

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

Evaluation of the UNPRPD Joint Programme

REPORT RATING SUMMARY			
Overall Rating		75%	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		Evaluation of the UNPRPD Joint Programme	
Report sequence number		Rep of Uzbekistan 66/2024/20211	
Region		MENA	
Year of report		2024	
Office		Uzbekistan	
Coverage (countries)		Uzbekistan	
ToRs present		Yes	
Date of review (dd/mmm/yyyy)		September 20, 2024	
Name of review firm		IOD Parc	
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		Yes	
Every child is protected from violence and exploitation		Yes	
Every child lives in a safe and clean environment		No	
Every child has an equitable chance in life		Yes	
Gender equality (cross-cutting)		Yes	
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)		No	
Evaluation object		Programme	
Evaluation type		Summative	
Evaluation strategy		Mixed methods	
Evaluation design (primary method used)		Participatory	
Evaluation level		Output & Outcome	
Geographic scope		National	
Primary SDG(s) covered (number)		1,3,4,5,16	
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.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The executive summary is a useful summary and can be used as a stand-alone document, although it slightly exceeds the expected length. - The background section describes the country context sufficiently, and programme stakeholders although it lacks contextual information about the prevalence of different types of disabilities (by age and gender). - The purpose, objectives and scope are all clearly set out as per the ToRs. - The evaluation design is sound and suitable for the purpose of the evaluation. The evaluation matrix unpacks the different elements of each evaluation question, and GEWE is integrated well. The sampling could be more specific (geographical location, types of disabilities) - The ethical considerations are as per international standards, but are not tailored sufficiently to the programme. - The findings are presented in a balanced way, with strengths and shortcomings. Standards/ benchmarks are used for the analysis. However there is insufficient discussion of the lines of evidence (interview data/ FGD data) and the strength of the data sources. - The conclusions are a summary of the findings, but do not add insight/ analysis so that they are more strategic than the findings section - The recommendations are well pitched , and targeted to different actors with timeframes and prioritisation. However, they do not include gender. H39 			
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.			
It is recommended that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the different types of disabilities are considered throughout the evaluation, within the context, sampling and differentiation of results - the methodology could be more specific about the sampling strategy - the ethical considerations could be more tailored to the programme - the evaluation findings should include narrative of the different evidence being utilised, whether triangulation showed concurrence of divergence of evidence and the strength of evidence overall - the conclusions could be more strategic with more insights and analysis - the recommendations could include gender considerations 			
SECTION RATINGS			
SECTION A:	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)	83%	Comments on Rating
Question 1.	Can the executive summary inform decision-making?		
	i) Is clearly presented, serves as a standalone document useful for informing decision making, and is of relevant conciseness and depth for key users (Maximum of 5 pages unless otherwise specified in ToR).	Yes	The executive summary is a clear and useful, and could be used as a standalone document for policy-makers (particularly as recommendations are clearly prioritised and targeted). However, it is 5.5 pages long so exceeds the guidance 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.	Partially	The executive summary includes all key elements - the purpose, objectives and intended audience of the evaluation, the methodology, 'main conclusions and findings' and recommendations. Notably, the 'main findings and conclusions' are the conclusions presented in full and are not summarised.

	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 includes all necessary information to understand the Programme, and evaluation. It does not introduce new background information.
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.	Yes	The object of the evaluation is described sufficiently in section 2.2 (pp20) in terms of funding levels and sources, geographic scope and implementation status.
	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).	Partially	The rights holders are clearly described within the context section as those living with disabilities in Uzbekistan. The definition is provided, as well as statistics. However, the different types of disabilities (and breakdown by gender and age) are not shared. The partnership and governance arrangements are set out clearly, with information about types of duty bearers.
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	Uzbekistan is briefly but adequately described in terms of geography, population, brief history, lower-middle-income status. There is significant relevant discussion around people with disabilities in terms of the definition, legislation, numbers, policies and indicators as well as international co-operation framework.
		Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Partially	There is an overview of Uzbekistan's general progress against the SDGs shared in a visual. However, there is no specific discussion of the most relevant SDGs and targets related to the Joint Programme (1.3, 3.7, 4.5, 5.1, 16.2) and progress against them. There is specific discussion of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the progress made around implementation and the National Action Plan, as well as the governance/ institutional arrangements and collaborative efforts.
	iii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Partially	There is some discussion of available statistics about levels of disabilities across groups (Table 1), however, what the groups comprise (persons with disabilities groups I-III) is not explained. Similarly the amongst the MICS data, the different domains of functional difficulties are not explained. Therefore, the reader is not informed about the prevalence and types of disabilities in Uzbekistan.
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	Within the context section, there is an overview of different actors and institutional arrangements (Government, Taskforce, Inter-Agency Council on Disability Affairs, Ombudsman etc.). There is also specifically a section on programme partnership and governance, setting out the different management structure, governance, implementing partners, participating UN entities and rights holders representative groups.
	ii	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Partially	Whilst there is broad discussion of the different management, governance structures and implementing partners, it lacks systematic description of the role and contributions of key stakeholders.
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 of the evaluation is shared clearly, including intended users and how they will use it. It was conducted at the end of the 2022-2023 cycle.
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	There is a clear description of the objectives and what the evaluation intends to achieve. The seven objectives listed are as per the ToR, and make sense within the context and purpose of the evaluation. They cover the key criteria for assessment, the analysis of UNICEF's contribution, the identification of lessons, the requirement of recommendations for different actors and also the need to assess disability and inclusion.
	ii	Clear and relevant description of the scope of the evaluation: what will and will not be covered (thematically, chronologically, geographically with key terms defined), as well as, if applicable, the reasons for this scope (e.g., specifications by the ToRs, lack of access to particular geographic areas for political or safety reasons at the time of the evaluation, lack of data/evidence on particular elements of the intervention).	Yes	The scope of the evaluation is set out well, in terms of timeframe, geographical scope and thematic areas and what will be covered in the evaluation. As these are comprehensive, no specific justification is required. The scope is as per 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 results framework is clearly explained, setting out its outcomes and outputs (and that the outcomes are aligned with the UNPRPD). Further, the Theory of Change (ToC) is shared (with 'if-then' logic).
	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 causal relationship between outputs and outcomes is shared both in narrative and visual form (Annex 2).

	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	The evaluation did not use a theory-based approach, and the ToR did not request that the theory of change/ results framework be assessed or revised.
SECTION D:	EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)	73%	Comments on Rating
Question 8.	Does the evaluation use questions and the relevant evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation? UNICEF evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria - Relevance; Coherence; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact (not all are necessarily relevant for all evaluations). Evaluations should also consider equity and leaving no-one behind, gender and human rights based approach (these can be mainstreamed into other criteria). Humanitarian evaluations should also consider Coverage; Connectedness; Coordination; Protection; Security.		
	i Evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The relevant criteria are specified and are aligned with the questions.	Yes	The relevant criteria are included (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and stability) and justified (section 4.1). Whilst the ToR states that assessing impact is premature, the evaluation goes beyond this to assess contribution to impact where possible (section 4.2). The evaluation questions are explained to have been reduced in number from the ToR (from 18 to 15) to sharpen the focus and reduce overlap. The evaluation questions are suitable for responding to the objectives and purpose of the evaluation.
	ii In addition to the questions and sub-questions, the evaluation matrix includes indicators, benchmarks, assumptions and/or other processes from which the analysis can be based and conclusions drawn.	Yes	The evaluation matrix (annex 3) helpfully unpacks the different elements for each evaluation question, and includes indicators, data sources and data collection methods.
Question 9.	Does the report specify adequate methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?		
	i Evaluation design and set of methods are relevant and adequately robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope; and are fully and clearly described.	Yes	The evaluation utilises a non-experimental design, and the mixed methods selected are aligned with the evaluation purpose and objectives as well as the ToR. These are described sufficiently and well.
	ii Data sources are appropriate - these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR) - and are all clearly described.	Yes	Data sources are qualitative and quantitative, and are considered appropriate. They are described, also in terms of numbers reached.
	iii Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or, if not, provide reasons for this).	No	The overall sampling approach (by geographical area, and for selection of interviewees) is not described. The selection criteria for focus group discussions is set out, but critically does not describe the selection criteria across people with disabilities and ensuring a range of perspectives across different disability groups.
	iv Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	The methods of analysis are clearly explained, and appropriate. Triangulation and weighting of sources is also included.
	v Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	The methodology allows for the causal connections between expected outputs and outcomes, particularly given specific evaluation questions around enabling and constraining factors, as well as unintended effects.
	vi Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias, and how these were addressed by the evaluators (as feasible).	Yes	The limitations and constraints are shared (section 4.2) and are plausible, as well as how the evaluation team aimed to mitigate. Any persistent concerns were described and their effect on the evaluation are outlined.
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	There is referral to UNEG as well as UNICEF's Procedures for Ethical Standards. Principles are described and ethical safeguards in place (e.g. verbal consent). All are set out as would be expected for any evaluation but are not specified in terms of the implications of an evaluation focused on disability issues and engaging with people and children with disabilities.
	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	The ethical aspects and safeguards are included as would be expected for any evaluations, and those that involve children. However, the specific nature of the evaluation and engaging with parents of children with disabilities, and children with disabilities themselves is not explained. Evaluation Report underwent an Ethics review procedure by the Ethical Review Board (ERB), available in annex 9.
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	There is no innovative practice described within the evaluation methodology, or planned for sharing results.
SECTION E:	EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)	67%	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 addresses all of the evaluation criteria, questions and sub-questions. There are no gaps in the analysis where insufficient levels of evidence have been found to respond to questions.
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	The results framework is clearly used and systematically analysed regarding achievements against targets.
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	The evaluation works through each of the evaluation criteria and question methodically. It presents output and outcome level data. Triangulation is not as apparent as it could be, and there is a general lack of discussion around the different data sources used and whether they concur or not. Within the analysis there therefore appears to be an overreliance on desk review data. Within effectiveness for example, there is a reliance on monitoring data for the outputs, but it lacks further triangulation and depth through other sources (e.g. interviews and FGDs). For example (Outputs 1.1 and 1.2) focus on the number of trainings achieved and how many reached, rather than further probing (e.g. from interviews) regarding the utility and uptake of the trainings. There is therefore a focus on what has been achieved as per the target, rather than the quality of the change e.g. output 3.1 focuses on the National Development Strategy being more disability inclusive, and what the JP has done is discussed (training of advocates, training in parliamentary procedures) but stakeholders' perspectives on what differences these made is not discussed.
	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 are presented in a balanced way and are both strengths and shortcomings. The findings respond to the evidence that is presented. The use of standards are included, particularly around the SDGs and UNPRPD as benchmarks for the analysis.
	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	Whilst the evaluation matrix includes a question (4b) as to what factors facilitating or inhibited JP achievement, this is not teased out as a separate area within the analysis. Whilst it is assumed that it is therefore included within the analysis of what has been achieved, this is uneven and lacking depth in places. Within the assessment of the achievement of results, most are 'fully achieved' and the inputs by JP are shared, but there is limited discussion of other contributory factors (as would be expected given the use of contribution analysis). Further, of the two outputs that are only partially achieved, one in particular (2.1c) just states that a review of the 'Law on Social Services for Older People, Disabled ...' was not conducted, but does not provide any explanatory reasons.
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	Monitoring data is mentioned as a limitation of the evaluation within the methodology, particularly around disaggregated data. However, there is no discussion of the monitoring data and its shortcomings within the findings section, and how it affected the analysis.
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).	Partially	The conclusions are summaries of each of the evaluation findings, organised by criteria. They are generally aligned to the purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation, however they do not synthesise the findings to a higher level, helping to answer the 'so what' questions. In terms of formulation, they are written in places as recommendations, rather than assessment of what has/ has not been achieved e.g. Sustainability 'other aspects need to be improved...'. Some also read as a description of what the programme has done e.g. Coherence 'JP PUNOs... agencies' rather than including any evaluative / conclusive judgement.
	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.	Partially	The conclusions include strengths and limitations of the interventions. They do not bring in any new information not included in the findings. They do not add insight and analysis beyond 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.	Partially	The lessons appear to relate to initiatives by different JP partners in the mainstreaming of disability (in inclusive education, strengthening capacity to prevent and respond to GBV and alternative reporting). However, it is not clear how they relate to other work by the JP which is not explained.
	ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Yes	The lessons are presented well with a summary of the approach and key results achieved so as to contextualise the lessons.
SECTION G:	RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	88%	Comments on Rating

Question 17.	Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?		
	i Recommendations align with the evaluation purpose, are clearly formulated and logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Yes	The recommendations provide policy and operational recommendations, and align with the evaluation purpose. They are logically derived from findings and conclusions.
	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 appear useful and actionable, and sufficiently targeted and practical.
	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).	Partially	It is stated that the recommendations were developed in consultation with key stakeholders, and were then presented and validated during an ERG meeting. It is not articulated as to whether rights holders , or representative organisations of rights holders were included.
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 helpfully set out the responsible entity as well as priority level, timeframe and resource implication.
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 include the object of the evaluation, date of report, timeframe, location, name of consulting firm, table of contents, list of figures and tables, names of commissioning organisation and Joint Programme partners and list of acronyms.
	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	Annexes include terms of reference, theory of change, list of key informants, data collection instruments, work plan, list of documents reviewed and other annexes which complement the finding sections.
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 overall structure is logical and there are clear titles and sub-titles, and it is well formatted. The sections are numbered.
	ii Structure accords to UNICEF guidelines for evaluation reports: context, purpose and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.	Yes	The structure follows UNICEF guidelines.
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 requests that the evaluation report is 50-60 pages, and the report is 64 pages long so exceeds the guidance.
	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 generally straightforward to understand, and written in an accessible way free of grammatical and spelling errors.
	iii Frequent use of visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, photos) to convey key information. These are clearly presented, labeled, and referenced in text.	Yes	There are sufficient tables and visuals to break up the text.
SECTION I:	EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)	69%	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	Human rights framework and language is included throughout the evaluation.
	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).	Yes	There is description of the level of participation of duty bearers and rights holders in the evaluation. Evaluation Report underwent an Ethics review procedure by the Ethical Review Board (ERB), available in annex 9.
	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 is empowering and inclusive, and free of bias. Data is disaggregated by marginalised groups where possible, but it is also noted that it is a data limitation given lack of availability of some disaggregated data. Given the focus on disability, there is a gap in data around different types of disabilities both in the context section and assessment of differential results.
	iv Evaluation assesses the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addresses child rights and Leave No-one Behind (gender and other excluded and marginalized groups). It is disability inclusive.	Yes	The evaluation matrix states that it is aligned with LNOB principles, and focuses on child rights and in particular disability rights.
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)	4	

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	The evaluation questions include GEEW considerations across relevance, effectiveness and sustainability.
ii	A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Partially integrated	The evaluation does not articulate a gender responsive methodology, but does mention consideration of gender in data collection e.g. gender balanced focus group discussions. Although there is some reference to women with disabilities, and children with disabilities, there is less differentiation of girls with disabilities.
iii	The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Partially integrated	The evaluation includes analysis of gender within the findings, conclusions (only as regards effectiveness) but does not include any gender-related 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>