

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

Accelerating Progress towards an Integrated and Modernized Social Protection System for All in Thailand (United Nations Joint Programme on Social Protection for All in Thailand)

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating	71%	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. 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	Accelerating Progress towards an Integrated and Modernized Social Protection System for All in Thailand (United Nations Joint Programme on Social Protection for All in Thailand)		
Report sequence number	Thailand/60/2022/18850		
Region	EAPR		
Year of report	2022		
Office	ILO DWT - Bangkok		
Coverage (countries)	Thailand		
ToRs present	Yes		
Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)	January 23, 2023		
Name of review firm	IOD PARC		
CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT			
Management of evaluation (Managerial control and oversight of evaluation)	Jointly managed with one or more UN agencies		
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	Yes		
Every child has an equitable chance in life	Yes		
Gender equality (cross-cutting)	Yes		
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	No		
Evaluation object	Country Programme		
Evaluation type	Summative		
Evaluation strategy	Mixed methods		
Evaluation design (primary method used)	Theory-based		
Evaluation level	Outcome		
Geographic scope	National		
Primary SDG(s) covered (number)	1.3, 10.1 and 2.2		
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.			
WEAKNESSES			
<p>.- The methodology is quite improvable, e.g. a) in the evaluation matrix no indicators have been used and no explanation is given as to why they have not been used; b) the obstacles to reach the rightsholders have not been addressed. Not including these voices in the evaluation is a major shortcoming; c) the methods of analysing the information were not clearly described; d) the constraints that were considered were not exhaustive;</p> <p>.- The conclusions are a summary of the findings and do not offer a second level analysis where the weaknesses and strengths of the programme are appreciated.</p> <p>.- Ethical considerations were not adequately described.</p> <p>.- There is room for improvement in the application of ethical principles, although it must be acknowledged that a significant effort has been made. For example, the design does not refer to relevant Conventions; the rightsholders are not taken into account and the GEEW approach is not clear in the data collection.</p>			
STRENGTHS			
<p>.- The executive summary is of very good quality.</p> <p>.- The context of the evaluation is well explained.</p> <p>.- The initial approach of the evaluation, i.e. its purpose, objectives and scope are clearly and fully explained.</p> <p>.- In general, findings are supported by triangulated evidence.</p> <p>.- Good use has been made of both the ToC and the logical framework to guide some of the parts of the analysis.</p> <p>.- Lessons learned are clearly expressed and very useful but are relegated to an annex.</p> <p>.- The recommendations are one of the strongest aspects of the report. They are clear, actionable, prioritised and explicit to whom they are addressed.</p> <p>.- The structure of the report is user-friendly and very easy to read, and the length of the report is adequate.</p>			
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.			

These are the measures that could have been considered to increase the quality of the report:

Methodological improvements: a) Specify which indicators are to be used, i.e. *how good is good enough*. In some more participatory methodologies these indicators are not integrated in the first evaluation matrix but are developed with the stakeholders throughout the evaluation. This would also be a viable option but needs to be explained; b) the inclusion of the voices of rightsholders is a must. It is what gives the evaluation special legitimacy. These days there are many techniques that can be used to gather their opinion even remotely. In the case of this evaluation the sample should not have been random but probably clustered among the users of the services c) more thought should be given to the elaboration of the limitations of the evaluation and especially the mitigation measures.

Conclusions

Conclusions are especially important because they are one of the most widely read parts of the evaluation. In this case they should have been an analysis of the findings rather than a summary of the findings. Analysis means that the conclusions should make clear the strengths and weaknesses, either of the programme as a whole or of the programme in each of the evaluation criteria.

Ethical considerations and values

.- It would be important for evaluation teams to explicitly state in the report their commitment to the ethical standards set out by UNICEF.

.- Even in reports where GEEW is present, it is necessary to look twice. A key aspect is to ensure that this is properly addressed in the data collection and evaluation questions. In this sense, although it is considered valid to have a separate criterion for mainstreaming cross-cutting issues such as GEEW, this does not mean that it cannot be mainstreamed into other criteria as well.

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 very clear and of adequate length.
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 the key elements are included in a concise and comprehensible manner.
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	The content of the executive summary is a true and complete reflection of the content of the main body of the report and Annex 6 (lessons learned).
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	All these elements are explained in the introductory pages.
ii	Clear and relevant description of intended rightsholders (beneficiaries) and duty bearers (state and non-state actors with responsibilities regarding the intervention) by type (i.e., institutions/organizations; communities; individuals...), by geographic location(s) (i.e., urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods, town/cities, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached, with disaggregation by gender, age, disability . . . (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation).	Yes	The duty-bearers are very well defined. In the case of rightsholders, the definition is more general, although it can be understood since the target audience of the intervention is the entire population in Thailand.
Question 3.	Is the context of the intervention clearly described?		
i	Clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention (i.e. relevant policy, socio-economic, political, cultural, power/privilege, institutional, international factors) and how context relates to the implementation of the intervention.	Yes	The report includes a clear and comprehensive explanation of the socio-economic environment in which the programme takes place, including reflections on inequality and a good gender analysis.
ii	Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Yes	Special emphasis is given to the linkages with the SDGs which are already mentioned in the first pages of the report.
iii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Yes	When explaining the users of the evaluation, the main duty-bearers of the programme are identified. In the programme description, the target populations of the programme are identified.
Question 4.	Are key stakeholders, their relationships and contributions clearly identified?		
i	Identification of implementing agency(ies), development partners, right holders, and additional duty bearers and other stakeholders; and of linkages between them (e.g., stakeholder map) (if relevant).	Partially	There is a very good explanation of the duty-bearer relationships. However, in the description of the intervention, although the rightsholders are identified, the relationship among them and/or with other stakeholders of the programme is not explicitly explained.
ii	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Yes	The programme description identifies the joint contributions made by the UN agencies participating in the programme but not what UNICEF has contributed specifically. However, in the chapter on efficiency it is clear what the contributions (both financial and human) of each of the Agencies were.
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 purpose, uses and users of the evaluation are identified and appropriate.
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 aligned with both the ToR and the inception report. There are 9 objectives, which may seem too many but are consistent with the complexity and scope of the programme.

	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, chronological and geographical scope is adequately defined and does not differ from 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 report includes a summary of programme outputs and outcomes as well as an annex (Annex 4) with the complete programme framework.
	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 logic model is presented in a table.
	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 ToC was developed by the agencies and is presented in the ToR. The evaluation team assessed this ToC as part of one of the evaluation questions.
SECTION D:	EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)	50%	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 asks 26 questions. This number is borderline too ambitious to be manageable. It could nevertheless be considered adequate, given that the ToR called for a similar number of questions, and that the programme is of significant scope and complexity.
	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.	No	No benchmarks or indicators are specified, neither in the description of the methodology nor in the evaluation matrix. Nor are explanations given as to why they are not used.
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 overall methodology of the evaluation is well described, including its scope, objectives and purpose.
	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	The fact that the rightsholders could not be consulted means that one of the main sources of information was not used and could not be taken into account in the evaluation. All other sources of information are well described and adequate.
	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 was adequate for the duty bearers within the constraints of the evaluation. However, rightsholders were not adequately sampled and therefore could not be consulted.
	iv Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	No	There is a section on information analysis where the deliverables are actually described. There is no information on triangulation or other methods to organise, validate and analyse the information that was generated during the data collection phase.
	v Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	The information that was generated during the data collection phase seems sufficient to be able to connect outputs and outcomes. The analysis presented in the findings also suggests that the methodology has been adequate for this purpose.
	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	Only one limitation is mentioned, which is that because of the pandemic the rightsholders could not be consulted. The mitigation strategy is not convincing (the relevance of the constraint is simply denied) and the bias that this constraint may have had on the evaluation findings is not explained. In an evaluation of this complexity, identifying a single constraint is not exhaustive. In fact some of the risks mentioned also proved to be limitations, for example, "Insufficient time and attention paid to the evaluation at critical points in the process"
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	Some relevant (but not the most up to date) UNEG codes on ethical behaviour of evaluators are mentioned. However, it is not explained how they have been applied and what elements have been taken into account in applying them, i.e. independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability, etc.

	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.	Partially	No mechanism is made explicit by which it has been ensured that participants could exercise self-determination. The confidentiality of informants is also not guaranteed, despite this being a requirement in the ToR. The aspect of fair representation has been taken into account.
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.	No	Regardless of the fact that the evaluation was conducted entirely remotely, there is no element in the methodology that can be considered innovative.
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.	Partially	The findings chapter is not entirely organised in a systematic way around the evaluation questions. The evidence is organised under different epigraphs. Most of them correspond to evaluation questions and a few are a composite of several of them or a break down.
	ii	Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	According to the evaluation matrix, the results framework and the ToC have been used as sources of information in 4 of the 26 questions (questions 6, 7, 11 and 13).
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.	Partially	A large majority of findings are supported by both quantitative and qualitative triangulated evidence. However, this does not occur in a systematic way. For example, under sustainability it is stated that " <i>networks and informal groupings among key national stakeholders and among individual staff members have been established and have the potential to sustain</i> " but it is not explained what is the evidence supporting this assumption.
	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.	Partially	Findings are mostly supported by evidence, which has been triangulated. However, since the evaluation matrix did not use any indicators, no such measures are used in the findings.
	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	All findings are appropriately contextualised.
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 evaluation assesses these elements by critically addressing the design of the programme.
SECTION F:		EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)	63%	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 formulation of the conclusions is understood clearly and is aligned with both the purpose and the objectives of the evaluation.
	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.	No	Conclusions are not appropriately derived from findings. Rather than an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the programme, what is presented here is a summary of the findings under each of the criteria addressed. In fact the text of the conclusions is the one used in the executive summary to synthesise the findings.
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 two lessons identified are in line with the findings and can be implemented in other programme contexts.
	ii	Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Partially	The lessons are presented in a very clear and useful way, using a table that in addition to the text of the lesson explores other aspects related to the lesson (the necessary context, preconditions, audience, success factors and challenges, etc.). However, they are presented in an annex and not in the body of the report, which does not give it the prominence it deserves.
SECTION G:		RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	75%	Comments on Rating
Question 17.		Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?		

	i Recommendations align with the evaluation purpose, are clearly formulated and logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Yes	The recommendations clearly relate to the objective and findings and are well formulated.
	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 sufficiently concrete that they can be implemented, the users of them are clear and guidelines are given on how they can be put into practice.
	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	There is no explanation of how the recommendations were developed other than that they are derived from the findings.
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 explicitly identify those responsible for their implementation and are appropriately prioritised.
SECTION H:	REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)	93%	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 present all this information in a very clear way.
	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 report has incorporated all the necessary annexes.
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 easy to navigate
	ii Structure accords to UNICEF guidelines for evaluation reports: context, purpose and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.	Yes	The various components of the report are arranged in a logical manner and in line with UNICEF guidelines.
Question 21.	Is the report well presented?		
	i Report is of reasonable length; it does not exceed number of pages that may be specified in ToR.	Yes	The report is 41 pages excluding the executive summary and annexes, which can be considered an adequate length.
	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 easy to understand and the grammar is correct.
	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	A few tables are used to break up the text and make the format more readable, but in general the text is hardly supported by visual aids.
SECTION I:	EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)	57%	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.	No	The design of evaluation does not refer to any of these Conventions.
	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 role of duty bearers in the management and implementation of the evaluation is clearly explained. However, the rightsholders are absent.
	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 used is respectful of different discriminated groups and minorities.
	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	Children's rights are not strictly addressed, although there is some information in the text that deals with this group in a disaggregated manner. Gender mainstreaming and the integration of PWDs are reasonably well integrated into the report through a specific criterion that addresses these issues.
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)	6	
	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.	Satisfactorily integrated	GEEW has been incorporated into the scope of the evaluation. The evaluation questions do not have a mainstreaming of GEEW although there is a specific criterion that addresses some (but not all) aspects of evaluable GEEW. For example, the extent to which sufficient resources were allocated to gender mainstreaming is not assessed.

ii	A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Partially integrated	Two thirds of the respondents were women, however it is unclear whether this was due to a specific data collection strategy or contextual causes.
iii	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated	GEEW is present in the findings as well as in conclusions and recommendations.

SWAP Rating Guidance

<p>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.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives?</p> <p>c. Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria?</p> <p>d. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation?</p>
<p>ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations?</p> <p>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility?</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate?</p> <p>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality?</p>
<p>iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.</p> <p>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?</p> <p>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?</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described?</p> <p>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?</p>