

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

Formative and summative evaluation of Government of Ghana / UNICEF Child Protection Programme (2012 - 2019)

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating		90%	Highly Satisfactory
● ● ● ● ●	Exceptional (96% - 100%)	5	Exceeds UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with a high degree of confidence
● ● ● ●	Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 95.99%)	4	
● ● ● ●	Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%)	3	
● ● ● ●	Fair (35% - 62.49%)	2	
● ● ● ●	Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.99%)	1	
REPORT DETAILS			
Title of the evaluation report		Formative and summative evaluation of Government of Ghana / UNICEF Child Protection Programme (2012 - 2019)	
Report sequence number		Ghana/61/2021/16864	
Region		WCAR	
Year of report		2021	
Office		UNICEF Ghana	
Coverage (countries)		Ghana	
ToRs present		Yes	
Date of review (dd/mm/yyyy)		December 4, 2021	
Name of review firm		DefEdge	
CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT			
Management of evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation)		UNICEF managed	
Unicef goal areas (Alignment with strategic plan priorities)			
Every child survives and thrives		No	
Every child learns		No	
Every child is protected from violence and exploitation		Yes	
Every child lives in a safe and clean environment		No	
Every child has an equitable chance in life		No	
Gender equality (cross-cutting)		Yes	
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)		No	
Evaluation object		Programme	
Evaluation type		Summative and formative	
Evaluation strategy		Mixed methods	
Evaluation design (primary method used)		Quasi-experimental	
Evaluation level		Output & Outcome	
Geographic scope		National	
Primary SDG(s) covered (number)		16, 5	
EQA Summary:			
This is a good quality evaluation that can be used for decision making to improve the child protection system and promote outcomes for girls and boys in Ghana. It combines an outcome harvesting approach to assess whether and how the programme contributed to change in intervention districts, and a quasi-experimental approach to measure the impact of social and behavioral change interventions. The evaluation integrated a rights-based approach and ensured the evaluation design and implementation was gender-responsive. It provides a detailed description of the child protection context and the legal and policy framework for child protection, touching on child welfare, alternative care arrangements, birth registration, child marriage and other gender issues, child online safety and discrimination. The evaluators used mixed methods to collect quantitative and qualitative data that was analysed and triangulated to draw inferences and answer the evaluation questions with accuracy. The findings present the evidence collected from a large number of programme functionaries, stakeholders and other informants. These are both positive and negative which reflects evaluative judgement. The conclusions are relevant to the programme's expected results and provide insight into the child protection system. The report includes lessons learned and recommendations that stem from the analysis and are in most cases articulated for a management response.			
Recommendations for Improvement:			
The suggestions focus on structure, content and presentation. The structure and length of the evaluation report could have been improved by reducing duplication - there were two sections on objectives and recommendations, and the findings were also integrated with preliminary conclusions (by finding) in advance of the final conclusion - and by reducing the number of evaluation questions. Good practice calls for having 1-2 main questions for each criterion, and for sub-questions to be included within these if need be. The background section could have provided readers with a sketch of the system to aid both understanding of the system and actor, stakeholder and partner relationships. The objectives and criteria sections could also have explained where the evaluation process modified the ToR and whether there resulted any perceived divergence from the intended use of the evaluation. Whereas much of the evidence was aggregated at the national level, the report could have also provided more detail to make clear that marginalised and vulnerable stakeholder groups were included at the regional, district and disadvantaged community levels. From a presentation perspective, those sections of text that were dense could have been broken up with sub-headings and use of tables to summarize information presented.			
SECTION RATINGS			
SECTION A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)		83%	Comments on Rating
Question 1.	Can the executive summary inform decision-making?		
i	Is clearly presented, serves as a standalone document useful for informing decision making, and is of relevant conciseness and depth for key users (Maximum of 5 pages unless otherwise specified in ToR).	Yes	The executive summary is clear and concise and serves as a standalone 5 page document useful for informing decision making.
ii	Includes all necessary elements (overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key conclusions on findings, lessons learned if requested, key recommendations) as per the ToR.	Yes	All necessary elements are present.
iii	Includes all significant information needed to understand the intervention and the evaluation AND does not introduce new information from what is presented in the rest of the report.	Partially	The summary includes all significant information, though it also introduces a new piece of information regarding the workshop used to validate recommendations. This was not discussed in the report.

SECTION B:	BACKGROUND (weight 5%)	79%	Comments on Rating
Question 2.	Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?		
i	Clear and relevant description of the intervention, including: location(s), timelines, cost/budget, and implementation status.	Yes	The report provides a description of the intervention. It includes information on the location, timeline and implementation status and the overall budget of \$48.5 million (2012 to 2022.)
ii	Clear and relevant description of intended rightsholders (beneficiaries) and duty bearers (state and non-state actors with responsibilities regarding the intervention) by type (i.e., institutions/organizations; communities; individuals...), by geographic location(s) (i.e., urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods, town/cities, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached, with disaggregation by gender, age, disability . . . (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation).	Yes	The report has a description of rightsholders and primary and secondary duty bearers. It provides an indication of the number of annual cases of violence against children (~15,000) and child rights abuse (~ 2,300), as well as information on other harmful norms and practices including gender-based violence (~32 %), female genital mutilation (~2.5 %) and child labour (~24.7 %).
Question 3.	Is the context of the intervention clearly described?		
i	Clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention (i.e. relevant policy, socio-economic, political, cultural, power/privilege, institutional, international factors) and how context relates to the implementation of the intervention.	Yes	The report provides a detailed description and information of the context, including the child protection system and the legal and policy framework, child welfare, alternative care, birth registration, and child marriage, gender and online safety issues.
ii	Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Partially	There report contained a linkage to SDG 16.2, though it could have identified other linkages to SDG 16 targets and SDG 5.
iii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Yes	There was a clear description of number of rightsholders and their defining characteristics embedded within the report sections on context and object of the intervention.
Question 4.	Are key stakeholders, their relationships and contributions clearly identified?		
i	Identification of implementing agency(ies), development partners, right holders, and additional duty bearers and other stakeholders; and of linkages between them (e.g., stakeholder map) (if relevant).	Partially	Key stakeholders, including UNICEF, Government Of Ghana implementing agencies (national, regional and local), and other development and implementing partners are described. The evaluators could have provided a sketch of the system to aid understanding of the system and relationships.
ii	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Partially	The report identified the budget of the 2012-2017 and 2018-2022 programmes, though there was no indication of how much was / is to be financed by UNICEF. The report could also have presented more detailed information on the roles of UNICEF and the many national, regional and local stakeholders, to better inform readers on the nature of the intervention.
SECTION C:	EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)	75%	Comments on Rating
Question 5.	Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?		
i	Purpose of evaluation is clearly defined, including why it was needed at that point in time, its intended use, and key intended users.	Yes	The report describes the purpose of the evaluation and states how it is intended to be used by each key evaluation user. It references the Terms of Reference (ToR) which clarifies the evaluation "is expected to focus on child protection outcomes for children and not try to establish a long-term impact."
Question 6.	Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?		
i	Clear and complete description of what the evaluation seeks to achieve by the end of the process with reference to any changes made to the objectives included in the ToR (if applicable).	Partially	The report provides 5 of the main objectives outlined in the ToR. It appears objective F "to test assumptions, validate and reconstruct (if needed) the theory of change of UNICEF/GoG child protection programme for the current country programme Mar 2018-2022" has been removed. Whereas a new gender-focused objective has been included, good practice is to clarify the process that reached this decision and to inform readers if there was any divergence from the intended use of the evaluation by any user(s).
ii	Clear and relevant description of the scope of the evaluation: what will and will not be covered (thematically, chronologically, geographically with key terms defined), as well as, if applicable, the reasons for this scope (e.g., 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).	Partially	The report provides a clear description of the scope, though more discussion of the geographical scope in the ToR could have been included to increase reader understanding of intervention and non-intervention sites.
Question 7.	Is the theory of change, results chain or logic well articulated?		
i	Clear description of the intervention's intended results, or of the parts of the results chain that are applicable to, or are being tested by, the evaluation.	Yes	The report describes the intended results and the overall change envisioned.
ii	Causal relationship between outputs and outcomes is presented in narrative and/or graphic form (e.g., results chain, logic model, theory of change, evaluation matrix).	Yes	The report provides the 2012-2017 and 2017-2021 outcomes, outputs and results.
iii	For theory-based evaluations, the theory of change or results framework is assessed, and if requested in the ToR, it is reformulated/improved by the evaluators.	Partially	The report discusses the UNICEF approach to implementing the ToC. Whereas the ToR identified objective f to "test assumptions, validate and reconstruct (if needed) the theory of change of UNICEF/GoG child protection programme for the current country programme Mar 2018-2022", good practice would have been to go beyond assumptions of the 2017 'Child Protection Programme Strategy Note' and enhance the ToC.
SECTION D:	EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)	95%	Comments on Rating

Question 8.	Does the evaluation use questions and the relevant evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation? <i>UNICEF evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria - Relevance; Coherence; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact (not all are necessarily relevant for all evaluations). Evaluations should also consider equity and leaving no-one behind, gender and human rights based approach (these can be mainstreamed into other criteria). Humanitarian evaluations should also consider Coverage; Connectedness; Coordination; Protection; Security.</i>		
	i Evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The relevant criteria are specified and are aligned with the questions.	Partially	This section of the report presented a concept of an assessment framework, noting the evaluation matrix includes most of the evaluation questions found in the ToR and other more-specific sub-questions. The relevant criteria have been covered although the Effectiveness and Impact criterion were merged. The main concern is the number of evaluation questions - 22. A more focused evaluation process could have been achieved if the evaluators had reduced and combined these.
	ii In addition to the questions and sub-questions, the evaluation matrix includes indicators, benchmarks, assumptions and/or other processes from which the analysis can be based and conclusions drawn.	Yes	The evaluation matrix includes information on how the achievements were measured.
Question 9.	Does the report specify adequate methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?		
	i Evaluation design and set of methods are relevant and adequately robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope; and are fully and clearly described.	Yes	The report has identified that an outcome harvesting approach was taken to collection information on what changed and work back to determine whether and how the programmes contributed to the change. Difference-in-difference analysis was also used to assess the extent to which change could be attributed to the programme. The mix of quantitative and qualitative methods were described, including the use of triangulation to clarify the validity of results.
	ii Data sources are appropriate - these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR) - and are all clearly described.	Yes	The report identifies all of the sources used to answer the questions, including quantitative and qualitative, and explains the intent for use of each source.
	iii Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or, if not, provide reasons for this).	Yes	A sampling strategy for sources of data was provided, as well as an overarching statement on the evaluation approach being grounded on equity and rights with special attention to vulnerable and at risk groups.
	iv Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	The methods of analysis are described.
	v Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	The method allowed for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes, as evidenced in the question responses to the Effectiveness criterion and the Table on page 58.
	vi Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias, and how these were addressed by the evaluators (as feasible).	Yes	There is a description of the limitations and constraints faced and the mitigation strategies employed to strengthen the evaluation.
Question 10.	Are ethical issues and considerations described? The evaluation should be guided by the UNEG ethical standards for evaluation. As such, the evaluation report should include:		
	i Explicit and contextualized reference to the UNEG obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) and/or the principles in the 2020 revised UNEG Ethical Guidelines (integrity, accountability, respect, beneficence).	Yes	The evaluators note the evaluation was guided by the CORAM international ethical protocol, UNEG ethical guidelines and ethical principles of research involving children. The report notes the evaluation was guided by the evaluators' obligations of independence, impartiality, credibility, avoiding conflicts of interest, and accountability.
	ii Description of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues relevant to methodology and how they are applied (respect for dignity and diversity, right to self-determination, fair representation, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups, confidentiality, and avoidance of harm). For those cases where the evaluation involves interviewing children, explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children.	Yes	The ethical safeguards for participants and how they were applied is discussed.
Question 11.	Does the evaluation incorporate innovative practice that adds value to the evaluation process?		
	i Innovation practice is used to improve the quality of evaluation process. This could evident in several ways such as the design of the methodology (i.e. use of technology for data gathering, extensive participatory processes, systematic analysis processes such as collaborative outcomes reporting and incorporation of big data, specific strategies to address complexity such as outcome harvesting, strong child rights focus), or ways of sharing of evaluation results.	Yes	An outcome harvesting approach was used to address complexity related to an evaluation that needed to cover the period 2012-2019. The evaluators collected evidence of what had changed over the course of the two child protection programmes and worked backwards to determine whether and how the programmes contributed to those changes.
SECTION E:	EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)	100%	Comments on Rating
Question 12.	Do the findings clearly address all evaluation objectives and scope?		

	i Findings marshal sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation's questions, sub-questions and criteria.	Yes	The report presents a methodical and detailed response to all of the evaluation questions and sub-questions.
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	The report uses the intervention's results framework in the formulation of 57 pages of findings, with key evidence found under the Effectiveness criterion.
Question 13.	Are evaluation findings derived from the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of the best available, objective, reliable and valid data and by accurate quantitative and qualitative analysis of evidence?		
	i Evaluation uses credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data. It presents both output and outcome-level data as relevant to the evaluation framework. Triangulation is evident through the use of multiple data sources.	Yes	The evaluation presents multiple lines of qualitative and quantitative evidence that were credible and ensured triangulation.
	ii Findings are clearly supported by, and respond to, the evidence presented, including both positive and negative. Findings are based on clear performance indicators, standards, benchmarks, or other means of comparison as relevant for each question.	Yes	The statements of fact build upon the evidence that was collected. The findings are positive and negative, and there was use of benchmarks. For example, when discussing amendments made to the foster care and adoption regulations, there was mention of GOG's accession to the Hague Convention.
	iii Causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. For theory-based evaluations, findings also analyse the logical chain (progression -or not- from implementation to results).	Yes	The report considered factors and reasons related to likely achievement and non-achievement of results.
Question 14.	Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?		
	i Assessment of the adequacy of the intervention's monitoring system (including completeness and appropriateness of results/performance framework - including vertical and horizontal logic, M&E tools and their usage) to support decision-making.	Yes	The report discussed the internal monitoring systems, which included a tracking system to monitor activity implementation and fund utilization against anticipated results. It discussed the adequacy of the system across both phases of the programme, noting reporting had not been prioritised until later years.
SECTION F:	EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)	88%	Comments on Rating
Question 15.	Do the conclusions clearly present an objective overall assessment of the intervention?		
	i Conclusions are clearly formulated and reflect the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. They are sufficiently forward looking (if a formative evaluation or if the implementation is expected to continue or have additional phase).	Partially	The report presents a summary of positive and negative findings and preliminary conclusions (by criterion) that reflect evaluative judgement. However, the final conclusions are presented in just one and a quarter pages of text that are relevant to the programme evaluation though could have been concluded in more detail. The section was presented as a solid block of text and could have included subheadings to increase readability. It is sufficiently forward looking.
	ii Conclusions are derived appropriately from findings, and present a picture of the strengths and limitations of the intervention that adds insight and analysis beyond the findings.	Yes	The conclusions are derived from the findings and present a picture of the strengths and limitations of the intervention.
Question 16.	Are logical and informative lessons learned identified? [N/A if lessons are not presented and not requested in ToR]		
	i Identified lessons stem logically from the findings, have wider applicability and relevance beyond the object of the evaluation.	Yes	The lessons are practical and insightful. They answer what has been learnt from the evaluation and could be useful for other/subsequent interventions.
	ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Yes	The lessons are clearly presented and have sufficient detail to inform the intended audience.
SECTION G:	RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	88%	Comments on Rating
Question 17.	Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?		
	i Recommendations align with the evaluation purpose, are clearly formulated and logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Yes	The recommendations are formulated clearly and stem from the findings.
	ii Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Yes	They are useful and actionable for users.
	iii Process for developing the recommendations is described, and includes the Involvement of duty-bearers, as well as rights holders when feasible (or explanation given for why they were not involved).	Yes	The executive summary states the recommendations were validated, discussed and developed during a participatory workshop, to ensure that they are actionable and appropriate to the Ghanaian context.
Question 18.	Are recommendations clearly presented?		
	i Clear identification of groups or duty-bearers responsible for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations). Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Partially	The recommendations are presented in two sections. In the section 14, the recommendations are prioritised though some of them do not identify the responsible entity for action. The numbering of recommendations in section 14 is also slightly modified from that in section 13 and the executive summary. Good practice is to have one consolidated section or subsection on recommendations.
SECTION H:	REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)	71%	Comments on Rating
Question 19.	Does the evaluation report include all relevant information?		
	i Opening pages include: Name of evaluated object, 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.	Yes	The required information is provided. Good practice is to list the annexes.

	ii Annexes include: terms of reference, evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, results chain/ToC/logical framework (unless included in report body), 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, information about the evaluator(s), etc.	Partially	The report contains most of the elements. The annexes with the summary of interviews provided only the gender-disaggregated number of KIIs and FGDs by region, instead of listing out participants by stakeholder type, organization, and position.
Question 20. Is the report logically structured?			
	i Structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles, well formatted).	Yes	The structure is easy to identify and navigate.
	ii Structure accords to UNICEF guidelines for evaluation reports: context, purpose and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.	Yes	The structure accords to UNICEF guidelines.
Question 21. Is the report well presented?			
	i Report is of reasonable length; it does not exceed number of pages that may be specified in ToR.	No	At 120 pages with annexes, the report significantly exceeds the 50 page limit required in the ToR.
	ii Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Partially	Although the language used is accessible, some sections of the text were overly lengthy and dense which made it difficult to integrate facts reported in earlier sections. It would have been helpful if in the Findings section the evaluation questions were numbered and a summary of key findings were presented in a text box under the main questions. Also, the evaluation questions for relevance contained the same questions twice.
	iii Frequent use of visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, photos) to convey key information. These are clearly presented, labeled, and referenced in text.	Yes	There are multiple visual aids.
SECTION I: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)		88%	Comments on Rating
Question 22. Did the evaluation design and style consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF's commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming, to gender equality, and to equity?			
	i Reference and use of rights-based framework, and/or CRC, CCC, CEDAW and/or other rights related benchmarks in the design of the evaluation.	Yes	The report referenced and used CRC, CEDAW, CAPD and the Hague Convention.
	ii Clear description of the level of participation of key rights holders and duty bearers in the conduct of the evaluation (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering).	Yes	The evaluation questions were refined in collaboration with the Evaluation Reference Group, and the recommendations were validated, discussed and developed during a participatory workshop held with key stakeholders.
	iii Language is empowering and inclusive, avoiding gender, heterosexual, age, cultural and religious bias, among others; use terminology of rights holders and duty bearers; data is disaggregated by marginalized group; differential results are assessed (distribution of results across different groups).	Partially	The language is empowering and inclusive, with use of rights-based terminology. The data has not been disaggregated by marginalized group, which makes it difficult to understand the differential results across different groups.
	iv Evaluation assesses the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addresses child rights and Leave No-one Behind (gender and other excluded and marginalized groups). It is disability inclusive.	Yes	The evaluation assessed the extent to which vulnerable groups were identified, with social norms and other factors limiting program reach. The report also touched on issues for children with disabilities, including abuse and intolerance. The intervention included children with disabilities in public consultations on the Ghanaian legal framework. The evaluation also identified gaps in disaggregation of data.
Question 23. Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? (Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards with detail provided below)		8	
	i GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.	Fully integrated	Gender considerations are included in the evaluation design, scope of analysis, criteria and questions to ensure GEEW-related data was collected.
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily Integrated	The methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques were gender-responsive. For example, 550 females and 472 males completed surveys. Good practice is to describe how the evaluators facilitated women's participation through timing of meetings, having women enumerators, etc.
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated	The findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis, with discussion of gender-based violence and high levels of early marriage (before age 18) in rural areas and poor households, gender-disaggregated findings and conclusions, and a GEEW-related recommendation.
SWAP Rating Guidance			
i GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.			
a. Does the evaluation assess whether sufficient information was collected during the implementation period on specific result indicators to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results?			
b. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives?			
c. Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria?			
d. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation?			

ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.

- a. Does the evaluation specify how gender issues are addressed in the methodology, including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gender considerations and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex?
- b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations?
- c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility?
- d. Does the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate?
- e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality?

iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.

- a. Does the evaluation have a background section that includes an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the issue or spell out the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality?
- b. Do the findings include data analysis that explicitly and transparently triangulates the voices of different social role groups, and/or disaggregates quantitative data, where applicable?
- c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described?
- d. Does the evaluation report provide specific recommendations addressing GEWE issues, and priorities for action to improve GEWE or the intervention or future initiatives in this area?