

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

Process-based and Formative Evaluation of the Education Equity Strategy in Nepal (2014-2021)

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating		82%	Satisfactory
●●●●●	Exceptional (96% - 100%)	5	
●●●●○	Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 95.99%)	4	
●●●○●	Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%)	3	Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with confidence
●●○●●	Fair (35% - 62.49%)	2	
●○○●●	Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.99%)	1	
REPORT DETAILS			
Title of the evaluation report		Process-based and Formative Evaluation of the Education Equity Strategy in Nepal (2014-2021)	
Report sequence number		Nepal/64/2021/17615	
Region		SAR	
Year of report		2021	
Office		UNICEF Nepal Country Office	
Coverage (countries)		Nepal	
ToRs present		Yes	
Date of review (dd/mm/yyyy)		January 15, 2022	
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		Yes	
Every child is protected from violence and exploitation		No	
Every child lives in a safe and clean environment		No	
Every child has an equitable chance in life		Yes	
Gender equality (cross-cutting)		No	
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)		No	
Evaluation object		Strategy	
Evaluation type		Formative	
Evaluation strategy		Mixed methods	
Evaluation design (primary method used)		Non-experimental	
Evaluation level		Output & Outcome	
Geographic scope		National	
Primary SDG(s) covered (number)		4	
EQA Summary:			
<p>This is a satisfactory report of the evaluation of the Nepalese Education Strategy. The Purpose, Objectives, and Scope of the evaluation are clearly described. The evaluation uses a non-experimental and mixed methods approach for data collection and analysis techniques, and makes good use of the theory of change. The Findings are data-driven and clearly address all evaluation objectives and scope. A notable example of good practice is the use of the intervention's yearly set of indicators, targets, results, and monetary value of the result to support findings under the Effectiveness criterion. In addition, there is a strong analysis of disability and inclusion. The Conclusions and Lessons Learned are sufficiently forward looking and add insights beyond findings and analysis. Although the recommendations could be more clearly formulated, they appear useful and the authors provided detailed guidance for implementation. There is a strong gender analysis and appropriate use of rights-based language throughout the report.</p>			
Recommendations for Improvement:			
<p>The main area in which this evaluation could more closely align with Geros standards is in the presentation of Recommendations. To facilitate the management response, it is good practice for this section to be concise with each recommendation clearly stated and followed by numbered sub-recommendations (or brief narrative guidance for implementation), the party responsible for implementation, the timeframe and priority rating. Information to justify the recommendations should be integrated into the Findings, and if high level, then reflected in Conclusions. The involvement of stakeholders in their development should also be stated. To increase accessibility, evaluation reports (without annexes) should not be longer than 80 pages. The Executive Summaries should also be more concise (5 page maximum) and include information on recommendations to better serve the needs of stakeholders who would not read the entire report. The intervention Background is well-written, but use of a stakeholder map could be useful for consolidating the discussion of the implementing agency(ies) and the contributions of the stakeholders. The Methodology section could provide more details on the overall approach. To reach the evaluation standards outlined by UNICEF/GEROS, it would be good practice for the evaluation manager to remind evaluators of the importance of following the UNICEF Adapted Reporting Standards (2017) and the Geros Handbook during the evaluation process.</p>			
SECTION RATINGS			
SECTION A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)		67%	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).	Partially	The Executive Summary is comprehensive and concise, but it could better serve as a standalone section if the recommendations were expanded upon, particularly for stakeholders who may not read the entire report.
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 of the elements are present, including the primary intended users and intended audience.
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 Executive Summary provides the reader with enough information to understand the evaluation with the exception of the recommendations being too briefly stated. No information that is not in the report is included in the summary.
SECTION B: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)		93%	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	There is a very thorough description of the intervention and information on the main objectives of the Consolidated Equity Strategy for the School Education Sector, the variables of the Equity in Education Index(es), the Equity Strategy Implementation Plans (ESIPs), the timeline of the Equity Strategy (details in Table 1), and funding mechanism.
	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	There are statistics related to rightsholders (i.e., enrollment levels of children in grades 1 to 12) and the geographical inequities in terms of lowest performing districts are described in the section on Equity Index and implementation plans. The duty bearers (the large number of government agencies at the national, provincial, district, and local levels) are provided.
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	There is a very detailed overview of the intervention context, including socio-political, the new federal governance system, and educational context in Nepal. The report provides an overview of the funding provided by the nine donors supporting the national education section strategy; and this shows that the equity strategy accounts for 1% of the S400 million budget.
	ii Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Yes	There are clear linkages to Sustainable Development Goal 4, in particular, ensuring equitable access to quality education and life-long learning by 2030.
	iii Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Yes	The status and needs of the beneficiaries with relevant analyses of inequities in education appears in Section 4.
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).	Yes	Paragraph 11 explains that the SSDP is implemented through a Sector Wide Approach (SWAp) supported by nine funding agencies and other Development Partners including Non-JFPs, I/NGOs, and the Ministry of Education Science and Technology (MOEST). Implementing partners are identified in Table 33 "Geographical presence Non State Actors in the 15 districts" in Annex 12.
	ii Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Partially	Although duty bearers are identified, the report could be more explicit about their different roles and responsibilities.
SECTION C: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)		100%	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 evaluation purpose of the evaluation is clearly described in paragraphs 57, and users and expected uses of the evaluation are summarized in Table 2.
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).	Yes	The seven objectives of the evaluation are defined in paragraph 58 and are based on those in the ToR.
	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).	Yes	The thematic, geographical, and chronological scope of the evaluation is described in paragraphs 59, 60, and 61 and are as specified by the ToR.
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 description of the intervention's intended results and pathways of change are provided in the Findings section under the relevance criteria.
	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 hypothesized causal linkages between outputs, outcomes, and impacts, including programmatic assumptions are described in Section 1.2 on the analysis of the design and framework of the Equity Strategy.
	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.	Yes	The authors indicated that a fully reconstructed theory of change is provided in the inception report and the simplified theory of change is presented in Annex 13. The simplified version is adequately detailed for the evaluation process.
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.	Yes	The evaluation questions are aligned with the intended purpose and objectives described in the ToR.

	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 final evaluation matrix presented in Annex 3 is complete. It provides the key evaluation questions and sub-themes including all relevant sections.
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.	Partially	Paragraphs 64 to 67 provide brief descriptions of the evaluation strategy and methods. The evaluators used non-experimental, theory-based and mixed methods designs. However, this section lacked explanation about the design and how the qualitative and quantitative methods were sequenced or mixed in analyses.
	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 data sources are appropriate as summarized in Table 3. Overall, the evaluators conducted 89 KIIs with participants at the national and sub-national levels and an extensive document analysis per list of sources in Annex 1. Data collection was affected by the pandemic, with the evaluators having to rely heavily on the secondary data provided by UNICEF.
	iii	Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or, if not, provide reasons for this).	Yes	The evaluators used purposive sampling technique to select participants for KIIs and convenience sampling to select municipalities. The rationale for selecting municipalities is provided in paragraph 69. It is noted that evaluators used snowball techniques to select participants from the municipalities. Table 4 presents the list of municipalities and schools selected and paragraph 75 presents the main characteristics of the municipalities visited.
	iv	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	Paragraphs 76 and 77 provide the techniques used for analysing qualitative data (manual coding) and paragraph 78 shows how the different sets of quantitative data were analysed.
	v	Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	Causal connections can be drawn, mostly from the re-constructed theory of change shown in Annex 13.
	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	The limitations encountered and mitigation measures used are outlined in paragraph 89.
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 UNEG obligations are described in paragraphs 79 through 88. The report describes how the team ensured independence, impartiality, credibility, honesty and integrity, avoiding conflicts of interest and ensuring accountability. A summary of UNEG ethical guidelines is summarized in paragraph 81.
	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 authors provide a summary of the actions taken to ensure gender equality and social inclusion in paragraph 88. The authors used the GESI Working Group's Common Framework for Gender Equality & Social Inclusion-2017 to ensure ethical safeguards appropriate for vulnerable groups.
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 be 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	There are three ways in which the evaluation demonstrates innovative practice - adaptability, use of a range of datasets, and disability inclusion. The evaluators changed from the initial purposive sampling strategy to convenience sampling to better select the municipalities and they provide the reasons for this change as 1) better fit with the challenges related to interviews' organization and municipalities' selection, 2) to consider both municipalities having implemented their ESIPs and municipalities having not. A notable example of good practice is the use of the intervention's yearly set of indicators, targets, results, and monetary value of the result in Table 10 to derive meaning for the Effectiveness criterion. Also notable are paragraphs 78 to 82 which provide exceptional narrative of the findings on disability and inclusion.
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 evaluation team organized findings by the key questions and sub-questions which were also connected with the evaluation criteria. In each case, evidence substantiating the finding was provided.
	ii	Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	The evaluators used the theory of change as a basis for analysis and interpretation of data. As noted above, an example of good practice is the use of the intervention's yearly set of indicators, targets, results, and monetary value of the result in Table 10 to derive meaning for 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 findings are evidently data-driven. The qualitative and quantitative sources of data shows a variety of stakeholders consulted including parents, education officials, non-state actors, and teachers. The evidence is often shown as direct quotes in textboxes and footnotes. Sources of quantitative data from secondary sources are provided in graphs throughout the report and sources provided in the footnotes. There is evidence that data was triangulated.

	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 evaluation findings are benchmarked on outcomes and performance indicators. The evaluators showed, in a number of cases, where positive or negative unintended outcomes were found and when the expected outcome could not be measured.
	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 findings are shown against the rather complex contextual factors in which (and with which) the Equity Strategy is implemented. Several contextual factors are mentioned, including cultural, socio-economic status, managerial, and organizational factors.
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 monitoring and evaluation system is discussed in paragraphs 15 to 30 under the Relevance criterion. The evaluators provided an independent assessment of the adequacy (or inadequacy) of the Equity Index.
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).	Yes	The report provides conclusions in the Findings section for each evaluation criterion which makes the connections very clear. There is also a standalone conclusions section with a synthesized set of clearly formulated and forward-looking conclusions.
	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 carefully derived, and they highlight both the strengths and weaknesses of the strategy. They provide insightful overview 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 evaluation provides seven useful lessons learned drawn from this evaluation. These lessons are logically derived from the findings and have applicability to other education programmes
	ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Partially	The lessons are very concisely presented, and could be a bit more fully explained to optimize their usefulness to external audiences.
SECTION G:	RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	25%	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.	Partially	The recommendations align well with purpose but are unconventional in their presentation. There two sections. The first is a 4 page descriptive section that provides the rationale and contextual information to the recommendations. However it also introduces some new information not included in findings, i.e., results from a study from New Zealand - it is explained in the preamble that the authors consolidated recommendations from other studies. The second section is a summary of recommendations in table format.
	ii Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Partially	The recommendations do appear to be very useful, and guidance for implementation can be found in the first section. However, having two sections impedes the extent to which they are actionable, especially as the numbering is not consistent.
	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).	No	The evaluators are not explicit about the participation of stakeholders in the development of the recommendations.
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.	No	The recommendations are neither prioritised nor targeted to the groups or duty-bearers responsible for implementation.
SECTION H:	REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)	79%	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 opening pages include the required material.
	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.	Yes	The annexes are thorough and complete. In addition to the documents expected, the annexes include contextual factors and details of analyses of key quantitative data.
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).	Partially	The report is clearly structured and includes a clear delineation of sections and sub-sections. However, the paragraphs are numbered but restart part way through the report (twice), and then there is no numbering in the final report sections.
	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 order follows the 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 143 pages, excluding the executive summary and introductory content, the report is of more than double the 40-60 pages 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.	Yes	The evaluation is generally well-written, with few noticeable errors.
	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 is extensive use of textboxes, tables (33 in number) and figures.
SECTION I:	EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)	81%	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.	Partially	The CRC is mentioned but is not clearly used in the evaluation design or analysis.
	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).	Partially	As noted in 17(iii) above, the report is not explicit about the participation of stakeholders in the evaluation processes. However, it does explain the range of stakeholders who were involved as evaluation participants.
	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).	Yes	The language is consistent with standards. For example, the evaluation used language such as vulnerable populations, children with disabilities, and systematic disparities in schooling and learning due to geographical location, caste, gender, family wealth and vulnerabilities. Right-based terminology is evident.
	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 report is explicit about addressing child rights and Leave No-one Behind particularly in the reference to SDG4. The authors noted in paragraph 15 Nepal's commitment to the principle of 'leaving no one behind' and that inequality is not only an impediment to growth and human development, but also a violation of shared norms, values and people's intrinsic sense of fairness. The report clearly addresses the extent of inclusion of children with disabilities. A notable example of good practice is the strong narrative of the findings on disability and inclusion in paragraphs 78 to 82.
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	GEEW is integrated in the evaluation scope, questions, and analysis. Relevant data is collected.
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated	The steps taken to ensure the methodology was gender responsive are described in paragraph 88. Gender concerns are discussed throughout the report with clear disaggregation of data by boys and girls in the Findings section. The list of persons consulted was disaggregated by gender.
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Satisfactorily integrated	The Findings and Conclusions reflect gender considerations although gender is not explicit in the Recommendations.
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?			