

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.	- Overall reports are rated against a four-point scale (Very Good, Good, Fair and Unsatisfactory), which is an aggregated rating of eight parameters. - Each overarching parameter is rated against a four-point scale (Fully, Mostly, Partially and Not at all). - Parameters such as evaluation methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations are given more weight. - <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 suggestions on how to improve future evaluation practice. The overall review, rating and executive feedback will be provided to the evaluation commissioning office.
Parameter Weight (%)	1: Object and context 2: Purpose, objectives and scope 3: Methodology 4: Findings 9: Disability Inclusion (bonus points)	5 5 15 20 5	5: Conclusions and lessons learned 6: Recommendations 7: Gender Equality and Human Rights (UN-SWAP) 8: Report presentation	20 15 10 10	Are weightings equal to 100% (excluding a DI criteria)? OK

PART I: REPORT DETAILS

Report title	CPE			Geographical Coverage	National
Sequence number	43	Evaluators	[Female] [Male]	Year	2022
Region	Eastern and Southern Africa	Country(ies)	Malawi	Type of intervention evaluated	Project
Portfolio Budget (USD)		Evaluation Budget (USD)		Reviewer	C. Marcondes
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Women's leadership and	Women's access to economic	Prevent VAW&G	Review Date	22 January 2022

PART II: THE EIGHT KEY PARAMETERS		
<b>SECTION 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION (weight 5%)</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>Very Good</b>
<b>Does the report present a clear and full description of the 'object' of the evaluation?</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 1</b>
1.1 The report clearly specifies the <b>object</b> of the evaluation, and provides a clear and complete description of the intervention's original logic (e.g. expected results chain or theory of change), timeframe, intended beneficiaries by type, geographic location(s) as well as the planned budget of the intervention.  <i>Note: Please address all aspects of this sub-criteria. If the project did not have a ToC, clearly outline the expected results of the intervention and how the activities were expected to lead to the results.</i>	Fully	The intervention is clearly described, with information on the ToC, expected results, stakeholders, budget and geographical area of intervention of the SN. The factors with direct bearing on the SN were well explained in the context description. More information about each of the other stakeholders involved in the implementation of the SN activities should have been included along with the role played, noting that there are references to stakeholder mapping information in the Annex, but these were not included. The addition of a results framework in the Annex would also have been helpful. Some high level information about the timeline is included along with references to implementation status.
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.  <i>Note: This section should be concise but sufficient to cover key contextual issue.</i>	Fully	
1.3 The <b>key stakeholders</b> involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(ies) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described.  <i>Note: Remember to include not only a list of partners but also a description of their main activities and/or the role they had in the implementation of the intervention in the body of report. Detailed description and stakeholder analysis can be provided in annexes.</i>	Mostly	
1.4 The report identifies any changes in the <b>timeframe and/or implementation plans</b> (e.g. original plans, strategies, logical frameworks), provides an explanation for these and for any implications these may have had regarding the evaluation.  <i>Note: Remember to identify the implementation status of the object, including its phase of implementation and any significant changes.</i>	Fully	
<b>SECTION 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>Good</b>
<b>Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 2</b>
2.1 <b>Purpose, objectives and use of evaluation:</b> The evaluation report provides a 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.	Mostly	The purpose, objectives, and scope of evaluation are clearly outlined although more details about the rationale for coverage of specific districts should have been described. There is little information about how the evaluation was to be used and this should have been included.
2.2 <b>Evaluation Scope:</b> The evaluation report provides a clear description of the scope of the evaluation, including a description of the timeframe and outputs/outcomes covered, and not covered (thematically, geographically etc.) as well as the reasons for this scope (e.g. specifications by the ToR, 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).	Mostly	
<b>SECTION 3 : METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>Good</b>
<b>Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and appropriate, and the rationale for the methodological choice justified?</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 3</b>
3.1 <b>Methodology:</b> The report provides a complete description of the methods used for data collection and analysis, the chosen evaluation criteria and evaluation questions, and demonstrate that the methods chosen are appropriate to inform the responses to the criteria and questions.  <i>Note: An evaluation matrix containing the evaluation questions in each evaluation criteria, the indicators, the data sources and methods for data collection is useful to show these, but it is still important to include some explanations in the body of the document to clearly demonstrate that the methods are appropriate for triangulation. Remember to keep this section succinct and use annexes to provide detailed information .</i>	Mostly	The methodology is well described but there are gaps with some information is missing. The information referred to as included in the Annex would have helped to show that the methods and selection of stakeholders were appropriate to provide responses to evaluation questions. The stakeholder mapping, the list of those interviewed and the questionnaires should have been included, along with the evaluation matrix which would have helped to show the evaluation questions, the criteria and the lines of evidence used for the triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE/HR specific results.

<p><b>3.2 Data collection, analysis and sampling:</b> The report clearly describes the tools used for data collection and the rationale for their selection as well as the sampling strategy and methods used for data analysis. The report includes discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, to guide the assessments of GE/HR specific results and to ensure data accuracy and completeness.</p> <p><i>Note: Please describe not only the types of data collection tools used (e.g. surveys, KIIs, desk review) but also how the data was collected (where, when, who, how) and what steps were taken to analyze it. Remember to include a description of original sampling strategy and the extent to which it covers the range of stakeholders involved in the intervention, with a clear justification of the selection of the targeted sample. Use annexes to provide detailed description.</i></p>	<p>Mostly</p>	<p>Data collection, analysis and sampling are well explained but sampling of the focus groups and the rationale for the selection of the districts surveyed should have been explained, to show that these were representative of the universe of the SN activities. References to adherence to ethics and specific evaluation standards (e.g. UNEG guidelines) during the evaluation are included. Limitations are well explained.</p>
<p><b>3.3 Stakeholders Consultation:</b> The evaluation report gives a complete description of the stakeholder consultation process in the evaluation, including the rationale for selecting the particular level and activities for consultation.</p> <p><i>Note: Include a stakeholder mapping, showing that the consultation process was comprehensive to assure the reader that the selection of KIIs and/or survey participants was appropriate and representative of the universe of project stakeholder (in line with descriptions under item 1.3 above). Use annexes to provide detailed description.</i></p>	<p>Mostly</p>	
<p><b>3.4 Limitations:</b> The report presents a clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation and if/how these were mitigated (e.g. gaps in the evidence, biases due to limits in stakeholder consultations, etc.).</p>	<p>Fully</p>	
<p><b>3.5 Ethics:</b> The evaluation report makes explicit references to the ethical obligations of the evaluators and shows evidence that data collection and tools adhered to these ethical principles, (e.g. mechanisms and measures were implemented to ensure that the evaluation process conformed to relevant ethical standards, including but not limited to, informed consent of participants, confidentiality and avoidance of harm considerations).</p> <p><i>Note: Mentioning/referencing UNEG standards in the report does not amount to sufficient evidence that the data was actually collected with sensitivity to ethics and discrimination. It is a good practice to provide a clear explanation as to how the evaluation adopted these, showing examples of tools and processes used were sensitive to ethical considerations (e.g. consent, confidentiality) and were not discriminatory against particular group's participation (i.e. were interviews or focus groups held in a location, at a time, in a setting, using language/translation, that is appropriate and respectful; and facilitates the participation of a full range of stakeholders). Use annexes to provide detailed description.</i></p>	<p>Fully</p>	

SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)	Rating	Good
Are the findings well substantiated, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?	57%	Executive Feedback on Section 4
4.1 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g. avoid ambiguities). <i>Note: It is a good practice to clearly outline the findings in the report, preferably using a "set" of findings statements, with clear articulation and conciseness, followed by substantiation and full demonstration of the evidence used to formulate the findings' statements.</i>	Mostly	The report contains 60 Finding statements which address and cover all evaluation criteria. These should have been more concisely articulated into a smaller number of findings statements which more clearly and directly provide responses to the evaluation questions, avoiding much of the repetition. The evaluation questions should have been presented. The substantiation of findings is not always consistent, with some statements containing clear presentation of the evidence that backs the statement and others containing only descriptions of achievements, with limited explanations/substantiation. Sometimes the narrative is not clearly connected to the finding statements (e.g Finding 12). The narrative should consistently fully back the statements and/or the statements should be adjusted to reflect the narrative (e.g. Finding 13). Analysis should more consistently show the contributions made by the SN activities to the expected results, with explanations provided systematically, showing the cause and effect links and how the activities led to the achievement of the results described, specially in the "Effectiveness" section. Unintended results have been identified.
4.2 The evaluation findings are <b>well substantiated, and provide sufficient levels of high quality evidence</b> to systematically address the evaluation questions and criteria. <i>Note: Ensure the findings narrative are consistent with the findings statements and fully back the statement, showing the evidence and triangulation clearly.</i>	Partly	
4.3 Findings reflect systematic and <b>appropriate analysis</b> and interpretation of the data; they are free from subjective judgments. <i>Note: in addition to describing the implementation of activities and completion of outputs, include an analysis of their contributions towards the intervention outcomes.</i>	Mostly	
4.4 Are <b>cause and effect links</b> between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended results highlighted? <i>Note: Remember to include information on both the cause/effect links and unintended results</i>	Mostly	
SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)	Rating	Good
Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?	68%	Executive Feedback on Section 5
5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings. <i>Note: Conclusions are not summaries of findings but they are formulated from the analysis and interpretation of the findings, giving meaning to them.</i>	Fully	The Conclusions contain a good summary of the findings in each of the evaluation criteria. Some in-depth analysis and weaknesses identified related to the Theory of Change could have been also presented (e.g. Finding 33), with further analysis to provide more insights, going beyond the findings and presenting issues which should have been addressed in the recommendations section (paving the way to those recommendations). A good section on Lessons is included.
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings. <i>Note: Conclusions should provide explanations for the findings and form the basis for recommending actions or decisions that are consistent with the conclusions.</i>	Partly	
5.3 Conclusions present the <b>strengths and weaknesses</b> of the object (policy, programmes, projects 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	
<b>5.4 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. <i>Note: The lessons learned from an evaluation comprise the new knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (initiative, context outcomes and even evaluation methods) that is applicable to and useful in other similar contexts. They should demonstrate the intervention experience and be generalized to enable applicability by other interventions.</i>	Fully	
SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	80%	Executive Feedback on Section 6
6.1 Recommendations are well grounded on the evaluation, logically <b>derived from the findings and/or conclusions</b> . <i>Note: The recommendations should be complete in number and depth, reflecting the analysis in the findings and conclusions and address the issues identified earlier.</i>	Mostly	A good number of recommendations are included but they are high level and could have been better grounded on the evaluation findings, as some key issues identified earlier in the findings (e.g. Finding 33, for example) should have been object of recommendations. The recommendations are clear and realistic but should have more action-oriented and contain information about the steps needed and how they should

<p>6.2 The report <b>describes the process</b> followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.</p> <p><i>Note: Include a relevant explanation on the extent to which the evaluation participants were specifically consulted for the formulation of the recommendations and/or the level of participation of stakeholders in this evaluation stage.</i></p>	Fully	<p>action-oriented and contain information about the steps needed and how they should be implemented. There are references to the process and they are prioritized.</p>
<p>6.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g. reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up) and actionable.</p>	Mostly	
<p>6.4 Clear <b>prioritization and/or classification</b> of recommendations to support use.</p>	Fully	

SECTION 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS (weight 15%)	Score	Meets Requirements
Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? <i>Note: this section will be rated according to UN SWAP standards.</i>	89%	Executive Feedback on Section 7
7.1 GEWE is integrated in the <b>evaluation scope</b> of analysis and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEWE related data will be collected.  <i>Note: Refer to the UNEG UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator Technical Note for guidance on this section.</i>	Fully integrated (3)	GEWE is fully integrated in the scope. Even though there is no assessment of data on specific gender results, and gender is a stand alone criteria. The project focus is on gender and there are indications that GEWE was integrated in the evaluation questions, even though the evaluation questions were not provided and the Annexes were not included. The methodology was satisfactorily gender-responsive. Some information is provided on how the evaluation integrated gender and the sample targetted women specifically. The data collection tools and details in the Annex were not provided. The methodology uses mixed data collection methods and references to confidentiality and ethical guidelines are included. Gender analysis is fully reflected in the report. Background section, findings, conclusions and recommendations contain gender-related analysis although explicit references and disaggregated data is not consistently presented. Unanticipated effects were identified.
7.2 A <b>gender-responsive methodology</b> , methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.  <i>Note: it is not enough to simply describe the methodology as “gender-responsive”, it is important to demonstrate that the data collection and analysis integrated gender considerations; that data was collected disaggregated by sex; that methods/tools were designed to enable GEWE assessments; and/or that processes employed (i.e. sampling, triangulation, validation) ensured inclusion and enabled data for GEWE analysis.</i>	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	
7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.  <i>Note: Please address all aspects of this sub-criterion.</i>	Fully integrated (3)	
SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)	Rating	Good
Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?	63%	Executive Feedback on Section 8
8.1 Report is <b>logically structured, concise and of reasonable length, well written and presented</b> with clarity and coherence (e.g. the structure and presentation is easy to identify and navigate (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 is written in accessible language with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors.  <i>Note: Reasonable length for project/programme and CPE evaluations is about 40 pages (excluding Annexes 60 pages); and 50 pages for institutional and thematic evaluations (excluding Annexes 60 pages).</i>	Mostly	Report is complete and well presented with appropriate structure but it should be shortened to about 40 pages long (currently 89 pages). The acronyms should have been spelled out the first time they show in the narrative. Formatting could be improved and some Finding statements are missing (e.g. Finding 44). No annexes are included although there are references to the existence of the key annexes in the body of the document. They should have been included and also listed in the ToC. Opening pages are complete and the executive summary should also have included a summary of the key findings to be a complete stand-alone section.
8.2 The <b>title page and opening pages</b> provide key basic information on the name of evaluators and, 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.  <i>Note: Executive Summaries should be maximum 5-6 pages long.</i>	Mostly	
8.4 <b>Annexes</b> should be of reasonable length and include, when not present in the body of the report: ToR, 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).  <i>Note: Annexes should be maximum 60 pages long.</i>	Not at all	
<b>Additional Information</b>		
Identify aspects of <b>good practice</b> of the evaluation  <i>Note: This section is to be populated by the QA Reviewer only, based on the overall Evaluation Report. No need to identify specific elements related to this section.</i>	N/A	

<p>[Piloting] SECTION 9: DISABILITY INCLUSION (weight: 5%)  <i>* The score for Section 9 will be 'bonus points' ( 5%), on top of the existing 100% weight.  ** Assessment is based on the UN Disability Inclusion (For further details, please refer to Technical Notes on Entity Accountability Framework).</i></p>	<p>SCALE (No, Partially, Yes)</p>	<p>OVERALL ASSESSMENT for DISABILITY INCLUSION (Missing, Partial, Sufficient)</p>
<p>Does the evaluation include consideration of disability inclusion?</p>		<p>Partial</p>
<p>9.1 The evaluation <b>questions</b> include references to disability inclusion.</p>	<p>No</p>	<p>Qualitative Feedback (Please highlight any findings on disability inclusion): Evaluation questions were not provided. Specific references to disability inclusion were included the evaluation methodology. The topic was covered in findings and conclusions but not under recommendations.</p>
<p>9.2 The evaluation <b>methodology</b> includes references to disability inclusion.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>9.3 The Evaluation <b>findings, conclusions and/or recommendations</b> contain references to disability inclusion.</p>	<p>Partially</p>	

## PART III: THE OVERALL RATING

Key Guiding Question	Total weighted score %	Overall Rating	Other reviewer's comments
Is this a credible report that addresses the evaluation purpose and objectives based on evidence, and that can therefore be used with confidence?	73.38	Good	This is a good evaluation report. It contains good assessments but gaps were identified in the findings related to concise finding statements addressing the evaluation criteria, the missing Annexes have pushed the ratings downward. Some good analysis (see comments in Conclusion section of this review) have not been presented in the conclusions section with missed opportunities to provide solid recommendations to move CP forward.