

Guidance
Document



UNEG
United Nations Evaluation Group

Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation -- Towards UNEG Guidance

Foreword

At a time when United Nations member states and the UN system of organisations are working together towards strengthening the UN's ability to deliver results and maximise impacts there is an increased focus on evaluation as a means to strengthen accountability and learning. The United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), which brings together all the evaluation offices of the UN, has consistently sought to support this process by enhancing evaluation within the UN through strengthened functions in each organisation, better collaboration and the development of methodologies and approaches that do justice to the range of issues that the UN system has to address -- from peace and security to humanitarian to environment to development. We are guided in our work by the Norms and Standards for Evaluation, Ethical Guidelines and Code of Conduct for Evaluation that we have developed.

The UN has played an important role in setting the normative, policy and development agenda for human rights and gender equality in countries. It has been the forum where the aspirations of people – men and women -- have been crafted into conventions promoting and protecting their rights. The UNEG Norms and Standards highlight the need for people centred evaluation and for evaluators to consider human rights and gender equality in their work but there has continued to be a gap in tools and frameworks for evaluation that fully reflect these considerations. We have, therefore, with this Handbook taken the first step to develop an approach to integrate human rights and gender equality into the practice of evaluation.

This Handbook is the result of extensive inter-agency collaboration and is testimony to the innovation that can be achieved when organisations work together. I would like to express my deep gratitude to the UNEG Human Rights and Gender Equality Task Force for their tireless efforts to produce guidance material and to all UNEG members for their support of this initiative. The United Nations Evaluation Group is proud to bring out this Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation -- Towards UNEG Guidance that we hope will be useful well beyond the UN.

Saraswathi Menon
UNEG Chair

Preface

The UNEG Handbook “Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation –Towards UNEG Guidance” provides step by step guidance on how to integrate these dimensions throughout an evaluation process. The Handbook is the result of the UNEG’s efforts to make available a practical tool for evaluators, evaluation managers, and programme managers both within and outside the UN system. It was endorsed at the UNEG Annual General Meeting in March 2011 and will be accompanied by a full Guidance Document to be finalized in 2012.

The Handbook is the culmination of the collaborative efforts of UNEG members. A dedicated Task Force composed of nine UN agencies (FAO, ILO, OHCHR, UNCDF, UNDESA, UNDP, UNICEF, UNOIOS, UN Women) reviewed existing frameworks and tools and developed this Handbook to address the gaps in existing guidance; build on the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System (2005); and inform and encourage those involved in evaluation to systematically incorporate human rights and gender equality dimensions in their evaluations.

A number of UNEG members have already piloted the Handbook and it has also benefitted from extensive review and feedback from experts, both internal and external to the UN, in the areas of evaluation, human rights and gender equality. The co-Chairs wish to extend their gratitude for their invaluable contributions.

As future developments in these areas could impact the relevance and applicability of the Handbook, it will be updated over a period of two to three years based on additional research and, more importantly, on feedback from users. We therefore encourage all users to provide us with substantive inputs not only on the usefulness of the Handbook, but also with case studies on the overall experience of integrating human rights and gender equality in evaluation. A feedback form, as well as the link to an on-line survey, is available at the end of the Handbook.

UNEG Human Rights and Gender Equality Task Force

March 2011

Acknowledgements¹

This Handbook was developed by the UNEG Human Rights and Gender Equality Task Force (TF). The following UNEG members have participated in the TF providing substantive feedback, contributions on content and the piloting of the Handbook: Tullia Aiazzi (FAO), Lucien Back (UNICEF), Cristina Battaglino (UNEP), Majid Benabdellah (IFAD), Alexandra Chambel (UNDP), Janie Eriksen (UNICEF), Scott Green (OCHA), Anna Guerraggio (FAO), Francisco Guzmán (ILO), Peter Hellmers (OHCHR), Yuen Ching Ho (UNCTAD), Chandi Kadirgamar (UNCDF), Aurélie Lamoyer (FAO), Christa Lex (OIOS), Thuy Thu Le (UNIDO), Elena Marcelino (UN Women), Caspar Merkle (UNV), Kay Nagata (UNDESA), Suppiramaniam Nanthikesan (UNDP), Ada Ocampo (UNICEF), Fumika Ouchi (UNDP), Suna Pallek (OIOS), Laurence Reichel (UNCDF), and Cynthia Viveros-Camo (OIOS). Shravanti Reddy (UN Women) is also a TF member and provided substantive support throughout the formulation process, including initially as a consultant.

UNEG would particularly like to thank Janice Muir (OIOS), Belén Sanz (UN Women) and Romain Sirois (OHCHR), who have served as TF Co-Chairs specifically during the development of the Handbook. UNEG is grateful to them for their valuable contribution and demonstrated leadership in guiding the TF through the development and finalization of the Handbook.

Ana Cristina Guimarães Matos and Rieky Stuart both worked as consultants developing the Handbook and we would like to thank them for their hard work and dedication to ensuring such a high level, quality product.

The piloting phase of the Handbook's development was critical to ensuring its relevance and usability. Those who volunteered to participate in the pilot and who provided important feedback included: Priya Alvarez (UN Women), Nazik Ali Elrayah A/Aziz (independent consultant), Nafisa Bedri (Asian University for Women), Roland Bill (OIOS), Carmen Colazo (independent consultant), Laura Gonzalez (UN Women), Yumiko Kanemitsu (UN Women), Ibrahim Hussein Mohamed (UNV) Mary Okumu (UNCDF), Ana Carolina Querino (UN Women), Martina Rathner (UNESCO), Roskriv Rivera (independent consultant), Babar Sobhan (independent consultant), Barbara Torggler (UNESCO), Danielle Valverde (UN Women) and Claudia von Monbart (independent consultant).

UNEG benefitted from excellent collaboration with various partners and would like to express its deep gratitude to those who contributed their expertise in evaluation, gender equality and human rights including: Andrei Abramov (former OSAGI), Marie-Hélène Adrian (Universalialia), Michael Bamberger (American Evaluation Association), Alfonso Barragues (OHCHR), Tony Beck (independent consultant), Penelope Beynon (Institute of Development Studies), Christine Brautigam (UNDESA), Heather Buchanan (Management Consulting Services), Maria Bustelo (Universidad Complutense de Madrid), Silvie Cohen (UN Women), Silvia de Giuli (UNICEF), Rangita de Silva (Wellesley University), Maribel Derjani-Bayeh (UNDESA), Yamina Djacta (UN-HABITAT), Isha Dyfan (OHCHR), Alejandra

¹ The list of persons acknowledged include those who have contributed to the process of developing the Guidance and Handbook from April 2008 to the finalization of the Handbook.

Faúndez Meléndez (Inclusión y Equidad), Neal Gilmore (OHCHR), Natascha Gomes (UNICEF), Katherine Hay (IDRC), Silvia Hordosch (UN Women), Sohail Hussein (Independent Consultant), Akiko Ito (UNDESA), Cecilia M Ljungman (independent consultant), Luz Angelo Melo (UNFPA), Donna M. Mertens (Gallaudet University), Stephen Porter (University of Witwatersrand), Katrina Rojas (Universalia), Andrea Rossi (Harvard University), Lydia Ruprecht (UNESCO), Inda Sajor (OHCHR), Maria Sarabia (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Spain), Dan Seymour (UNICEF), Inga Sniukaite (UN Women), Pierre Sob (OHCHR), Mara Steccazzini (OHCHR), Isabel Suarez (UN Women), Patrick Twomey (International Human Rights Network), Frederic Unterreiner (UNICEF), Lee Waldorf (UN Women) and Simon Walker (OHCHR).

We would also like to thank Sonila Aliaj (UN Women), Rhonda de Freitas (UN Women), Sasha Jahic (UNDP), Flora Jimenez (UNDP), Antana Locs (UN Women), Florencia Tateossian (UNDP), Thuy-Hang Thi To (UNDP), Juha Uitto (UNDP) and Michelle Weston (UNEG Secretariat) for their continued support.

Table of Contents

Foreword	2
Preface	3
Acknowledgements	4
Acronyms and abbreviations	8
Introduction	10
Human rights.....	11
Gender equality	13
Human rights, gender equality and evaluation.....	14
Principles for integrating human rights and gender equality in evaluation.....	14
Chapter 1: Preparing for an evaluation	16
Task 1.1. Determining the evaluability of human rights and gender equality dimensions of the intervention	16
Chapter 2: Preparing the evaluation Terms of Reference	21
Task 2.1. Identifying evaluation stakeholders and their roles in human rights and gender equality.....	21
Task 2.2. Evaluation criteria to assess human rights and gender equality.....	25
Task 2.3. Framing the evaluation questions.....	29
Task 2.4. Working with human rights and gender equality indicators.....	33
Task 2.5. Selecting an evaluation team.....	35
Chapter 3: Implementing the evaluation	37
Task 3.1. Selecting the appropriate evaluation methodology.....	37
Task 3.2. Collecting and analyzing data.....	39
Task 3.3. Preparing the evaluation report and alternative forms of reporting	42
Task 3.4. Disseminating the evaluation and preparing a Management Response.....	43
Annex 1: Summary checklist for a human rights and gender equality evaluation process	44
Annex 2: Examples of human rights and gender equality empowerment indicators	46
Bibliography	48
Feedback form	50

Tables	
Table 1.1. Determining the evaluability of the human rights and gender equality dimensions of an intervention in the evaluation.....	18
Table 2.1. Stakeholder analysis matrix.....	23
Table 2.2. How to populate and use the stakeholder analysis matrix	24
Table 2.3. DAC evaluation criteria and integrating human rights and gender equality	26
Table 2.4. Framing the evaluation questions to assess design and planning, implementation and results	30
Table 3.1. Key elements of an appropriate evaluation methodology to address human rights and gender equality.....	38
Table 3.2. Tailoring common methods to address human rights and gender equality.....	40
Table 3.3. Preparing the evaluation report.....	42
Boxes.....	
Box 1. UN common understanding of the Human Rights Based Approach to Programming	12
Box 2. Success story: Using an evaluability exercise to strengthen programme design.....	16
Box 3. Determining the degree of stakeholder participation	21
Box 4. What is a Theory of Change?	29
Box 5. Tips for formulating human rights and gender equality indicators.....	34
Box 6. Necessary ethical considerations.....	36
Box 7. Child’s play: Identifying an appropriate evaluation method from a stakeholder analysis...	37

Acronyms and abbreviations

ALNAP	Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance
CEDAW	Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
ECOSOC	UN Economic and Social Council
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
HR	Human Rights
HR & GE	Human Rights and Gender Equality
HRBA	Human Rights Based Approach to Programming
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ILO	International Labour Organisation
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OHCHR	Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights
OIOS	United Nations Office of Internal Oversight Services
OSAGI	Office of the Special Adviser on Gender Issues and Advancement of Women
TF	Task Force (UNEG)
ToR	Terms of Reference
UDHR	Universal Declaration of Human Rights
UN	United Nations
UN Women	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
UNCDF	United Nations Capital Development Fund
UNCTAD	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
UNDESA	United Nations Department for Economic and Social Affairs

UNDG	United Nations Development Group
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UN-HABITAT	United Nations Human Settlements Programme
UNHCR	Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNV	United Nations Volunteers
WHO	World Health Organisation

Introduction

1. The United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) is a professional network that brings together the units responsible for evaluation in the UN system, including the specialized agencies, funds, programmes and affiliated organizations. It aims to strengthen the objectivity, effectiveness and visibility of the evaluation function across the UN system and to advocate the importance of evaluation for learning, decision making and accountability.
2. The Handbook was developed by the UNEG Human Rights and Gender Equality (HR & GE) Task Force and provides guidance and options on how to integrate HR & GE dimensions in evaluation. It was developed in response to a noted gap in evaluation guidance in general and the UN system-wide mandates to integrate HR & GE in all areas of work, including evaluation. By doing so, the UN system will be better able to learn lessons, hold key stakeholders accountable for results, and in turn improve policies and programming, which will contribute to the realization of HR & GE and meeting the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and other UN mandates².
3. This Handbook integrates guidance on the two concepts of “human rights” and “gender equality” to take advantage of the synergies and overlap between these mutually reinforcing concepts, including the understanding that gender equality is both a human right, but also a dimension of development in its own right. Also, human rights are inclusive of, but not limited to, gender related human rights.
4. The Handbook is primarily tailored for use by UN evaluators conducting evaluations of programmes and projects (referred to in the text as “the intervention”), and is particularly useful for evaluation of interventions not specifically focused on either human rights or gender equality. It can also be helpful to those designing and planning new interventions to support their analysis of HR & GE and promote their inclusion in the design of interventions and M&E systems. With some adaptation by users, it can also be used as a tool to support other types of evaluation carried out within and outside the UN system. Furthermore, it is an abridged and user-friendly reference document which will accompany a UNEG Guidance Document on the topic (forthcoming)³.
5. The term **evaluation manager** is used throughout to describe the person responsible for organizing and leading the evaluation process, including preparing its design, and who will receive the evaluation report and ensure its quality. The term **evaluator/ evaluation team** is used to describe the person or team who collects and analyzes the data, and prepares the report of the findings and recommendations.
6. The Handbook is organized to follow the main stages of evaluation planning and implementation:

² The UN system uses monitoring, evaluation, auditing and inspection as elements of managing for results. This manual is concerned with evaluation. All types of evaluations can make use of the Handbook, including in development or humanitarian contexts.

³ The UNEG Guidance Document (to be published in 2012) will provide additional information.

- **Chapter 1: Preparing for an evaluation** - including how to assess the evaluability of the HR & GE dimensions in an intervention and how to deal with different evaluability scenarios.
- **Chapter 2: Preparing the evaluation Terms of Reference** –including step-by-step guidance on developing the elements of an evaluation TOR; how to conduct a stakeholder analysis that is sensitive to HR & GE and inclusive of diverse stakeholder groups in the evaluation process; how to define evaluation criteria, evaluation questions and indicators that take HR & GE into consideration; and criteria for selecting an evaluation team.
- **Chapter 3: Implementing the evaluation** - including the importance of selecting and using appropriate methods for an evaluation to ensure that the HR & GE aspects of the intervention will be identified and analyzed during the evaluation process. It also outlines the process of writing the evaluation report, dissemination of evaluation results and responding to evaluation findings and recommendations.

7. **A Summary Checklist for an HR & GE evaluation process** is also included. It will be a useful tool for evaluation managers/evaluators to assess whether all necessary steps for integrating HR & GE to the evaluation process have been duly followed.

Human rights

8. The promotion and protection of HR & GE are central principles to the mandate of the UN and all UN agencies must work to fundamentally enhance and contribute to their realization by addressing underlying causes of human rights violations, including discrimination against women and girls, and utilizing processes that are in line with and support these principles. Those UN interventions that do not consider these principles risk reinforcing patterns of discrimination and exclusion or leaving them unchanged⁴.

9. Human rights are the civil, cultural, economic, political and social rights inherent to all human beings, regardless of one’s nationality, place of residence, sex, sexual orientation, national or ethnic origin, colour, disability, religion, language etc. All human beings are entitled to these rights without discrimination. They are universal, inalienable, interdependent, indivisible, equal and non-discriminatory.

10. Human rights are expressed in **and** guaranteed by normative frameworks and laws that lay down the obligations of States to act in order to respect, protect and fulfil the human rights and fundamental freedoms of individuals or groups. We use ‘duty-bearers’ to reflect the obligations of States towards ‘rights-holders’, which represent all individuals in the concerned State.⁵

⁴ Action 2 is a global programme designed to strengthen the capacity of UN country teams to support the efforts of Member States, at their request, in strengthening their national human rights promotion and protection systems <http://www.un.org/events/action2/summary.html>.

⁵ The expression “duty bearer” is defined differently in programming and in human rights international law. Within this publication, the programming definition is adopted, which includes under the expression “duty bearer” both state and non-state actors, i.e. any actor with either duties or responsibilities for a development intervention.

11. The 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) is the over-arching UN document that formally recognizes universally agreed human rights.⁶ The UDHR was followed by the adoption of legally binding treaties: in 1965 the [International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination \(ICERD\)](#) and one year later two covenants on civil and political rights and economic, social and cultural rights respectively. Since, a total of nine core international human rights treaties have been adopted by the General Assembly and are in force as well as many optional protocols⁷. These international treaties further delineate and codify the rights contained in the UDHR.

12. Today, international human rights law and standards include the nine core international human rights treaties and their related international treaty monitoring bodies⁸, other universal human rights instruments and mechanisms, customary international law, general principles and other sources of international law.⁹

13. The strategy for **implementing** human rights in UN programming is called the Human Rights Based Approach to Programming (HRBA). In 2003, the Stamford Inter-agency Workshop on a Human Rights Based Approach in the Context of UN Reform reached a common understanding and consensus on

⁶ Although Declarations are by definition not legally binding, much of the norms of the UDHR have by now become part of customary international law.

⁷ The nine core international human rights treaties are:

ICERD International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination 21 Dec 1965

ICCPR International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights 16 Dec 1966

ICESCR International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights 16 Dec 1966

CEDAW Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women 18 Dec 1979

CAT Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment 10 Dec 1984

CRC Convention on the Rights of the Child 20 Nov 1989

ICRMW International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families 18 Dec 1990

CPED International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance 20 Dec 2006

CRPD Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities 13 Dec 2006

Optional protocols to the core international human rights treaties are:

ICESCR - OP Optional Protocol of the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights 10 Dec 2008 CESCR

ICCPR-OP1 Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights 16 Dec 1966 HRC

ICCPR-OP2 Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty 15 Dec 1989 HRC

OP-CEDAW Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women 10 Dec 1999 CEDAW

OP-CRC-AC Optional protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict 25 May 2000 CRC

OP-CRC-SC Optional protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography 25 May 2000 CRC

OP-CAT Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment 18 Dec 2002 CAT

OP-CRPD Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

A complete list of conventions and their texts can be found at <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law>

⁸ Further information on Human Rights Bodies is available at:

<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/Pages/HumanRightsBodies.aspx>

⁹ International Human Rights Law: <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/InternationalLaw.aspx>.

the definition of the HRBA and how the UN system could mainstream the HRBA in its policies and practices on development cooperation¹⁰.

Box 1. UN common understanding of the Human Rights Based Approach to Programming

1. All programmes of development co-operation, policies and technical assistance should further the realization of human rights as laid down in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights instruments.
2. Human rights standards contained in, and principles derived from, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights instruments guide all development co-operation and programming in all sectors and in all phases of the programme process.
3. Development co-operation contributes to the development of the capacities of “duty-bearers” to meet their obligations and/or of “rights-holders” to claim their rights.

Gender equality

14. Gender equality refers to the equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities of women and men, girls and boys. Equality does not mean that women and men will become the same, but that women’s and men’s rights, responsibilities and opportunities will not depend on whether they are born male or female. It implies that the interests, needs and priorities of both women and men are taken into consideration, recognizing the diversity of different groups of women and men. Gender equality is not a “women’s issue”, but concerns and should fully engage men as well as women. Equality between women and men, girls and boys is seen both as a human rights issue and as a precondition for, and indicator of, sustainable people-centered development. It is also an essential component for the realization of all human rights¹¹.

15. The pursuit of gender equality is integral with, but not subsidiary to, the UDHR and the covenants. The 1979 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW)¹² led the UN and its members to stress the importance of operationalizing gender equality. The Beijing Platform of Action and the Millennium Declaration also commit the UN to promoting gender equality in its development efforts.

16. Gender equality is not limited to the sphere of law and concerns both men and women, boys and girls, starting at the household level. Life at the household level has direct and profound implications in communities and for the relations between states and their citizens: progress toward gender equality requires changes within the family, culture, politics and the economy, in addition to changes in laws and their application.

¹⁰ See report of “The Second Interagency Workshop on Implementing a Human Rights-based Approach in the Context of UN Reform”, 5-7 May 2003. Available at: http://www.undg.org/archive_docs/4128-Human_Rights_Workshop_Stamford_Final_Report.doc.

¹¹ See OSAGI list of concepts and definitions (<http://www.un.org/womenwatch/osagi/conceptsanddefinitions.htm>) and UN (2008) “Report on indicators for promoting and monitoring the implementation of human rights, pp 4-10, paras 5 and 12.

¹² UN (1979), Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW).

17. Gender mainstreaming is the strategy adopted by the UN for integrating gender equality in programming. In the 1997 UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) report gender mainstreaming is defined as “the process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in all areas and at all levels. It is a strategy for making women’s as well as men’s concerns and experiences an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes in all political, economic and societal spheres, so that women and men benefit equally and inequality is not perpetuated. The ultimate goal is gender equality”¹³.

Human rights, gender equality and evaluation

18. Considering the mandates to incorporate HR & GE in all UN work, these dimensions need to be paid special attention when evaluating UN interventions. Attention to HR & GE adds the important principles of equality, inclusion and non-discrimination to evaluation.

19. Evaluations play a crucial role in examining to what extent UN interventions benefit right-holders (particularly those most likely to have their rights violated), strengthen the capacity of duty bearers or other actors to fulfil obligations and responsibilities, strengthen accountability mechanisms, and monitor and advocate for compliance with international standards on HR & GE. Evaluation can also shed light on how these processes occur and call attention to the exclusion of certain groups.

20. An evaluation that is HR & GE responsive addresses the programming principles required by a human rights based approach and gender mainstreaming strategy. It contributes to the social and economic change process that is at the heart of most development programming by identifying and analyzing the inequalities, discriminatory practices and unjust power relations that are central to development problems. HR & GE responsive evaluation, can lead to more effective interventions and better, more sustainable results¹⁴. This Handbook will address how to do this in practice, including understanding the different effects of interventions on women and men from diverse stakeholder groups.

21. An evaluation that neglects or omits consideration of HR & GE deprives the UN system of evidence about who benefits (and does not) from its interventions, risks perpetuating discriminatory structure and practices where interventions do not follow UN policy in these areas, and may miss opportunities for demonstrating how effective interventions are carried out.

Principles for integrating human rights and gender equality in evaluation

22. While the history, approach and analysis of human rights-based programming and mainstreaming of gender equality differ, evaluations that address HR & GE share interrelated principles such as:

- **Inclusion.** Evaluating HR & GE requires paying attention to which groups benefit and which groups contribute to the intervention under review. Groups need to be disaggregated by relevant criteria: disadvantaged and advantaged groups depending on their gender or status

¹³ UN (1997), Report of the UN Economic and Social Council: “*Mainstreaming the gender perspective into all policies and programmes in the UN system*”.

¹⁴ See UN Women's “*Manager's Guide to Gender Equality and Human Rights Responsive Evaluation*”.

(women/men, class, ethnicity, religion, age, location, etc.¹⁵) duty-bearers of various types, and rights-holders of various types in order to assess whether benefits and contributions were fairly distributed by the intervention being evaluated. In terms of HR & GE, it is important to note that women and men, boys and girls who belong to advantaged groups are not exempt from being denied their human rights or equal rights: for example, violence against media workers from advantaged groups who expose wrong-doing or corruption, or constraints on women's public presence and freedom of movement in some countries, regardless if they belong to advantaged or disadvantaged groups. Therefore the concept of inclusion must assess criteria beyond advantage. Likewise, it is not unusual that some groups may be negatively affected by an intervention. An evaluation must acknowledge who these stakeholders are and how they are affected, and shed light on how to minimize the negative effects.

- **Participation.** Evaluating HR & GE must be participatory. Stakeholders of the intervention have a right to be consulted and participate in decisions about what will be evaluated and how the evaluation will be done. In addition, the evaluation will assess whether the stakeholders have been able to participate in the design, implementation and monitoring of the intervention. It is important to measure stakeholder group participation in the process as well as how they benefit from results.
- **Fair Power Relations.** Both HR & GE seek, inter alia, to balance power relations between or within advantaged and disadvantaged groups. The nature of the relationship between implementers and stakeholders in an intervention can support or undermine this change. When evaluators assess the degree to which power relations changed as a result of an intervention, they must have a full understanding of the context, and conduct the evaluation in a way that supports the empowerment of disadvantaged groups, e.g. women's empowerment where women are the disadvantaged gender within a given context. In addition, evaluators should be aware of their own position of power, which can influence the responses to queries through their interactions with stakeholders. There is a need to be sensitive to these dynamics.

23. Additionally, evaluators should as a preference make use of **mixed evaluation methods**. Regardless of the size of an intervention, evaluating HR & GE should use both quantitative and qualitative methods. The former can give credible information about the extent of results for particular groups of stakeholders, while the latter can assist in explaining how those results are achieved. Qualitative methods also allow for the voice of the most vulnerable to be heard. Information from mixed methods can assist in the triangulation of data, increasing reliability and validity, as well as being useful for exploring whether/why different stakeholders groups benefited differently. Finally, mixed methods can help to compensate for bias in privileging certain ways of knowing and communicating (e.g. literacy, ability to speak publicly, conceptualizing in ways that resonate with the evaluators' frame of reference).

¹⁵ These examples of criteria are not limited to those of UN conventions, but demonstrate the range of possibilities that may need to be considered. . For example, if one lives in a remote area, one may have less access to services or information than if one is based in a city. Similarly, access to education, linked to poverty or wealth, may be important as a criterion of differentiation.

Chapter 1: Preparing for an evaluation

24. This Chapter focuses on how to determine whether the HR & GE dimensions of an intervention are evaluable¹⁶.

25. Before beginning an evaluation, it is important to assess whether HR & GE dimensions have been adequately considered during the design and implementation of an intervention. This is fundamentally important because the fulfillment of human rights and the realization of gender equality are necessary conditions for sustainable development and, therefore, **all UN interventions have a mandate** to address HR & GE issues. Thus, UN agencies have an obligation to take these dimensions into consideration when planning an intervention and beneficiaries of UN interventions also have a right to be engaged in a way that promotes HR & GE.

26. It is much easier to evaluate the HR & GE dimensions of an intervention when they have been addressed during the design, implementation and monitoring of an intervention. However, despite the UN mandate, the reality is that interventions do not always mainstream HR & GE. Notwithstanding mainstreaming, it is important for the evaluation manager and evaluation team to have the skills and knowledge to ensure the assessment of the HR & GE dimensions during an evaluation¹⁷.

Box 2. Using an evaluability exercise to strengthen HR & GE dimensions in programme design

During the piloting stage, UNCDF and UN Women used this Handbook to help improve the 'evaluability' of a regional multi-country project entitled "Gender Equitable Local Development Programme (GELD)". The programme had an overall budget of over US\$8 million for 2008-2011. The team sought to improve the theory of change, to refine activities, clarify targets, formulate indicators and build the monitoring framework for the project.

The biggest challenge was to keep the indicators few, simple and relevant. The initial M&E framework was considered over-ambitious and too costly to collect data. By determining the evaluability of the HR & GE dimensions of the intervention, the team was able to prioritize and focus on the most relevant indicators which resulted in an M&E framework of three outputs and seven indicators. This also strengthened the project's evaluability in the future. Since it was a gender-focused programme, the Handbook particularly helped to improve the evaluability of the human rights dimensions of the intervention.

Task 1.1. Determining the evaluability of HR & GE dimensions of the intervention

27. An **evaluability assessment** is an exercise that helps to identify whether an intervention can be evaluated, and whether an evaluation is justified, feasible and likely to provide useful information. Its purpose is not only to conclude if the evaluation can be undertaken or not, but also to prepare the intervention to generate all the necessary conditions to be evaluated. Interventions will fall into two categories:

¹⁶ Op. cit. 13.

¹⁷ Op. Cit. 10.

- Where either human rights and/or gender equality is the primary focus of the intervention.
- Where HR & GE is not the primary focus of the intervention.

28. All evaluations in both categories should include an assessment of the HR & GE dimensions of the interventions. For interventions in the first category, human rights and/or gender equality, will be a primary focus of the evaluation. In some cases, only one of these dimensions will be prominent, so care should be taken to ensure that the other dimension is also assessed during the evaluation. Interventions falling in the second category where HR & GE is not the primary focus will differ from each other in the extent to which gender or human rights were explicit elements of the program design (results chain, program theory of action).

29. Interventions will also differ depending on whether disaggregated information was systematically collected about women/men, different groups of rights-holders and duty-bearers. Interventions in the second category will also differ in their attention to human rights and to gender equality in implementation. In both categories, the evaluation methods and procedures for assessing HR & GE dimensions will be similar, although the evaluation questions may differ.

30. When considering the evaluability of an intervention from a HR & GE perspective, the evaluation manager/ team will encounter a range of different situations each requiring a different response as shown in **Table 1.1**. The table includes several levels of evaluability of HR & GE to be considered, as well as information on the characteristic of interventions and possible approaches to challenges. In all cases, the evaluation manager/ team will have alternatives on how to address evaluability challenges during the evaluation process. An intervention may also present a combination of the characteristics as shown in Table 1.1. In this case, a mixed approach is recommended on how to deal with the evaluability challenges.

31. It is important to also note that an evaluability assessment can be conducted as a separate exercise prior to the conduct of an evaluation. This allows for identifying areas where evaluability is weak and provide recommendations on how it can be improved. When the evaluability of the HR & GE dimensions of an intervention are unknown, or known to be weak, conducting a separate evaluability assessment exercise is a very useful practice to both enhance evaluability and scope the evaluation in terms of these dimensions.

Table 1.1. Determining the evaluability of the HR & GE dimensions of an intervention in the evaluation

Evaluability for HR/GE	Characteristics of the intervention	Possible approaches to address evaluability challenges
High	The intervention theory has clearly considered HR & GE issues (e.g. the intervention identified, from the beginning, problems and challenges that affect particular groups, inequalities and discrimination patterns in the area where it occurs, contextual or systematic violations of rights, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Make sure that the evaluation ToR takes full advantage of the information already produced by the intervention, and of the participation mechanisms established - Consult stakeholders on whether there are still areas where HR & GE evaluability needs improvement - Address any possible weaknesses and recommend steps to improve evaluability, if necessary. Consult stakeholders on their ideas about how to improve - If necessary, include methods and tools in the evaluation that can capture new data or strengthen the existing one on HR & GE (e.g. information on new groups of people, changes in the context, etc.) - Use the context (political, institutional, cultural) of the intervention in favor of the evaluation: when it's conducive, build on this support to ensure a highly participatory evaluation - Make sure that the HR & GE issues captured in this intervention are also well reflected in the evaluation report
	HR & GE are clearly reflected in the intervention design (logframe, indicators, activities, M&E systems, reporting mechanisms)	
	The intervention design benefitted from a strong and inclusive stakeholder analysis	
	The intervention design benefitted from specific human rights and gender analyses	
	Records of implementation and activity reports contain information on how HR & GE were addressed	
	Stakeholders (both women and men) have participated in the various activities of the intervention in an active, meaningful and free manner	
	Monitoring systems have captured HR & GE information (e.g. the situation of different groups of people, specific indicators, etc.)	
	Data has been collected in a disaggregated manner (e.g. by gender, race, ethnicity, age, etc.) reflecting diversity of stakeholders	
	Progress and results reports for the intervention include HR & GE information	
Context (political, institutional, cultural, etc.) where the intervention is inserted is conducive to the advancement of HR & GE		

Evaluability for HR/GE	Characteristics of the intervention	Possible approaches to address evaluability challenges
Medium	The intervention theory has considered HR & GE issues to a certain extent, with weaknesses in some areas of the intervention	- Understand the reasons for the limitations: are they political, operational, budgetary, time-related, due to limited know-how, etc.? Consult stakeholders and documentation that may offer insights on this
	HR & GE have been reflected in the intervention design to some extent (e.g. intended or mentioned, but not clearly articulated on how to address them in practice; limited to only a few disaggregated indicators such as number of men and women; addressing numbers without addressing actual changes in rights and equality situation; clear in the narrative but not in the logframe etc.)	- Highlight the evaluability limitation in the evaluation TOR. Include, in the evaluation design, tools and methods that make use of the existing data, but that may also help generate new information on HR & GE. Include tools and methods that strengthen stakeholder participation
	The intervention design benefitted from a stakeholder analysis, but important groups have been left out	- Pay special attention to the stakeholder analysis in the evaluation process, and who should be involved. Make sure to consider groups that have been left out, and how to include them at this stage
	The intervention design benefitted from limited human rights and gender analyses, or from only one of them	- Include in the evaluation process an exercise to strengthen the existing HR & GE analyses
	Records of implementation and activity reports include limited data on how HR & GE have been addressed	- During the evaluation process, seek partners and documents that may have useful information on HR & GE that has not been captured by the intervention (e.g. national evaluation/statistics offices, other development agencies, civil society and community organizations, media, academia, etc.)
	Stakeholders have participated in the intervention to a certain extent (e.g. being informed or consulted, but not taking part in decisions; only some groups have been consulted; etc.)	- Build on the context where the intervention is inserted: if it is conducive to the advancement of HR & GE only to a certain extent, identify key advocates and supporters of the cause and involve them in the evaluation design stage
	Monitoring systems have captured some information on HR & GE	- During the data analysis process, address whether the limitations in the intervention had a negative effect on particular stakeholders. Analyze also the negative effect of not being able to substantively assess HR & GE (e.g. how the lack of this information and data affects the overall evaluation findings, which would basically be incomplete). Consider and consult stakeholders on how this situation could be improved
	Some limited disaggregated data have been collected	- Include data on HR & GE in the evaluation report, address limitations and provide recommendations for improvement
	Progress and results reports for the intervention include some information on HR & GE	
	Context (political, institutional, cultural, etc.) where the intervention is inserted is conducive, to a certain extent, to the advancement of HR & GE	

Evaluability for HR/GE	Characteristics of the intervention	Possible approaches to address evaluability challenges
Low	The intervention theory failed to consider HR & GE dimensions in its design, implementation and monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Understand the reasons for the failure: are they political, practical, budgetary, time-related, due to limited know-how, etc. Consult stakeholders and documentation that may offer insights on this - Highlight the evaluability limitation in the evaluation ToR. Include, in the evaluation design, tools and methods that may help generate information on HR & GE, even if limited. Include tools and methods to enhance stakeholder participation - Pay special attention to the stakeholder analysis in the evaluation process, and who should be involved. Because the HR & GE dimensions have not been considered in the intervention, several important stakeholders will most probably have been left out - Include preparation of HR & GE analyses in the evaluation process - During the evaluation process, seek partners and documents that may have useful information on HR & GE that has not been captured by the intervention (e.g. national evaluation/statistics offices, other development agencies, civil society and community organizations, media, academia, etc.) - In spite of the context, try to identify advocates and supporters of HR & GE and involve them in the evaluation design stage - During the data analysis process, pay special attention to the question whether the intervention had a negative effect on particular stakeholders. Consider and consult stakeholders on how this situation could be improved - Highlight the challenges of addressing HR & GE in the evaluation report, also specifically in the evaluation section. Since HR & GE are a mandate of the UN, which should be considered in every intervention design, provide assertive recommendations for immediate action
	Stakeholder, HR & GE analyses were not conducted adequately or not existent at all	
	Data on HR & GE and/or disaggregated data are not available	
	Stakeholder participation in the design, implementation and monitoring processes of the intervention has been minimal or has left out important groups (women, men, indigenous people, people with disabilities and HIV/AIDS, children, etc.)	
	Progress and results reports for the intervention do not address HR & GE issues	
	Context (political, institutional, cultural, etc.) where the intervention is inserted is not conducive to the advancement of HR & GE	

Chapter 2: Preparing the evaluation Terms of Reference

32. This Chapter describes some tasks to help the evaluation manager decide how to address HR & GE in the evaluation terms of reference.

33. The evaluation manager will have the greatest influence to incorporate HR & GE in the evaluation during the evaluation planning stage – deciding the purpose, scope and focus of the evaluation, including potential users and developing the Terms of Reference (ToR). It is therefore important that the evaluation manager have a good understanding of HR & GE in the UN system. Otherwise, assistance, especially in planning and developing the ToR for the evaluation, should be sought.

Task 2.1. Identifying evaluation stakeholders and their roles in human rights and gender equality

34. Involving stakeholders directly affected by an intervention (be they the implementers or intended beneficiaries) in the design, planning and implementation of its evaluation is a fundamental principle of any process sensitive to HR & GE issues. According to UN mandates, **ensuring stakeholder participation** is an obligation of the UN, and it is the right of every beneficiary to have a say on processes and interventions that affects their lives. Evaluation is no exception. The UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System¹⁸ also emphasize the need for stakeholder participation in the evaluation process.

Box 3. Determining the degree of stakeholder participation

The following questions should be considered when deciding the degree of participation by stakeholders:

1. Beneficiaries, implementers, rights-holders, and duty-bearers can be involved in the process with varying degrees of intensity. What will be the implications in terms of effort, timeline and budget?
2. Should all stakeholders be consulted together or separately? If consulted together, would this create dangers for any members of the groups involved? What will be the process for ensuring all perspectives are fairly heard, avoiding bias because some may be more reticent than others for a variety of reasons (power differences, literacy levels, confidence levels, etc.), mediating differences, building agreement, and making decisions where differences cannot be reconciled)?
3. How can the envisaged level of participation by the evaluation process be ensured, even if the reality is that the intervention to be evaluated had limited participation so far? How can the evaluation generate lessons for the intervention to overcome participation challenges?
4. Is there a clear communication strategy with all stakeholders regarding who will participate, who will be consulted and who will make decisions when there are differences of opinion?
5. Do the evaluators have the appropriate level of commitment to, understanding of, facilitation skills and experience with the level of participation decided on?
6. Have the gains in credibility of the evaluation results by a particular level of participation been considered?
7. Has sufficient consideration been given to participation to ensure the credibility of evaluation results?

¹⁸ See UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System (2005).

35. The degree and level of stakeholder participation in an evaluation process varies and various challenges - institutional, budgetary and time - need to be taken into consideration. However, guaranteeing stakeholder participation strengthens accountability, builds trust and agreement in the evaluation process, generates credibility and can itself contribute to building HR & GE. Evidence also shows that stakeholder participation enhances the use of evaluation conclusions by increasing ownership. The evaluation manager will need to weigh the level of stakeholder participation against the benefits and constraints.

36. As far as possible, stakeholders should be involved in the evaluation from the early stages of the evaluation process, and a **stakeholder analysis** is the most effective tool to help identify who the different groups in an intervention are and why, how and when they should be included in the evaluation process.

“A rights-based evaluation is not just a technical exercise in data collection and analysis. It is a dialogue and a democratic process to learn from each other, to strengthen accountability and to change power relations between stakeholders”,
J.Theis.

37. **Disaggregation of information** is a critical factor of any process that is sensitive to HR & GE. This means not treating people as a uniform group (e.g. beneficiaries), but understanding and acknowledging that different groups exist and are affected by an intervention in different ways. There are many possible levels of disaggregation which depend on the nature and context of the programme, for example gender, race, ethnic group, age, area of residence, disabilities, income level, sexual orientation, HIV/AIDS, literacy and education level, employment type, political affiliations, and religious beliefs.

38. A stakeholder analysis is also a helpful tool to address the problem of positive bias in evaluations. Evaluations subject to budget and time constraints primarily interview the intervention’s direct beneficiaries and implementing agencies. An implementing agency can also be considered as a beneficiary in a sense as funding sources are often external to the agency. Consequently, most of the information received tends to be relatively positive if the intervention is progressing well. Often, however, information is not collected from groups who have been excluded or whose situation may have deteriorated due to the intervention. These unintended outcomes need to be examined; otherwise there is a real risk of missing the negative outcomes of an intervention.

39. The stakeholder analysis matrix in **Table 2.1** is a tool to assist the evaluation manager and evaluators decide who should be involved in the evaluation process and in what ways¹⁹. This analysis will permeate the whole evaluation process with different stakeholder groups being involved in different stages of the evaluation.

¹⁹ Op. cit. 13.

Table 2.1. Stakeholder analysis matrix

Who (stakeholders, disaggregated as appropriate)	What (their role in the intervention)	Why (gains from involvement in the evaluation)	Priority (how important to be part of the evaluation process)	When (stage of the evaluation to engage them)	How (ways and capacities in which stakeholders will participate)
Duty-bearers with the authority to make decisions related to the intervention: - government organizations - government officials - government leaders - funding agency					
Duty-bearers who have direct responsibility for the intervention: - funding agency - programme managers - partners (individual and organizations) - staff members					
Secondary duty-bearers: - private sector -- employers - other authorities within the context of the intervention					
Rights-holders who one way or another benefit from the intervention: women, men, girls, boys; other groups disaggregated					
Rights-holders who are in a position disadvantaged by the intervention: women, men, girls, boys; other groups disaggregated					
Other interest groups who are not directly participating in the intervention: - other development agencies working in the area - civil society organizations - other organizations					

Table 2.2 How to populate and use the stakeholder analysis matrix (Table 2.1. above)

<p>“What” (roles in the intervention)</p>	<p>Examples of roles that should be included in the matrix (not exhaustive, others should be added depending on the context and intervention):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Funder – more than 50% 2) Funder – less than 50% 3) Partner 4) Advisor 5) Supporter 6) Programme management 7) Programme staff member 8) Primary beneficiary 9) Secondary beneficiary 10) Non-participants possibly affected by the intervention
<p>“Why” (gains from involvement in the evaluation)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Inform: Keep the stakeholder informed of the evaluation’s progress and findings 2) Consult: Keep the stakeholder informed of the evaluation’s progress and findings, listen to them, and provide feedback on how the stakeholder’s input influenced the evaluation 3) Involve: Work with the stakeholder to ensure that their concerns are considered when reviewing various evaluation options; make sure that they have the opportunity to review and comment on options, and provide feedback on how their input was used in the evaluation 4) Collaborate: Incorporate the stakeholder’s advice and concerns to the greatest degree possible, and provide opportunities for meaningful involvement in the evaluation process 5) Empower: Transfer power for the evaluation over to the stakeholder: it is their evaluation. The evaluation team will offer options and advice to inform their decisions. Decision-making power ultimately rests with this stakeholder, whose decisions will be supported, informed and facilitated by the evaluation team
<p>“Priority” (how important to be part of the evaluation process)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Low level of relevance to the evaluation 2) Medium level of relevance to the evaluation 3) High level of relevance to the evaluation
<p>“When” (stage of the evaluation to engage them)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Preparation (e.g. preparation of ToR including setting of scope, selection of evaluation team) 2) Inception and primary research (e.g. development of evaluation design, framing evaluation questions and criteria) 3) Data collection and analysis 4) Report preparation 5) Management response 6) Dissemination
<p>“How” (ways and capacities in which stakeholders will participate)</p>	<p>Possible ways and capacity to participate in an evaluation (not exhaustive):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) As an informant 2) As a member of a steering committee 3) As an evaluator 4) As audience to be informed of the evaluation

Task 2.2. Evaluation criteria to assess human rights and gender equality

40. Evaluation criteria provide an overarching framework for an assessment and define the evaluation questions (Task 2.3). The UN commonly uses and adapts the evaluation criteria of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) to evaluate its interventions. These are relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability²⁰. Additional criteria, such as the ALNAP humanitarian criteria, are also commonly used.

41. However, the mainstream definitions of the OECD-DAC criteria are neutral in terms of the HR & GE dimensions. As a result, their application in evaluations often does not take into account HR & GE with the end result of producing evaluations that do not substantively assess these important and cross-cutting dimensions. **Table 2.3** provides some guidance on how to integrate HR & GE dimensions into the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria.

42. It is the evaluation manager's and evaluator's task to define and integrate HR & GE dimensions into all evaluation criteria identified for an evaluation. There are also criteria that can be applied to evaluations that are derived directly from the HR & GE principles of **equality, participation, social transformation, inclusiveness, empowerment**, etc. and their use is strongly encouraged.

²⁰ See [DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance](#).

Table 2.3 DAC evaluation criteria and integrating human rights and gender equality

DAC criteria and definition	Integrating human rights and gender equality
<p>Relevance: Extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries’ requirements, country-needs, global priorities and partners’ and donors’ policies</p>	<p>Assessing the HR & GE relevance of an intervention entails examining how the intervention is designed and implemented to align and contribute to HR & GE, as defined by international and regional conventions; and national policies and strategies; and the needs of rights holders and duty bearers both women and men, targeted by an intervention). Results of the intervention should also be relevant to the realization of HR & GE. Some examples of areas to assess include the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which the intervention is aligned with international instruments (e.g. CEDAW, CRPD, CRC), standards and principles on HR & GE and contributes to their implementation; • Extent to which the intervention is aligned with and contributes to regional conventions and national policies and strategies on HR & GE; • Extent to which the intervention is informed by substantive and tailored human rights and gender analyses that identify underlying causes and barriers to HR & GE; • Extent to which the intervention is informed by needs and interests of diverse groups of stakeholders through in-depth consultation; • Relevance of stakeholder participation in the intervention.
<p>Effectiveness: Extent to which the development intervention’s objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. Effectiveness assesses the outcome level, intended as an uptake or result of an output</p>	<p>Analysis of an intervention’s effectiveness involves assessing the way in which results were defined, monitored and achieved (or not) on HR & GE and that the processes that led to these results were aligned with HR & GE principles (e.g. inclusion, non-discrimination, accountability, etc.). In cases where HR & GE results were not explicitly stated in the planning document or results framework, assessing effectiveness in terms of HR & GE is still possible and necessary as all UN interventions will have some effect on HR & GE and should aim to contribute to their realization. Some issues to consider include the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which the Theory of Change and results framework of the intervention integrated HR & GE; • Extent to which a human rights based approach and a gender mainstreaming strategy were incorporated in the design and implementation of the intervention; • Presence of key results on HR & GE.

DAC criteria and definition	Integrating HR & GE
<p>Efficiency: Measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results. It is most commonly applied to the input-output link in the causal chain of an intervention</p>	<p>The HR & GE dimensions of efficiency require a broader analysis of the benefits and related costs of integrating HR & GE in interventions. A key aspect that needs to be considered is that HR & GE involve long-term and complex change processes that require sustained support. While a direct relationship between resource investment and long term results should be carefully established, the assessment of efficiency should also consider short term process achievements (participation and inclusiveness, etc.) and medium-term results (developing an enabling environment, building capacity, etc.). Some aspects to consider include the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of adequate resources for integrating HR & GE in the intervention as an investment in short-term, medium-term and long-term benefits; • Costs of not providing resources for integrating HR & GE (e.g. enhanced benefits that could have been achieved for modest investment); • Extent to which the allocation of resources to targeted groups takes into account the need to prioritize those most marginalized.
<p>Sustainability: Continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long-term benefits. The resilience to risk of the net benefit flows over time</p>	<p>To assess the sustainability of results and impacts on HR & GE the extent to which an intervention has advanced key factors that need to be in place for the long-term realization of HR & GE should be studied. Some examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing an enabling or adaptable environment for real change on HR & GE; • Institutional change conducive to systematically addressing HR & GE concerns; • Permanent and real attitudinal and behavioral change conducive to HR & GE; • Establishment of accountability and oversight systems between rights holders and duty-bearers; • Capacity development of targeted rights holders (to demand) and duty bearers (to fulfill) rights; • Redistribution of resources, power and workload between women and men.

DAC criteria and definition	Integrating human rights and gender equality
<p>Impact: Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended</p>	<p>Positive HR & GE impact can be defined as the actual and long-lasting realization and enjoyment of HR & GE by rights holders and capacity of duty-bearers to respect, protect and fulfill HR & GE. Impact can be positive or negative, intended or unintended, primary or secondary. For a number of reasons (e.g. multi-causality, timeframe to observe impact, etc.), the assessment and measurement of impact that can be attributed to an intervention, or to which an intervention has contributed, is a complex endeavor; however, it is essential to do so for learning on what works and what does not in terms of advancing HR & GE. For interventions that are not primarily focused on HR & GE, it may also lead to identifying if interventions are reinforcing existing discrimination and power structures that are contrary to HR & GE. Some aspects that should be considered in such an assessment include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether rights-holders have been able to enjoy their rights and duty bearers have the ability to comply with their obligations, whether there is no change in both groups, or whether both are less able to do so; • Real change in gender relations, e.g. access to and use of resources, decision-making power, division of labor, etc.; • Empowerment of targeted groups and influence outside of the intervention’s targeted group; • Unintended effects on any groups that were not adequately considered in the intervention design (e.g. women belonging to a broader group within which they were not considered as a specific group); • Effective accountability mechanisms operating on HR & GE.

Task 2.3. Framing the evaluation questions

43. The process for **framing questions to be answered by the evaluation** can either be derived from the evaluation criteria or the other way around – it can be an inductive or deductive process. In either case, it is essential that evaluation criteria and questions are interlinked and seek information on how HR & GE have been integrated into the design and planning, implementation and results achieved of the intervention.

44. **Table 2.4** presents examples of questions that could be used to assess HR & GE in an evaluation. Some questions may overlap between different evaluation criteria. When new criteria are established, specific questions should be included to address them.

45. As with the other tools in this Handbook, these examples of questions need to be considered in context, and adapted to the specific reality of the intervention to be evaluated. The questions must derive from the intervention's **Theory of Change**, which is specific to the intervention, and it should be noted that there will always be issues that cannot be preempted in guidance material. An evaluation can also reconstruct the Theory of Change for an intervention where it is not clearly or formally articulated. **The questions in Table 2.3 provide the starting point for a more profound investigation.** Probing on further details, underlying reasons, alternative scenarios etc., is critical to answering the questions as these qualitative refinements will help evaluators reach the more complex answers.

46. Monitoring reports, interviews with representatives of different groups involved in and affected by the intervention, expert informants, and observation are all sources of information that will allow for triangulation and provide evidence to answer evaluation questions. Where possible, comparisons can be made of information from the intervention area and comparable non-participating areas or national data. In all cases, the evaluator should try to identify disaggregated responses according to different groups of stakeholders. **Disaggregation and inclusion of various stakeholder groups** is a cornerstone of evaluations that are sensitive to HR & GE.

Box 4. What is a Theory of Change?

A Theory of Change is the belief about how change occurs that is embedded in the intervention design and its logical framework. A Theory of Change may be explicit, but often it is not. For example, often Theories of Change may assume that increasing women's income-generating capacity will lead to empowerment - which may or may not be true, or that legal norms ensuring human rights (in a constitution, for example) are sufficient to guarantee their fulfillment. More frequently, Theories of Change focus on one dimension (economic, skills training, infrastructure, for example) which is necessary but not sufficient, while ignoring other key factors (e.g. access to markets, self-confidence or other social and cultural phenomena etc.) A very important role of evaluation is to draw attention to implicit Theories of Change that may derive from social theory or from institutional approaches, and assess their strengths and weaknesses. Often HR & GE are absent in a Theory of Change, or expressed in a way that does not lead to concomitant action. For example, projects or programmes might note that woman-headed households are poorer than others, but include no activities designed to address this inequality. Alternatively, a programme of land reform that pays attention to gender equality might not only enact right to land, but ensure the registration systems includes a category for joint ownership and identifies the gender of the owner, communicate and promote women's right to land ownership and the advantages of joint registration, and provide information about changes in the gendered ownership of land.

Table 2.4. Framing the evaluation questions to assess design and planning, implementation and results

Criteria	Assessing design and planning	Assessing implementation	Assessing results
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Was the intervention formulated according to international norms and agreements on HR and GE (e.g. CEDAW, UDHR, CRPD), and to national and local strategies to advance HR & GE? - Was the intervention formulated according to the needs and interests of all targeted stakeholder groups? How were these needs and interests assessed? - Were HR & GE analyses conducted at the design stage? Did they offer good quality information on the underlying causes of inequality and discrimination to inform the intervention? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Did the activities undertaken operationalize a HR & GE approach? - Did the activities undertaken meet the needs of the various groups of stakeholders, including those who are most likely to have their rights violated? - Did the activities address the underlying causes of inequality and discrimination? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are the intervention results contributing to the realization of international HR and GE norms and agreements (e.g. CEDAW, UDHR, CRPD), as well as to national and local strategies to advance HR & GE? - Do the intervention results respond to the needs of all stakeholders, as identified at the design stage?
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Did the intervention's theory of change incorporate the HR & GE dimensions? - Are HR & GE objectives clearly stated in the results framework, including short, medium and long-term objectives? - Is the responsibility for ensuring adherence to HR & GE objectives well-articulated in the performance monitoring framework and implementation plans? - Does the intervention have specific quantitative and qualitative indicators and baselines to measure progress on HR & GE? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - During implementation, were there systematic and appropriate efforts to include various groups of stakeholders, including those who are most likely to have their rights violated? - Did the intervention implementation maximize efforts to build the capacity of rights holders and duty bearers? - Was monitoring data collected and disaggregated according to relevant criteria (gender, age, ethnicity, location, income etc.)? - Was sufficient information collected on 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What were the main results achieved by the intervention towards the realization of HR & GE? - Do the results validate the HR & GE dimensions of the intervention's theory of change? - To what degree were the results achieved equitably distributed among the targeted stakeholder groups? - Do the intervention results contribute to changing attitudes and behaviors towards HR & GE? - Do the intervention results contribute to

		<p>specific indicators to measure progress on HR & GE?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Was monitoring information adequately shared with stakeholders (duty-bearers, rights-holders, women, men)? - How was monitoring data on HR & GE used to improve the intervention during its implementation? 	<p>reducing the underlying causes of inequality and discrimination?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Did the intervention contribute to the empowerment of rights holders to demand and duty bearers to fulfill HR & GE norms?
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are there sufficient resources (financial, time, people) allocated to integrate HR & GE in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the intervention? - To what extent are HR & GE a priority in the overall intervention budget? - What are the costs of not addressing HR & GE adequately from the design stage? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Were the intervention resources used in an efficient way to address HR & GE in the implementation (e.g. participation of targeted stakeholders, collection of disaggregated data, etc.)? - Were there any constraints (e.g. political, practical, bureaucratic) to addressing HR & GE efficiently during implementation? What level of effort was made to overcome these challenges? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Was the use of intervention resources to address HR & GE in line with the corresponding results achieved? - Would a modest increase in resources to address HR & GE in the intervention have made possible a substantive increase in corresponding results (e.g. a small increase in monitoring budget to collect disaggregated data, instead of general information; allocation of staff time to look at HR & GE aspects of programme activities)?
Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Did the intervention design include an appropriate sustainability and exit strategy (including promoting national/local ownership, use of local capacity, etc.) to support positive changes in HR & GE after the end of the intervention? To what extent were stakeholders involved in the preparation of the strategy? - Did the planning framework build on an existing institutional and organizational 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Were the elements of the intervention exit strategy addressed during implementation? - To what extent were national and local organizations involved in different aspects of the intervention implementation? - Did the intervention activities aim at promoting sustainable changes in attitudes, behaviors and power relations between the different stakeholder groups? - How was monitoring data on HR & GE used to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To what extent do stakeholders have confidence that they will be able to build on the HR & GE changes promoted by the intervention? - To what degree did participating organizations change their policies or practices to improve HR & GE fulfillment (e.g. new services, greater responsiveness, resource re-allocation, improved quality etc.)?

	<p>context that is conducive to the advancement of HR & GE?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If not, did the intervention design address the institutional and organizational challenges to advancing the HR & GE agenda? 	<p>enhance sustainable change on these issues?</p>	
<p>Impact</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Did the intervention envisage any specific impact on HR & GE? Is it clearly articulated in the results framework? - Did the intervention design consider how impact on HR and GE could be assessed at a later stage? - To what extent were the potential unintended impacts on the various stakeholder groups identified during the design stage? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How did the intervention activities relate to the intended long-term results on HR & GE? - Did the intervention monitoring systems capture progress towards long-term results on HR & GE? - Were there any positive or negative unintended effects on HR & GE identified during implementation? How were they addressed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Did the intervention clearly lead to the realization of targeted HR & GE norms for the stakeholders identified? - Were there any unintended results on HR & GE in the intervention? Were they positive or negative and in which ways did they affect the different stakeholders? - Did the intervention activities and results in HR & GE influence the work of other organizations and programmes?

Task 2.4. Working with human rights and gender equality indicators

47. **Indicators** are one of the most critical tools for a good quality evaluation. They describe how the intended results are measured and illustrate the changes that an intervention contributes to. In terms of measuring HR & GE dimensions, they help evaluators assess, for example, whether the intervention has been successful in promoting empowerment at legal, political, economic and social levels. They also help address stakeholder diversity since, through measuring disaggregated indicators, an intervention can obtain information on whether it is affecting different groups of people in the most effective way. By comparing the progress on the indicators with baseline information (the situation at the beginning of the project), it is possible to establish quantitative and qualitative changes over a period of time.

48. Ideally, an intervention should have a set of quantitative and qualitative indicators from the beginning of its implementation, with information regularly collected through monitoring processes. Mixed indicators are important because they provide more complete and diverse information, enhance credibility by offering different perspectives, and improve design by making objectives and results more specific and measurable. As promoting HR & GE is a mandate of all UN agencies, the indicators should always address these areas. However, the reality is that, very often, even if interventions have a set of indicators, it may be that they are not of good quality, are not measured frequently enough, or do not address HR & GE issues at all.

49. An **evaluability assessment** (see Chapter 1) will help the evaluation manager identify whether the intervention has an adequate set of indicators (and information on their progress) to support the assessment of HR & GE during the evaluation process. If the existing indicators are not sufficient to allow for an accurate appraisal, specific indicators could be created during the evaluation planning stage (preparing and revising the ToR) and assessed during the evaluation process.

50. **Formulating HR & GE indicators** requires attention to general issues, such as whether the indicators are SMART. However, it also requires special attention to specific issues, such as being able to measure whether rights and equality are being promoted in a disaggregated manner. Prioritizing which indicators to use depends on several factors, such as the type of information needed, comprehensiveness of the picture provided, costs and efforts to produce the information required and the problem to be addressed. It may seem like a difficult task but the tips in the box 5 can be helpful in the process.

51. A meaningful indicator framework to promote and monitor human rights issues should also be anchored in the normative content of rights, as notably enumerated in the relevant articles of international human rights instruments, as interpreted, inter alia, by the relevant committees in their general comments (for example, the two general comments on gender equality)²¹. It is important to remember that the primary objective of a human rights assessment is to assess how duty-bearers are meeting their obligations - irrespective of whether they are promoting a right or protecting and fulfilling it. Consequently, the adopted framework should be able to reflect the obligation of the duty-holder to respect, protect and fulfill human rights. Finally, it is necessary to recognize and reflect cross-cutting human rights norms and principles (such as non-discrimination and equality,

²¹ General Comment No. 28: Equality of rights between men and women (article 3) : . 29/03/2000. CCPR/C/21/Rev.1/Add.10, General Comment No. 28. (General Comments); and General comment No. 16 (2005) : . 11/08/2005. E/C.12/2005/4. (General Comments), CESCR.

indivisibility, accountability, participation and empowerment) in the choice of indicators, as well as in the process of undertaking an assessment²².

Box 5. Tips for formulating HR & GE indicators

- 1) **Think SMART:** Indicators need to be Specific, Measurable, Accurate, Relevant, and Time bound. For HR & GE indicators, their formulation needs to address these aspects in a very clear manner.
- 2) **Identify suitable indicators:** Look for indicators that give as detailed, accurate and comprehensive a picture of progress as possible, can convincingly demonstrate how an intervention is developing, and that focus on the most critical aspects necessary for the results to be achieved.
- 3) **Clarify concepts:** Do not confuse gender (a cultural construct of what it means to be male and female) and sex (a biological difference between men and women), gender issues and women's issues, etc.
- 4) **Do not treat stakeholders as a uniform group,** especially beneficiaries: Beneficiaries of an intervention have the right to be treated fairly, pertaining to their specific situations and addressed accordingly. Disaggregating indicators and collecting information on different groups (according to gender, race/ethnic group, age, area of residence, disabilities, income level, sexual orientation, HIV/AIDS status, literacy and education level, employment type, political affiliations, religious affiliation, involvement in conflict, etc.), is a powerful ally in this process.
- 5) **Use a mix of qualitative and quantitative indicators** to measure the results of an intervention: A balanced mix is essential to generate more and diverse information, to add credibility to the data and to probe on more profound aspects of the changes demonstrated.
- 6) **Consult stakeholders when formulating and choosing indicators:** They may have additional ideas and the contextual knowledge to identify what information will be most relevant to understand the changes to which the intervention contributes.

52. There are several external sources that provide guidance on how to formulate HR & GE indicators, as a result of the progress made in the last twenty years in international and national statistics, such as gender statistics²³. There is also a reference document on structural, process and outcome indicators for human rights²⁴. They are worth consulting for more detailed guidance and ideas.

53. For the purpose of illustrating how to address HR & GE issues, the boxes provide some **examples of empowerment indicators**. However, indicators are only effective if they are context-specific, and closely related to the issues addressed by the intervention they are intended to serve so these should not be copied as a blueprint. **Annex 1** offers further examples with some illustrative categories of empowerment.

²² Op. cit. 10.

²³ See CIDA “*Guide to Gender-Sensitive Indicators*” (1997). Also see UN “*Report on indicators for promoting and monitoring the implementation of human rights*” and the Universal Human Rights Index, available online at <http://www.universalhumanrightsindex.org/>.

²⁴ Op. cit. 10, pp 9 -10, paragraph 15.

Examples of quantitative empowerment indicators related to HR & GE

- Number of cases related to HR & GE heard in local/national/sub national courts, and their results.
- Proportion of women and men in different stakeholder groups in decision-making positions in local/national/sub national government.
- Employment/unemployment rates of women and men in different stakeholder groups.

Examples of qualitative empowerment indicators related to HR & GE

- Extent to which legal services are available to women and men of different stakeholder groups.
- Changes in access to information about claims and decisions related to human rights violations.
- Extent to which women and men in different stakeholder groups have greater economic autonomy, both in private and public.

Task 2.5. Selecting an evaluation team

54. **Selecting a strong team** to conduct an evaluation that addresses HR & GE is a key step in a successful evaluation process. A good team must have an appropriate mix of skills and perspectives. The team leader is responsible for organizing the work distribution and for making sure that all team members contribute meaningfully. Insofar as possible, the following attributes and capacities should be included in the team:

- Women and men
- Local and/or international evaluators
- Evaluation knowledge and experience (quantitative and qualitative methods)
- Content/sectoral knowledge and experience
- Commitment to gender equality, and knowledge and experience in evaluating gender equality interventions
- Commitment to human rights, and knowledge and experience in evaluating human rights interventions
- Understanding and application of UN mandates on HR & GE
- Experience in and knowledge of participatory approaches and methods
- Research and relational skills, including cultural competence
- Knowledge of regional/country/local context and language

55. In putting together an evaluation team, one important aspect needs to be taken into consideration. It is common to see teams reproducing the same imbalances and patterns that exist in real life. What makes a good evaluation team that addresses HR & GE is not only about the skills and competences that the members collectively hold, but also the dynamics of the interactions between them. Team members must demonstrate their capacity to appreciate and include each other's expertise

and perspectives. The evaluation manager must ensure that appropriate weight is given to the HR & GE dimensions both through the team selection and attention to the dynamics and relations among team members. Working with a multidisciplinary team will most often be the ideal approach to deal with the complexities of evaluating an intervention²⁵.

Box 6. Necessary ethical considerations

Ethical considerations are a critical element of selecting and managing an evaluation team, particularly since all United Nations evaluations must deal with HR & GE issues. UNEG and some UN agencies** have produced strict guidelines on ethics and behaviors for evaluators. These Codes of Conduct must be an integral part of the contract with any consultant undertaking such a task. Some examples of ethical behavior in practice include:

- Treating all informants with respect and sensitivity. This may include having women interview women, respecting the right to speak in local languages, making sure that the use of words and images corresponds to the literacy level of speaker, wearing culturally appropriate clothes, and so on
- Telling all informants why they are seeking information and how it will be used. Ensure anonymity when possible, be honest when it is not. This should be made explicit in every interaction with informants, whether they are supplying factual information, opinions, or perspectives
- Interviewing stakeholders separately when there are differences of power, interest or influence. This may include separating women from men, rights-holders from duty-bearers, programme staff from beneficiaries, superiors from subordinates, and any other grouping where there may be differing information or where one party has power over another by virtue of their position. Be aware that doing this may require prior approval or negotiation.

* See UNEG (2008), *UNEG Code of Conduct*.

** See WHO (2001), *Putting Women First: Ethical and Safety Recommendations for Research on Domestic Violence Against Women*.

²⁵ There are a number of rosters of evaluation professionals that can be useful when searching for qualified evaluators. UNEG members have access to the online UNEG roster of evaluation consultants through the UNEG website.

Chapter 3: Implementing the evaluation

56. This Chapter highlights the importance of using appropriate methods for an evaluation to ensure that the HR & GE dimensions of the intervention will be identified and analyzed during the evaluation process. It also outlines the process of writing the evaluation report.

Task 3.1. Selecting the appropriate evaluation methodology

57. The evaluation manager must ensure that fieldwork meets standards of evaluation methods for gathering evidence to support findings and recommendations on the intervention's contribution to HR & GE. Irrespective of the size of the intervention, an evaluation design which applies a **mixed-method approach** will usually be the most appropriate to generate an accurate and comprehensive picture of how HR & GE are integrated into an intervention.

58. Defining the evaluation methodology is the first part of implementing a successful evaluation process. There are a number of external references mentioned throughout this Handbook that describe tools and methodologies for addressing HR & GE²⁶. In addition to being robust and generating reliable data, the tools selected should maximize the participation of stakeholders identified in the stakeholder analysis, allowing for active, free, meaningful participation by all. **Table 3.1** offers some guidance on how to select adequate tools.

59. Mixing qualitative and quantitative approaches, while ensuring the inclusion of different stakeholders (including the most vulnerable), will offer a wide variety of perspectives and a more reliable picture of reality. This, however, does not mean that large quantitative studies cannot benefit from HR & GE analysis. On the contrary, every evaluation has the potential to assess these areas, provided that appropriate questions are asked, the right data needs are identified and sensitive tools are used.

60. Many evaluations will face a **data challenge** with respect to HR & GE from the onset. For example, the intervention may not have adequate results framework with clear and specific indicators addressing HR & GE, information may not have been collected on a regular basis, or the quality of information may not be sufficient, good or reliable enough to inform a credible evaluation. Addressing data challenges is a key issue in the evaluation process. Possible approaches to address these issues are presented in **Chapter 1** on **evaluability assessment**. It is important to acknowledge

Box 7. Child's Play: Identifying an appropriate evaluation method from a stakeholder analysis

A UNV funded team working on an evaluation of a youth volunteer scheme in Liberia identified, through a stakeholder analysis, that young school children were one of the most important groups supported by the young volunteers. Some of the local schools agreed to give the team some time to speak to children as a large group.

The evaluators developed a creative "stand up for yes"/ "sit down for no" exercise to ask the children questions and have them discuss their views on the volunteers and volunteerism. Each question was then followed by some probing, with additional questions on why, how, etc. to both the sitting and standing children. Many of the children volunteered to speak and explain their answers.

The exercise was light and fun, yet allowed the team to obtain valuable information from an important and traditionally forgotten stakeholder group in an appropriate and sensitive way.

²⁶ The UNEG Guidance Document, under formulation, will contain information about and reference to methods like participatory techniques, participatory rapid appraisal (PRA), appreciative inquiry, etc. that can provide a useful overview for evaluation managers wishing to assure the use of robust methods to ensure all relevant perspectives are included.

that there has been significant progress in the quality of disaggregated data produced by national and international statistics institutes. When these important resources are available, evaluators should take advantage of them.

Table 3.1. Key elements of an appropriate evaluation methodology to address human rights and gender equality
Selecting the appropriate evaluation methodology
<p>Mixed-methods: An appropriate mix of qualitative and quantitative methods is used to gather and analyze data, in order to offer diverse perspectives to the evaluation, and to promote participation of different groups of stakeholders. Common evaluation tools that can be used in a mixed-method approach include (but are not limited to) desk reviews, interviews, focus groups, surveys, etc. (Task 3.2. explains how to collect and analyze HR & GE using these tools).</p>
<p>Stakeholder participation: The full range of stakeholder groups are interviewed to avoid biases including gender bias, distance bias (favoring the more accessible), class bias, power bias (are interviewees able to speak freely because privacy and confidentiality concerns have been addressed?). In addition, the choice of field sites to be visited should have an explicit rationale (differing conditions, random selection, etc.).</p>
<p>Inclusion of the most vulnerable: Identify and include those most likely to have their rights violated in the data gathering and analysis process. Explore alternatives to address the participation barriers these groups may face.</p>
<p>Adequate resources: Funds, time and human capacity within the evaluation are specifically allocated for stakeholder consultation and HR & GE data gathering.</p>
<p>Adequate sample: If the amount of information reviewed/data collected is too limited, the findings may be questioned. If budget concerns or time constraints limit the number of respondents, or if the number in some categories is very small (for example, only a few people can spare the time to speak with evaluators) the findings need to be validated by a larger group, or through triangulation. The sampling strategy also needs to address the inclusion of women and men in diverse stakeholder groups.</p>
<p>Data disaggregation: Data gathering instruments and methods are developed such that HR & GE related data can be disaggregated.</p>
<p>Triangulation: Wherever possible, data should come from more than one source. For example, if rights-holders report increased success in negotiating their needs or representing their interests, this may be confirmed through records of decisions, or asking duty-bearers if they have noticed any changes in the negotiation process with rights-holders. If women report increased income, they can be asked how they have used the income, and this may be confirmed by observation.</p>
<p>Taking advantage of existing data sets: Evaluators can make good use of existing national or international data sets (on employment, income, vulnerability, disease, mortality, human rights violations, etc.) to compare and confirm or refute programme findings. It may be useful and efficient to test findings with a diverse panel of experts, who can corroborate or suggest other interpretations. This may be particularly useful for smaller evaluations where field work is limited.</p>
<p>Validation of findings: When evaluators have gathered their information and prepared tentative findings, it is good practice to validate these findings through workshops with different groups, to increase their accuracy and reliability. The design may include report-backs of key findings to segregated or mixed groups of beneficiaries, to programme implementers, and to external experts. The information can be presented for validation, for deepening the analysis, and for eliciting potential conclusions and recommendations.</p>

Task 3.2. Collecting and analysing data

61. As previously explained, a number of tools/ methods are available to evaluators, which can be used in a mixed-method approach. Different tools can be used for different purposes including to address specific questions, to obtain data on certain indicators and to include particular stakeholder groups.

62. During the **data collection and analysis** stage, the most common tools in evaluation should be particularly tailored to assess the HR & GE dimensions. Table 3.2 indicates how this can be done.

63. **There are multiple dimensions to analyzing data** to address HR & GE issues in an intervention. First, it is important to guarantee that data produced and offered by various groups of stakeholders, including the most vulnerable, is treated with respect and valued equally. This does not necessarily mean treating them the same. Rather, it means recognizing the differences, but not underestimating the value of the information coming from anyone. Second, it requires understanding the context of the HR & GE issues that apply to these stakeholders, and using this understanding to inform the interpretations of their opinions. For this purpose, drawing from existing HR & GE analytical frameworks is particularly useful²⁷. Finally, it involves paying special attention to data and information that specifically refer to HR & GE issues in the intervention, and making the best possible use of these in the overall assessment of the intervention.

²⁷ Gender analysis frameworks are methods of research and planning for assessing and promoting gender equality issues in institutions. Information on these frameworks can be found at: <http://nzaidtools.nzaid.govt.nz/?q=gender-analysis/annex-2-common-gender-analysis-frameworks>

Table 3.2. Tailoring common methods to address human rights and gender equality

Method	How to address human rights and gender equality using the method
<p>Desk review:</p> <p>A desk review consists of a review of literature in the area of the intervention, as well as documents related to the intervention being evaluated (e.g. programme formulation document, activity reports, monitoring reports, databases, communication material produced by the intervention, etc.)</p>	<p>Look for specific information on HR & GE, such as: i) evidence of a HR & GE analysis at the design stage; ii) evidence of a detailed and inclusive stakeholder analysis, including the most vulnerable groups; iii) evidence of quality engagement and participation of stakeholders in the various steps of implementation; iv) information on various stakeholder groups collected in monitoring and reporting; v) evidence of how HR & GE were addressed by the intervention, and the results achieved in the area.</p> <p>Look for literature on how HR & GE relate to the area of the intervention being evaluated, including academic literature on the issue being studied.</p> <p>Look at organizational policies, international and regional conventions, general comments and recommendations, agreements, etc. on human rights and gender equality.</p> <p>Look for data on how HR & GE manifest in the particular context (country, region, community, etc.) of the intervention.</p> <p>Look for literature produced by programme partners and other organizations that may inform the assessment of HR & GE in the intervention.</p>
<p>Focus groups:</p> <p>Focus groups are small groups constituted to discuss specific issues or questions. Focus groups are, in general, organized according to interests, characteristics of the participants, etc., and discussions must be facilitated by one person (usually the evaluator, but not necessarily).</p>	<p>Pay special attention to the constitution of groups, as it will have a significant influence on the extent to which participants feel safe to participate and communicate their ideas. Seek disaggregation by gender, age, social position, income, sexual orientation, category (rights holders/ duty bearers), disability, etc. Refer to the stakeholder analysis in the beginning of the evaluation process to make decisions.</p> <p>Make sure that the most vulnerable are represented. Think about practical issues that may enhance or undermine participation including time, place, accessibility of the areas where the focus group will gather.</p> <p>Make sure that questions directed to the focus groups include an assessment of their views on HR & GE.</p> <p>Facilitate sensitively: before starting the focus group, seek information to help understand the context, the relationships between individuals and groups, the power dynamics, and how the different individuals and groups in the focus group are affected by HR & GE issues. During facilitation, use this knowledge to guarantee an adequate interaction between participants.</p> <p>Use the information gathered previously to inform the analysis of the focus group discussion.</p>

<p>Interviews:</p> <p>Consists of individual interactions with selected people, in person or by other means (telephone, e-mail, etc.). Interviews usually offer an opportunity to ask more profound questions, and to refine the qualitative data obtained during the evaluation process. They are also an opportunity for people to speak more freely.</p>	<p>Make sure that the sample selected for individual interviews adequately reflects the diversity of stakeholders of the intervention. Pay special attention to the inclusion of the most vulnerable stakeholders, who may have been forgotten or left out of discussions and decision-making in the intervention. Refer to the stakeholder analysis in the beginning of the evaluation process to make decisions.</p> <p>Consider language and translation needs.</p> <p>Make sure to ask specific follow-up questions on HR & GE during the individual interviews.</p> <p>Make sure to understand how each interviewee is affected by HR & GE issues.</p> <p>Interviewees should be guaranteed that they will not be negatively affected by providing their honest views on HR & GE issues.</p> <p>Respect confidentiality. Ask for permission to quote their words. In some cases, words or sentences may identify the person, even if their name is not in the report. In these cases, be honest about the confidentiality challenge and only quote interviewees if they agree with it.</p> <p>Make sure that an adequate understanding of the context, relationships, power, etc. informs the analysis of data collected in interviews.</p>
<p>Surveys:</p> <p>Surveys are implemented through the application of questionnaires (in person or electronically) and are the most common tool to obtain information from a large number of people in an evaluation.</p>	<p>Make sure that the sample selected to respond to the survey reflects the diversity of stakeholders in the intervention, including women and men. Include the most vulnerable groups. Refer to the stakeholder analysis in the beginning of the evaluation process to make decisions.</p> <p>Pay particular attention to the format and language of the survey. Consider alternatives to address respondents who are illiterate or have low education levels, and make sure that all are able to understand the questions.</p> <p>Create different questionnaires for different stakeholder groups. While you want to ensure that at least some of the questions are comparable in content (to inform the subsequent data analysis), it is also important to address the specific issues and interests of the various stakeholder groups. As indicated above, language and format will also need to be adaptable.</p> <p>Make sure that the survey includes specific HR & GE questions.</p> <p>Make sure that you are aware of bias when analyzing the data. This is particularly important in this large-scale tool, and it is essential to understand who responded, how the different stakeholder groups are represented in the respondents, who didn't respond and why.</p>

Task 3.3. Preparing the evaluation report and alternative forms of reporting

64. After the data collection process, evaluators will analyse the data and prepare the evaluation report.

65. It is good practice to discuss evaluation findings with stakeholders before the preparation of the report. It is an opportunity to explain how their contributions were used, and to provide them with the chance to correct any inaccuracies and clarify doubts. This can be done in the form of a **final workshop**, and the selection of participants should refer back to the stakeholder analysis, including special attention to the most vulnerable groups, who can normally be left out of discussions due to multiple kinds of constraints. To adequately respond to HR & GE, the workshop needs to follow the lines ideally already adopted in the evaluation process: being as inclusive as possible, and creating the adequate space for reflection and active, free and meaningful participation.

66. A good **evaluation report** will need to make sure that the information provided by participants during the evaluation process, including the final workshop, is duly captured with balanced perspectives and fair representation of different points of view. Findings and recommendations need to be formulated in detail, identifying to whom the recommendations are addressed and proposing concrete action points. The evaluation report is the most important resource for the evaluator to reassert the importance of adequately addressing HR & GE. **Table 3.3** presents some guidance on how to formulate an evaluation report that adequately addresses HR & GE.

67. A traditional evaluation report may not be sufficient to inform all audiences of an evaluation. At this stage of the process, the stakeholder analysis will have informed the evaluation team who the different audiences are and their particular needs. For example, there may be illiterate groups, or stakeholders who do not speak the official language of the evaluation. Understanding these differences and needs is key to including these stakeholders in the process of understanding the evaluation findings, learning with them and supporting the implementation of the recommendations. The evaluation team/manager can devise forms of evaluation reporting that make use of alternative ways of depicting information through for example imagery, theater, poetry, music, etc.

Table 3.3: Preparing the evaluation report	
Key elements of an effective evaluation report	
Coverage of HR & GE information:	The report should correspond with the requirements in the ToR for information and findings on HR & GE. Are the conclusions adequately supported by the findings?
Stakeholder participation:	The report should acknowledge how inclusive stakeholder participation was ensured during the evaluation process.
Recommendations on HR and/or GE:	Do the conclusions warrant recommendations, and are they appropriately targeted and specific, and likely to lead to appropriate action? If not, can they be made more relevant? Will it be possible to follow up on the recommendation to see if it has been implemented?
Challenges:	Challenges to obtaining HR & GE information or to addressing the issues appropriately should be included. Indicate the implications of not having data available, if this is the case: if data were available, what would have been different in the evaluation? What would have been the gains in the process?
Lessons:	Include lessons on HR & GE, both related to the intervention itself, and also on how to integrate these dimensions into the evaluation process.

Task 3.4. Disseminating the evaluation and preparing a Management Response

68. Once the evaluation has been completed, the evaluation manager is bound by his/her organization's policies on dissemination. However, they may wish to promote the fullest possible use of the HR & GE dimensions of the evaluation within the UN systems and among colleagues. Methods and elements of a good dissemination plan include:

- **Providing barrier-free access to the evaluation products:** Is the language and format of the report accessible to all potential users? Is it easy to find and disseminate?
- **Identifying the direct users of the evaluation:** Refer back to the stakeholder analysis to assess to whom the evaluation should be disseminated. How should they be engaged and how can they contribute to dissemination? How can direct users take advantage of their own channels to disseminate the evaluation?
- **Identifying indirect users of the evaluation:** There may be other groups who would be interested in the findings and conclusions of this evaluation, such as evaluation networks, gender focal points, human rights bodies, civil society organizations that can use the lessons and data identified. This may mean national, regional, or global users. Can the evaluation manager use his/her networks to inform these groups about the evaluation, or publicize the evaluation on an organizational website or agree to links on other websites?
- **Developing good practices and lessons learned:** Since the systematic inclusion of HR & GE in UN evaluations is a recent emphasis, especially for work that is not specifically targeting HR & GE, it could be useful to compare experiences in this area with evaluation colleagues in the UN system. Evaluation offices can create opportunities for their staff's professional development and for ensuring good practice by sharing examples of how HR & GE dimensions have been applied in evaluations and the resulting lessons learned.

69. The UNEG Norms and Standards recommend preparing a management response to all evaluations. A management response addresses recommendations, identifying who is responsible for their implementation and what are the action points and deadlines. Management responses are a practical means to enhance the use of the evaluation findings and conclusions to improve action. They "force" evaluators to be clear and straightforward in their recommendations. In the spirit of participation, stakeholders should also participate in the decisions on how to respond to the evaluation, and agree on clear roles and responsibilities. All agreed responses should take into consideration the possible effects on HR & GE.

Annex 1. Summary checklist for a human rights and gender equality evaluation process

Checklist for evaluation managers to assess whether all necessary steps to integrate HR & GE in the evaluation process have been duly followed.

Checklist for integrating the human rights and gender equality dimensions into the evaluation process	
Evaluability assessment pg. 16 - 20	Was an assessment to determine the evaluability level of HR & GE in the intervention performed?
	How will HR & GE evaluability challenges be addressed during the evaluation, based on the results of the evaluability assessment?
Stakeholder Analysis pg. 21 - 24	Was a HR & GE stakeholder analysis performed?
	Was a diverse group of stakeholders identified from the stakeholder analysis, including women and men, as well as those who are most affected by rights violations and groups who are not directly involved in the intervention?
	How will the evaluation team reach out to stakeholders to be engaged in the evaluation?
Criteria pg. 25-28	Were evaluation criteria defined which specifically address HR & GE?
	Were additional criteria specific to the context of the intervention to be evaluated identified?
Questions pg. 29 - 32	Were evaluation questions that specifically address HR & GE framed?
Indicators pg. 33-34	Are there indicators already defined by the intervention with available disaggregated data?
	Were additional indicators identified for the evaluation of the intervention, specifically addressing HR & GE?
	Were plans made on how to collect data to inform the additional indicators?
Team pg. 35-36	Was an evaluation team with knowledge of and commitment to HR & GE selected?
	Is the evaluation team diverse, in terms of gender, types of expertise, age, geographical origin, etc.?
	Is the team ethically responsible and balanced with equitable power relations, in line with the concepts of HR & GE?

Methodology pg. 37-38	Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed methods approach, appropriate to addressing HR & GE?
	Does the evaluation methodology favour stakeholders' right to participation, including those most vulnerable?
	Does the evaluation methodology favour triangulation of the information obtained?
Collecting and analyzing data pg. 39-41	Were all stakeholder groups identified in the stakeholder analysis consulted during the evaluation?
	Were all stakeholder groups consulted at the end of the data collection stage to discuss findings and hear their views on the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation?
Report and reporting pg. 42-42	Does the evaluation report address HR & GE issues, including in the recommendations section?
	How will the recommendations in the report affect the different stakeholders of the programme?
	Are there plans to disseminate the evaluation report to a wide group, in particular stakeholder groups who have an interest in and/or are affected by HR & GE issues?
	Was a management response prepared which considers the HR & GE issues raised in the report?
	Did the preparation of the management response and discussion of action points involve a diverse group of stakeholders, including those who have an interest in and/or are affected by HR & GE?

Annex 2. Examples of human rights and gender equality empowerment indicators

Quantitative	Qualitative
Legal empowerment	
<p>Number of cases related to HR & GE heard in local/national/sub national courts, and their results.</p> <p>Number of cases related to the legal rights of divorced and widowed women heard in local/national/sub national courts, and the results.</p> <p>Rate at which the number of women and men of different stakeholder groups in the local/ national/ sub national police force, by rank, is increasing or decreasing.</p> <p>Rates of violence against women and men in different stakeholder groups.</p> <p>Rate at which the number of local/ national/ sub-national justices/prosecutors/lawyers who are women or men of different stakeholder groups is increasing/ decreasing.</p>	<p>Availability of legal services and justice to women and men in different stakeholder groups.</p> <p>Enforcement of legislation related to the protection of human rights of women and men in different stakeholder groups.</p> <p>Changes in access to information about claims and decisions related to human rights violations towards women and men in different stakeholder groups.</p> <p>Change in rights-holders' ability to claim rights, and how/ in which areas</p> <p>Change in responsiveness to claims related to human rights violations towards women and men in different stakeholder groups (timeliness, rights-holder satisfaction).</p> <p>Effect of the enforcement of legislation in terms of treatment of offenders against women and children or other human rights violations.</p>
Political empowerment	
<p>Proportion of seats held by women and men in different stakeholder groups in local/ national/ sub national councils/ decision-making bodies.</p> <p>Proportion of women and men in different stakeholder groups in decision-making positions in local/ national/ sub national government.</p> <p>Proportion of women and men in different stakeholder groups in the local/ national/ sub national civil service.</p> <p>Proportion of women and men in different stakeholder groups in decision-making positions within unions.</p> <p>Percentage of eligible women and men in different stakeholder groups who vote.</p>	<p>Perceptions as to the degree that different groups (women/men, class, urban/remote ethnicity etc.) are aware of local politics, and their legal rights.</p> <p>Types of positions held by women and men in different stakeholder groups in local/ national/ sub national governments.</p> <p>Types of positions held by women and men of different stakeholder groups in local/ national/ sub national councils/ decision-making bodies.</p> <p>Knowledge about human rights obligations among women and men duty-bearers at various levels.</p> <p>Knowledge about human rights among women and men rights-holders of various types.</p>
<p>Proportion of women and men in different stakeholder groups registered as voters</p> <p>Proportion of union members who are women and men of different stakeholder groups.</p>	

Quantitative	Qualitative
<p>Proportion of women and men of different stakeholder groups who participate in public protests and political campaigning, as compared to their representation in the population.</p>	
Economic empowerment	
<p>Employment/ unemployment rates of women and men in different stakeholder groups.</p> <p>Changes in time-use in selected activities, particularly greater sharing by household members of unpaid housework and child-care.</p> <p>Salary/ wage differentials between women and men in different stakeholder groups.</p> <p>Changes in ratio of property owned and controlled by women and men (land, houses, livestock), across different categories of stakeholders (e.g. socio-economic and ethnic groups).</p> <p>Average household expenditure of female/male/child (orphans, child soldiers, etc.) headed households on education/health.</p> <p>Percentage of available credit, financial and technical support services going to women, men and children of different stakeholder groups from government/ non-government sources.</p>	<p>Ability to make small or large purchases independently.</p> <p>Extent to which women and men of different stakeholder groups have greater economic autonomy, both in public and private spheres.</p>
Social Empowerment	
<p>Number of women and men of different stakeholder groups participating in local/ national/ sub national institutions (e.g. women's associations, consciousness raising or income generating groups, religious organizations, ethnic and kinship associations) relative to project area population.</p> <p>Number of women and men in different stakeholder groups in positions of power in local/ national/ sub national institutions.</p>	<p>Extent to which women and men of different stakeholders groups have access to networks or negotiation spaces to realize human rights or resolve conflict.</p> <p>Extent of training or networking among women and men of different stakeholder groups, compared.</p>
<p>Control of women and men of different stakeholder groups over fertility decisions (e.g. number of children, number of abortions).</p>	<p>Mobility of women and men in different stakeholder groups within and outside their residential locality.</p> <p>Self-perceptions of changed confidence or capacity in women and men of disadvantaged or marginalized groups.</p>

Bibliography

- Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) (1997), *Guide Towards Gender Sensitive Indicators*, CIDA, Canada. Available at: [http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/inet/images.nsf/vLUIImages/Policy/\\$file/WID-GUID-E.pdf](http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/inet/images.nsf/vLUIImages/Policy/$file/WID-GUID-E.pdf)
- Gostin, L. and J. M. Mann (1994), “Towards the Development of a Human Rights Impact Assessment for the Formulation and Evaluation of Public Health Policies”, *Health and Human Rights*, No. 1 pp. 58-80.
- International Development Research Centre (IDRC) (2008), “Outcome Mapping: International Development Research Centre,” http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-26586-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html.
- Meléndez, A.F (2007), “Indicadores de Género, Mitos y Leyendas”, *Série Metodologías 4*. Santiago de Chile: Inclusión y Equidad Consultora.
- Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (1991), *Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance*, Development Assistance Committee (DAC) OECD, Paris. Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/31/12/2755284.pdf>.
- OECD (2000), *Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management (RBM)*, DAC-OECD, Paris. Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/29/21/2754804.pdf>.
- OECD (2005), *The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and Accra Agenda for Action*, DAC-OECD, Paris. Available at: http://www.oecd.org/document/18/0,2340,en_2649_3236398_35401554_1_1_1_1,00.html.
- Patton, M.Q (2008), *Utilization-Focused Evaluation*. 4th ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, California.
- Theis, J. (2004), “*Promoting Rights-Based Approaches: Experiences and Ideas from Asia and the Pacific*”, Save the Children Sweden, Keen Publishing, Thailand. Available at: <http://www.gsdr.org/go/display/document/legacyid/1587>.
- United Nations (UN) (2008), *Report on Indicators for Promoting and Monitoring the Implementation of Human Rights (Summary)*, UN, Geneva. Available at: http://www2.ohchr.org/english/issues/indicators/docs/HRI.MC.2008.3_en.pdf.
- UN (2002), *Summary of Action 2*, UN, New York. Available at: <http://www.un.org/events/action2/summary.html>.
- UN (1997), Report of the UN Economic and Social Council: “*Mainstreaming the gender perspective into all policies and programmes in the UN system*”. Available at: <http://www.un.org/documents/ecosoc/docs/1997/e1997-66.htm>.
- UN (1979), “*UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women*”, UN, New York. Available at: <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/cedaw/text/econvention.htm>.

- UN (1948), *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, UN, New York. Available at: <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/UDHR/Pages/Language.aspx?LangID=eng>.
- United Nations Development Group (UNDG) (2009), *Delivering as One on Human Rights: A proposal to institutionalize human rights mainstreaming in the UNDG* (Concept Note). Available at: <http://www.undg.org/index.cfm?P=1452>.
- United Nations Development Programme (2009), *UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results*, UNDP, New York. Available at: <http://www.undp.org/eo/handbook>.
- UNDP (2003), *Report of the Second Interagency Workshop on Implementing a Human Rights-based Approach in the Context of UN Reform*, UNDP, New York. Available at: http://www.undg.org/archive_docs/4128-Human_Rights_Workshop_Stamford_Final_Report.doc
- United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) (2008), *UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System*, UNEG, New York. Available at: <http://www.unevaluation.org/uneqcodeofconduct>
- UNEG (2005), *UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System*, UNEG, New York. Available at: www.unevaluation.org/uneqnorms.
- UNEG (2005), *UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System*, UNEG, New York. Available at: www.unevaluation.org/uneqstandards.
- United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women) (2010), *A Manager's Guide to Human Rights and Gender Responsive Evaluation*, UN Women, New York. Available at: http://unifem.org/evaluation_manual/.
- World Health Organisation (WHO) (2001), *Putting Women First: Ethical and Safety Recommendations for Research on Domestic Violence Against Women*, WHO, Geneva. Available at: <http://www.who.int/gender/violence/womenfirtseng.pdf>

Feedback form for the UNEG Handbook on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation - Towards UNEG Guidance

Your feedback is very important to us. Whether you have used the Handbook in an evaluation or review, or even if you didn't apply it in practice, we would be grateful if you could please complete the following. Your comments will assist us to continuously improve the Handbook and will be kept confidential.

Please return completed forms to: uneg-hrge-handbook@list.unevaluation.org. An online version of this feedback form is also available at: <http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/uneghrgehandbookfeedback>.

Use of the Handbook

Please indicate the type of evaluation for which you used the Handbook (check each applicable):

Institutional <input type="checkbox"/>	Joint <input type="checkbox"/>	Meta <input type="checkbox"/>	Programme/ project <input type="checkbox"/>	Strategic <input type="checkbox"/>	Thematic <input type="checkbox"/>	Other <input type="checkbox"/>
Specify other:	Click here to enter text.					

Please indicate the type of context:

Development <input type="checkbox"/>	Humanitarian <input type="checkbox"/>	Other <input type="checkbox"/>
Specify other:	Click here to enter text.	

Please indicate the context of the intervention:

Mainly gender equality <input type="checkbox"/>	Mainly human rights <input type="checkbox"/>	Not specifically gender equality or human rights <input type="checkbox"/>
--	---	--

Format and content of the Handbook

Please give us your opinion on the general quality of the Handbook. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Please check the responses that best express your views and give examples to help us strengthen the Handbook.

	N/A	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
The language in this publication is easy to understand:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Do you have any suggestions for improvements?					
Click here to enter text.					

	N/A	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
The format and design of the Handbook are adequate:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Do you have any suggestions for improvements?					
Click here to enter text.					

	N/A	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
The guidance provided is easy to follow:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Do you have any suggestions for improvements?					
Click here to enter text.					

	N/A	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
The different stages of the evaluation process are adequately explained:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Additional comments: Click here to enter text.					

Which topics need more explanation? Which topics are explained in too much detail?
Click here to enter text.

What did you find most/ least useful in the Handbook? Why?
Click here to enter text.

Chapter feedback

Please rate the different chapters of the Handbook and, if necessary, provide comments to improve them.

	N/A	Not at all useful	Of limited use	Useful	Very useful
Chapter 1: Preparing for an evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
What was most/ least useful in this Chapter? Why? How can we improve it?					

Click here to enter text.

	N/A	Not at all useful	Of limited use	Useful	Very useful
Chapter 2: Preparing the evaluation TOR	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
What was most/ least useful in this Chapter? Why? How can we improve it?					
Click here to enter text.					

	N/A	Not at all useful	Of limited use	Useful	Very useful
Chapter 3: Implementing the evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
What was most/ least useful in this Chapter? Why? How can we improve it?					
Click here to enter text.					

	N/A	Not at all useful	Of limited use	Useful	Very useful
Annex 1: Summary of Content: Checklist for the evaluation process	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
What was the Checklist useful? Why? How can we improve it?					
Click here to enter text.					

	N/A	Not at all useful	Of limited use	Useful	Very useful
Annex 2: Examples of HR&GE indicators	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Were these examples useful? Why? How can we improve them?					
Click here to enter text.					

	N/A	Not at all useful	Of limited use	Useful	Very useful
Links/ references provided	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Please specify:	Click here to enter text.				

Future use of the Handbook

	N/A	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
I intend to use the Handbook in the future	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Additional comments:	Click here to enter text.				

	N/A	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
Future evaluations undertaken by my organisation will be done differently as a result of what we have learned from this Handbook	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Additional comments:	Click here to enter text.				

	N/A	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
I would recommend this Handbook to others	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Please specify to whom (Country/ Regional Office, other UN agencies, non-UN partners etc.)					
Click here to enter text.					

Do you have any additional comments to help us improve the Handbook?

Are there any major gaps or omissions, additional areas that should be included, examples of successes and challenges from your practice that could be used to illustrate the guidance in practice etc.?

Click here to enter text.

	Colleague	UNEG website	Evaluation Network	Internet search	Other
How did you hear of the Handbook?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Please specify:	Click here to enter text.				

Please send us your personal details (**optional**):

Name:	Click here to enter text.
Organisation:	Click here to enter text.
Position:	Click here to enter text.
Country:	Click here to enter text.
Email Address:	Click here to enter text.
Phone Number:	Click here to enter text.

Can we contact you for any clarification or follow up?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
If yes, please indicate your preferred means of communication	Click here to enter text.	



UNEG
United Nations Evaluation Group