

Gender, Disability and Human Rights in Evaluation

KEY RESOURCES

This document includes excerpts from the UNEG Guidance on “Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation” (2024). The examples and tools presented below are intended to assist both evaluators and evaluation managers with the integration of humanitarian principles in their day-to-day practice.

Chapter 6. Methods for Conducting a HR&GE Responsive Evaluation

When deciding which exact methods and tools to use it is imperative to prioritize methods that, while **answering HR&GE-specific question**, will also:

- Measure any **meaningful changes** that occur in the life of the concerned rightsholders (enjoyment of fundamental rights and empowerment); including the extent to which the intervention being evaluated has contributed to them; and whether the capacity of the related duty bearers is commensurate to the magnitude of the needs to be addressed on the ground;
- **Capture adequately the voices** of the populations and individuals with whom the evaluation team will engage as part of an evaluation (in particular, if cultural and security issues are taken into account);
- Involve and elicit a **meaningful evaluator’s engagement with all the key stakeholders** of a given intervention or programme, without discriminating against any specific groups or individuals; and
- Facilitate the adoption of an **intersectional lens**.

Data collection

Whenever possible, data collected to answer the questions of a HR&GE responsive evaluation should come from **more than one category of respondents and more than one source**. The findings presented to answer evaluation questions should **derive from at least three methods (triangulation)**.

Mixed methods validate the findings obtained from diverse methods through iterative testing and parallel, sequential or multilevel analysis. This is an effective mechanism to build defensible conclusions (and derive from those solid and appropriate recommendations), which is of particular interest in evaluations concerning sensitive and sometimes questioned issues. Within a mixed-method approach, **each data collection method or tool can then be adapted** to integrate HR&GE dimensions, such as in the case of a humanitarian crisis or health emergency.

When using **samples** (such as purposeful sampling, theoretical sampling or snowball sampling), the selection of the sample is crucial since it can affect the credibility and technical adequacy of the information gathered. For HR&GE responsive evaluations, it is important to ensure the **representativeness of stakeholders transparently and without discrimination**.

In dealing with diverse samples, the data collection strategy may need to use **several collection methods and alternatives** to reach women and individuals/groups most marginalised and/or discriminated against. Sometimes,

even representative samples are too small to capture diversity within the total population; it will then be prudent **not to generalize findings** or report in terms of percentages.

Data disaggregation can be a powerful ally to triangulation, as the diversity in responses obtained can prepare the ground for cross-examination, using other methods and by asking different sources. Extensive disaggregation of the data, especially if broken into multiple smaller subgroups, means **generalisability could be questionable**.

Anonymity and protection of individual sources are important, especially with very small groups and/or extensively disaggregated data.

Box 32. Examples of Good Practice in Design: Using a Mixed-Method Approach

For the [Evaluation of the OHCHR Indigenous and Minorities Fellowships Programmes \(2022\)](#), a total of 100 individuals were interviewed, including a balanced number of men and women (fellows) from 38 countries. A survey was developed based on issues that came to the fore during the first phase of interviews which was circulated to all former fellows via email and Facebook. The survey was translated into French, Spanish, Russian and Arabic. There was a total of 160 respondents, about half of whom were women. For both interviews and surveys, specific questions required the collection and analysis of data on gender and disability inclusion within the programmes. The survey allowed for very small minority opinions, which were analyzed as ‘flags’ for potential issues regarding gender and disability which the programmes should be alert to.

The OIOS [Evaluation of Women and Peace and Security \(WPS\) in Elections and Political Transitions \(A/77/83\)](#), used an evidence-based theory of change and a variety of data sources, methods and expertise. For example:

- Curated data sets from the Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project (ACLED) for granular analysis of trends in political violence targeting women (PVTW) were commissioned.
- Country specific sex-disaggregated election data on turnout, candidates, voting patterns etc. was requested to UN field missions and/or national electoral authorities.
- World Bank indices for development and governance were analyzed to determine long-term effects of women’s representation.
- Peer-reviewed academic research, such as reports on women’s political participation containing data, trends and ethnographic studies, as well as research on electoral systems, were used to understand the benefits and disadvantages of each electoral system, and examine which ones lent themselves best to positive outcomes for participation of marginalized groups.

Data sources

Evaluators can make good use of **existing national or international data sets** to compare and confirm or refute findings. The use of these data, nevertheless, should be undertaken with an understanding of their possible limitations and constraints in representing local reality.

Existing national and international data sets include:

- Data produced by national and international statistics institutes on populations
- Data produced by governments to respond to international treaty-based or charter-based human rights bodies.
- Data produced by international organizations.

- Independent reports and research studies produced by academia and national and inter-national CSOs.
- Nationally and locally produced reports in the context of the intervention.

Methods and tools: Qualitative Data

- **Document Review and Analysis:**

- specific information on HR&GE available in relation to the intervention being evaluated
- organisational policies; system-wide policies, mandates and agreements, etc. on HR&GE
- literature produced by programme partners and other organizations.

- **Focus Group Discussions:**

- Pay special attention to the constitution of groups
- Disaggregate purposefully and mix when feasible
- Facilitate responsively
- Carefully consider language and culture issues
- Promote progress on HR&GE

- **Individual interviews:**

- Make sure the sample selected for individual interviews adequately reflects the diversity of stakeholders of the intervention
- Consider language and translation needs
- Consider practical measures such as timing, venue accessibility, participation incentives
- Ensure adequate safeguards are in place so that interviewees will not be negatively affected
- Respect confidentiality
- Consider how each interviewee is affected by HR&GE issues
- Make sure to ask specific follow-up questions on HR&GE during the individual interviews

- **Gender power analysis:**

- Helps better understand the gender transformative nature of an intervention.
- Focuses on the four main change areas of: Consciousness and Capabilities; Resources; Norms and Exclusionary Practices; and Rules and Policies

- **Field Observation of the intervention activities and ongoing dynamics:**

- Formulate questions that can be posed in subsequent interviews
- Examine the project's physical and social setting, staff and clientele characteristics, group dynamics, and formal and informal activities
- Highlight aspects of the project that may not be consciously recognized by participants or staff
- Learn about topics that programme staff or participants are unwilling to discuss
- Observe how project activities change or evolve over time.

Box 33. Possible Questions to Ask in Relation to Gender Equality Results

Oxfam (2002) sets out five dimensions in which change can potentially occur as gender equality is strengthened. Such dimensions could be used as proxy measures of results during a HR&GE responsive evaluation. For each of dimension, questions that will support gender analysis and orientate the interview are suggested.

| Dimension and Results Level | Suggested Questions |
|--|---|
| To what extent have women and men achieved more equal participation in decision-making in public and private spheres? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent has women's negotiating power in economic decisions and other family decisions been strengthened? • To what extent do women enjoy greater participation in the political processes of their communities? • To what extent has the influence of women on decision-making increased in relation to that of their male counterparts? |
| To what extent have gender stereotypes and discriminatory attitudes towards women and girls been challenged and changed? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent do men and women better understand how unequal power relations between them discriminate against women and keep them in poverty? • To what extent is women's unpaid and caring work better valued? • To what extent have changes in the traditional gender division of labour occurred with men taking on more household and caring work? • To what extent is greater value attached to girls' education? • To what extent is violence against women increasingly rejected by the public, especially by men? • To what extent are more men taking action to challenge discrimination against women? |
| To what extent have there been changes in women's empowerment to think and act freely, exercise choice, and fulfil their potential as full and equal members of society? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent have women's self-esteem and self-confidence to influence social processes increased? • To what extent are women more able to exercise their capacity for leadership? • To what extent are women increasingly organizing to strengthen their voice and influence? |
| To what extent do women and men have more equal access to and control over economic and natural resources and basic social services? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent have women's control over natural and economic resources increased? • To what extent do women have greater access to paid work? • To what extent do women achieve equal pay for equal work with men? • To what extent do women share the workload more equally with men and have more time for themselves? |

Box 34. Gender Power Context Analysis

| Change Area | Suggested Questions |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Consciousness and Capabilities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the division of roles and responsibilities between women and men in the community or communities where the programme will be implemented or where we seek to have policy impact? • What are the main beliefs and attitudes that determine the confidence and capacities of individual women, men and gender non-conforming people (of different social, age, ethnic, religious and other groups) to actively participate and lead decisions and actions through which they mitigate and adapt to the impact of shocks and crises, and create systemic changes (transformation) for their survival, wellbeing and security? |
| Resources | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do women, men and gender non-conforming people (of different social, age, ethnic, religious and other groups) have the same access to and control over resources such as land, water, food, assets, education, information, health services, markets or money? What are the differences? • What are the barriers they experience in accessing and controlling the resources that are essential to absorb and adapt to the impact of shocks and stresses, and to bring about systemic changes (transformation) for their survival, wellbeing and security? |
| Norms and Exclusionary Practices | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the dominant social norms and power structures that determine the vulnerabilities and capacities of women, men and gender non-conforming people (of different social, age, ethnic, religious and other groups, etc.) to absorb and adapt to shocks and crises, and to bring about systemic changes (transformation) for their survival, wellbeing, safety and security? |
| Rules and Policies | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the gender contents and consequences of policies and laws that affect people's ability to absorb and adapt to the impact of shocks and stresses, and to bring about systemic changes (transformation) for their survival, wellbeing, safety and security? |

Methods and tools: Quantitative Data

- **Surveys:**

- The most common tool for collecting standardized information from many people in an evaluation, including program participants or the general population of the communities being served by a program.
- The inclusion of HR&GE issues implies adapting some aspects of survey procedures:
 - Making sure that the survey includes specific HR&GE questions and enables disaggregation of the data collected
 - Paying particular attention to the format, accessibility, and language of the survey
 - Creating different questionnaires for different stakeholder groups

Additional methods

- **Case study:**
 - Context-specific
 - Can help enrich the evaluation by providing an in- depth analysis of specific instances (such as events, institutions, policies); particular dynamics within a given community; or by telling a story on a particular situation
 - Useful to describe good practice or provide vivid explanations of barriers experienced by individuals or groups.
- **Training and Use of Local Stakeholders to Act as Evaluators:**
 - Implies training and employing local stakeholders as evaluators, especially where there is a large sample size or geographical area to take into account
 - Depends on the resources available for the evaluation, as well as the level of competence and expertise of the ‘local evaluators

Box 35. Examples of Case Studies

The [Evaluation of the OHCHR country programmes in Guatemala and Honduras, and the subregional programme in El Salvador](#), included case studies for each country covered in the evaluation and focused on thematic areas developed and/or being carried out by the programmes. The case study, “The Reitoca case: supporting indigenous communities to claim their Economic Social and Cultural rights and their right to access to justice”, provided an in-depth analysis of the OHCHR’s work to support indigenous communities claim their economic, social, and cultural rights and their right to access to justice. The case study showed that analysis from a human rights perspective within the framework of the protection cluster of the UN Country Team was an effective way to identify the humanitarian needs of the different sectors of the community in terms of water, sanitation, hygiene health, education, food security and protection. The case also highlighted the importance of integrating a human rights approach into humanitarian actions, emergencies and human mobility in the region.

The team conducting the [Evaluation of the UNICEF emergency response to the Lake Chad Basin humanitarian crisis](#) identified a number of Internally Displaced People’s (IPD) camps, refugee camps and host communities in the four countries visited during the fieldwork and undertook extensive data collection with a large number of respondents in each site (including members of the affected population, children and persons with disabilities, implementing partners, heads of women’s community-bases organizations and representative from local emergency response agencies). By using the community as a case study, the evaluation was able to better determine the quality of interactions among the different emergency actors; the different levels of needs satisfaction among the various ethnic groups affected by the crisis; and the relationship between the host communities on one hand and the IDP and refugees on the other.

Box 36. Use of Local Stakeholders (Including Persons with Disabilities) as Evaluators

The UNICEF rapid evaluation of the humanitarian response to the devastations caused by the floods in Chad in late 2022 (unpublished) engaged female members of the affected population (including persons with disabilities) and a select number of implementing partners as data collectors under the guidance of a regional evaluation expert in participatory methodologies. Women with the same cultural and linguistic dynamics conducted interviews with women who had participated in the project. Their mutual familiarity led to a more in-depth elaboration on results than it may have been possible to obtain otherwise. One inherent risk to this approach is the bias of 'local consultants' when interviewing their peers. In this case, this was somewhat mitigated by ensuring that each of them went to a different geographical area than that of their own cooperative.

Such a direct engagement of the response actors and the affected population in the evaluation allowed critical HR&GE issues to not only surface but also be addressed during the data collection and analysis phases, without having to wait for the final debriefing and recommendation workshop. This methodology also empowers the 'local consultants' to gain confidence in their abilities and have a direct input into the evaluation process.

UNICEF has also developed innovative approaches to engage more meaningfully with children and youth (including boys and girls with disabilities) throughout the different steps of the evaluation process (from the TOR development to the actual field work and dissemination of the findings, conclusions and recommendations). These methods, highly participatory in nature, lend themselves to being used with children and youth but are also suitable to be used with adults (e.g. persons with disabilities, illiterate women, etc.). While the greater advantage in using such methods (e.g., Photovoice and Body Mapping⁶⁰) is to allow a genuinely bottom-up exploration of issues and community dynamics affecting the life of children, the highly engaging and entertaining nature of such methods as well as their transformative power vis-à-vis those who are exposed to them, risks undermining the evaluator's agenda (e.g. including the ability to answer all those evaluation questions not directly pertaining to HR and GE within an often limited timeframe). Three resources are particularly useful for those interested in learning more about child-focused methods, namely the [UNICEF Critical Review of Transformative Methodological Approaches](#), [UNICEF Presentation on Photovoice and other innovative Child-Focused Methods to be used in humanitarian settings](#) and, lastly, [UNICEF Guidance on Disability-Inclusive Evaluation](#).

Data analysis / interpretation

'Iterative' testing and analysis is advisable, particularly human rights and gender analysis, as early analyses will show where data is missing, what the most interesting questions are, etc., paving the way for further and more targeted data collection.

Data analysis should start in parallel to data collection, especially in the case of humanitarian evaluations or evaluations that are set to inform decisions under a quicker-than-usual turnaround. The **data analysis and interpretation processes should involve key stakeholders**, including duty bearers, rights holders, women and groups in vulnerable situations.

In HR&GE responsive evaluations, analysing data entails **several or all the processes below**:

- Comparing data obtained with existing information about HR&GE
- Processing data from surveys
- Ensuring that an adequate understanding of the context, relationships, power, etc. informs the analysis of data collected in interviews
- Comparing data obtained from different sources
- Comparing individual stories and case studies with general information

- Comparing the results obtained to the original plan

Tool: The Gender Continuum Model

| Box 39. Gender Continuum Model: Applying a Gender Lens in Data Collection | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| Gender Discriminatory/ Unequal | Gender Blind | Gender Aware/ Sensitive | Gender Responsive | Gender Transformative |
| Favors either boys/ men or women/ girls, deepening gender inequalities | Ignores gender in evaluation design, perpetuating the status quo or worsening inequalities | Acknowledges gender inequalities but does not robustly address them | Identifies and addresses the different needs of girls, boys, women and men to promote equal outcomes | Explicitly seeks to redress gender inequalities and empower the disadvantaged population |
| Example: Focus groups that exclude females, assuming that only males can exercise decisions related to households or community. | Example: Focus groups that bring all community members together in one space— this could put diverse groups of women/girls and/or men/ boys at risk when gender-related social norms, roles and behaviours are discussed. | Example: Gender-separated focus groups that happen simultaneously and ask the same questions, but do not further probe gender-differentiated experiences. | Example: Gender (and age)-separated focus groups that happen at the time best suited for each group. Questions are tailored to surface any gender-differentiated experiences; childcare and transportation are offered to everyone. | Example: Same as gender-responsive, plus: intersectionality of gender and other identities is taken into account; composition of the focus group and guiding questions are designed after consultation with an Evaluation Reference Group with an understanding of the gender context in the community. Analysis and validation of focus group data and findings is participatory. |

Tool: Six-point Assessment Tool for Gender and Development

This tool uses the following descriptors to assess strategy and implementation of GAD:

- **Relevance for GAD:** The extent to which the GAD approach (mainstreaming GAD) is a relevant issue in the understanding and management of the topic treated;
- **Technical quality of GAD contents:** The extent to which GAD issues are mainstreamed through the whole document, with contributions that reflect state-of-the-art discussions;
- **Innovations on GAD:** The extent to which the document makes an innovative contribution to understanding of GAD issues;

- **Potential impact as a tool for advocacy:** The extent to which the document is written with well-chosen case studies, and awareness of target audience and potential controversial aspects;
- **Potential impact as capacity development tool:** The extent to which a clear argument and well-chosen case studies are coupled with either capacity-building materials or directions towards such materials; and
- **Links between GAD and social inclusion:** The extent to which GAD issues are mainstreamed into discussions of social inclusion with concrete suggestions for successful integration.

The degree of interpretation **depends on the evaluation focus and the level of resources available.**

- For interventions where a **high level of resources** are available for evaluation, data interpretation involves assessing how power relations, including gender relations, have changed as a result of the intervention, and how the intervention brought about structural changes in these relations and in other human rights issues. This implies understanding the underlying causes of the development challenges tackled by the intervention, and to what extent these causes have been addressed. A detailed human rights and gender analysis can be carried out. Evaluations of interventions that have failed to address HR&GE issues in their design can consider if the interventions should have paid closer attention to these areas and how this could have been done.
- For evaluations with a **medium and low level of resources**, data interpretation is more likely to focus on whether capacity development of rights holders and duty bearers has led to a sustainable increase in capacity or whether there have been changes in attitudes, behaviours, institutions and legal frameworks, and whether this is likely to lead to an improvement in the rights situation of women and individuals/groups who are marginalised and/or discriminated against. These evaluations may also look at whether an enabling environment for improving HR&GE has been created with the support of the intervention. Finally, as in the analysis above, understanding the factors facilitating or hindering changes is critical to a more profound analysis.

Validation

It is good practice for evaluators to validate these findings through workshops with different groups, to increase their accuracy and reliability, and enhance the sense of ownership of the data and process with all stakeholders. To adequately respond to HR&GE, the workshop needs to follow the lines already adopted in the evaluation process i.e. being as inclusive as possible; creating an adequate and safe space for reflection; and generating active, free and meaningful participation.

Evaluation Report

The evaluation report should indicate the extent to which gender issues and relevant HR considerations were incorporated. It should specify:

- How gender issues were implemented as a cross-cutting theme in programming, and if the subject being evaluated gave sufficient attention to promote GE and gender sensitivity;
- Whether the subject being evaluated paid attention to effects on women and individuals/ groups who are marginalized and/or discriminated against;
- Whether the subject being evaluated was informed by HR treaties and instruments;

- To what extent the subject being evaluated identified the relevant HR claims and obligations;
- How gaps were identified in the capacity of rights holders to claim their rights, and of duty bearers to fulfil their obligations, including an analysis of gender and individuals/groups in vulnerable situations, and how the design and implementation of the subject being evaluated addressed these gaps; and
- How the subject being evaluated monitored and viewed results within this rights framework.
- Gaps, results and outcomes achieved in terms of gender and HR.

According to the UNEG Norms and Standards, a specific section on HR&GE should be included at the end of the report. Alternatively, HR&GE responsive evaluations can highlight the implications for HR&GE under each section of the evaluation report.

Box 38. Adapted UNEG Standards

1. Report structure

1.0 The report is well structured, logical, clear and complete.

2. Object of evaluation

2.0 The report presents a clear and full description of the 'object' of the evaluation (what is being evaluated).

- Clear and relevant description of numbers of stakeholders intended to be benefitted or influenced for each result disaggregated by:
 - Type (i.e., institutions/organizations; communities; social groups...)
 - Human rights roles (duty bearers, rights holders)
 - Gender groups (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation)
 - Geographic location
- An equity analysis of structural marginalisation, and social and cultural patterns, affecting groups targeted by the evaluation object; and a discussion of gender, power and human rights considerations in the design of the object.

3. Evaluation purpose, objectives and scope

3.0 The evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope are fully explained (why is it being evaluated).

- The evaluation requires an assessment of the extent to which an intervention being evaluated has been guided by UNICEF and system-wide objectives on gender equality and human rights, including child rights and equity
- Main evaluation questions including both standalone and mainstreamed issues of gender and human rights including child rights
- The evaluation analyzes how equity and gender equality mainstreaming principles were included in the intervention design and how results for children have been achieved

4. Evaluation methodology

4.0 The report presents a transparent description of the design and methods used in the evaluation that clearly explains how the evaluation addresses the evaluation criteria, yields answers to the evaluation questions, and achieves evaluation purposes (how is it being evaluated).

- Definition of the evaluation criteria, including mainstreaming of gender equality and human rights norms and standards. Gender equality and human rights dimensions are integrated into all evaluation criteria as appropriate and/or criteria derived directly from human rights principles are used (e.g. equality, participation, social transformation, inclusiveness, empowerment, etc.)
- Gender responsive and human-rights based indicators (disaggregated, gender-specific, gender- distributive, gender-transformative)
- Description of how the methods employed are appropriate for analyzing gender and human rights issues including child rights issues identified in the evaluation scope
- During data screening and data analysis, special attention is paid to data and information that specifically refer to gender equality and human rights issues in the intervention, and make the best possible use of these in the overall assessment of the intervention

5. Findings

5.0 Findings respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report; and are based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report.

- The evaluation findings reflect a gender analysis of the disaggregated effects of the intervention on different social and cultural groups and on the relations between groups

6. Conclusions

6.0 Conclusions present reasonable judgements based on findings and substantiated by evidence and provide insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation.

- The gender equality and human rights implications of the conclusions are clearly presented

7. Recommendations

7.0 Recommendations are relevant to the object and purpose of the evaluation, are supported by evidence and conclusions, and were developed with involvement of relevant stakeholders.

- Recommendations explicitly address the implications of the conclusions and findings regarding gender equality and human rights

8. Gender and human rights

8.0 The report illustrates the extent to which the design and implementation of the object, the assessment of results and the evaluation process incorporates a gender equality perspective and HRBA, including child rights.

The evaluation design and style consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming, gender equality, and equity.

- Stylistic evidence of the inclusion of these considerations can include: using human-rights language; gender-sensitive and child-sensitive writing; disaggregating data by gender, age and disability groups; disaggregating data by socially excluded groups
- Clear description of the level of participation of key stakeholders in the conduct of the evaluation, and description of the rationale for the chosen level of participation (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering)
- Clear proportionality between the level of participation in the intervention and in the evaluation, or clear explanation of deviation from this principle (this may be related to specifications of the TORs, inaccessibility of stakeholders at the time of the evaluation, budgetary constraints, etc.)

The evaluation approach and data collection and analysis methods are gender equality, and human rights—including child rights—responsive. They are also appropriate for analyzing the gender equality, human rights issues including child rights identified in the scope.

- The report assesses if the design, implementation, monitoring and results of the object of the evaluation, were based on a sound gender analysis, and human rights analysis including child rights.
- The evaluation assesses the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addressed gender, equity, and child rights.
- Identification and assessment of the presence or absence of equity considerations in the design and implementation of the intervention.
- Explicit analysis of the involvement in the object of right holders, duty bearers, and socially marginalized groups, and the differential benefits received by different groups of children.

The evaluation meets or exceeds UN-System Wide Action Plan (UN-SWAP) evaluation performance indicator criteria.

- GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis and Indicators are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.
- 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 evaluation methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.
- The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis.

Chapter 7. Applying HR&GE Principles to Evaluation Use and Dissemination

Promoting evaluation use

The impact of an evaluation exercise is determined by the degree to which the knowledge gained is accessed and used in practice by key decision-makers and a wider audience of affected stakeholders. **Dissemination** and **management response** are two of the principal means to increase levels of access and use of an evaluation.

Evaluators and evaluation managers can play an important role in guaranteeing that the process of defining the response (from document distribution to the discussion of the conclusions, and the determination of implementation strategies) meets the **principles of inclusiveness and participation, accountability, transparency, non-discrimination and empowerment**.

Three **preconditions to ensure an effective evaluation management response and follow-up** process is incorporated in HR&GE principles are:

- Involve internal and external stakeholders
- Quality evaluation recommendations.
- Evaluation credibility

Including HR&GE standards and principles in management responses

Preparation of the management response should consider the HR&GE dimensions from different perspectives:

- **Participation in the discussions:** the management response discussion should be an inclusive process, informed by the stakeholder analysis, and with appropriate representation of women and individuals/ groups who are marginalized and/or discriminated against
- **Implementation of HR&GE related recommendations:** addressing specific HR&GE recommendations, and what results need to be generated in these areas. Responses to HR&GE recommendations should be prioritized and resources and responsibilities need to be clearly articulated to ensure that they are addressed.
- **Observation of the HR&GE dimensions in other recommendations:** A HR&GE responsive management response should ensure that the implementation of recommendations contributes to the application of HR&GE standards and principles and/or does not impede them.

Dissemination taking into account HR&GE principles

Evaluation managers are responsible for designing a comprehensive dissemination strategy that will efficiently distribute evaluation findings and recommendations in the **most accessible, transparent and inclusive way** possible.

It is important to refer to the **stakeholder analysis** to assess to whom the evaluation should be disseminated, how best to provide access to information for the various stakeholder groups identified, how **direct users** should be engaged and how they can contribute to dissemination, and how they can take advantage of their own channels to disseminate the evaluation. Provide **barrier-free access** to evaluation products by ensuring sure that the language and format of the report are accessible to all potential users and accommodates any accessibility issues they may have.

Box 38. Dissemination of Evaluations: Clarity and Accessibility

[The UNEG Norms for Evaluation in the UN System](#), require that:

- Evaluations should be conducted, and evaluation findings and recommendations presented, in a manner that is easily understood by target audiences.
- Evaluation findings and lessons drawn from evaluations should be accessible to target audiences in a user-friendly way.

[The Technical Note on Integrating Gender in WFP Evaluations](#) highlights that:

Evaluation dissemination should consider gender dimensions. A gender responsive dissemination strategy should:

- Disseminate findings on gender to diverse groups of stakeholders who have interest in, and are affected by, the intervention under evaluation.
- Promote, as far as possible, the way in which the evaluation addressed gender issues within the UN system, NGOs, donor agencies, civil society and government stakeholders.

In addition to the direct users already defined in the stakeholder analysis, the dissemination phase is a key time to identify **other potential users** who may benefit from the evaluation findings, or who may have an interest to know the conclusions of the process including, for example:

- International and national human rights, women's rights and gender equality groups and other CSOs, including those representing persons with disabilities.
- Duty bearers.
- Evaluation networks.

Targeted dissemination

Dissemination planning should identify a **diversity of channels and formats** that appeal to and reach different audiences. Seeking **alternative ways to present evaluation findings** to women and individuals/groups who are marginalised and/or discriminated against is essential, and fulfils their right to know the conclusions of the processes to which they have contributed and by which they are affected.

Box 39 Targeted Dissemination

[The UNICEF Guidance on Gender Integration in Evaluation](#) requires that:

- Evaluation messages and recommendations reach all gender identity groups and key implementing partners;
- Methods and formats for dissemination of key evaluation findings are gender-sensitive, using various media tools (video, photos, social media) to reach women and girls and their organizations; and
- Evaluation recommendations and messages disseminated in a gender-responsive, and culturally-appropriate way.

Feedback and lessons learned

It is important to establish feedback and learning mechanisms on the effectiveness of the dissemination strategy, the quality of knowledge products, and their impact (where feasible). This will help to gauge the extent to which evaluation information has been useful and applied in programming and policy decision-making. Information should also be gathered on rights holders' (in particular, women and groups in vulnerable situations) participation in the follow-up process.