GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

Programme Evaluation of Swabhimaan across three Indian States (Bihar, Chhattisgarh and Odisha)

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating		86%	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	Programme Evaluation of Swabhimaan across three Indian States (Bihar, Chhattisgarh and Odisha)
Report sequence number	India-2023-64-18320
Region	SAR
Year of report	2024
Office	India
Coverage (countries)	India
ToRs present	No
Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)	January 29, 2024
Name of review firm	IOD Parc

CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT	
Management of evaluation *(Managerial control and oversight of evaluation*	UNICEF
Unicef goal areas *(Alignment with strategic plan priorities)*	
Every child survives and thrives	Yes
Every child learns	No
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)	Yes
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	No
Evaluation object	Programme
Evaluation type	Summative and formative
Evaluation strategy	Mixed methods
Evaluation design *(primary method used)*	Theory-based
Evaluation level	Output & Outcome
Geographic scope	National
Primary SDG(s) covered *(number)*	SDG 2, SDG 3 , SDG 5 SDG 6

EQA Summary: *The rater will provide top line issues for this evaluation relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet all criteria. As relevant, the rater will highlight best practice/added value elements and the level of complexity of the evaluation.*

The report of the 'Programme Evaluation of Swabhimaan across three Indian States (Bihar, Chhattisgarh and Odisha)' is rated as 'highly satisfactory'. It is well-written, and uses a robust evaluation methodology to develop findings, conclusions and recommendations that can be used with confidence to inform decision-makers .
Strengths of the evaluation:
- the purpose and scope of the evaluation are clearly explained at the outset, including why the evaluation is needed and who the intended users are
- the context section provides relevant and context-specific information about health, nutrition and gender equality with data from the specific locations of the programme i.e. across the three states
- the methodology which utilises a theory-based approach and contribution analysis, rigorously unpacks the causal pathways for each of the output-outcome areas
- the stakeholder analysis sets out responsibilities for each stakeholder, and also provides an organogram showing how the different partners work together
- the evaluation matrix sets out all key information around how information will be collected, indicators and means of verification. There is also clear articulation of why some questions were changed since the ToRs.
- Most Significant Change data is being used and explored through the evaluation
- the findings section systematically addresses each of the evaluation questions, and utilises a useful scheme ('strong' 'mixed' 'weak') to classify the strength of evidence for all data, based upon the process and results of triangulation
- a gender lens is used throughout, with gender-specific questions within the evaluation (mirroring the programme target groups), gender-orientated methodology, and includes an intersectional analysis (women of different tribal groups, caste groups) and male engagement
- the conclusions summarise the findings well, but also provide more strategic insight
- the recommendations are classified well in terms of priority and responsible actors, and provide a useful steer as well as suggested practical action points

Shortcomings include:
- the report does not set out the outcomes and outputs of the programme for readers to be aware of the key elements of the programme from the outset
- although there is useful description of the issues affecting the target groups, there is no information regarding the number of beneficiaries disaggregated by location, sub-groups (by target sub-groups) or by other factors (age, caste, marginalised groups)
- there is a lack of information about the number of beneficiaries (within FGDs) involved in the evaluation, disaggregated by groups
- the findings present the evidence of what has worked well, but does not consistently go into depth regarding the reasons behind achievement/ non-achievement of results for each questions
- there is limited review of the programme's monitoring and evaluation system, and therefore the utility for the evaluation
- the report lacks a 'tracing ' system of the links between individual findings, conclusions and recommendations

Recommendations for Improvement: *The rater will identify topline recommendations to improve the evaluation, and be specific to the sections of the report where shortcomings were found. As relevant, resources will be cited to assist evaluation managers in overseeing future evaluations.*

Suggested improvements are:
- the report could set out the outcomes and outputs of the programme briefly to provide clarity of the key elements of the programme from the outset for readers who are not as familiar with the programme
- there could be data provided regarding the number of beneficiaries disaggregated by location, sub-groups (by target sub-groups) or by other factors (age, caste, marginalised groups) so that the scale of the programme is known, and the breakdown of subgroups
- similarly there could be further information about the number of beneficiaries (within FGDs) involved in the evaluation, disaggregated by groups
- the findings could be more consistent in providing analysis regarding the reasons behind achievement/ non-achievement of results for each questions
- there could be more in-depth review of the programme's monitoring and evaluation system, and therefore the utility for the evaluation
- the report could benefit from providing a 'tracing ' system of the links between individual findings, conclusions and recommendations (using simple numbering of findings, and conclusions, and providing a table of which findings link to which conclusions and recommendations

SECTION RATINGS			
SECTION A:	**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)**	100%	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 a succinct and clear summary of the report, and provides sufficient information to inform decision-making. It is under 5 pages.
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	The executive summary covers all key components of the report, including introduction to the intervention, evaluation purpose and methodology, intended audience, findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.
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.	Yes	All of the key information to understand the evaluation and the intervention itself, is included. No additional information has been included.
SECTION B:	**BACKGROUND (weight 5%)**	86%	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	Section 1.1 provides important description regarding the location and timeline of the programme, and that it has completed. The budget is also specified (section 1.3) and how it has scaled up in the programme. A useful timeline is also provided in Figure 4.
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/cites, sub-regions…) and in terms of numbers reached, with disaggregation by gender, age, disability . . . (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation).	Partially	The rightsholders are set out in terms of primary targets by type (adolescent girls, newly-wed couples, pregnant women, and mother of children under two years of age) and secondary target groups (family members such as husbands and mothers-in law and farmer producer groups). Although the number of villages in different locations is set out, there is no presentation of numbers of beneficiaries, or broken down by location or disaggregated by gender/ age/ other groups. The duty bearers are shared, with government agencies and technical partners, and the organogram of the programme is shared in Figure 2.
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 context section (1.2) sets out the inter-related issues of health, nutrition, gender equality, with specific data from each of the three states (but not from the national level) and the policy status. Caste issues are also described.
ii	Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Yes	There is mention (in section 1.2) that four of the ten SDGs are addressed by the programme, and these are referenced to and expanded upon in Section 3.2 which describes them in more depth (SDG 2, 3, 5 , 6). This is sufficient.
iii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Partially	The health and nutrition status of women, and adolescent girls is described and data provided, with description of intersectional issues (caste, education, access to resources). There is less specific information on the needs and status of two of the four primary target groups e.g. newlyweds, mothers of under-2s.
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	The list of all stakeholders and their respective roles and responsibilities is shared in Table 3, complemented by Figure 2 which presents an organogram.
ii	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Yes	The contributions and roles of key stakeholders is set out clearly in Table 2 showing their geographical coverage.
SECTION C:	**EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)**	92%	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 purpose of the evaluation is clear (section 1.4) and it provides information about an impact evaluation and how this complements it (exploring reasons behind the impact findings). The timing of the evaluation is also highlighted and that it will be used to consider sustainability and scalability.
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 objectives of the evaluation are clearly set out in section 1.4 and make sense given the purpose of the evaluation. They are similar to the ToR although also include an additional objective 'capture the drivers/ triggers for the success of the programme' which chimes with the purpose. It would have been helpful if this had been explained within the text.
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 scope of the evaluation is clearly specified in section 1.5, sharing any parameters around the timeframe (from start to end), geographical coverage (all), sectors (health and nutrition, WASH but not antenatal check ups).
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.	Partially	The goals of the programme are set out in section 1.3, however it would have been helpful to include the outputs and outcomes so that there is sufficient background information to understand the intervention.
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	Annex 9 provides the 'Theory of Change ' of the programme, and includes expected outputs and outcomes . Annex 4, crucially, sets out the output-outcome causal pathways including assumptions and utilises the COM-B (capacity, opportunity, motivation) conceptual tool.
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 Theory of Change was adapted by the programme to elaborate upon the output -outcome changes for five output areas. This is core to the evaluation given the theory-based approach and use of contribution analysis.
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? *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	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 and sub-questions are set out in the evaluation matrix in Annex 3, and the departure from the 25 evaluation questions in the ToRs is articulated clearly within section 1.6.1. Changes include merging questions to avoid duplication/ enhance the cohesiveness of the narrative. The criteria cover relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coverage, impact gender equality and also fidelity.
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 (Annex 3) systematically includes indicators, means of verification and data collection tools for each evaluation questions.
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 evaluation overall design (theory-based, contribution analysis) and selection of methods are appropriate (drawing upon existing quantitative and qualitative desk review resources, and exploratory qualitative primary data collection) is relevant and robust.
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	Data sources included desk review, KII, FGDs and the full set of tools can be found in Annex 5. Most significant change stories were also collected from programme implementers. These are considered appropriate.
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 sampling strategy is provided (2.3.2.1) and involve purposive sampling for villages, focus group discussions and key informants. This included 'high-literacy' and 'low-literacy' villages, and FGDs included adolescent girls, mother of children under two years, pregnant women, and newlywed women to gain diverse perspectives.
iv	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	Analysis is set out well for both qualitative data, and quantitative (from baseline/ midline and endline surveys).

v	Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	The rigorous theories of change for output-outcome change, and how these have been translated into data collection tools (exploring the pathways for change) enables causal connections to be explored. This is an important component of the programme, enabling understanding of why the programme has achieved/ not achieved outcomes, to complement the impact evaluation.
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).	Partially	The limitations are set out in section 2.7 (table 6) and include methodological , data collection limitations (including external limitations). Some mitigation strategies were included, but not all.
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	Section 2.5 sets out the ethical considerations for the evaluation, and includes reference to UNEG and Ethical Research Involving Children. Principles are set out (including confidentiality, impartiality, independence, do no harm).
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	Specific focus was given to data collection with adolescent girls (oral consent by parents, location and time of meetings etc). Reference is made to Ethical Research Involving Children, and a ethical certificate was also provided (Signa Institutional Review Board).
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	Whilst not new, the evaluation has integrated well 'Most Significant Change stories' utilising available resources. The use of COM-B within the articulation of output-outcome changes is an appropriate and helpful tool, to support contribution analysis.
SECTION E:	**EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)**	75%	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 report systematically addresses each of the evaluation questions in turn. The analysis utilises the range of data (desk review, FGDs and interviews) to respond to each of the questions.
ii	Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	One of the key strengths of the evaluation report is the way that it has developed the output-outcome theories of change and methodically analyses the different elements of activities and capacity change, and behavioural change.
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	Quantitative data draws from secondary sources (e.g. baseline, midline and endline surveys) to analyse what has been achieved, and also qualitative data (FGDs and interviews) to explore the reasons behind achievement or non-achievement of results. A useful scheme of strong/ mixed and weak evidence regarding degree of convergence of results from triangulation across different sources is used.
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	Findings share both positive and negative results, and contributory factors are set out. Key challenges and strengths are elucidated. Analysis is systematic, for example consideration of the extent to which the programme is relevant to the SDGs maps the objectives and scope with each of the relevant SDGs, and a similar analysis is done for each of the relevant articles under CEDAW.
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).	Partially	Much of the analysis sets out what has been achieved and the degree of evidence across them. Whilst there are some challenges set out (e.g. around effectiveness), there is limited discussion of the contextual factors that led (or did lead not) to results. For example, section 3.8.1 discusses in depth the participation levels on community meetings, but the analysis around why this is the case is less in-depth and the evidence is not shared. There could also be more information provided about the separate impact evaluation, and data that has emerged from it, and whether the evaluation complements it/ or does not.
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.	No	Challenges in monitoring and reporting are set out within the findings. However, there is no assessment of the programme M&E system as a whole (within the methodology or findings sections) .
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 conclusions respond to the purpose of the evaluation, and assess the quality of implementation and evaluate them against the evaluation criteria. It has also addressed the objectives of the evaluation. The conclusions are also forward-looking considering issues around sustainability, both in terms of governance and also social norm change.
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 present a picture of both strengths and limitations, and usefully identifies underlying reasons. The conciseness of the argument helps to crystallise the insight and analysis.
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 clearly derived from the findings, and are of interest to the programme, but also to those beyond.
ii	Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Partially	The lessons are succinct and presented well, with an overall statement and more detail below. However, some are written with a strong programmatic focus and could be a little more generalised to appear widely applicable.
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.	Partially	The recommendations align with the evaluation purpose and are explicitly linked to evaluation criteria. They are logically derived from the findings and conclusions, although it would have been helpful to have had a clear 'tracing system' of across numbered findings, conclusions and recommendations.
ii	Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation, as appropriate.	Yes	The recommendations are useful for intended users, and sufficient practical guidance is given through suggested actions.
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 process of developing the recommendations is clearly set out and is appropriate . A recommendations workshop was conducted with a small group pf relevant stakeholders.
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.	Yes	The recommendations are classified by level of priority, and responsible actors. They are set out in a helpful table for users/ decision-makers.
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.	Partially	The opening pages include the name of the programme, timeframe of the programme, date of the evaluation report, location of the programme, evaluation commissioner and organisation that has undertaken the evaluation. The table of contents is comprehensive. Whilst the name of the programme ' SWABHIMAAN' is included on pp1 and pp2, it would be helpful to have a caption setting out what the programme focus is.
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 include: evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, results chain and expanded theories of change, data collection instruments, list of documentary evidence, terms of reference.
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 report is well structured and easy to navigate with numbered sections and clear headings and sub-headings.
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 follows UNICEF guidelines and the standard format.
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	The report is 76 pages long, and is therefore longer than UNICEF guidance (40 pages ideally, and no longer than 70). On pp12 it states that 'given the complexity and scale of the evaluation, the report exceeds the suggested length as per the GEROS format and as recommended in the ToR [30-40 pages]. Condensing the information in the report or executive summary may have led to the loss of pivotal findings and has been agreed on with the UNICEF ICO'. This shows that the report within various draft iterations has already been reduced quite significantly.
ii	Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Yes	The report is highly accessible and is well written, and is generally free of grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.
iii	Frequent use of visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, photos) to convey key information. These are clearly presented, labelled, and referenced in text.	Yes	The report is punctuated by tables, figures and images which all serve to illustrate the text. They are clearly labelled and listed.
SECTION I:	**EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)**	86%	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	CRC and protecting rights is included within ethical considerations and standards to adhere to.
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	The number of interviews at the community level, by gender, age and education level is included, however the numbers are not shared for other levels. For FGD, the methodology states that there were 60 held but there is no information of the number of participants, or disaggregation of them.
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	There is no language within the report that is considered to be disempowering. The language of rights holders and duty bearers is not used consistently within the report. Data disaggregation is conducted by gender and differential results are shared. However, there is a lack of information about the number of beneficiaries (within FGDs) involved in the evaluation, disaggregated by 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	Gender is central to the programme, and the analysis includes different subsets and intersectional analysis of women. There is also analysis around the extent of male engagement.
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)	9	
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	The evaluation scope and questions focus on the need and effectiveness for the primary beneficiaries which are gender delineated and by age (women with under 2s, adolescent girls, pregnant women, newlywed women). A separate evaluation criteria also explores access by tribal communities.
ii	A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated	Mirroring the programme, gender is integrated with female only focus groups, female enumerators, female interviewees. Methods are participatory with key informant interviews and focus group discussions.
iii	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated	A gender lens is used throughout. Findings includes analysis of gender by age/ status, and intersectional analysis considered participation and access to services by caste and tribal groups. Engagement of men is considered. The conclusions and recommendations reflect gender analysis.

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?