rights and engaged in broad discussions about social issues (such as co-existence), their agency can contribute to Preventing/Countering Violent Extremism."</p>
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	<p>8.1 The report is well written and organized. The conclusions and recommendations section could be more elaborated as the rest of the document.</p> <p>8.2 The title page and opening pages provide key basic information about the evaluator, timeframe and date of the report.</p> <p>8.3 The executive summary is a stand-alone section.</p>
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	<p>8.4 The annexes have TOR, list of document review, evaluation matrix, and data collection instruments.</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.	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	The overall evaluation report is well written, the methodology used in a crisis context is also a good example.



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?	70.94	Good	