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Background

- UN SWAP and the Evaluation Performance Indicator
- Evaluation Performance Indicator Technical Note and Scorecard developed by UNEG HR and GETF
- UNEG 2013 AGM Endorsement for piloting
- UNEG 2014 AGM decision on review
- Role of UN Evaluation Offices SWAP Focal Points in reporting
UN SWAP Evaluation Indicator Overview

Evaluation PI measures to what extent UN agencies meet UNEG gender related norms and standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Evaluation Performance Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5a. Performance indicator is not relevant to a UN entity

5b. None of the UNEG gender-related norms and standards are met

5c. Meets some of the UNEG gender-related norms and standards

5d. Meets the UNEG gender-related norms and standards

5ei. Meets the UNEG gender-related norms and standards and

demonstrates effective use of the UNEG guidance on evaluating from a human rights and gender equality perspective
Evaluation Performance Indicator
2014 Global Results

Not applicable: 27.4
Missing requirements: 11.3
Approach requirements: 29.0
Meet requirements: 29.0
Exceed requirements: 3.2
## 2014 Evaluation Indicator Reporting Results (frequencies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
<th>Missing requirements</th>
<th>Approach requirements</th>
<th>Meet requirements</th>
<th>Exceed requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secretariat Departments</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds and Programmes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Entities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entities with Technical Focus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Institutes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback from entities after 2014 piloting of Technical Note and Scorecard

• Most entities did still not use the scorecard for reporting; some reports based on self-perception

• The application of scorecard was often found overambitious

• Complexity of the scorecard rating system

• Not all the entities that used the scorecard were able to apply all 13 scoring criteria

• Time frame for reporting
Review process

• 2014 UNEG AGM
• Task force under SO3: FAO, GEF, UNCDF, UNCTAD, UNDP, UNECE, UNFPA, UNICEF, WFP, WIPO and WMO.
• Review and analysis of 2014 reporting results and global survey
• Updated Technical Note and Scorecard
• UNEG Heads endorsement
• Use of the reviewed scorecard for SWAP 2015 reporting cycle
Update version of Technical Note and Scorecard

New Reporting Tool

- From 3 Headings to one heading: evaluation report as unit of analysis
- From 13 Scoring Criteria to 4 Scoring Criteria
- Simplified rating system
- References to the new HR&GE
Elements that will remain

- Number of evaluation to be included in the meta evaluation
- Both corporate and decentralized evaluations
- Mix of evaluation types
- Widespread geographic coverage
- Interventions where GEEW is primary focus and interventions where it is not
4 Scoring Criteria

- **GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis and Evaluation Indicators are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.**

- **GEEW is integrated in Evaluation Criteria and Evaluation Questions specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into the design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved.**

- **A gender-responsive Methodology, Methods and Tools, and Data Analysis Techniques are selected.**

- **The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation reflect a gender analysis.**
New rating system: scoring individual evaluation criterion

4 point scale:

- 0 Not at all integrated
- 1 Slightly integrated
- 2 Satisfactory integrated
- 3 Fully integrated
New rating system: individual evaluation score

Individual reports rating system:

- 0-3 points = Missing requirements
- 4-7 points = Approaches requirements
- 8-10 = Meets requirements
- 11-12 = Exceeds Requirements
New rating system: meta-evaluation

Meta-evaluation rating system:

- 0-3.5 points = Missing requirements
- 3.51-7.5 points = Approaches requirements
- 7.51-10.5 points = Meets requirements
- 10.51-12 = Exceeds Requirements
### Overview: meta-evaluation scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation 1: Scoring (0-3)</th>
<th>Evaluation 2: Scoring (0-3)</th>
<th>Evaluation 3: Scoring (0-3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Evaluation Scope of Analysis and Indicators</strong> are design in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. GEEW is integrated in <strong>Evaluation Criteria and Evaluation Questions</strong> specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into the design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A gender-responsive <strong>Methodology, Methods and Tools, and Data Analysis Techniques</strong> are selected.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation reflect a gender analysis</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Individual evaluation score*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Meta review-evaluation Score* (average of individual evaluation scores)  

7.66 = meets requirements
2015 Reporting Cycle

- Next SWAP reporting deadline: January 2015
- Web based reporting system
- SWAP FPs and SWAP Evaluation Business owners
- Additional Qualitative Reporting
- UN Women Evaluation Performance indicator
  Helpdesk: isabel.suarez@unwomen.org

- Key references:
  - Updated UN SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator Technical Note and Scorecard
  - UNEG Guidance Integrating Human rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation
Thank you for your attention!