

**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>	End Of Project Evaluation Of The Ec Strongim Mere: Promoting Women's Political Participation And			<b>Geographical Coverage</b>	National
<b>Sequence number</b>	9	<b>Evaluators</b>	3	<b>Year</b>	2018
<b>Region</b>	Asia and the Pacific	<b>Country(ies)</b>	Solomon Islands	<b>Type of intervention evaluated</b>	Project
<b>Portfolio Budget (USD)</b>		<b>Evaluation Budget (USD)</b>	30,000.00	<b>Reviewer</b>	Glaiza Veluz
<b>Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)</b>	Women's leadership			<b>Review Date</b>	06 February 2019

**PART II: THE EIGHT KEY PARAMETERS**

<b>SECTION 1: OBJECT AND CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION (weight 5%)</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>Good</b>
--	---------------	-------------

Does the report present a clear and full description of the 'object' of the evaluation?	50%	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 The project was funded by European Union (EU) and was implemented by UN Women Solomon Island Country Office from January 2014-2016. The report presented the project's theory of change. However there was no discussion on where the project was implemented or of the intended beneficiaries (e.g., no demographic information on which women were reached such as rural women or women who lived on below \$2 etc was shared). Further, there was no discussion on budget and modalities.
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.	Partly	1.2 Discussion of context was brief and lacked details ( such as background data, historical information) to elucidate women's political participation issues at a deeper level.
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.	Partly	1.3 The key stakeholders such as staff of UN Women and other UN agencies (e.g. UNDP), donors, implementing partner organisations, representatives from key government offices, ministries and agencies, civil society representatives and project beneficiaries were mentioned in the report, but their roles were not described.
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.	Fully	1.4 The evaluator explained that a review of the program's log framework found that outcomes and indicators were too ambitious considering the project's timeframe. As a result, the evaluators concluded that a new measure of success would be needed to assess the program's effectiveness. Hence, the theory of change of the project was reconstructed.
SECTION 2: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)	RATING	Good
Are the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope sufficiently clear to guide the evaluation?	50%	Executive Feedback on Section 2
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.	Mostly	2.1 The "Evaluation Overview" section discussed the purpose, objectives, intended use, and users. The description of the purpose however was rather brief (only noting to assess progress (and challenges) towards project outcomes, with measurement of the achievement of project outputs and identification of factors that affected the implementation of activities). The intended users of the evaluation was also highlighted, but was quite general rather than discussing how each stakeholder, based on its role, would benefit from the evaluation. The only topic discussed in more detail were the objectives.

<p><b>2.2 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).</p>	Partly	2.2 The report provided basic information related to the scope and limitations (e.g., unavailability of some key stakeholders for the study). Reasons for these limitations are typically not explained.
<p><b>SECTION 3 : METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)</b></p>	RATING	Fair
<p><b>Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and appropriate, and the rationale for the methodological choice justified?</b></p>	28%	Executive Feedback on Section 3
<p><b>3.1 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.</p>	Partly	3.1 The methodology of the evaluation was basic, broken up by the OECD DAC evaluation criteria and evaluation questions that fell under them. There was no specific gender analysis framework or lens used for data analysis. However the report mentioned that the methodology was gender and human rights responsive without further elaboration.
<p><b>3.2 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.</p>	Partly	3.2 Data gathering techniques employed were primarily qualitative, such as process of change workshop, desk-based research, key informant interviews, and participatory workshop. However, there was no extensive discussion on the rationale for selecting such data techniques, or why there was no pre and post testing after workshops and events, which made the evaluation design weaker. There was no discussion on how the data would be triangulated. This was implied though by noting that the evaluation allowed for participation and consultation of key stakeholders although the details were not included.
<p><b>3.3 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.</p>	Partly	3.3 It was noted that key stakeholders were consulted but the process was not explained.
<p><b>3.4 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.</p>	Not at all	3.4. There was no dedicated section on limitations and mitigation activities in case of bias.
<p><b>3.5 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.</p>	Not at all	There was a description of a limitation due to unavailability of key stakeholders for the data collection period. However, there were not many details on this either.
<p><b>SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)</b></p>	Rating	Fair

<b>Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?</b>	33%	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 4</b>
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 report presented data in the form of captured quotes from evaluation participants. However, these quotes are not seen all throughout the findings. The evidence cited was not of high quality and standard. The report would have been strengthened by pre and post testing to show shifts related to programming more reliably.
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.	Partly	4.2 The evidence presented was not consistent. Some findings were backed up by quotes while some were not. Qualitative data was not coded and aggregated so that trends could be seen. The evaluation should have included the use of quantitative data and pre/post testing as mentioned. There were some findings which were not supported by evidence, and hence, sounded subjective.
4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.	Partly	4.3 There was a dedicated section on the reasons for achievement and non-achievement of results, but it only looked at what was not achieved.
4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities).	Partly	4.4 The evaluators language was clear. But the findings were not substantiated by sufficient evidence and there ambiguous and undefined terms used throughout. An example, "The project obtained a wide reach through its project activities. " - it is unclear what "wide" means in this context, especially without substantiating evidence.
<b>SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
<b>Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?</b>	2%	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 5</b>
5.1 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.	<b>Not at all</b>	5.1 - 5.3 The report did not have a dedicated conclusion section.
		5.4. There was a lessons learned section which was based on the findings. But it was rather brief composed of only five bullet points with 1-3 sentences each. As each lesson learned

5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Not at all	was brief, it did not allow for a robust discussion of how these can be applied to different contexts and sectors.
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.	Not at all	
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.	Partly	
<b>SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Fair
<b>Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?</b>	47%	<b>Executive Feedback on Section 6</b>
6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Fully	6.1 The recommendations were connected to the findings. There was essentially no separate chapter for recommendations. Recommendations were placed after the presentation of findings in each evaluation criteria.
6.2 The report <b>describes the process</b> followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	Not at all	6.2 There was no discussion of whether the recommendations were developed from consultations.
6.3 Recommendations are clear, realistic (e.g., reflect an understanding of the subject's potential constraints to follow-up) and actionable.	Partly	6.3 The recommendations were mostly specific and actionable. However they did not present detailed information such as possible barriers/constraints to implementation. It appeared that the recommendations could be achieved.
6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Partly	6.4 There was no prioritization, although the recommendations were grouped by evaluation criteria.
<b>SECTION 7: GENDER AND HUMAN RIGHTS (weight 15%)</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Approaching Requirements</b>

<p><b>Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? Note: this section will be rated according to UN SWAP standards.</b></p>	<p>67%</p>	<p><b>Executive Feedback on Section 7</b></p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Fully integrated (3)</p>	<p>7.1 GEWE was well integrated into the evaluation criteria, questions, and analysis.</p>
<p>7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.</p>	<p>Partially integrated (1)</p>	<p>7.2 They were able to include as evaluation stakeholders, the grassroots women but the report did not mention use of gender lens framework on analysis and data collection.</p>
<p>7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.</p>	<p>Satisfactorily integrated (2)</p>	<p>7.3 The evaluation was able to capture information about the gains and weaknesses of the project on gender inequity in political participation. However, the conclusions were not necessarily clear and recommendations were not that specific and actionable</p>
<p><b>SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)</b></p>	<p><b>Rating</b></p>	<p><b>Good</b></p>
<p><b>Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?</b></p>	<p>60%</p>	<p><b>Executive Feedback on Section 8</b></p>
<p>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</p>	<p>Partly</p>	<p>8.1 The report followed a general clear pattern, in terms of the sequence and structure. However, the findings had a different format (conclusive statements at the beginning, data presentation, and the recommendations right after). The data presentation, conclusion and recommendations were combined in the findings section. This made the report confusing and difficult to read. It would have been clearer if each finding was backed up by data and conclusions and recommendations were in separate sections.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Mostly</p>	<p>8.2 The name of evaluators was presented, although details about them were not present. The report had no date though the table of contents contained the usual elements.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>8.3 The report had a concise executive summary which provided an adequate overview of the overall content.</p>
<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</p>	<p>Not at all</p>	<p>8.4 There was a list of Annex at the table of contents but the report only had one Annex (Annex E)</p>

<b>Additional Information</b>	
Identify aspects of <i>good practice</i> of the evaluation	N/A

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?	35.91	Unsatisfactory	The evaluation design was not built on a strong foundation and the findings were lacking adequate evidence to support its claims.