Executive Feedback

Title of the evaluation: Summative Evaluation of the UNICEF-EU Project on protecting Women and girls’ rights in Guinea Bissau

Sequence No: 2017/002
Region: WCAR
Office: Guinea Bissau
Coverage: Guinea Bissau

Evaluation Type: Project
Year of Report: 2017

OVERALL RATING

Fair

Implications: Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports in some regards, but not all. Decision makers may continue to use the evaluation with caution, but substantive improvements are possible.

Lessons for future evaluations: The evaluation faced some serious limitations in accessing quantitative data. It was assumed in the ToRs that adequate project documentation would be available, which was not the case. In future, it may be useful to conduct an evaluability assessment before designing the evaluation methodology to ensure that the necessary data is available and to make alternative methodological arrangements if it is not.

SECTION A: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)

Satisfactory

The project is generally well described and includes information on the implemented activities and planned outputs and outcomes. A logic model is presented but does not explain how outputs are designed to contribute to outcome-level change. Stakeholders and their contributions to the project are well described. While the needs of project beneficiaries are well outlined (and broken down into equity groups), the context in which the project operated and how it affected the implementation of the initiative could be more thoroughly discussed.

SECTION B: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)

Satisfactory
The report describes which stakeholders will use the information generated from the evaluation and how this information will be used. However, the report states on page 15 that "the target population for this evaluation is basically the beneficiaries of the project—women, girls, children and community leader residents in the communities intervened by the project". It is questionable whether these groups are truly the target population for the evaluation or whether groups that serve women and children (such as government actors, international organisations, etc.) are the true primary target audiences for the evaluation as they will use the information generated by the evaluation to inform future programming. The report does not mention whether any changes were made to the ToRs and does not discuss what programming elements (if any) fall outside of the evaluation scope.

### SECTION C: EVALUATION METHODOLOGY (weight 15%)

**Fair**

The report is particularly strong at explaining the data analysis techniques used to assess information. The evaluation follows standard OECD/DAC evaluation criteria but does not include the criterion "impact" or explain why it was not included. The methodology used (based primarily on qualitative data) is well described, although the reasoning behind the selection of this methodology could be further discussed. The evaluation faced serious limitations around accessing quantitative data, and the report does not identify mitigation strategies to address the limitations. The report explains that purposeful sampling was applied but does not outline the criteria used to select evaluation participants. Evaluation questions are clearly presented but are not included in an Evaluation Matrix. While the report provides a description of the ethical safeguards used to protect participants, it does not discuss the ethical obligations of the evaluator.

### SECTION D: EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 20%)

**Unsatisfactory**

The findings provide an assessment of the project in terms of efficiency and sustainability. However, they do not provide an explicit assessment of the extent to which project results were achieved (outputs or outcomes). They explain that changes in behaviour occurred because of the project but are unable to identify the degree of change that has taken place. They also provide very little insightful discussion around the factors that have contributed to the achievement and non-achievement of results. The report mentions that the project was unable to monitor output-level results but does not provide an assessment around opportunities for improving the monitoring system.

### SECTION E: EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 15%)

**Fair**
The conclusions consist primarily of a summary of the evaluation findings and provide little additional analytical insight that can help a reader to understand the foreseeable implications of the findings for the future of the intervention or area of work. While the report identifies seven (7) lessons learned, they are overly specific to the object of evaluation and are not pitched at a level where they can be easily usable to projects in other contexts.

SECTION F: RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)

Fair

Recommendations are logically derived from the evaluation findings and are presented in numerical order. However, they could be more useful to decision makers. For instance, they do not include a description of how to implement each recommendation; several of the recommendations require additional resources, which may or may not be feasible; and the target group for action for each recommendation is not consistently identified. The report also does not explain how the recommendations were developed and whether stakeholders were involved in their development and/or validation.

SECTION G: EVALUATION STRUCTURE/PRESENTATION (weight 5%)

Fair

The report is an accessible length (29 pages) and is structured in a traditional evaluation format with one section logically leading to the next. The opening pages contain some of the required information. However, the project timeframe, the name of the organisation commissioning the evaluation, and the name of the evaluator are missing. Additionally, the opening pages do not contain a list of annexes. While the annexes include some important elements, they do not include an Evaluation Matrix.

SECTION H: EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 15%)

Fair

The report uses human rights language but does not structure the evaluation around a human rights framework at the national or international level. Some information on the needs of different equity groups is provided but equity considerations are not mainstreamed throughout the report. In terms of SWAP criteria: 1) Indicators are designed to collect data on the rights of women and girls but does not include indicators on changes in beliefs and perceptions among men; 2) Evaluation questions are designed to understand the project's success in advancing the rights of women and children; 3) While the methodology captures the voices of women and girls, no special measures were taken to ensure that they felt comfortable participating in the evaluation, which is particularly concerning due to the sensitivity of the themes covered by the evaluation (i.e. FGM); and 4) The findings and recommendations discuss how the project has advance women's rights and also include some information on the involvement of men in this pursuit.

SECTION I: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)
The Executive Summary is a good length (5 pages) to inform decision makers. It includes all of the necessary elements, with the exception of a description of the problem or issue to be addressed. This information is important to help a reader who may be unfamiliar with the project to understand the findings and recommendations. The findings section is quite short and does not provide enough detailed information to adequately inform decision makers.

Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators?

7 Approaches requirements

Recommendations for improvement

Section A

The social, economic, and political context in which the project operated could be more thoroughly discussed by outlining the national policy frameworks relevant to the protection of women and children, and by explaining how the context has facilitated or proved challenging in terms of implementing the project. While it is good practice to include a logic model in the project description section of the report, it is important for the model to explain how outputs are designed to contribute towards outcome-level change. To learn more about how to create a theory of change model, please see: http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/resource/guide/purposeful_program_theory.

Section B

In the future, it may be useful to re-evaluate whether the evaluation’s primary users are indeed the project beneficiaries or if they are actually the organisations that support them. It is good practice to mention in the final report whether or not any changes were made to the ToRs (these usually occur during the Evaluation Inception Phase). Finally, while it is good practice to identify what programming elements lay within the evaluation scope, it is also important to mention whether or not any programming elements lay outside of the scope.

Section C

The criterion of “impact” could have potentially been included in the evaluation since the evaluation was conducted 18 months after the end of the intervention. Regardless, the decision regarding whether or not to include “impact” should be explicitly outlined in the report. It is also good practice to present the reasons behind selecting this particular methodology over alternative approaches, including the criteria used for purposeful sampling. Additional credibility is often awarded to the methodology when evaluators present mitigation strategies to help reduce the effects that limitations may have had on the evaluation. This would have been particularly useful in the case of this evaluation where the limitations were quite serious. Additionally, it is good practice to include evaluation questions, indicators, and sources of data in a dedicated Evaluation Matrix. It is also good practice to explicitly outline in the report the ethical obligations of the evaluator.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section D</strong></td>
<td>The report's findings could have been strengthened by clearly presenting an assessment of the extent to which project output and outcome results were achieved (this could be done through the use of a table in the effectiveness section). Even though the evaluation had very little access to quantitative data, the qualitative data could have served to inform a discussion around the factors that have contributed towards the project's successes and areas for improvement. Since monitoring data was not collected by the project, further assessment around opportunities to strengthen data collection would have been very useful and insightful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section E</strong></td>
<td>Conclusions should not simply present a summary of the evaluation findings but should provide additional analytical analysis to explain how the findings will likely affect the future of the initiative. Conclusions should discuss why the findings are important and answer the question: &quot;so what?&quot; Lessons learned could be more easily applicable to other contexts if they were presented in a more generalizable format. For instance, each lesson learned could include a summary statement that could be applied to other contexts followed by a detailed explanation of how this lesson was learned in relation to the object of evaluation and how it could be applied to other contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section F</strong></td>
<td>It is important for evaluation recommendations to be useful to end-users. Ways in which recommendations can be made useful include: identifying recommendations that don't require significant additional resources; providing a description of how to implement each recommendation; and specifically identifying the actors responsible for the implementation of each recommendation. Additionally, it is good practice to engage stakeholders in the development and/or validation of recommendations to ensure that their views are accurately portrayed and taken into consideration, and to develop stakeholder buy-in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section G</strong></td>
<td>For clarity purposes, it is good practice to include the project timeframe, the name of the organisation commissioning the evaluation, and the name of the evaluator in the opening pages. It is also recommended to include an evaluation matrix in the annexes. To learn more about how to develop an Evaluation Matrix, please see: <a href="http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/search/site/evaluation%20matrix">http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/search/site/evaluation%20matrix</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section H</strong></td>
<td>UNICEF evaluation standards require the integration of equity considerations and principles into all of its evaluation work. To learn more about how to conduct equity focused evaluations, please see: <a href="http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/node/4427">http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/node/4427</a>. While the report is generally good at integrating gender equality, further attention could have been paid to ensuring that the data collection methods were gender sensitive and that the data on perceptions of community members would be sex disaggregated. To learn more about how to conduct gender sensitive evaluations, please see: <a href="http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/resources/guide/gender-responsive_evaluation_handbook">http://www.betterevaluation.org/en/resources/guide/gender-responsive_evaluation_handbook</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section I</strong></td>
<td>The Executive Summary could be more useful for informing decision making if it were to include a description of the problem or issue to be addressed and a more detailed summary of the findings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>