

**Independent Evaluation and Audit Services (IEAS)**  
**UN WOMEN Global Evaluation Quality Assessment and Rating**



Rating Scale	Very Good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory	Reviewer Guidance :
<b>Rating explanation</b>	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"> <li>- Overall reports are rated against a 4-point scale (Very Good, Good, Fair and Unsatisfactory), which is an aggregated rating of eight parameters.</li> <li>- Each overarching parameter is rated against a 4-point scale (Fully, Mostly, Partially and Not at all).</li> <li>- Parameters such as evaluation methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations are given more weight.</li> <li>- <b>Executive feedback</b> - 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.</li> </ul>
<b>Parameter Weight (%)</b>	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><b>OK</b></p>

**PART I: REPORT DETAILS**

<b>Report title</b>	Country Portfolio Evaluation			<b>Geographical Coverage</b>	National
<b>Sequence number</b>	31	<b>Evaluators</b>	2	<b>Year</b>	2018
<b>Region</b>	Western and Central	<b>Country(ies)</b>	Liberia	<b>Type of intervention evaluated</b>	CPE
<b>Portfolio Budget (USD)</b>	20,158,500.00	<b>Evaluation Budget (USD)</b>	50,000.00	<b>Reviewer</b>	Benoit Conti
<b>Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)</b>	Global norms, policies Prevent VAW&G and	Women's leadership in peace, Women's access to economic	Women's Gender	<b>Review Date</b>	10 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 UNW Liberia programme is described in details in the introduction. Each outcome is presented and the results matrix with it. TOC presneted and anlyzed at lenght on page 25. till 30 No financial/budget analysis, no real logic of interventions. There is a notable situational analysis of women and HR and distribution of roles between agencies.
1.2 The <b>context</b> 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	1.2 Factors are clear in the piece on gender and HR (traditional practices, violence, lack of literacy etc.)
1.3 The <b>key stakeholders</b> involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described.	Fully	1.3 Stakeholders are diligently presented in a table 5 on p 21
1.4 The report identifies <b>the implementation status of the object</b> , 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.	Not at all	1.4 No specifics on implementation status of the object
<b>SECTION 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>Very Good</b>
<b>Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 2</b>
2.1 <b>Purpose, objectives and use of evaluation:</b> 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 3 The main purposes mentioned: decision-making,accountability, capacity development; 4 users: target beneficiaries, technical units, UN- agencies, development partners
2.2 <b>Evaluation Scope:</b> 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	2.2 Mentioned: not an impact assessment, not about organizational structures of the Country programme, includes joint programmes
<b>SECTION 3 : METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>Very Good</b>
<b>Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and appropriate, and the rationale for the methodological choice justified?</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 3</b>
3.1 <b>Methodology:</b> 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	3.1 Methodology described and linked to theory of change, includes evaluation criteria on p34 and is focused on gender
3.2 <b>Data collection, analysis and sampling:</b> 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 Rationale for collection and sampling clearly outlined on page 34, sources of information mapped and managed for diversity. Quality controls are in place
3.3 <b>Stakeholders Consultation:</b> 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.	Fully	3.3 See figure 2 on page 35 for a detail of the stakeholders
3.4 <b>Limitations:</b> 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	3.4 Table 6 summarizes the constraints and mitigation mechanisms
3.5 <b>Ethics:</b> 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.	Mostly	3.5 Does not go beyond the main criteria except maybe for vulnerability

SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?	100%	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.	Fully	4.1 Findings are high-level and are included by the evaluation questions, which are addressed
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 are well-evidenced. See tables and reports cited pages 40 and 41 for example.
4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.	Fully	4.3 There is an effort to go to the root causes of gender challenges. For example, this finding:: "Stakeholders also felt that most of the interventions are dealing with the ad hoc rather than the underlying causes of gender inequality.' and it is accompanied by a way of elucidating the causes of achievement of results
4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities).	Fully	4.4 Findings are logically and clearly presented
SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?	95%	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 Conclusions are following the evaluation criteria and the way they are presented ensures alignment with findings.
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Fully	5.2 Conclusions are so well-linked to findings that flows from the findings down to conclusions
5.3 Conclusions present <b>strengths and weaknesses</b> 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 Conclusions are presented in a nuanced way see CCL 7 for example.
5.4 <b>Lessons Learned:</b> 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.	Not at all	5.4 No lessons
SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	77%	Executive Feedback on Section 6
6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Fully	6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and conclusions
6.2 The report <b>describes the process</b> followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	Mostly	6.2 Consultation with the reference group
6.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g., reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up) and actionable.	Mostly	6.3 Recommendations are clear, time-bound, have a degree of urgency and difficulty. Some are more actionnable than others. More details could have helped
6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Mostly	6.4 No real prioritization, but thematic classification
SECTION 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS (weight 15%)	Score	Approaching Requirements

<b>Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? Note: this section will be rated according to UN SWAP standards.</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 7</b>
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.	Partially integrated (1)	7.1 a) Not mentioned b) Yes, on page 36 c) Yes table 2 p.15 for evaluation criteria. "Is UN Women Liberia Country Office (UNW-LBR) portfolio aligned with international gender equality and human rights norms?." d) yes: "Does the strategy allow UNW-LBR to address underlying causes of gender inequality, the situation of women and marginalised groups both in terms of the strategic work areas prioritised and the weight given to each area?"
7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	7.2 a) Disaggregation by sex is done consistently but there is no overall concern for integration of gender consideration further than data disaggregation b) Quantitative not mentioned but graphs show a great variety of informants c) There is no mention of much around triangulation and sources of information d) Diversity of stakeholders yes, the most vulnerable is hard to assess e) Yes, see 3.4 on page 36 7.3 a) Yes. See section: Context of gender equality and women's human rights b) Triangulation is achieved through the diversity of groups interviewed but it is not directly addressed in the evaluation c) No d) Some recommendations are addressing GEEW but only some. Not overall approach
7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	
<b>SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Very Good</b>
<b>Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 8</b>
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 is logically presented and structured 8.2 Key information present and clear. 8.3 Standalone executive summary 8.4 Annexes are complete
8.2 <b>The title page and opening pages</b> 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 <b>Executive Summary</b> 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	

<p>8.4 <b>Annexes</b> 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>	Fully
--	-------

**Additional Information**

Identify aspects of <b>good practice</b> of the evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Tables and graphs are consistently illustrating the narrative</li> <li>-Findings are well embedded in evaluation questions, clearly framed for easy grasp and are nuanced and address all aspects</li> <li>-Methodologies are well described and illustrated by graphs that right away clarify the approach to the reader</li> <li>-Recommendations are presented thematically with useful details: urgency, impact difficulty that make them more actionable</li> </ul>
--	--

**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?	89.30	Very Good	