

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	End-Term Evaluation Of The Joint Programme On Gender, Menstrual Hygiene And Sanitation			Geographical Coverage	Multi-country
Sequence number	29	Evaluators	2	Year	2018
Region	Western and Central	Country(ies)	Cameroon, Niger, Senegal	Type of intervention evaluated	Programme
Portfolio Budget (USD)	2,650,000.00	Evaluation Budget (USD)	120,000.00	Reviewer	Benoist Conti
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Women's access to			Review Date	12 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

<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 clearly noted the object, geographic focus areas and type. The report illustrated the program country reach with maps an additional background information. The project is a joint initiative/program that reached Senegal, Cameroon, and the Niger regions. The report includes a clear description of beneficiaries and budget of \$2.6 million over four years.</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 outlined distinctly the social, political, economic and other key distinctions for Senegal, Cameroon, and Niger. The report references the gender equality and human rights issues, particularly in alignment with SDG 6 and the greater 2030 agenda. Furthermore, the report note the joint program alignment to the OECD principles and in support of the gender and human rights principles.</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 The evaluation also clearly noted consultation with 96 stakeholders, including but not limited to: ministry staff, NGOs, and other multilateral organizations.</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>Not at all</p>	<p>1.4 The report is high-level and does not clearly include significant changes or implications of changes. In lieu of implementation status information, the report focuses on key recommendations and outcomes of multi-sectoral activities.</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 Accountability for donors is noted.</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>2.2 The scope is clear in terms of geography and timeline. It is however too broad or limiting to cover all interventions under " gender, hygiene and sanitation."</p>

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?	90%	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.	Fully	<p>3.1 Methodology section introduced by paragraphs on principles used throughout: HR and gender are specifically addressed. Participative approach. Evaluation criteria are integrated in the methodology. Methodology detailed</p> <p>3.2 Data collection and sampling detailed, mixed methods, quality control for data accuracy.</p> <p>3.3 Clear table with stakeholders on p7 but the rationale is not really explicit</p> <p>3.4 Limits addressed: no baseline but almost no activity beforehand</p> <p>3.5 Do not go further than main criteria</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.	Fully	
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	
3.4 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.	Fully	
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	
SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)	Rating	Very Good

<p>Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?</p>	<p>93%</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>Fully</p>	<p>4.1. Findings address evaluation questions overall and provide all sorts of evidences: graphs, numbers, tables, references. 4.2 Following 4.1 it is easier to see the objective aspect of findings 4.3 The causal factors are there in general (p18,19) but there could be a deeper analysis on organizational or contextual factors. 4.4 Findings are clear and logical</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>4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.</p>	<p>Mostly</p>	
<p>4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities).</p>	<p>Fully</p>	
<p>SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)</p>	<p>Rating</p>	<p>Very Good</p>
<p>Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?</p>	<p>82%</p>	<p>Executive Feedback on Section 5</p>
<p>5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>5.1 Conclusions follow and are aligned to the findings. They are presented in a tailored way. 5.2 Conclusions are sometimes short but do provide a level of analysis that is more advanced than findings in general 5.3 Strengths and weaknesses are not fully developed in the conclusions.</p>

5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Mostly	5.3 Strengths and weaknesses are not fully developed in the conclusions. 5.4 Lessons learned are well documented and some material could have been used for conclusions although lessons are also at higher level
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.	Mostly	
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	Good
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	70%	Executive Feedback on Section 6
6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Mostly	6.1 Recommendation follow logically conclusions although the link is sometimes loose 6.2 Stakeholders have been consulted. 6.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic but could be organized and crafted in a more practical way.
6.2 The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	Fully	6.4 The fact that they are organized in terms of timing and recipient/area is helpful
6.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g., reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up) and actionable.	Partly	

6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Fully	
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 Although the evaluation does not assess whether sufficient information was collected during the implementation, it is focused on integrating gender considerations in developing the programme. The evaluation includes a specific objective to assess gender issues. Gender is treated as a standalone criteria for the MHM programme. there is also an evaluation question on gender.
7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated (3)	7.2 The methodology is gender responsive. Data is collected in a gender sensitive way, mixed-methods are used, triangulation is discussed and different groups' perspectives are taken into account, especially most vulnerables: young girls. However, the approach doesn't clearly note the diversity of stakeholders. Additionally, ethics standards are considered.
7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated (3)	7.3 The evaluation does not present specifically a section on on gender as it relates to specific social groups but the study of groups affected seems to have been done and is underlying the report. The findings do integrate gender, section 4.9 on page 37, there are attempts to touch upon unanticipated effects of the intervention concerning MHM . The evaluation presents recommendations that integrate gende.
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 errors.	Fully	8.1 Report was well-structured and presented, easy to navigate. 8.2 All information available 8.3 Standalone executive summary 8.4 Annexes are complete regarding all documents mentioned here
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 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"> -The report is exhaustive and well-organized: once again, multiplying sub-sections that address main points expected from an evaluation is a good practice -Evidence is very well presented: maps, tables, graphs, data, examples are placed to support the findings. -Causality and nuances in the conclusions and recommendations gives them a practical and concrete turn -timeline in recommendations is helpful as well as targeted sub-recommendation to stakeholders. 	



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?	86.91	Very Good	