

# INTEGRATION OF GENDER EQUALITY IN EVALUATIONS

Presentation to CES

April 2015



*Meta-evaluation*





## *Gender Equality at CIDA (now DFATD)*

- 1976 – First policy guidelines on Women in Development (WID)
- 1984 – WID Policy and creation of a WID Directorate
- 1993 – Evaluation of 1984 WID Policy (updated 1995)
- 1999 – Gender Equality (GE) Policy
  - Policy calls for the integration of GE as a cross-cutting theme throughout CIDA initiatives
- 2008 – Evaluation of 1999 Policy
- 2010 – Gender Equality Action Plan (2010-2013)



## *Rationale and Specific Objectives*

- 2008 evaluation noted an increasing trend to include GE in evaluations.
- Stronger methodological approach and analysis required to assess GE integration in evaluations.
- Evaluation Directorate mandated to “increase feedback from project and program evaluations on gender equality results.”
- 2014 Meta-evaluation: assess relevance, quality of information and level of GE integration in program-led evaluations to improve reporting on GE performance



## ***Meta-evaluation: Literature Review of Gender Equality Issues in Evaluation - Themes***

- a) evaluating institutional gender equality strategies and policies (assessing 'gender mainstreaming')
- b) "feminist evaluation"
- c) evaluating initiatives that target gender equality and/or women's empowerment
- d) how evaluations can/should take up/integrate gender equality dimensions



## *Meta-evaluation: Approach*

- Review of a sample of evaluation ToR, work plans and reports (2010 -2012)
- Staff interviews and survey of local advisors
- Grids developed to assess attention to GE in each document
- 4-level scale used to assess GE integration in relevant sections of each document





# Example: Grid to Review Work Plans

Section reviewed	Rating (0-3)
Development context	
Description of intervention	
Evaluability Assessment	
Analysis of the logic of the intervention	
Methodology	
Resources allocated	
Design matrix (if included)	

## Rating Scale:

- 0: *no mention of GE issues*
- 1: *brief/superficial mention of GE issues*
- 2: *some elaboration or discussion of GE issues*
- 3: *robust discussion of GE issues*



## *Selected Findings*

- In general, evaluation documents have an unsatisfactory level of GE analysis and integration
- ToR: none of the sections received a satisfactory rating
- Work plans: overall rating unsatisfactory
- Report: rating of the “findings” section on average satisfactory – but rarely picked-up in conclusions and/or recommendations
- Lessons: only 5 out of 18 final reports had lessons pertaining to GE





## *Selected Findings (cont'd)*

- Stakeholder perceptions of factors having an impact on GE integration:
  - Experience and capacity of evaluators
  - Consideration of GE in ToR and in data collection
  - Attention to GE in project/program planning
  - Lack of understanding of GE on the part of partners and/or DFATD staff





## *Selected Recommendations*

- Continue to invest in capacity building, accountability and engagement on GE
- Improve quality of GE integration in project/program design to increase the quality of reporting on GE performance
- Ensure evaluation training courses contain specific information on GE and GE courses include evaluation issues and methodologies



## *Steps Taken*

- Updated tools to help staff, local advisors and evaluators improve GE analysis and integration in program-led evaluations and reporting on GE performance
  - Templates with standards (TORs, work plans, reports)
- Updated guidance for Programs in revised Annual Project Planning process, including attention to GE in program/project planning and design
- Work planned with the Continuous Learning Center to strengthen GE content in evaluation courses and evaluation content in GE courses



# Questions?

