# 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.<br>- Each overarching parameter is rated against a four-point scale (Fully, Mostly, Partially and Not at all).<br>- Parameters such as evaluation methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations are given more weight.<br>- **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 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 | 5 | 5: Conclusions and lessons learned | 20 | |
| 2: Purpose, objectives and scope | 5 | 6: Recommendations | 15 | *Are weightings equal to 100% (excluding a DI criteria)?* |
| 3: Methodology | 15 | 7: Gender Equality and Human Rights (UN-SWAP) | 10 | **OK** |
| 4: Findings | 20 | 8: Report presentation | 10 | |
| 9: Disability Inclusion (bonus points) | 5 | | | |

| PART I: REPORT DETAILS | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Report title | End of Project Evaluation Report "Prevention of COVID 19 infection among vulnerable women & Girls in Drought-affected D | | Geographical Coverage | | National |
| Sequence number | 4 | Evaluators | [Female] | [Male] | Year | 2024 |
| Region | Eastern and Southern Africa | Country(ies) | Zimbabwe | | Type of intervention evaluated | Project |
| Portfolio Budget (USD) | | Evaluation Budget (USD) | | | Reviewer | C. Marcondes |
| Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply) | Prevent VAW&G and | | | | Review Date | 04 April 2024 |

| 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? | 100% | Executive Feedback on Section 1 |
| 1.1 The report clearly specifies the **object** 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.<br><br>*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.* | Fully | The intervention is well described with information on budget, ToC, expected results and intended beneficiaries, as well as project activities. The description of the context provides a good overview on the factors that have a direct bearing on the project. Information about the key partners and stakeholders is included along with information timeframe and implementation status. |
| 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.<br><br>*Note: This section should be concise but sufficient to cover key contextual issue.* | Fully | |
| 1.3 The **key stakeholders** involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(ies) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described.<br><br>*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.* | Fully | |
| 1.4 The report identifies any changes in the **timeframe and/or implementation plans** (e.g. original plans, strategies, logical frameworks), provides an explanation for these and for any implications these may have had regarding the evaluation.<br><br>*Note: Remember to identify the implementation status of the object, including its phase of implementation and any significant changes.* | Fully | |

| 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 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. | Fully | The purpose, objectives, use and scope of evaluation are clearly outlined. |
| 2.2 **Evaluation Scope:** 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). | Fully | |

| 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? | 100% | Executive Feedback on Section 3 |
| 3.1 **Methodology:** 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.<br><br>*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.* | Fully | The methodology is described in a summarized way and information in the Annex (e.g. evaluation matrix and questionnaires) is a useful complement. The methods for data collection, sampling and analysis chosen are explained. Information about the rationale used to choose these methods is included and fully demonstrates that they were appropriate to provide responses to evaluation questions and for triangulation, analysis and assessments of GE/HR specific results. References to triangulation and cross-checking of the data across the lines of evidence are also included. References to adherence to ethics and specific evaluation standards (e.g. UNEG guidelines) during the evaluation are included along with a good overview of the limitations and |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 3.2 **Data collection, analysis and sampling:** 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.<br><br>*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.* | Fully | guidelines) during the evaluation are included along with a good overview of the limitations and their impact on the evaluation findings. |
| 3.3 **Stakeholders Consultation:** 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.<br><br>*Note: Include a stakeholder mapping, showing that the consultation process was comprehensive to assure the reader that the selection of KIs and/or survey participants was appropriate and representative of the universe of project stakeholder (in line with descriptions under item1.3 above). Use annexes to provide detailed description.* | Fully | |
| 3.4 **Limitations:** 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.). | Fully | |
| 3.5 **Ethics:** 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).<br><br>*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.* | Fully | |

| SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%) | Rating | Very Good |
|---|---|---|
| **Are the findings well substantiated, clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?** | **100%** | **Executive Feedback on Section 4** |
| 4.1 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g. avoid ambiguities).<br><br>*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.* | Fully | A set of findings statements in line with the evaluation questions is not included, containing direct responses to the evaluation questions consistently. However, the findings section contains good analysis and systematically address the evaluation criteria. The analysis is well substantiated, coherent, and presents clear arguments. Cause-effect explanations are included but unintended resulta were not specifically highlighted. |
| 4.2 The evaluation findings are **well substantiated, and provide sufficient levels of high quality evidence** to systematically ad-dress the evaluation questions and criteria.<br><br>*Note: Ensure the findings narrative are consistent with the findings statements and fully back the statement, showing the evidence and triangulation clearly.* | Fully | |
| 4.3 Findings reflect systematic and **appropriate analysis** and interpretation of the data; they are free from subjective judgments.<br><br>*Note: in addition to describing the implementation of activities and completion of outputs, include an analysis of their contributions towards the intervention outcomes.* | Fully | |
| 4.4 Are **cause and effect links** between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended results highlighted?<br><br>*Note: Remember to include information on both the cause/effect links and unintended results* | Fully | |
| SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%) | Rating | Good |
| **Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?** | **52%** | **Executive Feedback on Section 5** |
| 5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.<br><br>*Note: Conclusions are not summaries of findings but they are formulated from the analysis and interpretation of the findings, giving meaning to them.* | Mostly | The Conclusions section is very short and contains a good summary of the findings in line with most evaluation criteria (e.g. gender is missing). They derive from the findings and, as such, are well substantiated but need to go beyond the findings, providing more insights on the issues that the recommendations propose to address. They should also contain a better balance of strengths and weakness identified. A good set of lessons are identified but are presented in a very summarized way and should have described the project experience fully, showing what worked or not in the project experience, providing guidance to other projects. |
| 5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings.<br><br>*Note: Conclusions should provide explanations for the findings and form the basis for recommending actions or decisions that are consistent with the conclusions.* | Partly | |
| 5.3 Conclusions present the **strengths and weaknesses** 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 | |
| **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 gen-eralizing from single point observations.<br><br>*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.* | Partly | |
| SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%) | Rating | Very Good |
| **Are the recommendations relevant, useful, actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?** | **90%** | **Executive Feedback on Section 6** |
| 6.1 Recommendations are well grounded on the evaluation, logically **derived from the findings and/or conclusions.**<br><br>*Note: The recommendations should be complete in number and depth, reflecting the analysis in the findings and conclusions and address the issues identified earlier.* | Mostly | The recommendations are clear and realistic, but more information should have been included in the conclusions (and/or finding sections) to address some of the issues tackled, and fully show that they derive from the findings/conclusions. Nevertheless, the recommentations contain good guidance and are action-oriented.There are references to the process as well as prioritization. |
| 6.2 The report **describes the process** followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.<br><br>*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.* | Fully | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 6.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g. reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up) and actionable. | Fully | |
| 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. | 89% | **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.<br><br>*Note: Refer to the UNEG UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator Technical Note for guidance on this section.* | Fully integrated (3) | GEWE is fully integrated in the evaluation scope as gender is an evaluation criteria and gender-related evaluation questions are included. The methodology was fully gender-responsive. It uses mixed data collection methods and gender was taken into consideration in the determination of the sample and the identification of the project beneficiaries to be consulted. There are also references to confidentiality and ethical guidelines are included in the report. Gender analysis is satisfactorily and reflects the fact that this is a gender-related project targetting women. Background section contains information about the gender issue to be addressed and findings contain gender-related analysis, including some disaggregated data. Unanticipated effects were not identified. The gender evaluation criteria is no reflected in the conclusions but the recommendations reflect gender analysis. |
| 7.2 A **gender-responsive methodology,** methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.<br><br>*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.* | Fully integrated (3) | |
| 7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.<br><br>Note: Please address all aspects of this sub-criterion. | Satisfactorily integrated (2) | |

| SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%) | Rating | Very Good |
|---|---|---|
| Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented? | 97% | **Executive Feedback on Section 8** |
| 8.1 Report is **logically structured, concise and of reasonable length, well written and presented** with clarity and coherence (e.g. the structure and presentation is easy to identify and navigate (numbered sections, clear titles and subtitles, context, pur-pose 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.<br><br>*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).* | Fully | Report is complete, reads really well and is well presented with appropriate structure and length. Some of the tables numbering need to be corrected. The Opening pages are complete. Most Annexes are included but a list of people consulted is missing and should have been included in the Annex. The executive summary is a stand-alone section. |
| 8.2 The **title page and opening pages** 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.<br><br>*Note: Executive Summaries should be maximum 5-6 pages long.* | Fully | |
| 8.4 **Annexes** 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).<br><br>Note: Annexes should be maximum 60 pages long. | Mostly | |

| Additional Information | | |
|---|---|---|
| Identify aspects of **good practice** of the evaluation<br>*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.* | N/A | |

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

| 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? | 89.88 | Very Good | This is an excellent evaluation report. It reads really well and contains good and well substantiated assessments in response to the evaluation questions, based on sound methodological approach. A good set of lessons is included (even though more details are needed to enable their replication) along with a good set of recommendations. |