

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	MT Evaluation of WEE project in Gaza Mozambique			Geographical Coverage	National
Sequence number	26	Evaluators	1	Year	2018
Region	Eastern and Southern	Country(ies)	Mozambique	Type of intervention evaluated	Project
Portfolio Budget (USD)		Evaluation Budget (USD)	25,770.00	Reviewer	Zayid Douglas
Strategic Plan Thematic Area (select all that apply)	Women's access to			Review Date	07 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?	100%	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 evaluated project focused on mitigating the gendered impacts of climate change in 6 districts in Gaza Province, Mozambique. The project aimed to identify and facilitate economic empowerment strategies - awareness raising, advocacy, support of women's role in decision making , engaged with norms setters-- "to create an enabling environment for women to exercise their rights to access and control productive resources" - all under a budget of \$2.3 million USD.
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.	Fully	1.2 The report highlighted that the power dynamics and gender roles affect how women and men in Gaza have been impacted by climate change. They noted that women often lack access and control over to natural resources & form the majority of the poor population in these communities. 1.3 The evaluation stakeholders included project beneficiaries, district, provincial and national government partners, academy, partner NGOs and CSOs who advised during evaluation design and planning and through follow up.
1.3 The key stakeholders involved in the implementation, including the implementing agency(s) and partners, other stakeholders and their roles are described.	Fully	1.4 The evaluation was for the first three years of a four-year project, from September 2014 to August 2018. (Originally this mid-term evaluation was meant to have occurred at the two-year mark.)
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.	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 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 - The report explained the evaluation purpose & objectives, using OECD/DAC criteria - relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability - in addition to assessing M&E and knowledge management, identify lessons learned, and recommendations for the way forward. The evaluation user membership was not clearly stated. However, the Evaluator Reference Group for this exercise comprised of " UN Women program staff, national government representatives, development partners, donors, UNCT representatives, and CSO Advisory Group representatives"
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).	Fully	2.2 The report noted that they took a sample of 4 from the 6 districts, representing geographic diversity, to constitute the sample for the evaluation.
SECTION 3 : METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)	RATING	Good
Is the methodology used for the evaluation clearly described and appropriate, and the rationale for the methodological choice justified?	58%	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.	Partly	3.1 Qualitative data was used to collect primary and secondary data alongside a desk review to answer the key research and review performance data. Change stories from program beneficiaries documented stories for impact.
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	3.2 Sex-separate FGDs were used to collect context-specific data to better understand those linkages between women's welfare and gender, climate, & women economic empowerment (WEE) with project beneficiaries, & representatives in local governance and civil society. Representatives from partners, in addition to civil society participated in IDIs to help explore these issues on a more intimate basis. These along with change stories documenting perceived change from the participant's voice helped triangulate the data sources.
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.	Partly	3.3 No, this was touched upon lightly in terms of members of the Evaluation Reference Group which were provincial (and national) government, NGOs and civil partners and stakeholders. District decision task force, and district planning force task team members

<p>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.</p>	<p>Mostly</p>	<p>could have attended this group meeting.</p> <p>3.4 There was no theory of change (TOC) nor performance indicator matrix present. The team developed a results chain (graphic depiction of pathways , relationships), and focused attention to assessing outcomes.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Not at all</p>	<p>3.5 The report included one notable mention about participant (human subjects research) protection - "The evaluation strived to follow the most inclusive, participatory and respectful approach for all stakeholders (both rights holders and duty bearers)."</p>
<p>SECTION 4: FINDINGS (weight 20%)</p>	<p>Rating</p>	<p>Very Good</p>
<p>Are the findings clearly presented, relevant and based on evidence?</p>	<p>80%</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 The findings presented were extracted from the data collected and analyzed under this evaluation, and then organized for presentation under the relevant criteria. The criteria had gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEWE) integrated throughout.</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>4.2 - The project launched activities and approaches that challenged gendered norms and discrimination, emphasized women's self-confidence and self-esteem, and supporting those opportunities that allow for women's participation in decision-making--all contributing to an enabling environment for women and economic decision making and access to related resources.</p>
<p>4.3 The causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified.</p>	<p>Not at all</p>	<p>4.3 Since there was no clear TOC, causality could not be presented; however, outcomes were noted instead. Various data were considered and reviewed in addition to primary qualitative data, secondary data was reviewed including that of budgetary data- to better understand the number of women that accessed federal funds.</p>
<p>4.4 Findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence (e.g., avoid ambiguities).</p>	<p>Fully</p>	<p>4.4 The findings are presented in logic manner- each finding is presented in order of the criteria, and then key question that it is associated with.</p>

SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED (weight 20%)	Rating	Very Good
Are the conclusions clearly presented based on findings and substantiated by evidence?	100%	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 The conclusions aligned with the findings and aligned with the noted strengths and weaknesses.
5.2 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgments that add insight and analysis beyond the findings	Fully	5.2 The summary included clear assessments in addition to findings. The evaluation makes explicit reference to both strong and weak gender transformative approaches. For example, women increasingly accessed district development funds compared to baseline but still these numbers were as many are in spaces that do not recognize women's decision making.
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.	Fully	5.3 In the summary, the evaluation makes explicit reference to both strong and weak gender transformative approaches. For example, women increasingly accessed district development funds compared to baseline but still these numbers were as many are in spaces that do not recognize women's decision making.
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	5.4 The lessons learned takes notes of thematic advances or hiccups and presented these in a cohesive manner in order to provide the evaluation user with more insight.
SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	Rating	Good
Are the recommendations relevant, useful, and actionable and clearly presented in a priority order?	53%	Executive Feedback on Section 6

6.1 Recommendations are logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Fully	6.1 The recommendations were derived from the findings in a logical form. First a finding/highlight extracted from the data is presented, accompanied by some learnings on how this finding can be applied or detracts from the existing setting then followed by next steps for action.
6.2 The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendations including consultation with stakeholders.	Partly	6.2 There was some mention of stakeholders providing input through the evaluation process via consultation. This included during the validation of findings but no defined list was provided.
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 Partly, having some recommendations that were SMART in orientation or had level of urgency or feasibility denoted would help for planning purposes. 6.4 The evaluation needed recommendations that are SMART, noting who/is, responsible to strengthen clarity and inform future planning.
6.4 Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Partly	
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.	78%	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 Yes, each criteria has ensured that a gender equality and human rights lens has been applied throughout. 7.2 - Yes, the a gender based methodology was employed along with tools and approaches. IDIs were a great way to discuss sensitive topics as they arose during the course of the project.
7.2 A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	7.3 - Yes, despite limitations, all findings, conclusions and recommendations "... reflect(s) the gender analysis integrated in the evaluation: a particular attention is therefore dedicated to describing the intervention's effects on gender perceptions, values, as well as

7.3 The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendation reflect a gender analysis.	Satisfactorily integrated (2)	on the power relations present among the involved men and women."
SECTION 8: THE REPORT PRESENTATION (weight 10%)	Rating	Good
Is the report well structured, written in accessible language and well presented?	73%	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.	Mostly	8.1 - The report was mostly well written and logically structured. 8.2 - The title and opening pages provided mostly key information. 8.3 - The executive summary is a standalone document.
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.	Mostly	8.4 The annexes were not presented with the report that was reviewed.
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).	Not at all	
Additional Information		

Identify aspects of good practice of the evaluation	<p>-While outside of the scope for this mid-term evaluation, the evaluator proceeded to observe and make recommendations for improving the project's results framework and indicators, as there is opportunity remains for the project to revise its indicators.</p> <p>- An example of how the most significant change (MSC) approach was applied during data collection during this mid-term evaluation was presented in a report annex.</p>
--	--



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?	77.85	Good	