

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

Evaluation of South Asia's Current Community Health Worker Policies and System Support and their Readiness for Community Health Workers' Expanding Roles and Responsibilities within Post-Astana National Health Care Strengthening Plans: Country Report for Bhutan

REPORT RATING SUMMARY

Overall Rating	79%	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	Evaluation of South Asia's Current Community Health Worker Policies and System Support and their Readiness for Community Health Workers' Expanding Roles and Responsibilities within Post-Astana National Health Care Strengthening Plans: Country Report for Bhutan
Report sequence number	ROSA, Nepal/64/2021/18457
Region	SAR
Year of report	2021
Office	Regional Office for South Asia
Coverage (countries)	Bhutan
ToRs present	Yes
Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)	February 4, 2022
Name of review firm	DeftEdge

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	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	No
Gender equality (cross-cutting)	Yes
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	No
Evaluation object	Thematic area
Evaluation type	Formative
Evaluation strategy	Mixed methods
Evaluation design (primary method used)	Non-experimental
Evaluation level	Output
Geographic scope	National
Primary SDG(s) covered (number)	3,5

EQA Summary:

This report is one of seven country studies that seek to better understand the policies and systems that are in place to support effective functioning of Community Health Worker (CHW) programmes in South Asia. The Bhutan study drew upon extensive document review and 12 KIIs with national level government officials and representatives from UN agencies and development partners. In alignment with the ToR, instead of using OECD-DAC criteria, the evaluation was based on three key questions that explored the current situation for CHWs; the improvements needed in policies and systems to better serve maternal and newborn health; and measures needed to optimize the contribution of CHWs. The evaluators present detailed and evidence based findings to address each question. These provide a comprehensive overview of the strengths and weaknesses of the CHW programme in Bhutan which then feed into a Regional Brief. The set of recommendations in this report appears useful for government decision making in respect to strengthening this component of the health care system and for UNICEF in determining how to support CHW programming across the region. This evaluation is exemplary for its multi-prong approach to assessing gender equity and social inclusion (GESI). As a result there is a very strong analysis of gender and of equity issues throughout the report. However, there are a number of ways in which this country study could better align with UNICEF evaluation standards as described below.

Recommendations for Improvement:

This study does not use OECD-DAC criteria which is standard practice for evaluations in the UN system. It is suggested that evaluators try to align the main questions with the criteria or at least explain why this was not feasible. It is also important to discuss any deviations from the requirements set out in the ToR. In this case, the ToR indicated that CHWs and other subnational stakeholders be included in the study; the decision not to involve them should be explained in the final report. Other ways to more fully meet the expectations of the Geros system include (i) disaggregating the number of evaluation participants by stakeholder group and gender to increase transparency of the representativeness of the final sample; (ii) being specific about the UNEG principles that are followed and how they are applied; (iii) explicitly using the theory of change in the analysis; (iv) organizing Conclusions by criteria/evaluation question; (v) including a specific section on Lessons Learned which is good practice for supporting organizational learning; and (vi) including the list of evaluation participants in the annex (or explain why this was not done) as well as the ToR. To reach the evaluation standards outlined by UNICEF/GEROS, it is good practice for the evaluation manager to mention the UNICEF Adapted Reporting Standards (2017) and the Geros Handbook in the evaluation terms of reference, and to remind evaluators of the need to refer to these documents during the evaluation process.

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 can serve as a standalone document and is within the 5 page limit. The Findings section is organized by the three key evaluation questions, though it includes more detail than is necessary. The findings could be articulated by consistently using headings that actually state the findings rather than their subject. The descriptions of the findings sometimes include recommendations and in some cases are just that. Formatting is inconsistent between the three questions. Recommendations are clearly formatted and articulated succinctly. This Executive Summary would likely be more useful for decision makers if the main findings for each question area were more clearly summarized.
	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.	Partially	All of the requirements are included with the exception of 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.	Yes	This section includes sufficient information on the intervention and the evaluation results, and does not introduce new information from the rest of the report.
SECTION B:	BACKGROUND (weight 5%)		100%	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 an overview of the CHW programme in the context section, and it is explored and explained in more detail in the findings.
	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)	Yes	There is a solid overview given of rightsholders and duty bearers in this section, and more detail being presented in the findings.
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 succinct but solid description of the Bhutanese context and of progress towards meeting health outcomes as well as remaining gaps including in respect to reaching 2030 SDG targets. In addition, there is also mention of the situation faced by those living in the more socio-economically depressed communities where CHWs generally work - for this description the same text is used for all of the reports that are part of this multi-country study.
	ii	Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Yes	The evaluators note that the intervention most closely relates to SDG 3 and 5, but that the investments in health workers has broader implications for other targets including GEEW.
	iii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Yes	Relevant statistics are provided in a narrative format on a range of health issues including immunization, child and maternal mortality, communicable and non-communicable diseases, and mental health. These issues are much further explored as part of the first question in Findings.
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	There is a solid discussion on the current and historical roles played by Bhutan's one CHW cadre. There is also a discussion and list of stakeholders.
	ii	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Yes	UNICEF is noted as being a key partner in the global Community Health Roadmap. Its role in working with governments to elevate community health in national agendas is described. The roles of government and the different groups involved in community health in Bhutan are discussed under EQ1.
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	It is clear that the purpose / overall objective includes better understanding of policy frameworks and support system requirements to better serve maternal and newborn health, and to respond to PHC reform and strengthening in the 7 South Asia countries. The intended use and users are also identified.
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	Four specific objectives are listed. It is then explained that a further aim was to determine the extent to which Gender Equity and Social Inclusion (GESI) is incorporated into CHW programmes and policies.
	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 is defined in terms of subject (in this case the one CHW cadre in Bhutan and the policies and system support that enable and guide its work), geography (national), and time (2018 to present).
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	Intended results, mainly through the input to output level, are briefly discussed and then shown in an illustrative theory of change (figure 1). It is clear where the evaluation will focus: on policy and systems support.
	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	Causal relationships are shown in the ToC.

	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.	Not Rated	This is not a theory-based evaluation.
SECTION D:	EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)		77%	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	Three key evaluation questions are stated and it is briefly explained how each will be analysed. These align with the purpose and ToR. However, the TOR does not request use of OECD/DAC criteria and these are not used, nor does the TOR mention UNICEF evaluation standards.
	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	There is an indicative evaluation matrix that includes the 3 main questions with corresponding columns for primary and secondary data sources, data analysis & evidence generation, and outputs.
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	A mixed methods approach is used with data being obtained through desk review and 12 KIIs. This is fewer interviews than what is generally expected for a full evaluation. The evaluators compensate for this to some extent by drawing on other studies of the health care system in Bhutan in their desk review.
	ii	Data sources are appropriate - these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR) - and are all clearly described.	Partially	A good range of documents were reviewed and their use is described. In respect to primary data collection, the team conducted KIIs with national level government officials and representatives from UN agencies and NGOs. However, the expectation in the ToR is that sub-national level perspectives were also to be obtained, including from CHWs. If this expectation was changed at the Inception Stage, it should have been explained in the evaluation report.
	iii	Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or, if not, provide reasons for this).	Partially	The sampling strategy is explained as being purposive. It was drawn up with the Country Office with the aim of obtaining a diverse sample of participants to ensure the inclusion of a gender-balanced range of organizations, cadres, and stakeholders. However, as the list of participants is not provided and the sample is not disaggregated by stakeholder group or gender, it is not feasible to assess the extent to which it was representative.
	iv	Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	The evaluation matrix describes the general framework for data analysis, and the analysis plan for the gender dimensions of different topics explored is clearly set out in Table 2. The data from KIIs were analyzed using NVivo.
	v	Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	The methodology enables connections to be drawn, with the focus of this study being on inputs through to outputs.
	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	Four limitations and the mitigation strategies are clearly explained.
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).	Partially	The UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations are mentioned but the specific obligations and principles are not articulated.
	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	Ethical safeguards are clearly explained.
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	The well structured multi-country evaluation approach is innovative, as are the extensive analysis processes applied to the gender assessment. Multiple frameworks were used including the WHO Gender Responsive Assessment Scale.
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 questions are all answered systematically and thoroughly.
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Partially	Although the ToC is not explicitly mentioned in the findings, the main inputs, processes and outputs of the ToC are all assessed.
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	Document sources are frequently cited, including other studies that enable rightsholder perspectives to be brought out. The evaluators also indicate when data was obtained from interviews, and include respondent quotes both within the text and pulled out for emphasis. Triangulation is evident.
	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 show both progress that has been made and areas where there is still much to be done. The use of benchmarks is most clearly seen in the assessment of GEEW which is based on the Gender Responsiveness Scale.
	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	Causal factors are discussed throughout the findings section.
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	There is no discussion of any formal monitoring systems related to the project, so it is unclear how exactly it occurs.
SECTION F: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)		50%	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	Conclusions are well written and sufficiently forward looking. However, alignment with the main purpose of the evaluation would be more evident if they were organized by each of the three main questions.
	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	This section is clearly based on the findings, and provides a good overview of the strengths and weaker areas of the CHW system.
Question 16.	Are logical and informative lessons learned identified? [N/A if lessons are not presented and not requested in ToR]		Comments on Rating
	i Identified lessons stem logically from the findings, have wider applicability and relevance beyond the object of the evaluation.	No	There is no Lessons Learned section in this report or in the accompanying Regional Brief, although some lessons and good practices can be found within the latter report. The ToR does not require this to be done stating that "this evaluation is not specifically intended to document best practices". However, it seems a missed opportunity for organizational learning to not have captured such results, particularly for a multi-country exercise.
	ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	No	Lessons are not presented.
SECTION G: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)		100%	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 10 recommendations are clearly stated and align with the evaluation purpose and 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 actionable. Each includes explanatory text to support implementation.
	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	It is noted that the draft report included recommendations and was reviewed by UNICEF and government 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	Dutybearers are clearly shown, with most being directed to the government. The evaluators note that recommendations are not prioritized since all are important to improve the policies and system for CHWs.
SECTION H: REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)		67%	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	All elements are included except for the timeframe covered.

	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 annexes include the interview protocols, the list of documents reviewed and the ethics approval letter. The evaluation matrix and ToC are included in the body of the report. Missing are the list of interviewees and the ToR, though the ToR is available in a separate document.
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 clear with sections being easy to identify.
	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 usual structure is followed: Executive Summary, Introduction and Background, Purpose, Methodology, Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations.
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.	Yes	This is a concise report at 45 pages in length, including annexes.
	ii Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Partially	The report is well written and has few errors. However, it relies heavily on acronyms (at least two of which are not spelled out in the list of acronyms or elsewhere - MNCH and GESI) which somewhat hinders accessibility. The document contains several of instances where text is repeated either within a paragraph or from one paragraph to the next. For example, see the bottom of p.11 and the top of p.12.
	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.	Partially	There is good use of visual aids. They are labeled but they are not consistently referenced in the text.
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.	Yes	The evaluators note applying a rights-based approach and CEDAW in the design of the evaluation process.
	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	There is a subsection in Methodology entitled Participation of Key Stakeholders and Duty Bearers. It is noted that initial results were shared at a UNICEF Regional Management Team meeting, and that the draft report was shared with relevant government entities. However, contrary to what was set out in the ToR, there was no direct engagement with rightsholders and no explanation of why.
	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 appropriate with right-based terminology being used throughout.
	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.	Partially	Equity issues and the strategies of the Bhutan government to address these in terms of access to health care and gender are mentioned briefly and recommendations related to those are made. However, other dimensions of equity such as caste are not discussed.
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	The scope includes undertaking a comprehensive gender analysis to determine the extent to which GESI considerations are incorporated into CHW programmes and policies. GEEW is mainstreamed throughout the evaluation with the inclusion of multiple relevant questions.
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Satisfactorily integrated	The evaluators provide a clear explanation for how a gender-responsive process was carried out during the collection and analysis of data. Ethical considerations to ensure the comfort and safety are provided in the text and are reflected in the annexed interview protocols. There is also a detailed description of the analysis frameworks used to assess multiple dimensions of gender equity and social inclusion (GESI). One shortcoming is that the evaluation participants are not disaggregated by gender or stakeholder group.
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated	There is a very thorough analysis of a wide range of gender issues throughout the document from context through to recommendations. The report is exemplary in this respect.
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?