

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

UNICEF SBCC Cells Programme Evaluation for 2017-21

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating	73%	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	UNICEF SBCC Cells Programme Evaluation for 2017-21		
Report sequence number	India/64/2023/19842		
Region	SAR		
Year of report	2023		
Office	India		
Coverage (countries)	India		
ToRs present	Yes		
Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)	16th, 17th January		
Name of review firm	IOD		
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	Project		
Evaluation type	Formative		
Evaluation strategy	Mixed methods		
Evaluation design (primary method used)	Theory-based		
Evaluation level	Output & Outcome		
Geographic scope	National		
Primary SDG(s) covered (number)	SDGs 3 and 5 are noted as well as their inclusion justified.		
EQA Summary: <i>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.</i>			
This is a satisfactory report which offers a list of relevant and inter-connected conclusions, findings and recommendations, which will help inform programmatic decisions moving forward. Its areas of strength are:			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> It is clear why there was a need to undertake this evaluation, the findings will be useful to UNICEF and the Indian Government. The executive summary is comprehensive. Reference has been given to the SDGs. The purpose, scope and objectives of the evaluation are clear. The stakeholders are noted. The evaluation questions are appropriate. The intended results are clear, these are noted in a ToC. The methodology allows for causal connections between the outputs and expected outcomes, there is a caveat though, please see below. Reference has been made to UNEG guidelines. The conclusions, findings and recommendations sections are all connected. The findings present both the strengths and limitations of the intervention, this is important as it will facilitate forward learning. The annex section, is overall, comprehensive. The report is easy to navigate. 			
Limitations:			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> There are sections of the report that require a copy edit. The methodology section of the report requires further analysis and detail, specifically there is a lack of information pertaining to the methods that were employed and why they were employed. For example, the report notes that focus group discussions were undertaken, it isn't however clear who these were with nor how may were undertaken. The report also makes reference to the inclusion of vulnerable people, it isn't clear who these are. There are also sections in the methodology that would benefit from being in the annex section and there are some issues with structure. The ethics section would benefit from having more context. A limitations section is included in the report, though a welcome inclusion more detail is required here. The findings, though interesting are very descriptive, there is minimal evidence of triangulation. 			
Recommendations for Improvement: <i>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.</i>			
Recommendations for improvements:			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Add the ToR to the final report. Before the report was submitted it would have helped if the report had been professionally edited, proofed and formatted, a final copy edit was needed. The methodology section requires a lot more detail as too does the ethics section. Include a stakeholder map. Demonstrate stronger triangulation. 			
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 concise, it is within the 5 page limit for this criteria. It can be used as a standalone document and will be useful in terms of decision making. Furthermore, it is clearly presented.
	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 contains all of the necessary elements that one would expect to see within an executive summary.
	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	It is clear what the intervention is and what it intends to do, no new information has been included that is not in the main report.
SECTION B:	BACKGROUND (weight 5%)	71%	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.	Partially	A clear and relevant description of the intervention is provided, of which location and context relating to the states chosen is included. Timelines and implementation status are also noted. The report notes that in 2013 \$107 million was provided by GAVI, however it is not clear how this money was allocated and if it covered the latter elements of the intervention, it would help if this was clarified.
	ii Clear and relevant description of intended rights holders (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).	Partially	Some reference has been made to the intended rights holders as well as to duty bearers. Given the focus of this intervention, this is a rural as well as urban intervention. With regards to numbers, it is not clear how many people should/could be reached, no reference has been made to age and or disability, this may be due to the objectives of the intervention.
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 of the report is clear and relevant, it is clear how the context relates to the intervention and importantly why the intervention was needed. The context relates to relevant policies more specifically those that relate to health.
	ii Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Yes	Reference, as well as detail, has been given to SDG3 targets and to a lesser extent SDG5.
	iii Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rights holders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Yes	A clear and relevant description is provided that highlights that even if there have been great advancements in India in terms of health care, life expectancy etc., there is still somewhere to go before SDG 3 is met. Importantly a relevant description of the status and needs of the beneficiaries has been included.
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	Numerous actors are involved in an intervention of this nature, many of which are noted. The report would benefit from having a stakeholder map as well as noting how the third sector are/have the potential to be of importance in this intervention as it is evident that the Government, be this national or local, are constrained in terms of reach and what it is that they are able to achieve.
	ii Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Partially	The roles of the key actors have been noted, however more could be said with regards to what they have done including financially. As noted above it would help to know what the Third sector have been involved in in terms of this intervention.
SECTION C:	EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)	83%	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.	Partially	The report notes who the intended users of the report are and how it will be used. Although the evaluation timeframe is given as 2017-2020, it is not clear why this timeframe was chosen, here more context/information is needed. For example is this when the funding ended?
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	It is clear what the evaluation sought to achieve by the end of the process, it would appear that the objectives have remained consistent.

	ii Clear and relevant description of the scope of the evaluation: what will and will not be covered (thematically, chronologically, geographically with key terms defined), as well as, if applicable, the reasons for this scope (e.g., specifications by the ToRs, lack of access to particular geographic areas for political or safety reasons at the time of the evaluation, lack of data/evidence on particular elements of the intervention).	Partially	Section 4.3 provides the scope of the evaluation. Though a welcome inclusion, it would help to know why the states where the evaluation was undertaken were chosen over others, this would add to the validity of the report.
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	This has been done, with the ToC being a comprehensive ToC.
	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	During the evaluation, the team designed a retrospective theory of change, this is included in the report in graphical format and with an accompanying narrative. Causal relationships between outputs and outcomes are noted.
	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	Part of the evaluation included the development of a retrospective ToC, this has been done. The ToC has been assessed throughout the evaluation.
SECTION D:	EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)	68%	Comments on Rating
Question 8.	Does the evaluation use questions and the relevant evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation? <i>UNICEF evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria - Relevance; Coherence; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact (not all are necessarily relevant for all evaluations). Evaluations should also consider equity and leaving no-one behind, gender and human rights based approach (these can be mainstreamed into other criteria). Humanitarian evaluations should also consider Coverage; Connectedness; Coordination; Protection; Security.</i>		
	i Evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The relevant criteria are specified and are aligned with the questions.	Yes	The evaluation questions, including sub questions as noted in table one and annex two, are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The evaluation questions are aligned to the DAC criteria.
	ii In addition to the questions and sub-questions, the evaluation matrix includes indicators, benchmarks, assumptions and/or other processes from which the analysis can be based and conclusions drawn.	Yes	The evaluation matrix includes the following sections: evaluation questions, indicators, means of verification, data sources and data collection tools. The matrix is comprehensive.
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	The methods that the team chose are relevant and adequately robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope. What is missing in this section of the report is a justification as to why the methods that were employed were employed, more detail is needed here. The evaluation design is also briefly noted, though an interesting section there is a lack of detail that specifically looks at the evaluation design and the rationale for choosing this, with the reader being directed to the evaluation matrix. Ideally the team needed to be more specific about the approach.
	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 evaluation employed a mix of secondary data in the form of a literature review and primary data in the form of interviews, focus groups and observations, all of which are appropriate. What is missing in this section is a justification for the choice of methods as well as some clarity. On page 26, the report refers to a questionnaire. Usually a questionnaire generates quantitative data, or on some occasions both qualitative and quantitative data. They are not commonly used when undertaking interviews and FGD, therefore this will need to be clarified.
	iii Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or, if not, provide reasons for this).	Partially	In the report the sampling strategy section refers to how the evaluation sites were sampled, this is helpful. The report then notes in table 4 the distribution of stakeholders interviewed by type, again this is helpful. What is missing however is the method that was employed, in this instance it would have been purposeful sampling. Also it is not clear how many focus groups discussions were undertaken. In table 5 the number of interactions are included, this would appear to be interviews, however this needs to be clarified.
	iv Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	The analysis methods are noted, the information pertaining to how the primary data was analysed is a welcome inclusion.
	v Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	The methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and the expected outcomes.

	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 report includes a section that discusses some of the limitations and constraints faced by the team, what is missing in this section is how the team worked to ensure that all of the limitations and constraints were addressed. This section could be further expanded upon.
Question 10.	Are ethical issues and considerations described? The evaluation should be guided by the UNEG ethical standards for evaluation. As such, the evaluation report should include:		
	i Explicit and contextualized reference to the UNEG obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) and/or the principles in the 2020 revised UNEG Ethical Guidelines (integrity, accountability, respect, beneficence).	Yes	The report has made reference to UNEG obligations, this is a welcome inclusion.
	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	Some reference has been made to ethical safeguards, Protocols for interactions and data collection including on-field conduct, particularly with women, and other vulnerable groups, were defined. Adherence to "do no harm" principle, respect for dignity and diversity, compliance with codes was ensured for the same. Further, the team was trained and periodically oriented on the protocols (p29). What is missing is who these vulnerable people were, and why specific reference has been given women. The inclusion of this implies that women are a homogeneous group. This section would benefit from greater detail about how the team worked with participants. This is a limitation to this section.
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.	No	The report has demonstrated some degree of innovation, on page 21 the team note that the evaluation questions were categorised in collaboration with the team, the UNICEF India country office and state teams. This demonstrates collaborative practices.
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 questions have been answered, they are aligned to the DAC criteria. Though rather descriptive, sufficient evidence has been provided. This noted, the report would benefit from incorporating some secondary data sources so that triangulation is stronger.
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	This has been done, it is clear to see that attention has been given to the ToC when formulating the findings section of the report.
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	As noted above, the findings section, though interesting, is rather descriptive, there is a lack of engagement with secondary documents thus questioning the teams claims of triangulation. The team appear to have relied on the data from the interviews and possibly the focus group discussions. This noted, the evidence presents both output and outcome level data.
	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	The findings present both the positives and negatives of the intervention, given the lack of monitoring data comparisons have been difficult to make and as noted the findings are descriptive in nature.
	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	It is evident that the retrospective ToC has been used when preparing the findings of the report. There is, however the caveat that there has been minimal engagement with secondary data, therefore claims of triangulation are difficult to support.
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 lack of monitoring systems is something that was noted by the team, there are evident gaps in how UNICEF work in this area, therefore it should be noted that this had the potential to be a limiting factor in the evaluation process.
SECTION F:	EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)	100%	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 are clearly formulated and reflect the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. They are forward looking and will be helpful to UNICEF India.
	ii	Conclusions are derived appropriately from findings, and present a picture of the strengths and limitations of the intervention that adds insight and analysis beyond the findings.	Yes	The conclusions are derived from the findings, they present a picture of the strengths as well as the limitations of the intervention. This noted there is a caveat, this being the limited evidence of triangulation of data.
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.	Not Rated	The report does not contain a lessons learned section.
	ii	Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Not Rated	As above.
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 align with the evaluation purpose, they derive logically from the findings and conclusion section.
	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 have the potential to be actionable, guidance has been provided.
	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	Other than a brief reference at the beginning of the report that a small recommendations workshop was held, the processes have not been noted, hence why this has been given a no.
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	It is clear who should be implementing the recommendations that have been proposed. The recommendations have also been prioritised as well as put into clusters.
SECTION H:		REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)	71%	Comments on Rating
Question 19.		Does the evaluation report include all relevant information?		
	i	Opening pages include: Name of evaluated object, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluated object, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents -including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes; list of acronyms/abbreviations, page numbers.	Yes	The opening pages of the report include all of the elements that are noted within this criteria.
	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 annex section of the report includes a great deal of information, information which is helpful to the reader of the report. This noted the ToR has not been included, this would need to be added. A ToC has been included that requires development, this requires more context.
Question 20.		Is the report logically structured?		
	i	Structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles, well formatted).	Partially	The report is easy to navigate, there are clear titles and the work is formatted. This noted there are some sections of the report that would benefit from being in the annex section, for example the state sampling strategy and the methodology section would benefit from being reorganised. The letter that is at the beginning of the report also is not needed.
	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 report follows UNICEF guidelines, however as noted above there are sections of the report that would benefit from being restructured.
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.	Partially	The ToR notes that the report should be maximum 30 pages excluding the executive summary, this report is currently significantly longer than 30 pages, if deemed appropriate it would need a full edit. It should be noted that it would be difficult to reduce the report significantly due to the scope of the evaluation and due to the high number of evaluation questions.

	ii Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Partially	Overall the report is easy to understand and it is accessible, it would benefit from having a final copy edit.
	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 visual aids that are used convey key information, texts boxes are a good inclusion. The figures are clearly presented and referenced within the text.
SECTION I:	EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)	29%	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	No reference has been made to CEDAW or other rights benchmarks.
	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	On page 8 the report notes that there was a reference group and that there was also a recommendations workshop that included several stakeholders (it should be noted that neither of these groups included beneficiaries or members of the Third sector) this demonstrates a degree of inclusiveness.
	iii Language is empowering and inclusive, avoiding gender, heterosexual, age, cultural and religious bias, among others; use terminology of rights holders and duty bearers; data is disaggregated by marginalized group; differential results are assessed (distribution of results across different groups).	Partially	The language used in the report is inclusive and avoids any bias towards vulnerable groups. However, the lack of disaggregated data means it is not clear how vulnerable people or women were involved in this evaluation and this somewhat hampers the incorporation of insights from diverse groups across the evaluation process.
	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.	No	No reference has been made to child rights or leave no one behind. The report notes that gender is something that is cross cutting, this isn't however completely clear.
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)	3	
	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.	Not at all integrated	The report notes that gender was something that was cross cutting, there is minimal evidence to support this, other than in the recommendations section. There aren't any gender specific questions.
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Not at all integrated	The methodology, methods and tools are not gender responsive, they are standard methods.
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Fully integrated	The recommendations section is the strongest element in terms of gender, it is strong as it highlights the gaps in the initiative and how these can be addressed. A gender analysis is also evident within the findings section and the conclusions section.

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>