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Workshop contributors and participants

Information provided by experts and workshop participants formed a key input to this paper. We acknowledge the involvement and thank direct participants and their institutions for their open, frank and generous contributions.

The functions of the now-dissolved DGPOLDE have been assumed by the Secretariat for International Cooperation (SGCID). SGCID is made up of the Evaluation Division for Development Policies and Knowledge Management and the State Secretariat for International Cooperation and for Ibero-America (SECIPI) within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation (MAEC).
### Table 1: Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA) Workshop Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution/Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jaime Hermida</td>
<td>Human Rights Office (ODH), MAEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen Borja</td>
<td>ISI Argonauta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paloma García</td>
<td>ISI Argonauta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bárbara Calderón</td>
<td>San Sebastián de los Reyes Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocío Poo</td>
<td>MPDL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta Arranz</td>
<td>Save the Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adriana Osset</td>
<td>AECID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulia Tamayo</td>
<td>Consultant and expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina Ramírez</td>
<td>IUDC, UCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanesa Valiño</td>
<td>Observatori DESC (ESCR Observatory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos Martín</td>
<td>Hegoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta Valdés</td>
<td>Oxfam Intermón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Maquieira</td>
<td>IUEM-Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (UAM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Participants in the Gender in Development (GID) Workshop

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution/Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emma Puig</td>
<td>Kalidadea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura González</td>
<td>UN Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Molpeceres</td>
<td>EnRed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena Álvarez</td>
<td>Fundación Mujeres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kattya Cascante</td>
<td>Fundación Alternativas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Otero</td>
<td>Leitmotiv Social Consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa Domínguez</td>
<td>independent consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta Casamort</td>
<td>Catalan Agency for International Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nava Sanmiguel</td>
<td>SGCID, MAEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniele Cibati</td>
<td>Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (UAM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following experts were also consulted:

- Ada Zambrano, GID.
- Manuel Sánchez, cooperation and human rights.
- Lilian Celiberti, GID.
- Miguel Donayre, evaluation and human rights.
- Carolina Mayeur, Head of Sectoral Planning, DGPOLDE, MAEC.
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A NOTE ON STYLE:

The terms “project”, “programme”, “plan”, “policy”, “service”, “action” and “development intervention” are used interchangeably in the text to refer to the element under evaluation as the approach can be applied to any of these. We are aware that the terms may have different meanings in certain contexts, but we will not be exploring the differences in definition here as this is beyond the remit of this paper.
Diferentes aproximaciones para una evaluación sensible al GED y EBDH
### List of acronyms and abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AEA</td>
<td>American Evaluation Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECID</td>
<td>Spanish Agency for International Development Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALINe</td>
<td>Agriculture, Learning and Impacts Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALNAP</td>
<td>Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESR</td>
<td>Center for Economic and Social Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA</td>
<td>Canadian International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Department for International Development (United Kingdom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGPOLODE</td>
<td>Directorate-General for Planning and Evaluating Development Policies (MAEC, Spain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECLAC</td>
<td>Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCR</td>
<td>Economic, social and cultural rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIIAPP</td>
<td>International and Ibero-American Foundation for Administration and Public Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GID</td>
<td>Gender in development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GID workshop</td>
<td>Workshop of GID experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>Human Development Report, UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRBA</td>
<td>Human rights-based approach (to development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRBA workshop</td>
<td>Workshop of HRBA experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICESCR</td>
<td>International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labour Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUDC</td>
<td>Institute of Development and Cooperation, Universidad Complutense de Madrid (Spain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUDEM</td>
<td>Institute of Women's Studies, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (Spain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFA</td>
<td>Logical Framework Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAE</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Spain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAEC</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation (Spain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPDL</td>
<td>Movement for Peace (Spain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORAD</td>
<td>Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAS</td>
<td>Organization of American States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODH</td>
<td>Human Rights Office, MAEC (Spain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHCHR</td>
<td>Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAE</td>
<td>Royal Academy of the Spanish Language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECIP: State Secretariat for International Cooperation and Ibero-America, MAEC (Spain)
SGCID: General Secretariat for International Development Cooperation, MAEC (Spain)
SIDA: Swedish International Development Agency
ToR: Terms of Reference
UAM: Universidad Autónoma de Madrid (Spain)
UCM: Universidad Complutense de Madrid (Spain)
UDHR: Universal Declaration of Human Rights
UN Women: United Nations organization dedicated to gender equality and the empowerment of women
UN: United Nations
UNDP: United Nations Development Programme
UNEG: United Nations Evaluation Group
UNICEF: United Nations Children’s Fund
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In recent years, the international development community has become increasingly aware of the fragile human rights situation faced by most of the global population, along with the wide and persistent social gap between men and women.

The classic development model of providing aid to those in need is shifting toward a new understanding that each individual is the holder of certain rights they must demand and enjoy. The full exercise of human rights and gender equality does not constitute development in itself, but it is a necessary condition or prerequisite for development (Jonsson, 2004). Citizens are viewed not as passive actors and recipients of goods but as conscious and skilled individuals capable of managing their own change processes.

This premise underlies the perspective of both the gender in development (GID) and human rights-based approach to development (HRBA) - two analytical frameworks that aim to contribute toward the construction of developed societies respectful of rights and equality between members.

There is broad recognition of the importance of HRBA and the gender perspective in cooperation initiatives. In a common document (UNHCR 2006:35), the various UN agencies agreed that: “all programmes of development cooperation, policies and technical assistance should further the realization of human rights(…)” Similarly, the 2010 Plenary Meeting on the Millennium Development Goals specifically recognised that: “gender equality, the empowerment of women, (…) full enjoyment of all human rights and the eradication of poverty, accountability, participation,” should permeate all cooperation initiatives (UN, 2010:3).

More specifically, in 1995, the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing stressed the need for gender equality to be placed on the political agenda and for the gender approach to be integrated throughout the cycle in all interventions (the gender mainstreaming strategy).

The Spanish Constitution states that the rules on fundamental rights recognised within it are binding on all public authorities (Art. 53.1). In other words, the promotion and respect for human rights must be a guiding principle of public action. Relevant legislation on the matter includes Act 23/1998 of 7 July on International Development Cooperation (Article 1.1., paragraph three; Article 2.b) and Organic Law 3/2007 of 22 March on effective equality between women and men. Similarly, units specifically focussed on human rights, such as the Human Rights Office within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation (MAEC), have been gradually introduced into the administrative architecture.

In keeping with this legislative framework, the Cooperation Master Plans (2001-2004; 2005-2008; 2009-2012) have incorporated the HRBA and GID perspectives into Spanish aid policy. The current 2013-2016 Plan builds on previous commitments (MAEC, 2012:15) and includes an explicit commitment to develop tools that will guarantee the consideration of human rights, gender, environmental sustainability and cultural diversity approaches into Spanish cooperation activities. More specifically, the Cooperation Evalu-
ation Policy promotes the mainstreaming of the rights- and gender-based approaches in the evaluation process (MAEC, 2013:7). Many of the Master Plans for the Autonomous Communities in Spain also introduce these approaches.

As new approaches are used in cooperation initiatives, evaluation methods must be adapted and made sensitive to these (MAEC, 2009; UN, 2006; DAC, 2010). Application of the HRBA and GID perspectives in evaluation will permit detection, understanding and assessment of the promotion or protection of human rights and gender equality in initiatives.

However, incorporation of the two approaches into the evaluation process (sensitive evaluation) is no easy matter. Theoretical frameworks vary widely, there is little agreement on conceptual definitions and clear differences exist in terms of methodology. Moreover, the HRBA and the GID perspectives do not always run parallel.

As a result, anyone aiming to follow the advice of national and international bodies in incorporating the HRBA and GID perspectives into an evaluation will be obliged to perform a major theoretical and methodological undertaking. Moreover, evaluators will often use a given method, unaware that other alternatives exist that may be better suited to their specific needs and purposes.

In this context, SGCID has sponsored this research and methodological analysis of approaches to gender- and HRBA-sensitive evaluation in order to provide clearer user guidance that will lead to more sensitive and better-quality evaluations.

This paper offers the synthesis and classification of possible evaluation frameworks from an HRBA and GID perspective, while also providing guidance and other elements to inform choice between the various options where necessary. Although we address various ways of performing an evaluation, this document is not intended as a manual and therefore does not explain the practicalities of evaluation performance. That information is given by the source documents used to compile the various proposals given here, and further information on these be found via links provided within the body of the text and details in the references section.

The document does not favour any method in particular and was never intended to do so. Each of the models is suited to different purposes and each can be of use in given circumstances. Our approach to the compilation process does, however, represent our stance on the issue, which counters the claims made in some of the proposals: that sensitive evaluation can only be performed in one specific manner. We intend to cover all of the proposals and the accompanying methodological or conceptual debates.

The differences in the social, academic and practical development of the human rights-based and gender-based approaches justify separate treatment. The two approaches can, however, be discussed in a complementary manner.
In short, we believe the main strength of this document lies in the understanding it provides of the various approaches, offering tools to aid choice between the various options and providing methodological criteria for the design of best-fit evaluation processes for each context. An organisational structure and methodological criteria are suggested, but the final decision on which approach to take is a matter for members of the individual evaluation commission groups to whom this text is ultimately addressed.
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2. PRELIMINARY CONCEPTS

2.1. Sensitive evaluation

We can define evaluation as a systematic process of collecting and analysing information for one or more of the following purposes (adapted from: Patton, 2008; Greene, 2007):

a) To understand and attribute meaning to the events that take place in a programme or service;

b) To judge, assessing the value or merit of an intervention;

c) To allocate responsibility through public accountability; and

d) To promote social justice and equity.

Many different elements of a single programme may be evaluated while others may be omitted, for the simple reason that interventions are often extensive and multi-faceted. It is difficult, if not costly, to address and cover the entire situation in a single evaluation exercise. For example, while the DAC cites the use of criteria such as impact, effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, sustainability, other value criteria are needed for different aspects of the intervention (e.g. coverage, ethics, transparency, participation). An evaluation will only assess what it is told to assess and look where it is told to look\(^3\). The proposals and methods selected here tend to provide a faithful reflection of the values within the context where the evaluation is commissioned.

As a result, there can be otherwise rigorous and serious evaluations that are blind to issues such as the gender inequalities caused by a programme. The evaluation process itself does not guarantee the consideration of gender systems or changes in the human rights situation unless the models and approaches are deliberately prepared to take these aspects into account.

Incorporating the HRBA and GID perspectives into evaluation implies analysis of progress and development on human rights and gender equality in both the programme and the real-world context the programme aims to modify. It also implies that the evaluation process must consider respect for all groups, particularly the most vulnerable, and understand those structural situations that generate inequality. Specifically, we understand sensitive evaluation\(^4\) to mean those systematic evaluation processes that can lead to interpretation and judgement of an intervention from a gender or HRBA perspective.

---

\(^3\) This is usually defined through the evaluation commission and team.

\(^4\) We are aware of criticism from those who consider the term sensitive to fall short of the transformative intention of the HRBA and GID perspective, but from the range of terms available, we find it to be the one that best encompassed all of the methodological proposals (regardless of their impact) and emphasised the permeability and transformation of evaluation methods to incorporation of the gender and HRBA perspectives.
2.2. The gender perspectiva or GID approach

In international cooperation terminology, the gender perspective or gender in development approach (GID approach) is a method of social analysis focused on the various factors that foster and reproduce existing inequalities between men and women in order to transform and change these.

The approach is built upon differentiation between the concepts of “sex” and “gender”. “Sex” refers to biological differences between men and women, while “gender” describes the social categories assigned to each sex (feminine/masculine; femininity/masculinity; etc.) that are used to shape many dealings between women and men and the individual behaviour of individuals of both sexes. The gender categories are social constructs that are not built on any biological, genetic, natural or evolutionary grounding.

The gender system is the structure given to the social power relationships into which people are arranged on the basis of social constructs of gender.

Equality between men and women first appeared as a political objective on the international development agenda in the 1970s, but gender equality only began to be recognised internationally as a human right and prerequisite for development at UN Fourth World Conference on Women (Beijing Conference, 1995).

The idea of measuring progress on this front began in the 1990s in the international aid evaluation field, with the initial schemes examining programmes and projects specifically aimed at promoting gender equality. However, the Beijing Conference and gender mainstreaming strategy highlighted the need for a cross-cutting gender perspective in the evaluation of all programmes and projects (Espinosa, 2011).

New methods, practices and meta-evaluations have flourished over the last twenty years, as have many professional organisations that place emphasis on this aspect. The various manuals published by international agencies, among them the UNEG (2011) and UN Women (2011), bear testimony to this.

The increased emphasis has spurred the creation of specific evaluation groups interested in incorporating the approach into their practice, including: the European Evaluation Society (EES) Gender and Evaluation Thematic Working Group (TWG); the Latin American Network of Monitoring, Evaluation and Systematization (RELAC) Evaluation, Gender and Human Rights Group; the American Evaluation Association (AEA) Feminist Evaluation Topical Interest Group; the Africa Gender and Development Evaluators Network (AGDEN), and; the Institute of Social Studies Trust (ISST) Gender and Evaluation Community.
All of the above indicates a growing interest in ensuring that gender inequality is considered within these analyses and, in recent years, something similar has occurred with the incipient focus on intersectionality - a concept that examines how gender inequality interacts with other forms of inequality such as: ethnic origin, disability, age, sexual orientation, etc.

2.3. The human rights-based approach to development (HRBA)

The human rights-based approach to development (HRBA) is a theoretical perspective that seeks to promote, respect and guarantee the effective enjoyment of human rights, with a particular focus on the most vulnerable groups. It seeks to analyse the inequalities that lie at the heart of development problems and redress the discriminatory practices and unjust distributions of power that impede development progress (UN: 2006).

The effective enjoyment of human rights is a basic condition for human development and cooperation initiatives should therefore incorporate the promotion, protection and assertion of rights either as specific objectives or as cross-cutting goals in projects focussed on other issues.

The system of relations between right-holders and their claims to rights and duty-bearers and their responsibilities is known as the pattern of rights (Jonsson, 2004).

The HRBA can be incorporated at all stages of the process, from analysis, programming, and implementation, through to evaluation.

Most of the sources on the human rights-based approach (HRBA) describe concepts, principles and legislation on human rights (UN, 2006). The UN Agencies were first urged to “further the realisation of human rights as laid down in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights instruments” on the basis of the 2003 Common Understanding declaration and the concept of HRBA has been on the increase since then.

In the evaluation field, however, there is still room for improvement in the progress made and the current state of affairs. Many of the current proposals aim to evaluate how the State (the duty bearer) fulfils its obligations, including the monitoring and indicator guides drawn up by the United Nations (Hunt, 2006; UN HRI, 2008; UN, 2012), the Organization of American States (OAS, 2008 and 2011) and the Ombudsman’s Office of Colombia (2006 and 2010).

The rights-based approach is far broader than this and a fuller understanding can be gained from literature on cooperation (Jonsson, 2003; Marks, 2005; Fernández Aller, 2009, inter alia) or other consolidated proposals, such as the Guidance issued by the United Nations (UNEG; 2011) or the work by Bamberger and Segone (2012).
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This document is the outcome of two complementary requests: 1) the summary and classification of a collection of sensitive evaluation models, and; 2) the creation of a set of criteria for analysis or a guidance framework to help readers choose the most appropriate methodological option. These two broad requirements shaped the working process.

The first element was approached through two major tasks: 1) the systematic classification of existing literature and; 2) the analysis of opinions and observations provided by experts in the field. All of the information obtained was organised into the conceptual structure provided here as a framework for the comparison of the various methods.

The request for guidance on method selection was approached in a more theoretical manner through study of the literature on evaluation and our own practices. Each stage is described in more detail below.

3.1. Systematic classification of the literature and expert opinions

Relevant materials from the fields of evaluation, development, gender and HRBA (see Bibliography5) were studied. The main points of this material were then summarised into an initial grouping of ideas associated with gender- and rights-sensitive evaluation.

This grouping of ideas promoted deeper consideration of the theoretical points of departure in human rights, gender and evaluation methods by the team. In parallel, we organised two workshops involving input from experts, one on the HRBA and another on gender6, creating proposals on the basis of the nominal group technique.

### Nominal Groups

The nominal group dynamic allows multiple ideas to be presented and heard in an orderly fashion, while establishing mechanisms for recording the various proposals and individual reflections. The dynamic works on a basis of listening and choosing a personal stance rather than by debate or confrontation.

The intention is to capture the various ideas arising from a given group following a process of explanation and reflection. The process does not aim to arrive at a single line of discourse, as in consensus techniques, or to contrast and discuss the different options.

---

5 The main sources consulted can be found in the bibliography.

6 A list of individual workshop participants is provided in the workshop contributors and participants section.
as in discussion groups. The summaries are drawn up and incorporated into the working paper at a later stage of the research process.

Nominal groups are built on a set of individual presentations taken together to obtain an overview of a situation. This allows people to work without peer pressure or social constraints. Pressure can be further removed by making personal opinions anonymous.

Nominal groups can be run in many ways, but the following stages were chosen for these workshops:

1. **Presentation** of the topic (by the facilitator).
2. **First round.** Individual presentations. A maximum presentation time is set.
3. **Second round.** Requests for clarification, amplification or explanation of details but without debate.
4. **Third round.** Further explanation is given. There is no debate, only clarification, and no responses are permitted.
5. **Participants write down their personal stance on the subject,** working in silence. Debate is not permitted as the technique requires the personal opinions of each participant.

Where individuals could not attend in person, they were interviewed by e-mail.

### 3.2. Synthesis and classification

The second stage brought together the opinions gathered at the workshops and the conclusions obtained from reading of the literature. The information provided by the experts was analysed through semantic mapping.

#### Semantic mapping

A semantic map is a representation of the discourse under analysis, showing the various (semantic or idea) fields identified and how they relate to one another.

Jost Trier defines a semantic field as a set of words that can appear at a point in a message and that can be interchanged without profoundly altering the overall meaning. “Meaning”, which is taken as the unit of analysis, is not considered an absolute, but is viewed as being dependent upon the context in which it is used and received. Therefore, it is not solely a denotational, referential matter, as meaning is also found in the connotations associated with the word, phrase or image. Two basic operations are useful in producing semantic fields:

- Similarity (equality).
- Difference.
The similar ideas identified are grouped to create a single set. The internal homogeneity of the set should be such that the words, phrases or ideas within the set are interchangeable without altering the overall concept of the field. These homogenous sets have meanings that differ from the others. In building a field, it can be helpful to examine figures of speech within the discourse that could indicate similarity or a close relationship:

- Synonyms: One concept has a number of signifiers.
- Metaphors: The name of an object is replaced with another seen to be similar.
- Metonymy: A concept is designated with the name of something else with which it has some form of relationship (for example, authors and their works).

The paper is viewed as a two-dimensional synoptic space (Abril, 2008) where the layout of elements reflects the different sets and the closeness-distance relationships or arrangements between them. These relationships between sets include cause-effect relationships, subordination or juxtaposition including:

- Antonyms. Opposite meanings.
- Scale or gradation. All notions can be placed on a scale between two extremes (Mounin, 1972).
- Hierarchical structure (two relationships are possible—hyponymy or hypernymy).

The ideas are organised on the basis of similarity, leading to clear indications of topics and issues central to a sensitive evaluation process. The conclusions drawn from the literature were added to this semantic map. The iterative process between the information provided by the team members and their reflections was complete once new ideas could be added to the organisational structure without any further alterations being needed to the section headings—a strong indication of a robust underlying framework. While preconceived criteria and personal views on evaluation can undoubtedly influence the structure, the process has been respectful at all times with inductive construction of the important questions.

The final outcome presents a set of criteria proposed by a range of authors and experts as ways of increasing the sensitivity of an evaluation, organised into the sequence followed in an evaluation process. Certain fields or areas may have less coverage than others as the sources consulted provided uneven information. The team resisted the urge to complement the information found with personal contributions as this would have fallen beyond the remit of systematic classification of the available methodologies, and we had not been asked to provide our own guidance on how to perform a gender- or HRBA-sensitive evaluation.
3.3. Guidance and criteria for selection of a proposal

A third section offers guidance on choosing between the various methods. This section is probably the most theoretical of all, even though a practical outcome is the ultimate goal and the main sources came from the generic literature on evaluation. Our working method was to list the various sections and then gather together those theoretical guidelines that would help the reader to choose between the proposals.

As was stated in the introduction, we have not opted for any particular method, although the very act of defining certain criteria or guidance in order to make any sort of decision itself implies the adoption of a stance.

In summary, this closing section of the document provides a list of considerations and reflections on the sequence constructed that we believe will provide guidance in methodological decisions.
4. Proposals for Sensitive Evaluations

There is not just one way to evaluate (Ligero, 2011), nor is there only one way to incorporate the GID and HRBA perspectives into evaluation processes (UN Women, 2011; Bustelo, 2011). In fact, it may even be wrong-headed to build a single model, as any such device will fail to reflect the variety of approaches to the subject studied (Sielbeck et al., 2002b:110).

During our analysis of the literature on evaluation, HRBA, GID\(^7\) and the opinions of many different specialists on these subjects, we have observed many different ways of performing sensitive evaluations.

All of the various proposals focus on different aspects of the evaluation process in the pursuit of gender- and human rights-sensitive outcomes. The ideas, recommendations and guidance vary depending on which particular aspects and issues are approached, their scale and also their capacity to impact upon sensitivity.

We placed the various topics in chronological order, using the sequence proposed by DGPOLDE (MAEC, 2007b) and Bustelo and Ligero (http://www.magisterevaluacion.es)\(^8\) as a reference, leading to the creation of the following framework:

1. THE COMMISSION. Preliminary conditions, the institution and the evaluation team.
   • Institutional sensitivity.
   • Evaluator focus.

2. DEFINITION OF THE UNIT AND EVALUATION OF PROGRAMME OR POLICY DESIGN IN RELATION TO GENDER- AND HRBA.
   • Point of departure: programming.
   • Identification of underlying theory or logic model.
   • Analysis and comparison.

3. EVALUATION APPROACH. Various methods for the design and performance of an HRBA- and GID-sensitive evaluation.
   • Evaluation driven by theory of change.
   • Stakeholder focussed.
   • Evaluation approach aimed at by critical change or transformative paradigm.
   • Evaluation of final judgements.

\(^7\) See the full bibliography.

\(^8\) This framework is a revised version of a previous proposal by María Bustelo Ruesta, Juan Andrés Ligero Lasa and Marta Martínez Muñoz.
The institution or individual evaluator wishing to perform a sensitive evaluation can apply the recommendations suggested at each stage of the process. At some stages, such as when choosing the evaluation approach, they can opt for just one way of working or a combination of methods. However, not all of the proposed options will lead to a full evaluation from a GID and HRBA perspective. We believe that some issues clearly impact upon the sensitivity of the evaluation, while others only promote or contribute to sensitivity, while not guaranteeing this. In Section V (Guidelines for sensitive evaluation) we reflect upon criteria that could be used to ensure equitable focus and assessment in an evaluation.

4.1. The Commission

The “commission” stage is when the request and justification of the evaluation are defined, and the means and resources required to perform the evaluation are gathered.

The strategies we have identified in relation to performing sensitive evaluation are non-specific for this stage of the process. They assume that both the commissioning institution and the evaluation team already have a culture that contains the expertise and sensitive outlook necessary, such that this will be inevitably incorporated into the evaluation process.

Two separate sub-sections will explore the issues of institutional sensitivity and evaluator focus. While each of these may exist in isolation, it is logical to think that sensitive evaluation will be most effective where the two co-exist.

a) Institutional sensitivity

The basic premise is that an organisation “sensitised” to gender or human rights will, in turn, promote sensitive evaluation. Any organisation that commissions or participates in
such an evaluation incorporates, develops or strengthens GID and HRBA culture in a number of ways. Institutional sensitivity is reflected in:

• The political will to evaluate and incorporate the gender perspective and HRBA into institutional policy.

• The existence and development of a GID- and HRBA-sensitive evaluation culture. By evaluation culture we understand all the knowledge, assumptions, values and customs widely accepted by the institution in order to favour and strengthen the performance of evaluations, which implies understanding and acceptance of the outcomes, being sufficiently flexible to assume change and showing accountability on practices.

The commission is set forth in the Terms of Reference (ToR) or similar agreement. These should:

• Include key questions on human rights and gender equality (Bustelo, 2011).

• Consider the requirements of these approaches (CIDA, 2001) in budgeting. The World Bank even suggests establishing incentives to staff (World Bank, 2005).

• Establish specific clauses in the Terms of Reference or commission that emphasise the HRBA and GID perspectives (NORAD, 2005; CIDA, 2001). These can include training, awareness-raising, the establishment of specific stages for inclusion of these issues in the process, or any of the other proposals outlined below.

b) Evaluator outlook

This strategy is based on the assumption that individuals who have already assumed the gender and HRBA perspectives (a situation that implies sensitivity and certain capabilities) will incorporate the approaches throughout the evaluation process. During the inquiry, they will take decisions that are consistent with their personal views and conducive to the consideration of gender and human rights. The literature does not stipulate how this should be done, simply assuming that the capability of sensitive individuals will be sufficient. Ward (2002) considers this to be one of the most robust ways of performing sensitive evaluation.

Personal outlooks certainly have an impact on the evaluation process. Greene (in Sielbeck-Bowen et al., 2002a:5) states that these influence the decisions taken throughout the process—any social inquiry is linked to the outlook of the individual inquiring, the justification of the purpose and the means available for the research, their philosophical framework and methodological preferences, etc. Perspectives such as HRBA or GID bring a certain world vision, an understanding of reality and a way of interacting in the world (Ibid.:112), that results in constant concern for gender equality and human rights that will be reflected throughout the entire evaluation process.

The key to this strategy is the involvement of people with gender and human rights-related capabilities or the capacity to assume these. The literature states that a sensitised evaluation team should:
• **Be capable of empathy**: Evaluators should be able to understand other positions and conditions, putting themselves in the place of others and treating them with respect (UN Women, 2011; DAC, 2010; UNEG, 2005a and 2005b; Fernández-Layos, 2003; Nuusbaum, 1997 and 2008; Donayre, 2011; GID workshop).

• **Understand the concepts of the approach**: Assuming sensitivity means understanding the concepts defended by these approaches. This is not necessarily a given; both the gender perspective and the HRBA are theoretical constructs with a certain degree of complexity.

• **Share the values of the HRBA and gender perspective**: The proposed methods are underpinned by a set of values—equality, democracy, respect, etc. Respect for democracy itself indicates respect for the different (House and Howe, 2001; Greene, 2008; AEA, 2004). The team should believe in (Fernández-Layos, 2003) and defend (GID workshop) human rights and gender equality from a transformational point of view.

A more sensitive outlook can be encouraged in teams and evaluators by:

• **Raising awareness**, generating an attitude and inclination toward social inequalities. This can be achieved by:
  — Discussion and dialogue with the actors involved in the programme to be evaluated, human rights and gender equality activists or campaigners (Ward, 2002:50).
  — Encouraging greater awareness (NORAD, 2005) that includes a phase defined as a stage of connection. This consists of the absorption of information within a process of reflection and involvement with the associated issues (Rueda Palenzuela, 1993).

• **Training in competences and skills** (World Bank, 2005; Hunt and Brouwers, 2003; ALiNe, 2010; GID workshop).
  — Defining an initial training/awareness-raising stage in the evaluation process that focusses on unifying language, agreeing definitions, handling concepts and unifying HRBA and GID perspectives. This stage can be included in evaluation planning and may even be incorporated into the Terms of Reference or agreement.

• **Mixed-gender teams on gender-related issues**. Differing gender experiences can lead the two sexes to differing views of the same reality (DAC, 2010; DFID, 2008; UNEG, 2005a; ILO, 1995). At the fieldwork stage, having a mixed-gender team also facilitates communication between the two sexes, as they sometimes display different communication patterns or may be located in separate spaces (Espinosa, 2011; GID workshop). As the majority of gender experts are currently women, awareness and expertise among men is to be encouraged.
4. Proposal for Sensitive Evaluations

• **Experts on the team** (NORAD, 2005; CIDA, 2001; ILO, 1995) or **external support** on gender equality (ALINE, 2010) or human rights issues.

• Adoption of or reference to existing guidelines or **suggested codes of ethics** such those of the UNEG or CAD (AEA, 2004; MAEC, 2007a).

Sielbeck-Bowen et al. (2002b) found that it is not just any individual who can be a sensitive evaluator, finding that the team must feature the above-listed aspects to be successful. However, they also asserted that it is possible for individuals to learn these qualities. They stated that sensitivity does not arise spontaneously in an evaluator, and that evaluators must conduct a constant, on-going review of their personal values in order to consciously adopt evaluation approaches consistent with and suited to the values of GID and HRBA.

4.2. Unit definition and design evaluation

The various key dimensions and logical assumptions of a programme are examined at this stage in order to assess programme design, consistency and appropriateness in terms of GID and HRBA.

The proposals in this section aim to establish a priori whether the theoretical framework of a programme is reliable, sufficient and valid for consideration within the gender- or HRBA-based category. The process produces an analysis of the underlying logic, an opinion on the foreseeable transformative impact and recommendations for improving or reinforcing the strategy adopted.

The proposals we have identified have been categorised into three broad stages:

a) **Point of departure: Programming**

Development initiatives should promote social change in situations of gender inequality or **violations of rights**. According to the United Nations, they are temporary special measures to level the playing field and rectify structural discrimination (UN, 2006:24).

The HRBA and GID perspectives can be incorporated into programmes in many ways, and Espinosa (2011) provides a useful list of some of the leading strategies for GID:

---

The authors originally formulated these questions and answers for feminist and gender-sensitive evaluation. They have also been adapted for the HRBA.
The various United Nations agencies have reached a three-point Common Understanding (UN, 2006:35) on what should be included in a programme with a HRBA:

1. All programmes of development cooperation, policies and technical assistance should further the realisation of human rights as laid down in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights instruments.

2. The standards and principles set forth in international law on human rights guide all development cooperation and programming in all sectors and in all phases of the programming process.

3. Development cooperation contributes to the development of the capacities of “duty-bearers” to meet their obligations and/or of “rights-holders” to claim their rights.

This common framework has formed the basis for the preparation of various programming proposals. UNICEF works with the much cited Jonsson (2004) model, which identifies five steps for the identification of rights-holders and duty-bearers and the obstacles to assertion of rights or fulfilment of commitments faced by these actors. The analysis provides a basis for specific action plans to develop the potential of the various individ-
uals involved. Fernández Juan et al. (2010) build on this approach, combining it with the Logical Framework Approach to programming, assigning results and activities to different actors within the rights-duties pattern (pattern analysis)\textsuperscript{10}.

This is currently the most common approach to understanding HRBA-based programming, and has sometimes been cited as the only way to proceed or the minimum requirement for compliance with HRBA (HRBA workshop). However, the United Nations itself states that there is: “no universal recipe for a human rights-based approach” (UN, 2006:15).

Criticism of a one-size-fits-all approach to HRBA

María Bustelo (2009) uses the traditional classification system commonly applied in public policy analysis to broadly classify policy responses to inequality into two blocks: reactive and proactive. Proactive policies (ALINe, 2010) aim to promote, strengthen and make effective the enjoyment of rights. They aim to promote equality in all aspects and structures, even attempting to prevent discrimination before it takes place through explicit and visible efforts at “attacking” those structures that generate, reproduce and maintain inequality. The focus of reactive policies is the assertion, reclamation, respect of and protection of rights (in other words, giving an immediate and necessary response to existing discrimination). In gender policies, for example, there is a clear awareness that asserting a right and obtaining a legal framework to protect it is an absolutely necessary first step that may not alone be sufficient to ensure effective equality. Other promotion policies are needed to gradually conquer social spaces and rights. In other words, even where equality is legally recognised, serious inequalities may still exist in cultural and social systems that block the implementation of effective equity. Formal recognition of a right does not necessarily lead to its effective enjoyment (UNDP, 2000) and the claim or assertion should be accompanied by social awareness-raising initiatives fitted to the individual situation in order to ensure that rights are effectively exercised.

Jonsson’s interpretation of the HRBA is said to cause a restrictive tendency resulting in more reactive than proactive policies. Emphasising and prioritising the State in rights-asserting initiatives can push more proactive policies down on the priority list, some of which might contribute more effectively to progress on rights. In fact, as we have already said, furthering the realisation of human rights is one of the three minimum points of understanding given by the UN (2006).

The second criticism of this single approach is that there could be a degree of confusion in the definition, methods and theoretical approaches of the human rights protection system and the HRBA to development (UN Women, 2011). Logic would dictate this might not be the case, as the two approaches pursue the same aim: to guarantee the effective

\textsuperscript{10} For more information see Annex.
enjoyment of human rights by the population. However, the two approaches have been developed in different spheres and work with different mechanisms meaning that they can be used to complement one another.

The first approach operates within an internationally regulated rights protection system endorsed by and mandatory for the signatory countries. The second, the HRBA, uses policy as a way of achieving respect for human rights. It has generally operated via development policy.

The one-size-fits-all approach to the HRBA could be caused by “certain loans” from the human rights protection system, such as the principles of universality and inalienability; indivisibility; interdependence and interrelatedness. But this should not prevent the HRBA from working with duty-holders to fulfil their obligations or fostering the capacity of rights-holders to assert their claims. The HRBA can also develop other actions to promote rights that not necessarily directly linked to claims by right-holders.

The regulatory function of the system of human rights guarantees must not curb the versatility of the various programmes, projects and policies that adopt the HRBA. Conversely, the strategies of any development programme must not substitute the legal demands that rights be guaranteed under the protection system. This tension is exposed in a UNEG publication of 2011, which explains how the term “duty bearer” is defined differently in programming and in international human rights law. The UNEG document consistently uses the definition given in programming, which includes both state and non-state actors, i.e. any actor with either duties or responsibilities for a development intervention.

The HRBA perspective is fundamental in the development of international cooperation policies, plans and programmes. An overly narrow vision of the HRBA could lead to the omission of necessary initiatives or poor orientation of these. For example, an HRBA-focused intervention may be dismissed in a situation where the established legal framework aims for equality between women and men but where violations are still common. Conversely, a project may wrongly focus on demanding State assurance of real equality between men and women when equality is already covered in the legal framework while the true problems may lie in the social gender system.

A comparison of track records in GID and the HRBA highlights their diverging methodological development. In most organisations, gender mainstreaming is far more familiar than human rights mainstreaming but, in the words of the UN (2006:26): “structures and processes set up to ensure gender mainstreaming can be emulated or adapted to facilitate the introduction of a human rights-based approach”.

As is the case for GID, HRBA-driven programmes can assume a variety of forms ranging from right-holder assertion initiatives, through programmes to promote, educate and raise awareness, and on to the provision of guidance.
Programming is framed within a document such as a programming matrix. If, as recommended by the United Nations (UN, 2006:15), the programming matrix includes the GID or HRBA perspective, it will be labelled a gender- or rights-aware project, meaning that the project outline comprehends and allows for gender differences (ALINe, 2010) and the HRBA.

Conversely, when the logic behind an intervention does not include gender- and human rights-sensitive aspects, this will be a gender- or rights-blind project (UN Women, 2011; Bustelo, 2011), i.e. a project that does not distinguish between the situations and conditions of men and women or observe aspects related to the enjoyment of rights. These initiatives normally presume that there is equal access to and adoption of gender roles and the exercising of rights, placing them within a group labelled as “biased projects” by Ward (2002). Figure 1 provides an example of a gender- and rights-blind fishing production project.

*Bustelo argues that while some projects may not be explicit about their approach, there is no such thing as gender- or human rights-neutral project. All projects have an impact on these issues (whether positive or negative). Hence, all projects can be evaluated, and the evaluation exercise may reveal the invisibility of the strategy (Bustelo, 2011:18).*
b) Identifying the programme theory or logic model

Programme theory, theory of change, theory of action or logic model are some of the various names used to describe “the set of assumptions that explain (…) the mini-steps that lead to the long term goal of interest” (Weiss, 1998:2). In more detail, the United Nations defines the logic model as a diagram or graphic display of the goals, activities and results chain in a way that demonstrates the links or causal relationships among them (UN Women, 2011:8). The application of this theoretical approach to evaluation is shown in Section IV.3.

For identification exercises to be effective, therefore, they should describe and consider outcomes and outputs, as well as processes (UN, 2006; Jonsson, 2004). Broadly speaking, the issue of outcomes has undergone substantial development, but the same cannot be said for processes, which have “seldom been defined” (Jonsson, 2004:4): a conclusion found in both HRBA and GID literature.

Programme documentation can provide a good starting point for observing the theory of change. In some countries, including Spain, the Logical Framework Approach (LFA) to programming is in widespread use in the development sector. This method offers a matrix with a logical hierarchy of goals that display most of the theoretical basis of the programme. However, the LFA is principally focussed on results, leaving less room for processes and implementation.

Other systematic logic models can be used to identify results, processes and structural elements in greater depth (Ligero, 2011:22). One of these examples is that of UN Women (2011:8) which distinguishes between inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and impacts. The same guide offers a link with tools for further development of the model (2011:49)\(^\text{11}\).

c) Analysis and comparison

The key issue in design evaluation is determining whether the theoretical models selected have sufficient capacity to transform the gender system and rights situation and several resources can help us in this matter.

Resources for GID:


- Checklist produced by Vargas and Gambara (2010), designed for assessing whether proposals include the gender perspective in the situation analysis, goal setting, strategy definition and the identification of the monitoring and evaluation system.

\(^{11}\) See Annex.
• Moser’s (2005) participatory gender audit proposal, focussed on how much progress has been made toward the adoption of gender mainstreaming. The Gender Audit Score Card is used to measure integration of the gender approach into national policy, sector programmes and specific activities aimed at empowering women, while also identifying whether internal institutional responsibility, associated capacity-building and budgetary resources to promote gender equality have been defined.

**Resources for HRBA:**

• Checklists produced by Vargas and Gambara (2010) following initial research, interviews and participant observation, designed to assess development programmes and projects through evaluation from the HRBA and GID perspectives.

In line with the Stamford Principles, Jonsson (2004:6) establishes that:

• Assessment and analysis identify the human rights claims of rights-holders and the corresponding human rights obligations of duty-bearers as well as the immediate, underlying, and structural causes of the non-realisation of rights.

• Programmes assess the capacity of right-holders to claim their rights and of duty-bearers to fulfil their obligations. They then develop strategies to build these capacities.

• Programmes monitor and evaluate both outcomes and processes guided by human rights standards and principles.

• Programming should be informed by the recommendations of international human rights bodies and mechanisms.

By making the logic model explicit, we can also determine whether or not an intervention is entirely focussed on achieving rights, including gender equality, and to what extent it incorporates the HRBA or GID perspective as a cross-cutting element:


• **Generic projects incorporating these perspectives as cross-cutting elements**: Generic interventions focussed on any area of development but which seek to promote, guarantee and respect equality and human rights. UNEG (2011) recognises this differentiation, Bustelo (2011) also mentions it while highlighting the importance of mainstreaming in gender strategies, and ALINe (2010) specifically suggests mainstreaming gender as part of the theory of change of any intervention.
Figure 2 presents an example of the generic project to improve fishing production following gender mainstreaming to achieve equity (the changes added have been marked in grey).

**Figure 2: Generic project to improve production activity with a gender perspective.**

The tools discussed here all support users in forming a judgement on the theoretical basis of the programme, helping them to estimate the expected degree of transformation from the outset. Moreover, when the theory is made explicit, this favours the development of other evaluation strategies such as evaluation by “end criteria” or “theory-driven evaluation”. This will be explored in Section 3.

Source: Created by authors
4.3. Evaluation approach

The evaluation approaches refer to different ways of carrying out evaluations. Each approach establishes criteria which define how to design and execute the evaluation, what products are to be obtained and what possibilities it offers.

We have identified four possible approaches to evaluations using GID and the HRBA:

a) Theory of change
b) Stakeholder-driven
c) Critical change
d) Final or summative judgements

The choice of option tends to depend upon the theoretical background and training of the evaluation team, or the institutional context from which the commission arises. When properly applied, any of these methods is sufficient for a sensitive evaluation as long as the remaining phases are fully completed, although some of the elements can be used in combination from one method to another.

a) Evaluation driven by theory of change

Programme theory evaluation\(^\text{13}\) is a process that starts by identifying how the intervention functions and what are the outcomes it intends to obtain, constructing or identifying the theoretical model, before moving on to structure the entire investigative process on the basis of this theoretical model. This approach evaluates whether the objectives have been achieved but can also identify the causal mechanisms leading to them (Ligero, 2011:4).

The first step in this kind of evaluation is to obtain the theory of change. The aim is to identify, reconstruct or directly formulate a theoretical framework that establishes the causal relationships between the various dimensions of an intervention. The start-

\(^{13}\) Carol Weiss defines ‘theory of change’ as the sum of programme theory (causal relationships that establish outcome relationships) and implementation theory (causal relations that tie what the programme does to the outcomes obtained). However, other authors, such as Rogers (Funell & Rogers, 2011), use the term ‘programme theory’ generically, and ‘theory of change’ precisely to denominate what Weiss refers to as ‘programme theory’. In this document, we are using Weiss’s definition, because we believe it is currently better known by the target audience, even though both terms are valid and the Rogers version also enjoys wide acceptance.
The programme theory given in the documentation can then be revised if it is incomplete, which tends to be a reasonably common occurrence, validating the inclusion of this phase in which the theory of change undergoes reconstruction (Ligero, 2011:36). This process fosters the production of a logical model better fitted to the real-life situation of the intervention, with the inclusion of gender and rights-related elements. It is recommended that the process include interviews with key stakeholders, targeting especially vulnerable groups and women. Aline (2010) develops this idea further, with a wider-ranging concept of participation through dialogue, respecting various perspectives and experiences.

The final logical model is then used as a framework to determine which variables will be measured during the evaluation process (Davidson, 2000:18). Key aspects are identified for measurement and evaluation of the outcomes, processes and structure dimensions (Ligero, 2011). The selected elements should cover all aspects of the intervention logic.

Figure 3: Evaluation or key questions for a generic project to improve productive activities.

Source: Created by authors.
The theory of change (Figure 3) forms the framework for the identification of evaluation questions. Tables 4 to 6 show an example of possible questions on HRBA issues, organised in line with the dimensions of the fishing production project.

### Table 4: OUTCOMES AND OUTPUTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving productive fishing activities</td>
<td>Is there enough food? Are the resources generated sufficient to buy the food necessary for the population? Does the food reach the entire population, without discrimination toward any group?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable exploitation of the lake</td>
<td>Does legal access to exploitation put limits on or exclude any collective? Does sustainability of the lake help to improve the health of the entire population?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organised fishers</td>
<td>Is there effective legal freedom to organise, associate, or form trade unions? Are there impediments or obstacles to participating in associations/trade unions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern boats and gear in good condition</td>
<td>Is the quality of fishing gear and instruments the same for men and women? Are there enough boats and gear to carry out tasks satisfactorily?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men and women receive equal training</td>
<td>Does the entire population have a right to training? Are there any restrictions on this right? Are the skills and capacities acquired through training similar for different groups or social collectives?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5: STRUCTURAL ELEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural element 1</strong></td>
<td>Ownership of boats and gear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is real ownership or possession of boats and gear equal among the different groups? Is there free access to ownership or possession of boats and gear?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural element 2</strong></td>
<td>Laws and regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are there regulations on the sustainability of the lake? Are working conditions in accordance with regulations and labour agreements? Are there any work/life balance measures in place?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tabla 6: PROCESSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Maintenance (boats and gear)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can the project ensure adequate maintenance of the gear to provide good working conditions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are criteria in place regarding the condition of boats and gear that will guarantee the safety and security of fishers while at work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Access to credit</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do all collectives have legal and effective access to credit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there legal coverage for credit management, reimbursement and cancellation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Monitoring and ecological management of the lake</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does environmental information reach the entire population?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are lake monitoring reports public and accessible?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are health regulations met in exploitation of the lake?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the scheduled closed seasons respected?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are catch measurements respected?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are boats and gear maintained in accordance with environmental regulations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Promoting and developing associations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In practice, is the development of associations limited to one collective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there effective legal freedom for the operation of associations and trade unions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process 5</strong></td>
<td><strong>Coordination meetings of fishers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does everyone express their ideas freely, without coercion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are there reprisals or other forms of pressure exerted on those expressing opinions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are vetoes regulated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process 6</strong></td>
<td><strong>Catch, sale and consumption</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are working conditions the same for different collectives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there a policy of monitoring risk to workers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are closed seasons for fishing established?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process 7</strong></td>
<td><strong>Training cycle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does access to training present difficulties in terms of coverage and access for any collective?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is training culturally adapted to the needs of users?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As was stated in Section IV.2, theory can be sensitive, blind or simply insufficient to stimulate transformations in equality systems. However, Figure 2 shows how sensitivity can be incorporated at a later stage.

Where both the gender perspective and the HRBA are to be included in the logical model, the evaluation questions extracted from that model will have to be designed to collect and evaluate HRBA and gender aspects. Moreover, the analysis can be designed to assess whether implementation contributes to achieving the outcomes—in this case, to changing the gender or rights system.

In the inverse situation, where the theory is blind or has not shown itself sufficiently robust to stimulate any change in rights and equality, the questions will be designed to examine whether rights and gender were adequately considered in each of the aspects under evaluation.

The evaluation models we have identified cover these two situations, meaning that the evaluation questions will confirm whether GID and HRBA were indeed incorporated into the programme. In the UNEG (2011) model, the evaluation questions are identified on the basis of a theory of change structured around design, implementation and outcomes (complemented by a system of end criteria), while Paul Hunt (2006), Special Rapporteur to the UN Economic and Social Council, proposes a division according to structure, processes and outcomes.

An analysis of ASDI’s gender mainstreaming strategy evaluation by Freeman et al. (2003) presents an evaluation model built around three major issues: a) the gender content present in the design and implementation; b) the approach, and; c) the changes generated by the actions (design, processes and outcomes). The Organization of American States (OAS, 2008) has established a similar system of indicators organised by dimensions (structure, process and outcome).

Fernández-Layos (2003) describes a greater number of dimensions. In particular, she proposes analysis of: the project’s development visions and theoretical organisation chart, project design, execution and gender impact. These dimensions cover all relevant aspects within a systemic perspective to be evaluated according to the theory of change.

### b) Stakeholder-driven evaluation approach

One of the most widespread principles in gender-sensitive evaluation is the placing of “women and their material realities at the centre of evaluation and analysis planning” (Ward, 2002:46). Similarly, for the HRBA, the most vulnerable collectives, i.e. those most at risk of having their rights infringed, can be placed at the centre of the process.

This centrality can be achieved by introducing representatives of women and the most disadvantaged groups throughout the evaluation process, taking their views into account.
in all of the decisions relating to the evaluation (Ward, 2002). For example, the ALINe (2010) proposal identifies specific technical measurement indicators related to stakeholder needs.

**Stakeholders:** Freeman (1984) defines the term to designate any group or individual who can affect or be affected by the achievement of the organisation’s goals (Patton 2008: 62). Robert Stake goes even further, defining the term to cover persons who have invested in the programme or benefit from it, including sponsors, workers, beneficiaries, and, from a certain standpoint, even contributors (2006:45).

Approaches that incorporate different actors into the process can be generically known as stakeholder-driven or participatory evaluations. This school of thought covers a number of important methods including collaborative, empowering, inclusive, pluralist, use-oriented, learning-oriented and responsive evaluation. All of these are sensitive to the needs of various programme stakeholders and they are all based on what Guba and Lincoln have described as fourth-generation evaluations.

Many authors agree with this trend and encourage others to be inspired by it (UN Women, 2011). For example, democratic evaluation can be understood as a process that respects the issues of interest, experiences and values of people, especially those of the poor and minorities, as well as all those far from centres of power (Stake, 2006:279); a clear indication of the breadth of coverage needed for some GID and HRBA evaluation projects.

The key aspect of this approach is stakeholder involvement and participation in the evaluation process (Bustelo, 2011; Bamberger and Podems, 2002; UN Women, 2011; DAC, 2010), and we have identified some aspects that can contribute to this participation process:

- **Subsystem of legitimation:** Covers the key actors viewed as legitimately responsible for the decision. This legitimacy may be conferred legally, politically, or technically.

- **Subsystem of action:** Covering those actors who implement the programme in one way or another, e.g., experts, managers or collaborators.

- **Subsystem of reaction:** Comprises a variety of social actors, who react to the programme, whether as beneficiaries, non-beneficiaries or as self-appointed defenders of a given group.

A fourth subsystem can be added to this list, covering the evaluation team itself. Legitimacy is conferred on the evaluators to participate, although with certain limitations. Cronbach warns that the evaluators should seek out questions formulated by the local people, further stating that it would be an abuse of authority for all of the evaluation questions to be of their own invention (Ligero, 2011:7).
4. Proposal for Sensitive Evaluations

– Establishing participation channels in the evaluation

- There is no participation without organisation (Marchioni, 1989). One possibility offered by the United Nations (UN Women, 2011) is the creation of Reference Groups with the participation of different actors.

- Invite people to contribute and include them (Marchioni, 1989). The evaluation process should explicitly include questions formulated by a variety of stakeholders.

- Take their answers into account, respect and listen to their voice by first listening to multiple voices (Bamberger and Podems, 2002). The purpose here is not to collect opinions, but to achieve on-going participation in the formulation of the research questions and the data- compilation mechanisms (Ward, 2002:49). The data collected must be considered and built in to the decision-making framework of the evaluation and the informative analyses.

Active comparison of the perspectives provided by various stakeholders is also one of the best ways to mitigate against personal bias in the evaluation team.

Participation is a means by which to generate ownership, empowerment and the creation of a civic culture (UN Women, 2011; UN, 2006:35). The participatory process also increases the awareness and capacity for reflection of participants, leading to greater involvement of individuals in both the evaluation and the real-world situation that the intervention seeks to change. The participatory strategy provides a solid approach toward more sensitive evaluation.

c) Evaluation approach driven by critical change or a transformative paradigm

The traditional view of the role of evaluators is that they produce information on the programme in order to understand or judge it, and perhaps to propose recommendations for improvement. Evaluators can be involved in the reality affected by the intervention to a greater or lesser degree, but the responsibility for transforming that reality lies within the scope of the programme itself, not that of the evaluation.

However, there are other ways to view the evaluation task. Some evaluators see themselves as agents of change, they assume an activist attitude and use the evaluation to increase social justice and eschew any pretence of traditional objectivity (Patton, 2002:103). This manner of evaluation is known as a critical change-driven approach (Patton) or transformative paradigm (Ward Hood and Cassaro, 2002).
Mertens and Greene, the academic defenders of this paradigm, assume that knowledge is not neutral, but is influenced by human interests and, therefore, that all knowledge reflects the social and power relationships within a society; all of which should also be considered in the evaluation process.

This evaluation approach seeks to determine where social, economic and political inequalities lie; criticise social injustice; and raise awareness. The evaluation aims to change the balance of power in favour of those less powerful and, if nothing else, to represent their own interests more effectively through evaluation (Patton, 2002). Evaluations made using these “lenses” can create a more equitable, just society (Sielbeck-Bowen et al., 2002b).

The inclusion of stakeholders throughout the evaluation process would make it appear as though these approaches were a type of participatory method, but it is the inherent aspiration to transform reality that differentiates it from this and other approaches. Patton makes this clear when explaining whether a feminist evaluation is a true evaluation, setting out a series of criteria by which to differentiate evaluation models with a critical change paradigm from other approaches:

- Raises awareness about injustice.
- Identifies the nature and source of inequality and injustice.
- Represents the viewpoint of less powerful people.
- Makes visible the ways in which the powerful exercise and benefit from their power.
- Incorporates values and the historical context into the evaluation.
- Involves those with less power in a respectful and collaborative manner.
- Builds and strengthens the capacities of those involved in the action.
- Identifies potential strategies to catalyse change.
- Affects praxis.

Some of the definitions of HRBA and GID evaluations agree with this view of evaluation. For example, Ward Hood and Cassaro cite how Jennifer Greene views feminist evaluation as a form of ideologically open exploration that seeks to illuminate the historical structure and the values on which social phenomena are based in order to catalyse the policies and social changes necessary for greater justice, equality and democracy. The UN (2006) states that both of the approaches (GID and HRBA) are based on an analytical framework (for GID - the different situations experienced by men and women and the different roles played in a given society, and; for HRBA - a regulatory framework based on rights and duties). Both approaches consider the impact of activities on the wellbeing of certain groups, as well as the importance of enhancing autonomy and involvement in decision-making, in view of the change processes that could be generated.
In HRBA, there are different examples of this type of approach. Chacón et al. (2009) propose a system of human rights indicators derived explicitly from the appropriate standard. These are essential for the monitoring of human rights and in ensuring that duty-bearers fulfil their responsibilities and obligations. A similar proposal is made by the Ombudsman’s Office of Colombia (2006), seeking to demonstrate the existence of potential barriers to the exercising of a right, and to draw attention to the political and social responsibility of public administrations in creation and implementation of public policy. The CESR model is based on the same methodological approach and establishes indicators that show progress as an incentive for countries to make advances on human rights.

Within the gender perspective, the conceptualisation is similar. Vargas and Gambara (2010) propose a model built upon analysis of a series of elements in the situation of women and men, pinpointing the expected changes in terms of gender equality, participation, and capacity-building. Bamberger and Podems (2002), cite another example given in the World Bank document ‘Engendering Development Through Gender Equality in Rights, Resources and Voice’ (PRSP). This approach examines the four dimensions of opportunity, capacity, security and empowerment before verifying the changes made in each of them.

Ultimately, the HRBA and the GID approach are characterised by the following aspects:

- Analysis of the situation of exclusion or inequality, focussing on the most vulnerable and disadvantaged collectives.
- Strengthening the autonomy and capacities of disadvantaged social stakeholders.
- Favouring the involvement of stakeholders in change actions.

In particular, the main focus of the evaluation is on the extent to which the project has made the State more responsible for guaranteeing rights and whether the situation has improved for the most vulnerable collectives once the project is completed.

Although the situation analysis is not exclusive to this approach, transformative models have encouraged a great deal of theoretical development in this area and some of the major contributions are listed here. The definition of “evaluation” provided by Sielbeck-Bowen et al. (2002a:4) was formulated exclusively from a gender perspective14, but it still provides a good description of the purpose of this phase as: “a critical examination of the formal or informal practices (declared or undeclared) and of the activities integrated into the context of the programme for the purpose of exploring and making explicit how inequalities operate”.

This task is designed to make inequalities evident and to explore the mechanisms through which the gender system and rights model operate.

When considering gender analysis, the literature on evaluation reviewed by the team highlighted the importance of focussing on the aspects listed in Table 7.

---

14 Formulated for a feminist evaluation.
Table 7: Gender situation analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Subtopics</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access and control of resources/mechanisms and spaces for decision-making on resources.</td>
<td>Fernández Layos (2003); Espinosa (2011 and 2013a); Bamberger and Podems (2002); Murguialday et al. (2008); Vargas and Gambara (2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gendered division of labour/profile of activities.</td>
<td>Fernández Layos (2003); Espinosa (2011 and 2013a); Murguialday et al. (2008); Vargas and Gambara (2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time use; control of time use/organisation.</td>
<td>Espinosa (2011 and 2013a); Bamberger and Podems (2002); Vargas and Gambara (2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empowerment and voice.</td>
<td>Bamberger and Podems (2002); Murguialday et al. (2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition, social position and needs</td>
<td>Practical and strategic needs; needs and interests/problems and needs.</td>
<td>Fernández Layos (2003); Espinosa (2011 and 2013a); Murguialday et al. (2008); Bamberger and Podems (2002); Sierra Leguina, 2000; Vargas and Gambara (2010).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the HRBA, the United Nations (UN Women, 2011) has proposed a possible methodology for completing a situation analysis:

- Causality analysis: Makes manifest the basic causes of development problems and systemic patterns of discrimination.

- Analysis of functions/obligations: Helps to define who has which obligations to whom, especially in relation to the basic causes identified.

- Definition of the interventions needed to increase the capacities of rights-holders and improve the actions of duty-bearers.

One concrete example can be found in Jonsson (2003:102), where he presents a dual-entry table showing examples of State obligations regarding the right to food, health and nutrition assistance. On the vertical axis of the table, the author lists the type of obligation, such as respect, protection and facilitating compliance, while the vertical axis shows the rights that are subject to monitoring, such as food, health, and care/assistance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Nutritional care/assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respect:</strong></td>
<td>- No licenses for monopolistic marketing of small holder farm inputs or products.</td>
<td>- No tax on import of iodate.</td>
<td>- Not allow the free distribution of breast milk substitutes in government healthcare facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Adequate compensation in the event of land expropriation.</td>
<td>- No tax on mosquito nets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Non-interference in positive traditional health practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protect:</strong></td>
<td>- Land registration systems and provisions granting secure tenure of land.</td>
<td>- Legislation and enforcement against early marriage and harmful traditions and practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Labour laws related to conditions of work, minimum wage, etc.</td>
<td>- Environmental protection laws.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Food safety laws and system for inspection and enforcement.</td>
<td>- Law prohibiting the sale of alcohol and tobacco to minors and enforcement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Standards and licensing for public and private health care professionals, facilities and system for regular inspection, enforcement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: HRBA situation analysis
The infringement of a right cannot be analysed without taking other personal conditions or situations into account (Ward Hood and Cassaro, 2002) and this is generally approached through “intersectionality studies”. These provide analysis of those interactions that occur in an individual or group of situations or conditions and that serve as a basis for exclusion on the grounds of gender, ethnic origin, phenotypic differences, social class, sexual orientation or any other distinguishing feature.

Variables can intersect and combine within a power system to produce an intricate network of domination and subordination relationships, and any analysis must address the various factors for exclusion.

Table 8: HRBA situation analysis (Cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fulfilled (facilitate): The Obligation to Facilitate requires States to adopt appropriate legislative, administrative, budgetary, judicial, promotional and other measures toward the full realisation of the right.</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Nutritional care/assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- National food policy.</td>
<td>- National health policy.</td>
<td>- Sanitation and drinking water policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Famine Codes with resources.</td>
<td>- Sub-national resource allocations for health, according to regional needs.</td>
<td>- Baby friendly hospital initiative policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Constitutional guarantees on land ownership for everyone.</td>
<td>- School health education programmes, antiretroviral drugs for all pregnant women.</td>
<td>- Legislation to ensure employed mothers ability to breastfeed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Women’s right to land granted.</td>
<td>- Establishment of national food reserves.</td>
<td>- Maternity and paternity leave and other benefits ensured.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Laws relating to salt, iodisation and iron and/or vitamin A food fortification.</td>
<td>- Distribution of food.</td>
<td>- Constitutional right of every child to a free basic education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fulfilled (provide): The Obligation to Fulfil requires States to directly provide the assistance or services for the realisation of these rights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Nutritional care/assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Distribution of food.</td>
<td>- Provision of free basic health services accessible to all.</td>
<td>- Provision of an adequate supply of safe and potable drinking water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Micronutrient supplementation.</td>
<td>- Provision of care for orphans.</td>
<td>- Social security and other safety nets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Jonsson, 2003
4. Proposal for Sensitive Evaluations

Following the situation analysis, the remainder of the process consists of establishing evaluation questions. These questions stem directly from the analyses made, as suggested by the World Bank (2005) in relation to mainstreaming GID actions. The questions refer to the participation of each gender in the project, the benefits for of each gender, the changes perceived by women and men, the comparison of expected goals and results achieved, factors explaining success or failure, and how gender impact can be increased or maintained. Another proposal by Borja and García sets out a matrix of rights (as expressed in regulations) and principles (availability, access, acceptability, quality, participation and sustainability) providing a basis at each intersection of variables for the formulation of evaluation questions and the production of indicators with their corresponding sources of verification.

In short, the transformative model in GID and the HRBA attempts to describe advances and retreats in rights and equality, while also covering: other factors that interact or intersect to generate exclusion; skills development by the programme beneficiaries; and; the generation of change processes. This sequence provides the framework from which the rest of the evaluation questions and design will be drawn, and it can be summarised in four points:

- Diverse exclusion factors in a group and individual.
- Changes that have taken place in issues detected in the situation analyses.
- The development of actors’ skills and capacities.
- Participation, demands and reality change processes developed by the actors themselves.

d) Judgement-driven summative evaluation approach

These evaluations aim to determine the merit, worth, significance or overall validity of an element. This type of evaluation is essentially used as a basis for decision-making on the programme, most of which are decisions on whether to continue with the programme, expand it or amend it in some way (Patton, 2006:113-114).

Patton describes four necessary steps in summative or judgement-driven evaluation, that are described by Scriven as rules for “the logic of evaluation”:

1. Establish criteria.
2. Construct standards.
3. Measure performance and compare to standards.

---

15 See Bibliography.
16 We use the word ‘summative’ as used by Patton although we understand Michael Scriven’s (1991) view of ‘summative’ as used to describe final judgement evaluations that may also contribute to formative purposes.
Many authors use the elements of end judgement or criteria in their approach to gender and rights sensitivity, such as Hunt and Brouwers (2003), who understand that the evaluation of gender equality content must be built on well-defined evaluation criteria and gender-sensitive indicators.

Our research uncovered three strategies for criteria-based evaluation of the HRBA and GID:

1. Use the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria adapted for GID- and HRBA-sensitivity.
2. Use the DAC criteria plus other more specific criteria.
3. Use new value criteria.

Criterion: An attribute of a specific object or activity used to recognise its merits and deficiencies. This may be a feature or ingredient considered essential. This forms the basis for an evaluation or an action when a standard is set.

Standard: A quantity, degree or expression of a specific criterion, which indicates the difference between two different degrees of merit (Stake 2006:111).
1) Use the DAC criteria, adapted for GID- and HRBA-sensitivity

There are several widely used models for the HRBA approach, including the DAC model based on five evaluation criteria for all cooperation activities: impact, effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and sustainability. These criteria are widely accepted and have been adopted by leading international actors in the development field. In Spain, the State Secretariat for International Cooperation of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation published these in its 1998 handbook *Metodología de Evaluación de la Cooperación Española* (Methodology for the Evaluation of Spanish Cooperation) (MAE, 1998).

However, a gender-sensitive evaluation requires some rethinking of the evaluation criteria and questions (sub-criteria), to account for various dimensions of gender, such as: gendered division of labour, gender roles, the participation of men and women in private and public spaces, control over the use of women’s bodies, practical and strategic gender needs, time use by men and women, and access to and control over resources and benefits by both genders (Espinosa, 2011 and 2013a).

The International Labour Organization (1995 and 2007) proposed revision of the criteria from a gender perspective, suggesting the use of three checklists covering:

- Analysis of the participation of women and men in the project.
- Gender-oriented review of effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, sustainability and compliance with international labour standards.
- Gender-oriented review of the purpose, scope, content, design, implementation, performance (examining effectiveness, relevance, efficiency and sustainability) and compliance with international labour standards.

Murgualday et al. (2008) have proposed the criteria be made gender-sensitive, while Gómez Galán (2011) built a matrix with the DAC criteria in one section with HRBA-related questions on the horizontal axis. A similar approach would be applicable to gender.

2) Use the DAC criteria plus other specific criteria

Another form of evaluation builds on redefining the DAC criteria by adding new value criteria (Espinosa, 2011 and 2013a; Sierra Leguina, 2000). During the design negotiation and discussion phase, the evaluator is able to offer additional criteria for judgement to those initially suggested by the foreseen users. Clarifying the values to be used as a basis for judgement is a key function of the evaluator (Patton 2008: 114).

---

17 See Annex.
The DAC structure allows for criteria to be discarded or new criteria added, depending on the evaluation questions and on the goals of the evaluation (DAC, 2010:9). In Spain, the SGCID also acknowledges that there may be situations where complementary criteria might be necessary, even suggesting a list of these (MAEC, 2007a:57).

Specific methodological proposals include the UN (2006:36) framework, which adds the following criteria to those of the DAC:

- **Equality and non-discrimination**: All individuals are equal as human beings and by virtue of the inherent dignity of each human person. All human beings are entitled to their human rights without discrimination of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, ethnicity, age, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, disability, property, birth or other status. As development programmes cannot reach all persons at the same time, priority must be given to the most marginalised.

- **Accountability**: This contributes to a more transparent policy-formulating process and gives individuals and communities capacity for action so that duty-bearers are made accountable, ensuring that effective channels exist for redress in the event of a rights violation.

- **Participation and inclusion**: Sierra Leguina (2000) stresses the importance of the “quality of participation” criterion where participation means lobbying for direct national stakeholders to genuinely identify with the development processes and to have real control over these processes at every stage of the programme cycle (prior evaluation, analysis, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation). The HRBA seeks to help in the participative formulation of the necessary political and legislative framework, and to lobby for the participative and democratic processes to be institutionalised at local and national levels (even increasing the capacities of families, communities and civil society to participate constructively in the relevant forums).

In another UN text (2005) and in Jonsson’s (2004) discussion of the issue, links are established between the human rights principles and the criteria for HRBA-sensitive evaluation of development policy processes:

- **Universality and inalienability**: Human rights are universal and inalienable. All people everywhere in the world are entitled to them. The human person in whom they inhere cannot voluntarily give them up. Nor can others take them away from him or her.

- **Indivisibility**: Human rights are indivisible. Whether of a civil, cultural, economic, political or social nature, they are all inherent to the dignity of every human person. Consequently, they all have equal status as rights, and cannot be ranked, a priori, in a hierarchical order.
Interdependence (among the different rights): The realisation of one right often depends, wholly or in part, upon the realisation of others. For instance, realisation of the right to health may depend, in certain circumstances, on realisation of the right to education or of the right to information.

Equality and non-discrimination: All individuals are equal as human beings and by virtue of the inherent dignity of each human person. All human beings are entitled to their human rights without discrimination of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, ethnicity, age, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, disability, property, birth or other status as explained by the human rights treaty bodies.

Participation and inclusion: Every person and all peoples are entitled to active, free and meaningful participation in, contribution to, and enjoyment of civil, economic, social, cultural and political development in which human rights and fundamental freedoms can be realised.

Accountability and rule of law: States and other duty-bearers are answerable for the observance of human rights. In this regard, they have to comply with the legal norms and standards enshrined in human rights instruments. Where they fail to do so, aggrieved rights-holders are entitled to institute proceedings for appropriate redress before a competent court or other adjudicator in accordance with the rules and procedures provided by law.

Progressiveness of economic, social and cultural rights, construed as the adoption of a public policy that regards the full realisation of economic, social and cultural rights, cannot, generally speaking, be achieved quickly and thus requires a process during which each country advances at its own pace toward achievement of the goal. This principle invalidates regressive measures, except in justifiable extreme cases, and it rules out inaction.

The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) proposes a series of evaluation criteria within the Framework of Results and Key Success Factors (CIDA, n/d):

Achievement of results: This refers to what progress is being made toward achievement of gender equality (participation in decision-making, rights of women and girls, access to and control over resources and benefits). Moreover, in analysing this criterion, it also proposes comparing the results achieved for women and men, the identification of unintended results and assessment of what contribution has been made to the capacity to promote equality.

Cost-effectiveness of results: This refers to the existence of a reasonable relationship between costs and gender equality results. Furthermore, it focusses on studying whether there are other more cost-effective models for achieving the same results.
Relevance of results: Consider the extent to which gender equality results contribute to poverty reduction; the extent to which men and women stakeholders are satisfied with the gender equality results achieved; the extent to which gender equality results are in line with the commitments of key partners; and the extent to which supporting these partners contributes to greater gender equality in that specific country.

Sustainability of results: The probability of gender equality results continuing after the development action has ended; what factors in the context pose the greatest risks to sustainability and what can be done to minimise them.

Participation and partnership: This focuses on the extent to which equal participation of women and men in decision-making is promoted, as well as the extent to which contributions are made to capacity-building in order to promote equality in partner countries. Moreover, it involves analysis of whether women and girls face constraints or obstacles in their participation in development action, and the extent to which women’s organisations and organisations advocating gender equality are involved in the strategy to promote equality.

Appropriateness of design: This examines whether a gender analysis has been performed, disaggregating data by gender, age, ethnicity and socioeconomic group, and whether a realistic strategy is included for promoting gender equality.

Appropriateness of resource utilisation and timely implementation of actions: This refers to equal representation at all levels of management; to how women’s participation in management affects gender equality results; and to the impact of the inclusion/absence of gender specialists in management. Furthermore, it also analyses whether progress in gender equality results is adequately monitored.

From the gender perspective, De Waal (2006) proposes combining the DAC’s classic evaluation criteria with gender mainstreaming goals:

Parity: Refers to the number of women and men participating in or benefiting from a development project or action.

Equality (formal): Analyses whether women have the same opportunities as men.

Equity (equality of results or substantive equality): Refers to equivalence in the impact on the lives of women and men, recognising their different needs, preferences and interests. It acknowledges that achieving equality of results may require different treatment of women and men.

Empowerment: Women’s degree of awareness of their position of subordination and how their capacities to counter it are increased.

Transformation: Refers to including gender equality on the agenda and to incorporation of the gender approach into all policies and programmes, as well as into administrative and financial activities.
A document produced by UN Women (2011) opened up the possibility adding the AL-NAP criteria for humanitar

ian action interventions (Berck, 2006) to the DAC criteria:

- **Relevance/appropriateness**: Relevance is concerned with assessing whether the project is in line with local needs and priorities (as well as the donor policy). Appropriateness is the tailoring of humanitarian activities to local needs, increasing ownership, accountability, and cost-effectiveness accordingly.

- **Connectedness**: The need to ensure that activities of a short-term emergency nature are carried out in a context that takes longer-term and interconnected problems into account.

- **Coherence**: The need to assess security, developmental, trade and military policies, as well as humanitarian policies, to ensure that there is consistency and, in particular, that all policies take into account humanitarian and human rights considerations.

- **Coverage**: The need to reach major population groups facing life-threatening suffering wherever they are.

Moreover, they also add equality, participation, social transformation, inclusion and empowerment to the list.

This proliferation of supplementary criteria is summarised in Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9: Supplementary Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universality and inalienability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality and non-discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indivisibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependence (among the different rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability and rule of law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3) New criteria

Some other evaluation proposals do not use the DAC criteria. For instance, the CESR, uses criteria taken from international standards, organised according to systemic dimensions (see Annex).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10: Criteria according to dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood malnutrition (food)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal mortality (health)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-completion of primary school (Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CESR.

For GID, Murgualday et al. (2008) present a set of quantitative and qualitative indicators to measure the specific impact on the subjective, economic and political empowerment of women.

4.4. Operationalisation

Operationalisation is a process defining how each evaluation question is to be measured or answered. It establishes the logical relationships between the questions, indicators or measurement systems, the techniques or sources and their corresponding methodological options. It is a logic chain showing the concept defined and the research system proposed for its evaluation. This process can be both deductive and inductive, as well as being shaped or constructed by the stakeholders themselves.

The framework of a deductive operationalisation involves two kinds of tasks:

a) Vertical work: Identifying possible questions based on a diagnosis of the context, of the evaluation situation, the purpose, evaluation approach and the different stakeholders.

b) Horizontal work: Once the priorities have been established on the vertical axis, the information-gathering systems can be designed.
4. Proposal for Sensitive Evaluations

Figure 4: Operationalisation of evaluation questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Aspects that define the question (optional)</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Information-gathering techniques or sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Definition of questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Indicators for each question</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Sources or techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: author generated.

a) Vertical work

The evaluation questions are requests for information on some aspect of the programme or service which involve an assessment, not just an inquiry.

The questions are key elements of the evaluation; they define what is to be ultimately evaluated. They form the basis of the research system structure and the information is organised accordingly. For an evaluation to be sensitive, the HRBA and the GiD approach must be implicitly or explicitly covered by the question set.

The evaluation approach influences how the evaluation questions arise or are identified:

- **Theory of change-driven evaluation**: The questions arise from observing the theory of change or logic model of the programme, organised on the basis of the causal relationships revealed by the model.
• **Pluralist evaluation**: The questions arise from the different stakeholders legitimised by the evaluation through a coordinated involvement system.

• **Transformative evaluation**: The questions arise from the aspects detected through situation analyses and stakeholder capacity-building.

• **Judgement-driven summative evaluation**: The final criteria are formulated as the questions. When this approach is chosen, a system of sub-criteria can be established with the final judgement drawn from the combination of these.

For example, the UN model (UN Women, 2011) for drawing out the questions is based on a systemic approach of design, implementation and outcomes; it also uses the DAC criteria and opens up the possibility of using ALNAP criteria. This model also proposes specific criteria, such as: equality, involvement, social transformation and empowerment.

Some evaluation models are based on already established questions, although it is quite common to build a degree of flexibility into the operationalisation in order for the evaluation model to be adapted to the context. The DAC-OECD and the SGCID-MAEC recommend that the questions formulated reflect the interests of stakeholders, including the evaluators.

b) **Horizontal work: Definition of systems of measurement, indicators and sources**

According to Ligero (2011), the evaluation questions do not have to consider the issue of measurability. It is the “indicators” that will be used to actually measure the concept defined, generally in the form of estimates. While the questions should aim to represent the various issues defining the evaluation approach as fully as possible, the indicators should take the form of measurable, observable or recordable variables presumed capable of providing information that might answer the questions.

Indicators must represent the concept or criteria to be measured as closely as possible, although it is common for them to reflect the situation of parallel or similar phenomena to the target concept, contributing an approximation of the information sought rather than exact data to the evaluation. Rutter et al. (2000:40) describe indicators as features indirectly connected to the causal processes but not forming part of the mechanisms directly associated with causation.

The following table provides an example of questions, indicators and techniques for the fish production project with a gender perspective.

---

18 As described by Scriven in the analytical evaluation approach.
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A good gender indicator is the one best adapted to the question. Information disaggregated by sex will be needed as and when the research requires; but default disaggregation for all indicators does not necessarily imply a higher degree of evaluation sensitivity.

Despite the obligatory relationship between the question and the indicator, there are aspects of GID and the HRBA on which there is a great deal of consensus and they are normal considerations in evaluations, e.g. empowerment, participation, control of resources, etc. Some authors have proposed batteries of indicators, which facilitate the task and provide ideas when designing indicators. For instance, Murgualday et al. (2008) have a good model for empowerment, the UNEG (2011) examples are strong and Hunt (2006) provide indicators to detect compliance with international conventions on human rights.\(^{19}\)

Table 11: Example of an evaluation matrix for the fish project with a gender perspective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there a significant number women fishers?</td>
<td>Women go out to fish daily (a participation percentage within two sigmas of the percentage of women in the population is considered significant).</td>
<td>Daily observation log.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are boats owned by or allocated to women.</td>
<td>Questionnaire for fishers M and F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a significant number of women among the leaders (holding positions of leadership)</td>
<td>There are women among the leaders (those holding positions of leadership) mentioned by the members of the fisher associations (a participation percentage within two sigmas of the percentage of women in the population is considered significant).</td>
<td>Questionnaire for fishers M and F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the quality of fishing gear and boats evenly distributed between men and women?</td>
<td>Men and women have similar scores on a quality scale for their gear.</td>
<td>Quality test for gear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allocation list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do men and women receive the same training?</td>
<td>The percentages of men and women in training groups reflect their percentages in the population.</td>
<td>Population figures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>List of those registered on courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are men involved in household chores?</td>
<td>Declaration on daily chores involving care of family members carried out by men.</td>
<td>Questionnaire for fishers M and F.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Created by the authors.

\(^{19}\) More information on these proposals can be found in the Annex.
In the case of purely qualitative methods and techniques, no indicators are required as the qualitative logic breaks with predefined data structures. These techniques generate dynamics in which the informants contribute free, unstructured discourses that can answer the evaluation questions with confidence and veracity, but the data produced cannot be treated with the same logic as that of the quantitative information system.

4.5. Methodology and Techniques

Methods of inquiry include strategies on how to obtain valid, reliable, trustworthy information based on the various paradigms on which the inquiry is based.

Techniques and sources are the specific instruments used for gathering information.

The selection of one evaluation method over another depends upon the purpose and scope of the evaluation questions (DAC, 2010) or on the underlying paradigm used by the evaluators and evaluation decision-makers. In his work entitled The Paradigm Dialog, Guba (1990) identifies four paradigms for social research: positivism, post-positivism, critical theory and constructivism, but there are no particular elements in GID or the HRBA that would favour the use of any one of these approaches over the others. GID or HRBA evaluations are exposed to the same influences and methodological decisions as any other evaluations.

Katherine Hay’s description of feminist evaluation is enlightening on this front. She describes the field as not a design or a set of methods, but rather: “a lens or standpoint that influences the choices made in design and methods. A rigorous feminist evaluation uses the mix of methods that matches the questions (...) Individual methods per se are not feminist or non-feminist” (2012: 329).

Patton (2002:104) argues that some kind of sympathy toward constructivism is necessary, but not in itself sufficient, for the performance of a sensitive feminist evaluation. There are many recommendations tending toward the qualitative model and this is sometimes considered the most appropriate method for sensitive research. Porter (2009:85) defends the use of this kind of evaluation in ethnography and, moreover, the main qualitative techniques can be found widely recommended in the literature:

- Discussion groups/Focus group (Bamberger and Podems, 2002:90).
- Interviews (UNEG, 2011).
These recommendations are balanced by many others for the quantitative approach. For example, Bamberger and Podems (2002:87) believe that the measurement of comparison groups can provide useful help in understanding the change processes observed. Longitudinal models using baselines, so often promoted in development cooperation, are also cited by various sources (ALINe, 2010; World Bank, 2005; NORAD, 2005). Quantitative approaches are also recommended as they usually have higher credibility among the primary users of the evaluation. Sudarshan and Sharma (in Hay, 2012:323), point out that figures can often provide more effective arguments than a narrative approach in the field of feminist evaluation.

However, the debate over qualitative vs. quantitative models, widely known as the “paradigm war”, can now be considered a thing of the past (Patton, 2002). Today, a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches is accepted as the most well-balanced form of research (Serrano et al., 2009) and many institutions and authors (Bamberger and Podems, 2002; OAS, 2008; Hay, 2012) recommend multi-method approaches in GID or HRBA evaluations.

4.6. Fieldwork

Fieldwork comprises all activities carried out to apply the techniques or to compile data from secondary sources.

During this phase, the particular features of GID and the HRBA evaluation demand that the evaluators maintain an empathetic, sensitive and respectful attitude when working with collectives in disadvantaged, unfair or exclusionary situations (Bamberger and Podems, 2002) and there are two key recommendations that apply:

- Propose schedules and spaces adapted for the actors (Murguialday et al., 2008).
- Establish a relationship of equals between the evaluation teams and the informants (Bamberger and Podems, 2002).

The temporary power that the evaluation confers on the evaluators should be administered horizontally avoiding the creation of autocratic evaluation models. According to McDonald (in Stake, 2006) autocratic evaluators legitimise the policies they analyse in exchange for consolidating their academic or professional territory. The evaluation process should involve co-responsibility on the part of informants and evaluators, avoiding any exploitation of the subjects involved in the programme.

20 Multi-method research is also known as mixed method research.
These considerations fit within the framework of a pluralist or democratic approach. The participation of various stakeholders in information-gathering is also suggested: promoting alliances for data collection and analysis with women’s non-governmental organisations, grassroots organisations, research centres, etc. (World Bank, 2005).

4.7. Data Analysis and Interpretation

The objective of this phase is to integrate the data from various indicators or information systems and to facilitate understanding of the “reality” of the programme. This is an exercise to explain and make sense of all the information extracted and to resolve any apparent contradictions or problems detected (Ligero, 2011).

In practice, for example, this is not a question of simply collecting data on women but of making an honest and truthful interpretation of their realities (Ward, 2002). The following suggestions can facilitate the interpretation process:

- **Data triangulation** (UN Women, 2011). This concept means integrating data from different sources into a single interpretative approach. For more information, see Serrano et al. (2009).

- **The whole evaluation team participating in the analysis.** All of the evaluators involved in the process should also participate in the interpretation phase.

- **Validate the findings obtained** (UN Women, 2011). Ensure that the final conclusions make sense to the stakeholders involved. One of the methods proposed is the organisation of workshops with the various groups in order to present the outcomes. More specifically, ALINE (2010) suggests inviting stakeholders to the debate. However, the debate should be carefully prepared in consideration of possible tensions between the actors.

- **Discussion of discrepancies and their possible significance between team members** (DAC, 2010:14).

The final product should be an interpretation explaining how the development programme has achieved its impact and outlining the influence it has had on the exercising of human rights and the gender equity and equality situation.

4.8. Judgement

Judging means making a valuation regarding some aspect of the programme, based on a systematic and explicit process.
Judgements made regarding the programme will depend on the individual evaluation design, the purposes, criteria and models chosen. However, sensitive evaluations should facilitate judgement regarding whether the programme has contributed to a more egalitarian gender system or a more effective enjoyment of rights. This judgement should make it possible to classify the programme on the basis of the degree to which they have transformed the reality:

   a) Transformative interventions.
   b) Interventions that preserve the status quo.
   c) Interventions that damage or worsen the situation.

### a) Transformative interventions for gender and rights situations

These have also been described as redistributive (Kabeer and Subrahmanian, 1999) or gender-transformative (ALINe, 2010) actions.

The UNEG identifies two major categories here: (1) interventions with a high level of transformation and; (2) medium level interventions that incorporate GID and the HRBA but that demonstrate certain weaknesses (UN Women, 2011).

For some authors, there are more than two categories; for example, De Waal (2006) found five levels of impact: transformation, empowerment, equity, equality and parity, while Freeman et al. (2003) defined another scale that measures mainstreaming in six stages: none (or zero), pro forma, integrated, institutionalised, implemented and included in monitoring/evaluation (M/E).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Sub-division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNEQ</strong></td>
<td>1) High level: Programme theory incorporates HR and gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Medium level: Incorporated in the programme theory, but with certain weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>De Waal</strong></td>
<td>1) Transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5) Parity (representation and participation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeman et al.</strong></td>
<td>0) Zero (or none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) Pro forma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Institutionalised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5) Included in M/E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Created by authors.
b) Interventions that preserve the status quo

These are interventions that do not seek to change the gender system, nor the rights situation, even when there is awareness of inequality. ALINe (2010) and Fernández-Layos (2003) define this kind of intervention as neutral policies. This term has been criticised, as it is widely considered that there is no such thing as a gender- or rights-neutral policy (Bustelo, 2011; GiD Workshop). The critics argue that maintaining the status quo of inequality systems cannot be considered neutral as it abets and contributes to the inequality, meaning that there is only a small difference of degree between this category and the next there.

c) Interventions that damage or worsen the situation

These interventions affect the reality in a way opposite to the values desired, i.e. they increase inequality or worsen the situation regarding gender or human rights.

These frequently start out with a pro-equality discourse that evaporates during the implementation, monitoring and evaluation processes. On other occasions, development actions that are initially understood to be neutral can tend to replicate inequalities if countermeasures are not established (Kabeer, 1998; Boserup, 1993).

Judgements allow for general categories of the degree of impact on gender and rights to be established, without ruling out the possibility of other alternative evaluations. Assessment of the degree of impact on reality forms the basis of public accountability.

4.9. Reporting of Outcomes

The process via which the evaluation outcomes obtained are reported to the various stakeholders and audiences in order to influence them.

The term “evaluation report” is used to refer to all of the various evaluation products, for example: verbal or written reports, visual presentations and group seminars (DAC, 2010).

The impact of the reporting can be increased with the following considerations:

- In general terms, it is good to distinguish between the different levels of products, and the OECD (DAC, 2010:13) proposes presenting data in terms of: findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned.
Decisions and actions carried out in the other phases should be included to maintain the coherence regarding GID and the HRBA. The report should explicitly state how sensitivity was incorporated, whether through the outlook of the evaluators, the design evaluation or the evaluation approach chosen.

Reports should be drafted in a culturally sensitive manner (UN Women, 2011). Finch (in Sielbeck-Bowen et al., 2002a) even considers of providing a preview of findings to the various groups in order to avoid any misinterpretation of the situation or any harm to vulnerable groups.

The products and reporting processes should be targeted on useable outcomes that can be applied to increase understanding and change ideas on the gender and human rights situations (UN Women, 2011). Where knowledge of a policy and its effects is increased, more change is likely to ensue where this is needed.
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5. **Guidelines for Sensitive Evaluation**

As we mentioned in the Introduction, our work has consisted of identifying the various proposals and rearranging them on the basis of the elements or methods they propose for incorporating gender or rights into the evaluation.

However, we felt the need for a further section to lay out the criteria and guidelines we considered most important in the decision-making process in order to adequately incorporate the perspectives into the evaluation. The individual evaluators or institutions will ultimately be responsible for the decision on which approaches to adopt on the basis of the context or evaluation needs. We merely aim to provide reflections that could serve as the criteria on which to base this decision.

In the process of presenting these elements, some methodological considerations have arisen that extend beyond the framework of human rights and gender, but we have included them as we consider they could be useful in the evaluation design process.

Our main understanding is that the sensitive approach is achieved through two central mechanisms, complemented by the evaluation of the programme design (included Section IV.1):

- Evaluator outlook - which places emphasis on equity at every phase of the evaluation process.
- Conscious and explicit introduction of sensitive method in the evaluation design.
- Evaluation of the programme design.

There may well be a fourth constituent element in the form of data interpretation. If an evaluation did not work with a sensitive perspective, the analysis can allow for the extraction of information on which to base a gender or rights analysis. Such an approach would depend on the versatility of the data in each individual case.

**Table 13: Classification of proposals by contribution to sensitivity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guarantee or contribute substantially to sensitive evaluation:</th>
<th>Contribute to, strengthen or continue efforts but <strong>do not by themselves guarantee a sensitive evaluation:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Design evaluation strategies</td>
<td>• Methodological and technical choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluator outlook (commission)</td>
<td>• Fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incorporation into the design (operationalisation and evaluation approaches)</td>
<td>• Judgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Outcomes reporting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Can have a high degree of influence on sensitivity:**

- Data interpretation and analysis.

*Source: Created by authors.*
We believe that the remaining proposals contribute to, or have the potential to continue or strengthen the previous approaches, but they do not have sufficient impact on the evaluation process to make it sensitive. They can, however, be considered essential actions capable of complementing the decisions or approaches that do have impact. This category includes all of those tasks related to the design of techniques, methods and judgement.

However, it is possible that these perspectives were not taken into account in designing the evaluation and, for example, that the research was reoriented toward gender issues during the fieldwork stage. Evaluation is not always a preordained linear process and reorientation can be considered normal or even desirable in achieving evaluations adapted to new contexts and findings. However, where this occurs, the main consideration is more the issue of “evaluation team outlook” than of explicit strategies to ensure sensitivity.

A sensitive evaluation can be defined as one that incorporates these viewpoints in the evaluation design, whether non-specifically (through team attitudes) or specifically (through the choice of strategies) and which deliberately maintains the approach throughout the remainder of the evaluation process. Therefore, the work of the evaluators will entail making decisions during the design phases and keeping the issue alive as the evaluation moves forward.

Figure 5: The evaluation process

Source: Created by authors.

The following sections expand on our reflections and criteria for each of the strategies. We have grouped techniques, methods and fieldwork design into a single section.
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5.1. Considerations on the Evaluation of Programme Design

Evaluation of the programme design establishes a certain analytical logic that we consider sufficient and complete for the revision of the gender and human rights approach in terms of technical programme design.

Use of this strategy will be appropriate when there is a clear demand for design evaluation. This may be the case when there is a need to decide between a series of programmes or when appraisal is needed of the theoretical consistency of the intervention. The design evaluation may be performed in isolation as there is no need for it to be included in every programme evaluation process.

5.2. Considerations on Evaluator Outlook

Team competence is a key issue. This strategy does not provide a prescriptive evaluation process as it counts on the capacities of evaluators who are aware of and sensitive to these issues and who will develop particular strategies during the “evaluation journey”.

While the non-specific nature of the proposal may appear to generate uncertainty, we agree with Ward’s (2002) opinion that this is one of the most robust ways to perform sensitive evaluations due to the on-going tension between team members throughout the decision-making process.

Thus, assurances must be sought of adequate team competences when commissioning an evaluation. Section IV.1, The Commission provided some guidelines for this which can be summarised as:

**Evaluator Outlook**

- Capacity for empathy.
- Understanding of the concepts in the approaches.
- Sharing of HRBA and gender values.

The outlook of the team or evaluator can be made more sensitive through:

- Awareness-raising:
  - Reading specialist literature on human rights.
  - Discussion and dialogue with stakeholders involved in the programme under evaluation. Generating awareness.
- Training in competences and skills:
  - Defining an initial phase of training/awareness-raising.
- Creating mixed-gender teams where gender is the issue.
- Inclusion of experts.
- Adopt or follow guidelines or proposed codes of ethics.
5.3. Incorporating Approaches into Evaluation Design

This section addresses the set of methodological options that can be consciously used to design sensitive evaluations. If the evaluation design incorporates these perspectives and the subsequent work follows the plan, then HRBA- and GID- sensitive evaluations will be guaranteed.3

The first decision concerns evaluation approaches which have been grouped into four major models:

- Theory of change.
- Participative.
- Transformative approach.
- Summative judgement-driven.

Any of these methods, when applied properly, will be sufficient to ensure a sensitive evaluation. However, each one generates a different range of products and can be used in a variety of ways, so the choice of one over another will affect the outcome to some degree.

We believe that the principal decision on which approach to use depends upon the purpose of the evaluation, which in turn is closely linked to the outlook of those stakeholders who contribute to the evaluation requirements.

Jennifer Greene (2007:17) has identified four main purposes for evaluations and also outlined those stakeholders most likely to ask for these:

- Providing a basis for decision-making and accountability - can respond to the information needs and interests of political leaders or other actors with decision-making capacity.
- Improving the programme and the organisational development - provides valuable information for managers or other persons in charge of normal programme operations.
- In-depth and contextualised understanding of the programme and its practices - usually to meet the information needs and interests of programme staff or, sometimes, the participants.
- Promoting greater justice and equality in the programme and in the context in which it is being evaluated - usually addresses the needs of participants, their families, and the community.

Patton (2008:116), however, views the relationship between evaluation purposes and stakeholders as more of a trend than a definitive classification. Whatever the truth may be, the actors asking for information will generally provide some indication of the purpose or use of the evaluation where this is not already explicit.
The next step in the selection process is the appraisal of which of the four approaches described is best adapted to the evaluation purpose defined. The following section provides a picture of the purposes or stakeholders most likely to benefit from each of the four major currents.

**a) Evaluation driven by theory of change**

This approach enables understanding of the mechanisms and links between processes and results, contributes to analysis of the causal relationships in the programme and explains the keys to success or failure of the intervention. The data generated contribute to greater understanding of the intervention and its implementation.

We take the view that organisational improvement or development is best built on prior knowledge of the programme history.

In summary, theory-driven evaluation provides a valid framework for understanding and can also contribute to improvement where it meets the needs of:

- Managers or other individuals responsible for the normal operation of the programme.
- Programme staff and, sometimes, participants.

The task of evaluation is made easier where the programme theory has been predefined and HRBA and gender sensitivity have been incorporated. However, this is not necessarily a prerequisite for choosing this type of orientation.
b) Stakeholder-driven

This approach coordinates participation processes between the various stakeholders, placing particular emphasis on the most underprivileged groups. Therefore, these models are appropriate for plural social situations, where the different groups involved in the evaluation can be given legitimacy and bargaining power, just as Monnier explained in reference to pluralist evaluation (1992).

Other situations, where a single or hegemonic view prevails over public action, as is the case in technical, economic or legal contexts, render the application of genuinely participatory dynamics more complex.

c) Critical change-driven or transformative paradigm

This approach has the clear purpose of social transformation, justice and progress toward equality and democracy. This form of evaluation is aimed at groups in a greater situation of inequality or rights violations. Analysis of the context of the evaluation and the commission should make it possible to judge the appropriateness of this approach.

Michael Patton has proposed a series of criteria to distinguish between evaluation models with a critical change paradigm:

- Raising awareness about injustice.
- Identifying the nature and source of inequality and injustice.
- Representing the viewpoint of less powerful people.
- Making visible the ways in which the powerful exercise and benefit from their power.
- Incorporating values and the historical context into the evaluation.
- Involving those with less power in a respectful and collaborative manner.
- Building and strengthening capacity for those involved in the action.
- Identifying potential strategies to catalyse change.
- Praxis.

d) Judgement-driven summative evaluation

As was described above, final or summative judgements are essentially used as a basis for decision-making in relation to the programme (Patton 2008:114). Primary users, those requiring this type of evaluation, are usually political leaders, funders of the intervention, or other stakeholders with decision-making capacity. This model is often requested by international organisations and donor agencies.
Within the judgement-driven approach, there is essentially a choice between two approaches: a) standardised or preordinate\(^{21}\) criteria, or; b) approaches sensitive to the needs of the various stakeholders.

\(\text{a)}\) Standardised criteria offer the convenience of being predefined, justified and validated, and also present the advantage of enabling the analysis of different interventions using the same parameters. Certain proposals, such as that of the OECD’s DAC, are widely used and have been endorsed by various cooperation actors.

\(\text{b)}\) Conversely, Jennifer Greene (1999:164) has pointed out that consideration of what constitutes the quality of a programme may vary between the different groups of stakeholders involved. Respecting all legitimate stakeholder perspectives in the determination of quality has been widely recognised as an important part of our work. In practice, those stakeholders who have legitimate interests regarding the programme are the ones who define the criteria for evaluating the intervention.

As has already been explained, some mixed approaches seek to use standard criteria in combination with those suggested by the stakeholders. This is an eclectic solution that would respond well to the varied demands and contexts involved in commissioning the evaluation.

In general, a certain degree of combination or supplementation is possible between the different approaches. For example, theory of change can be combined with end criteria, as has been brilliantly proved by certain non-governmental development organisations. However, this supplementation of methods does not change the uses and purposes of each individual part. Indeed, they can be best understood as almost two separate evaluations within a single exercise, with an obvious impact on budget and resources. Carol Weiss identifies a degree of practical incompatibility in the combination of purposes:

> With all the possible uses for evaluation to serve, the evaluator has to make choices. The all-purpose evaluation is a myth. Although a number of different types of questions can be considered within the bounds of a single study, this takes meticulous planning and design. Not even a well-planned study will provide information on all the questions from all the people involved. (1998:33).

Theoretically, it is possible to synchronise evaluation interests and requirements, and carry out multi-method evaluations. However, we recommend careful analysis of the commission and the real information needs, because there is usually more agreement in the evaluation requirements than is anticipated by the different types of stakeholders involved.

\(^{21}\) The term preordinate has been adopted from Robert Stake (2006).
5.4. Considerations on Operationalisation

We believe the identification of questions, indicators or systems to answer the questions, in combination with the approaches, are the key phases in developing sensitive evaluations. Evaluation questions are central to the investigation and therefore, either jointly or severally, they must reflect the rights- and gender-based approaches. In other words, the questions express the requirements and criteria that enable us to appraise the contribution to equality of the programme.

When the perspectives described in the previous section are applied, this ensures that the questions express sensitivity. Once these outlooks have been set, they must also be transferred to the indicators or to the information collection techniques.

Indicators are measurement systems used to respond to evaluation questions or criteria. Therefore, a good HRBA or gender indicator will be the one best adapted to the evaluation question. The indicators have no intrinsic value where there is no known question to answer. The questions should be formulated first, before the indicators are checked to see which will provide the best-fit estimations for the question asked.

This leads us to reflect that the sexual disaggregation of data will be meaningful when the investigation requires this; as a default disaggregation for all indicators does not necessarily imply a higher degree of sensitivity in the evaluation.

Ultimately, operationalisation must ensure that the HRBA and GID perspectives are transferred throughout the entire evaluation information system.

5.5. Considerations on Techniques, Methods and Fieldwork

In the literature review, the authors tend to suggest qualitative techniques and methods for evaluating the HRBA and GID. Just as for the indicators, our recommendation here is to select the methods and techniques that best respond to and feed information into the evaluation indicator or question in hand.

Our proposal is best suited to a pragmatic outlook and a multi-method approach (mixed method) and a combination of the qualitative and quantitative approaches is currently considered the most complete form of investigation (Serrano et al., 2009). Several different publications recommend this course of action (UNEG, 2011; Bamberger and Podems, 2002; OAS, 2008) and the choice of a multi-method approach.

The combination of methods offers:

- The certainty of covering the gender- and rights-based approaches through structured techniques that respond to the evaluation questions arising from the approaches.
5. Guidelines for Sensitive Evaluation

• Qualitative techniques and methods that cover both foreseen and unforeseen elements, leaving it up to the informants to structure the information with which they will perform the evaluation.

In fieldwork, no different options are available and the recommendations given here are always applicable. The advice on being empathetic, sensitive and respectful when working with groups in disadvantaged, unfair or exclusionary situations appears especially appropriate to us. We also consider that this respectful attitude is good for both GID and the HRBA, and also for all other types of evaluations.

5.6. Considerations on the Interpretation Phase

The interpretation of data is another key stage in sensitive evaluation and the outcome of this phase should be an explanation of how the programme impacts and exerts influence on the human rights situation and gender equity and equality.

Each approach will have identified the evaluation questions and, therefore, the information that has been collected and how to treat it. The interpretation will be performed accordingly, in response to the purposes of the evaluation.

The difficulty lies in evaluations that do not collect data. In these cases, explanations relating to the impact of the programme on gender or rights systems will have to be “forced” from the data available, making use of the evaluators’ skills and expertise. The information will sometimes allow for such versatile analysis, but will sometimes not. The only option here is to reactivate fieldwork in order to collect more meaningful information that will enable us to construct interpretations.

Given the outlook of the evaluators (plus their skills and sensitivity), it may possible to obtain broad gender or equality analyses with data that is apparently blind to these sensitivities. Hence, we view the interpretation phase as a good opportunity in which to attempt incorporation of these approaches.

But even though this is possible in certain situations, the possibilities will certainly be fewer where the HRBA and GID outlooks have not been previously considered. We reiterate the importance of incorporating sensitivity into all of the phases directly contributing to evaluation design.
5.7. Considerations on Judgement

The central idea of this section is for an evaluation to result in a fact-based judgement on whether the programme is able to transform the reality. This is principally based on three major categories (as described in the section on design evaluation). These can be further qualified and expanded, but their simplicity is attractive. However, there are many other scales that can also be selected to measure the degree of transformation.

a) Transformative interventions.
b) Interventions that preserve the status quo.
c) Interventions that damage or worsen the situation.
6. **How to Coordinate the Gender- and HRBA-Based Approaches**

There are some common evaluation models for GID and HRBA, such as those created by UNEG (2011), Vargas and Gambara (2010) and Fernández Juan et al. (2010). But even in these joint methods specifications are given on how to apply both approaches. We identify three possible general ways to combine these:

1. **Successive or parallel treatment.** Any of the methods chosen is applied first to GID and then to the HRBA, or the other way round. In other words, two reflection exercises are completed in each phase, but they are presented together in a complementary manner. The basic premise is that they are approaches with different—albeit complementary—specificities, and they are treated accordingly.

2. **Understanding gender as an issue that is mainstreamed into human rights.** In this option, gender is understood in the form of equal access to human rights for men and women. The study examines how the most vulnerable groups are affected in terms of each of the human rights and how this impacts on the gender system. For example, the right to food is analysed by examining access to and enjoyment of food by both women and by men.

3. **Considering gender equality as another human right.** This approach adopts gender equality as an inalienable right, alongside all the other rights recognised in the various international regulations.

Option 1 is the most respectful toward the specificities of each approach, although it requires a two-pronged working exercise. Conversely, options 2 and 3 could reduce the visibility or depth of gender analyses in methodological terms. Therefore, even though it may be more labour-intensive or costly, we believe that the option of successive analyses is the most appropriate for full coverage of the two specificities.
Diferentes aproximaciones para una evaluación sensible al GED y EBDH
7. **Some Considerations on the Process**

The initial commission was to examine the various existing approaches to GID and HRBA evaluations, not only those explicitly mentioned in the text. As this task covered review of two separate approaches, we were able to discover that similar methodological proposals had been developed almost in parallel in different spheres, while there was also some uneven development of either one approach or the other in some schemes. Comparative analysis has helped us to identify cross-cutting trends that would have been more difficult to detect had we worked with only the gender or rights approach alone.

The joint outcome is a structure that enables us to systematise the various GID and HRBA proposals. Moreover, the classification process compels us to consider the aspects that distinguish these two approaches from each other. Deciding between them requires methodological reflection. We believe that readers of this text will have a more comprehensive overview of the various methodological possibilities, but also greater skills in adapting their model to the various evaluation demands; each method has its virtues, and these must be understood in order to find the best-fit to each evaluation context.

This sequencing and classification process could also be used as a form of guideline or tick list to introduce other social considerations (such as the environment, human development and capacities, cultural diversity, etc.) into the evaluation model. In fact, these could perhaps be described as methodological systems for the introduction of cross-cutting approaches that, we believe, may be valid for other perspectives. These will have to be tested and proven in practice.

We have attempted to present material that will contribute to sensitive evaluations, covering and respecting the diversity of methodological approaches, but at the same time inserting these into a decisions-making sequence of that clarifies the evaluation process. We hope this document will contribute to more and better evaluations, as this will ultimately result in fairer and more equal cooperation activities.
Diferentes aproximaciones para una evaluación sensible al GED y EBDH
A I. CONCEPTUALISATION OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS

The expression ‘human rights’ is ‘an ambiguous term that means two different things’ (Peces-Barba, 2004:20). One meaning refers to a set of moral values that are considered absolute and universal; a perspective that can be understood as natural law. The other sense reads the rights as legal guarantees set out in objective form in legislation (legal regulations) in the form of conventions, constitutions and treaties. The human rights are those laid out in the treaties. This is defined as a ‘positive right’.

We have chosen to use the rights covered by international treaties. The following legislation and agreements have been considered in this process (see Tables 1 and 2):

<p>| Table 1: The seven ‘basic’ international treaties of the United Nations on Human Rights matters (UN, 2006) |
|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treaty</th>
<th>Date adopted</th>
<th>States Parties</th>
<th>Oversight entity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Human Rights Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Committee for the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>Committee against Torture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention on the Rights of the Child</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>Committee on the Rights of the Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Committee on the Protection of the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Main documents and references

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document/Agreement</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Oversight entity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Agreement on Economic Social and Cultural Rights, 1966:</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CESCR.aspx">http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CESCR.aspx</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination:</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CERD.aspx">http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CERD.aspx</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment:</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CAT.aspx">http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CAT.aspx</a></td>
<td>Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination: <a href="http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cerd/">http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cerd/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, 1993:</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/Vienna.aspx">http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/Vienna.aspx</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As well as these positive rights there are other sources of rights. The human rights are also considered in the form of social constructs, meaning that a new right might emerge ‘and become socially accepted and gradually become encoded in conventions and accepted for ratification’ (Jonsson, 2004:4). For example, the right to security and the holding of property (see case of favelas, UN 2006:16). Or the cases of femicide¹, where the Inter-American Court of Human Rights used the expression ‘gender-related killing of a woman’, also known as feminicide (paragraph:143) and it has entered several national legislations under this name.

The Spanish HRBA perspective shares this double perspective on rights, for while it takes the international human rights regulatory framework as one of its main strengths, it also considers that rights are built through debate and contributory processes in the North and South, inspired by independent social movements of: women, landless rural workers, indigenous peoples, etc. It recognises that it is these social, cultural and political debates that ensure rights can evolve and eventually be recognised, or not, and can become consolidated into standards and national or international regulatory frameworks (MAEC, 2009:33). This form of development of rights has been termed ‘emergent rights’ by some experts (HRBA workshop).

WHICH ARE THE HUMAN RIGHTS

The general announcement in each of the treaties provides specifications of each of the rights regulated. These are further development can be found in the norms, protocols, interpretations of monitoring entities and in the implementation and development of national legislation and jurisprudence.


---

International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migratory Workers and Members of their Families:
http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cmw/cmw.htm

Oversight entity: http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/CMW/Pages/CMWIndex.aspx

Constitution on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities:
The various editions and interpretations of the international treaties and agreements add amplifications, nuances and interpretations to the concepts. Even the international entities for monitoring human rights have the interpretation and granting of meaning to rights or freedoms listed within their functions. The various legal actors (monitoring entities, constitutional courts, courts of law, and others), broaden and limit these, making interpretations. Each of the various legal entities provides a different interpretation and even the terminology can vary. If only one treaty were chosen, this problem would not exist, but this would destroy the interdependence of rights and reduce the field of definition of the positive right.

Therefore, there is no one, single exhaustive statement of human rights, there is no single document that explains the whole ambit of the human rights, meaning that it is therefore necessary to consult the various supporting conventions. However, the United Nations (2006:1) does provide a list of rights:

1. The right to life, liberty and security of person
2. Freedom of association, expression, of meeting and of movement
3. The rights to the highest possible level of health
4. The right to not be subjected to arbitrary arrest or detention
5. The right to an impartial tribunal
6. The right to fair and satisfactory working conditions
7. The right to adequate food, housing and social services
8. The right to education
9. The right to equal protection of the law
10. The right not to be subjected to arbitrary interference with privacy, family, home or correspondence
11. The right not to be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment
12. The right not to be held in slavery
13. The right to nationality
14. Freedom of thought, conscience and religion
15. The right to vote to participate in public affairs
16. The right to participate in cultural life

We have performed a synthesis (as presented in Table 3) of some of these rights, with the sole intention of facilitating a methodological approach to the evaluation of human rights. This is in no way intended to be a legal interpretation. The rights and elements presented must be taken as a simple conceptual guideline and the reader would have to consult the sources cited for any further work on the issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RIGHT</th>
<th>CONSTITUENT ELEMENTS SHAPING THE LAW</th>
<th>LEGAL SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Reduce infant mortality</td>
<td>International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High level of physical and mental health (including reproductive)</td>
<td>Convention on the Rights of the Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life expectancy</td>
<td>Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detected and treated diseases</td>
<td>Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detain the propagation of HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>MDGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce the incidence of malaria</td>
<td>Political Constitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vaccinate children</td>
<td>Laws guaranteeing access to health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health information and education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility (care, water, medicines)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention with prior consent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability (health care, facilities, goods and services, drinking water)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Healthy work and environmental conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Right to primary, secondary, technical and professional, higher education</td>
<td>International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Basic education, will cover the elements of availability, accessibility, acceptability and adaptability</td>
<td>MDGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School system; adequate grant system; material conditions of teaching staff</td>
<td>Political Constitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right to the freedom of education</td>
<td>National Laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-discrimination and equal treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic freedom and autonomy of institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIGHT</td>
<td>CONSTITUENT ELEMENTS SHAPING THE LAW</td>
<td>LEGAL SOURCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Food:** | Nutrition  
Food security and consumer protection  
Availalibility and accessibility of food | International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights  
MDGs  
Political Constitution  
National Laws |
| **Personal security/safety** | Non-existence of torture  
The State protects the private sphere and autonomy (identity, integrity, sexuality, communications, family and domicile), causes no harm and offers a minimum of: protection, integrity and security. | International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights  
Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment  
Political Constitution  
National Laws |
| **Freedom of expression** | Freedom of communication and information  
Access to information and participation  
Existence of a law or disposition to establish this  
Existence of statistical sources of information | International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights  
Political Constitution  
National Laws |
| **Rights associated to the public and political sphere of the person** | Political participation  
Right to meeting and Association (legal personality)  
Nationality  
Right to a name  
Property  
Right to asylum | International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights  
Political Constitution  
National Laws |
| **Rights associated to the private expectations of persons** | Personal freedom of movement, thought, conscience and worship  
Non-discrimination on the basis of sex, origin, ethnicity, religion, etc  
Control over their own body (health, sexuality, etc)  
No interference with the body without consent: torture, interventions  
Right to intimacy  
Right to honour and reputation | International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights  
Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination  
Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women  
Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment |
### Human Rights Principles

The principles facilitate interpretation of the situations and norms we are analysing. In relation to the human rights we have:

- **Universality and inalienability**: The human rights are universal and inalienable. All human beings in every part of the world possess these rights. Any inherent human right cannot be voluntarily renounced, nor can it be usurped by other persons. As is established in Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR): ‘All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights’.

- **Indivisibility**: The human rights are indivisible, whether of civil, cultural, economic, political or social nature, all of these are inherent to the dignity of all human being. Hence, all of the rights have the same rank and condition, and they cannot be classified in hierarchical order.

- **Interdependence and interrelation**: The realisation of a right often depends, totally or in part, on the realisation of other rights. For example, the realisation of the right to health can depend, in some cases, on the realisation of the right to education or information.

- **Equality and non-discrimination**: All individuals are equal as human beings by virtue of the inherent dignity of all human beings. All human beings have the right to their human rights with no discrimination of any kind, with no distinction at all on the basis of race, colour, sex, ethnicity, age, language, religion, opinion, whether political or of any other nature, as has been explained by the monitoring bodies of the human rights treaties.
o Certain characteristics of the rights are both principles and rights, for example, equality.

o Participation and inclusion: Every person and all peoples have the right to active, free and meaningful participation in development, and also to contribute and enjoy civil, economic, social and political development, where the human rights and basic freedoms can be realised.

o Responsibility and rule of law: The State and other duty holders must answer for the fulfilment of human rights. In this sense they must fulfil the legal norms and standards contained in the human rights instruments. Where they do not fulfil their duties, the holders of rights violated are supported to initiate legal processes for the appropriate reparation of damage before a competent court or judge according to the legal rules and procedures.
INTRODUCTION

Most of the texts indicated in relation to the Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA) explore the human rights concepts and principles. Only preliminary information is given in direct relation to the evaluation of development actions. Many of the documents aim to evaluate the implementation of State obligations, and this is certainly the case for the monitoring guidelines produced by the United Nations and the Organisation of American States or those of the Ombudsman’s Office of Colombia.

The rights approach is, in fact, broader than this and the further aspects are sometimes better covered in other sources dealing with the issue of cooperation. The HRBA and cooperation guide and manuals often approach evaluation aspects only tangentially, but there are some more consolidated proposals available.

The total number of texts available, however, is still very low and evaluation is especially needed of the issue of scale in the design aspect. For example, one of the most polished proposals - the United Nations Guide - is generally used in evaluation processes with the State as one of the counterparts and this means that a different strategy would be needed when evaluating projects by non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and other smaller or less significant counterparts.

The bibliography entries on gender are affected by different issues. Even though the first evaluative exercises on gender equality date from the early 1990s, a broader range of reference materials only began to be developed in the 2000s. Reviews of the Beijing commitments and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) created a need for proposals on how to include the gender focus in evaluation and the development of evaluation practice on this matter.

As gender equality became less central to the development agenda and was considered less openly in the new aid models, ever louder calls were heard for feminist methodologies, with activists wanting a gender responsive approach to evaluation.

In general terms, the bibliography clearly shows that the efforts made to date have been centred on methodological proposals largely produced by international entities and bilateral agencies. The existing references are therefore principally linked to methodologies on gender in evaluation and, to a lesser degree, with specific articles on the issue and meta-evaluative exercises.

The impression given by the revised bibliography clearly demonstrates there are two main concerns in the matter of gender and evaluation: (i) how to incorporate the gender perspective into the cycle of development actions; and (ii) how to incorporate this focus into evaluation.
In accordance with these two central concerns, the methodologies, meta-evaluations and articles reviewed place an emphasis on the creation of strategies to ensure that the gender perspective does not evaporate during the implementation phase and that attempts to ensure that gender questions are taken into consideration during the design, execution and dissemination of the evaluation processes. A broad range of specific checklists and guidelines has been developed to this end.

However, little debate is provide of the methodological implications involved in the performance of evaluation from a gender perspective and the most informative contributions on this issue come not from the development setting, but from academic articles reflecting upon the characteristics of feminist evaluation.
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The author proposes that the transferral of the principles and norms of international law on human rights into the implementation of development policies is not a simple path and that, on the contrary, this can at times be treacherous. Certain situations must be considered, such as the flexibility and the room for manoeuvre available to States when the time comes to implement a development plan. The principles and declarations must not form a straitjacket on implementation.

Abramovich proposes concentrating on the aspects that can be covered through a HRBA in policy implementation, as is the case with participation and accountability, which have been used as the basis for legal action by stakeholders in development. It is not an easy transferral. He does not approach the HRBA issue in aspects of cooperation for development projects.

The objective of this guide is to support those responsible for leadership and implementation in agricultural development programmes with the integration of a gender perspective in monitoring and evaluation from the initial design and technical proposal phrase.

Specifically, it aims to help evaluate whether programmes and plans for monitoring and evaluation are based on: rigorous analysis of the existing context in terms of gender; a theory of change that includes gender assumptions; a theory of change and an agreement on how to implement this (incorporating the negotiation of possible conflict of interest and compensation between different socio-economic and gender groups); as well as specific indicators relating to these gender assumptions and disaggregation by sex in the remaining indicators.

The guide starts with a brief introduction to gender and agriculture and a presentation of the various perspectives that a programme can adopt in relation to gender equality. The main body of the document presents specific recommendations on how to integrate the gender perspective into monitoring and evaluation.

In order to do this, it takes performance measurement of ALINe staff as a reference and develops five proposals (in the form of consecutive steps to be followed) to incorporate this perspective: 1) make gender a cross-cutting issue in the definition of the theory of change used in the programme; 2) design a performance framework that includes gender indicators; 3), measure performance using a gender sensitive baseline; 4) report on performance, giving specific details on changes in gender relations and roles; 5), debate and propose improvements to advance toward gender equality, amongst other aspects.

Similarly, the author stresses the relevance of resources (internal support and access to external specialists) and specific training for staff.

The annexes include examples and guidance on gender indicators, sensitive methods and the cost of monitoring and evaluation activities.
This article reviews how issues related to women have been approached in the evaluation of the impact of aid. In concrete terms, it explores the extent to which a feminist perspective has been adopted in evaluation practice and how the inclusion of this perspective could be strengthened more explicitly in evaluation design.

It explores the evolution of thought on gender and evaluation in aid as well as the main feminist critiques of the gender analysis frameworks developed from the 1980s. The critiques stress that the analytical frameworks concentrate more on the description of inequality than on understanding of the underlying causes. This perspective of the diagnosis is not sufficient, however, as it does not directly refer to changes in the design and implementation of development actions.

The article explains what it means to apply feminist research methods in the evaluative processes and reflects on the relevance of combined methods, of using qualitative and participatory perspectives, of empowering dialogue between the various persons involved and of recognising any lack of conformity. It emphasises the importance of considering the interactions between gender, ethnicity and class and of analysing who has a voice and who does not, and what mechanisms are being promoted in order to give the less powerful groups a voice. It underlines the need to analyse the impact of gender and to review changes in time use, the control of resources and participation in decision making.

Two case studies are used to present evaluations focused on gender impact analysis and some proposals are indicated where feminist evaluation methods can strengthen analysis and interpretation of results.

---


This publication has been developed so that project leadership teams, donors and partners can recognise and include gender affairs throughout the life cycle of rural development projects. In line with the World Bank results-based evaluation model, the report aims for there to be monitoring and evaluation of results, outcomes and impacts in rural well-being.

It presents a group of activities to bear in mind during the various phases of the project in the form of key questions for review. In the identification phase, it specifically stresses the relevance of: performing a gender sensitive baseline study; visualising possible negative impacts on women and men; participatory identification of priorities and objectives relating to gender equality and; evaluation of the institutional capacity to integrate gender into development activities.

In the design phase, emphasis is placed on the importance of: including gender objectives and the availability of specific capacities, resources and tools to integrate gender into implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

In the implementation phase, the outlook concentrates on the collection of gender sensitive data and monitoring of gender outcomes. In the project closure and final evaluation phase, a group of concrete questions are presented on the outcomes and impacts related to the integration of gender into the project and to the changes made in the lives of women and men.

The document also stresses the importance of participation in the monitoring and evaluation exercises and presents a checklist and specific indicators to evaluate the participation of women.
and men throughout the life cycle of a project.
Finally, it presents a group of examples relating to rural development projects.


This document sets out the steps for the incorporation of the HRBA into cooperation for development. First, it reinforces the underlying concepts. Chapter 2 sets out the steps to follow: a) project programming phase; b) identification phase, and; c) project monitoring and evaluation phase.

For the measurement system that is explained through examples such as the right to health, right to education, right to water and housing, right to sustainability of life. The model is based on the Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ESCR). It establishes three phases or participate a reconstruction of a measurement system: a) strategic planning; b) identification of projects; c) construction of variables and indicators.

The characteristics of the rights being measured were considered in the construction of the indicator matrix, such as: availability, access, acceptability, quality, participation and sustainability (in the vertical section). The horizontal section of the matrix refers to actions that have been performed (in favour of the right to evaluated), actions to be completed and how to measure fulfilment of the actions to be completed. The final outcome is the construction of variables and indicators, and questions are formulated for each characteristic of the right under evaluation in order to do this.

Guatemala/Spain: Instituto Centroamericano de Estudios Fiscales.

The initial aim of the report was to analyse fiscal policy as a determining factor in the systematic violation of ESCR in Guatemala, with the main emphasis on the rights to health, education and food (child malnutrition, maternal mortality and school failure).

The report proposes three steps to evaluate fulfilment of the duty of compliance on the rights to health, education and food by the Guatemalan State. The methodology outlined in the previous section was used for this.

First step: A group of outcome indicators relating to malnutrition in children, maternal mortality and non-completion of primary School is analysed in the light of the three principles of progressivity, universality and equality. This step aims to determine:
1. To what extent the population enjoys minimum thresholds for these rights.
2. To identify inequality gaps between population groups.
3. To evaluate the extent to which advances through time have been reasonable in relation to achievements in other comparable countries.

Second step: Evaluate the performance of the State in terms of some of the main public policies implemented to combat these three issues in the last decade. Analysis of the extent to which policies have promoted: accessibility, availability, quality and relevance of adequate services for the population without discrimination.

Behaviour indicators include those developed in the field of public health, food security and education.

Third step: Budgetary limitations toward realisation of the three rights are analysed (how much is assigned to each area, developments in spending over time and who has seen the benefit). The aim is to determine to what measure of these shortfalls are due to the lack of resources or the lack of political will in granting these resources.

**Return to index**

**Chacón, A., Ozkoz, J., & García, B. (2009). Guía metodológica para la incorporación de los derechos humanos en la cooperación al desarrollo. Vitoria-Gasteiz: Servicio Central de Publicaciones del Gobierno Vasco.**


The authors explain HRBA in cooperation for development in the global arena, concentrating on non-governmental cooperation and advising on the potentialities and risks of this perspective. They link the principles of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) to human rights.

The text outlines and reports on the eight basic international United Nations treaties on human rights and points out that incorporation of the gender focus goes hand-in-hand with the HRBA.

In the following sections, the authors illustrate this through a case study in the Democratic Republic of Congo, which clearly shows the usefulness and limitations of the HRBA. The annexes contain a selection of texts providing information on the economic social and cultural rights and the principles and directives for the integration of human rights into poverty reduction strategies. The document contains a complementary bibliography on the issue.

**Return to index**

**CIDA. (2001). How to Perform Evaluations – Gender Equality. Quebec.**


This guide by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) complements the entity’s general evaluation guide known as the CIDA Evaluation Guide and aims to improve measurement and evaluation of outcomes related to gender equality and to increase their inclusion in evaluation reports.

The document is aimed at individuals responsible for management, evaluation teams and social organisations and institutions, and the content describes how to plan, design and implement an evaluation that will allow for identification of outcomes achieved on gender equality. It specifically concentrates on four points in the evaluation process: preparation of terms of reference; assignment of resources and selection of expert staff; methodologies; and the production of reports and dissemination of results. In each of these steps, lessons learned from experience are explored and a checklist is provided.

The guide presents a group of evaluation questions to ensure the inclusion of gender content. These questions are built upon the reference framework of the CIDA Framework of Results and Key Success Factors and are presented in accordance with the following blocks of content:
achievement of outcomes; cost-effectiveness and relevance of the outcomes; sustainability of results; participation in partnership; appropriateness of design; appropriateness of resource utilisation; and timely execution of actions.


This article presents a proposal for the evaluation of development actions from a gender mainstreaming prospective. Before entering fully into this, the author clarifies the concepts, differentiating between gender equality, parity and equity. She explores various perspectives from which gender mainstreaming is approached.

When considering the specific issue of evaluation, she proposes combined evaluation of the classic evaluation criteria (relevant common efficiency, efficacy, impact and sustainability) and the objectives of gender mainstreaming (parity, equality, equity, empowerment and transformation). She approaches this via the incorporation of gender into the DAC criteria definitions and suggests the use of gender analysis tools and data disaggregated by sex.

The proposed evaluation model underlines the need to reflect on the outcomes relating to gender equality at various levels: the macro level - relating to the political and economic context, the policy of strategy, the budget, the structures and the system; the meso level - referring to institutional capacity, human and financial resources and management systems; and the micro level - referring to the implementation of the project and the personal and interpersonal experiences.


Through the PROSEDHER programme to monitor public policy in human rights, the Ombudsman’s Office of Colombia has proposed and designed a system of monitoring and evaluation that provides a clearer idea and knowledge of the effectiveness of public policies in relation to the right to health.

The proposed monitoring and evaluation system for public policy on health covers two dimensions:

a) providing evidence of possible barriers to the realisation of the right
b) calling attention to the political and social responsibility of public administrations in the formulation and implementation of public policy from the human rights perspective.

According to the proposal set out by the Ombudsman’s Office of Colombia, public policy on health should be organised around four essential elements:

1) Availability: The State must have a sufficient number of public health establishments, supplies, programmes and services and health centres. Similarly, it must include the various determining factors of health in its design and operational process: drinking water, adequate sanitation conditions, health care centres such as clinics and hospitals, specialised and well-paid staff (according to national criteria) and the drugs outlined in the World Health Organisation (WHO) programme of action on essential drugs.

2) Accessibility: Consists of ensuring that the medical establishments, services and programmes, along with the basic drinking water and sanitation systems and services are accessible to all, with no discrimination. A further four dimensions must be satisfied: non-discrimination, physical and
economic accessibility, access to information.

3) Acceptability: Involves a dimension of respect for individual and collective idiosyncrasies that surround and determine the potential of exercising the right. Acceptability includes freedoms and conditions that are cultural, ethical, historical and socially determined.

4) Quality: Involves a group of conditions that allow individuals and communities to have access to and availability of scientifically and technically appropriate health care and health determining services. Quality in this right is linked to the criteria of effectiveness, opportunity, efficiency and efficacy.

In production of the evaluation matrix, the vertical section contains the essential elements of the right to health: availability, accessibility, acceptability of quality. The horizontal section contains obligations of a progressive type, the type of obligation, the name of the indicator or related question and objective.

The following steps have been followed:

1) Description of the content of the right to health and the obligations for the Colombian State in the realisation of this.
2) Definition of indicators and the measurement instrument.
3) Validation of references ans the measurement instrument.
4) Systemisation of the measurement instrument (construction of a database).
5) Application of the measurement instrument.
6) Analysis and evaluation of the information.
7) Production of the report.

DFID. (2008). *How to Note on Integrating Gender within Evaluation. Unpublished manuscript. UK*

This guide aims to help Department for International Development (DFID) staff to understand the importance and reason for the integration of gender within evaluation, as well as existing challenges in the measurement of inequalities between women and men. The guide seeks to provide tools to ensure that gender content is totally integrated within DFID evaluations.

Thus, the guide gives detailed descriptions of the steps to be followed in employing the gender perspective throughout the evaluation process: from planning and monitoring of the evaluation, to its development and later use.

In relation to planning and monitoring, it is suggested that gender content be covered in the terms of reference, that the participation of all critical age and male and female be promoted, that gender balance be sought, and that this analytical focus be included in the evaluation teams.

The actual evaluation process places emphasis on the development of an appropriate methodology, field work to ensure the participation of most of the stakeholders and for the evaluation report to reflect rich gender analysis.

Lastly, in the use of the evaluation reports, attention is directed toward examination of recommendations and lessons learned on gender matters, whether these are included in the management response of the administration and whether the report is published in a variety of forms in order to be accessible to various audiences.

Examples of evaluation methods and complementary reading are included along with a checklist for the inclusion of gender content in evaluation.
This article presents gender sensitive evaluation as a key tool in advancing toward greater quality and efficacy for aid. A general analysis is given of gender sensitive analysis in cooperation and development, with reflection upon the implications of incorporation of this throughout the evaluative process and a description of the main challenges faced in this type of practice.

The article starts by differentiating two broad perspectives that can be identified in the evaluation phase just as they can in planning: the women in development (WiD) perspective and the gender in development (GiD) perspective.

The document goes on to define what is understood by gender sensitive-evaluation establishing a series of proposals to be implemented in practice in this type of exercise. Is clearly underlines the centrality of ‘gender analysis’ in gender-sensitive evaluation and the need to consider the various gender dimensions throughout the evaluative process. Similarly, it proposes the redefinition of criteria and evaluation questions relating to gender and the production of specific indicators.

Finally, it makes note of the central challenges relating to gender and evaluation: the lack of political will, limited institutional capacity, the use of gender and women as synonyms, and existing assumptions on the difficulty of incorporating gender into evaluative processes.

---

This collective work approaches of HRBA from different perspectives. It looks at the background, foundations and concept of this perspective, along with experiences of incorporating HRBA into practice, the related contributions to cooperation for development, challenges and steps needed in the production of the conceptual framework. It demonstrates the stages involved in the production of HRBA in concrete cases such as: the right to education, to health, to food, to gender equality and governance.

Chapter 5, outlines the limits of HRBA as a crucial aspect to be considered in the evaluation process. For example, it indicates that caution must be taken in indicating that human rights are applied universally regardless of the cultural context, considering aspects such as legal pluralism or the temporary nature of cooperation for development projects.

---

This chapter combines reflection on the relevance of gender equality for human development.
with the presentation of a group of actions and tools to integrate the gender perspective throughout the project cycle (identification, formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation).

It presents the Participatory Gender Audit (PGA) and the Gender-Impact Analysis as key elements in the identification phase. At the same time, it underlines the need for gender-sensitive staff to ensure planning and implementation that acts upon structural gender inequality. In project implementation, it specifies three different policy modes for execution (specific, neutral and redistributive) and the respective advantages and disadvantages are indicated.

Evaluation is explored through a reflection on existing obstacles to the integration of a gender perspective in evaluation and two models are specified to evaluate the impact of gender on the basis of analytical axes and evaluation questions. Both models direct attention to the incorporation of the gender perspective in the design and implementation of interventions and the specific outcomes generated by this.

In conclusion, integration of the gender perspective in the cycle of development actions occurs when it is taken into consideration in all phases: sexual division of labour, access and control over resources and benefits; practical and strategic needs; the condition and position of women and men; and the quality of their participation.
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The study builds on the evaluation of the gender mainstreaming strategy of the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA) (Mainstreaming Gender Equality, Sida Evaluation Report 02/01) to identify the main methodological challenges when measuring changes in gender equality.

It reflects upon the methods and tools used and their usefulness, their strengths and weaknesses for evaluating the SIDA gender mainstreaming perspective and evaluating changes in terms of equality. It also explores the dilemmas that emerge when evaluating a transverse policy or strategy and when evaluating processes and changes. Finally, the study summarises the main lessons relating to methodology for future gender equality evaluations.

The document clearly states the existence of different views, sometimes conflicting, on how a gender equality programme should be implemented. A key element during the evaluation is the establishment of a common understanding of concepts such as gender equality, gender mainstreaming and empowerment, amongst others. On this basis, a combination of methods are proposed, along with the promotion of participatory processes. The axes of analysis adopted include: content relating to gender equality in design and implementation; mode of approach (participation of stakeholders, obstacles and opportunities lost, links with other equality promotion initiatives); changes generated (relating to gender needs, masculine roles and the empowerment of women).

In terms of the lessons learned, the need for better quality sexually disaggregated data and process indicators is indicated along with a broader timeframe for encouraging greater participation. The link between gender policies and poverty reduction policies is brought into question, while highlighting that asymmetries in aid relations can make it more likely for evaluation dialogue to be, in reality, a disguised monologue.

Return to index
This source presents a detailed explanation of aspects of human rights and development within the cooperation for development setting. The author also suggest that the application of the HRBA is not an easy path, as difficulties can be encountered especially in counterpart States from the South where emphasis is placed on recognition of obligations as human rights givers and receivers.

In this article, the author indicates various obstacles to the full application of the HRBA. Lastly, some ideas and general outlines are produced in relation to monitoring and evaluation for the implementation process. A table shows the criteria (relevance, efficacy, efficiency, coverage, impact and sustainability) on the vertical axis and the questions or issues linked to HRBA on the horizontal axis.

This working paper departs from the premise that every development action impacts upon women and men and their social relations. A gender sensitive evaluation is a key element in evaluating to what extent the results achieved have contributed to satisfying the needs and interests of both sexes and to what measure they have modified existing gender inequalities within the specific field of action.

Given the gender blindness of most evaluation processes, there is reflection upon what this means and why it is useful to incorporate a gender perspective into evaluation.

To introduce this perspective, the authors propose the use of classic gender analysis instruments in an evaluation (activity profile, access and control of resources matrix and profile of gender needs and interests). They underline the need for evaluation elements within the logical framework (indicators and verification sources) and for the classic DAC criteria to be gender sensitive.

In terms of gender indicators, they presents a broad group of these that vary according to the level of measurement, nature, location within the project cycle and the use in measuring participation and empowerment of women and men. Lastly, they present a key redefinition of the evaluative criteria from a gender point of view accompanied by specific examples to aid understanding.

The document outlines a conceptual and methodological framework of quantitative indicators to monitor the fulfilment of international human rights treaties on the part of the States.
framework does not fit with HRBA proposals that are more oriented to cooperation for development. It covers specific indicators aimed at reinforcing accountability. The Report includes guidelines on which to produce indicators, such as the determination of attributes and the configuration of rights monitored, along with the structure, process and outcome indicators.

The annexes provide an illustration of indicators for human four human rights: to life, to judicial review of detention, to adequate food and to health.

The indicators for the right to life take into account Article 6 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Millennium Development Goals indicators formulated in the following manner: the vertical axis shows the structure, process and outcome indicators. And the horizontal axis shows the constitutional aspects of the right to life such as the privation of life, disappearances, health and food, and the death penalty. Most of these are quantitative indicators.

In terms of the right to judicial review of detention, the vertical axis shows the structure, process and outcome indicators, while the horizontal axis shows detention and imprisonment on criminal charges, the privation of freedom and effective review by tribunal.

In relation to the right to adequate food, Article 11 of the International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights, was taken into account along with the Millennium Development Goals, all related in the following manner: the horizontal axis bearing the substantive and relevant aspects of this right: nutrition, food security and consumer protection, availability of food and accessibility of food.

Lastly, for the right to the enjoyment of the highest possible level of physical and mental health (Article 12 of the International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights, and Millennium Development Goals), the substantive and constitutive part (horizontal axis) of the right to health has taken into account: reproductive health, infant mortality and health care, natural and working environment, prevention, treatment and control of disease, accessibility of health centres and essential medicines. The vertical axis shows the structure, process and outcome indicators. These indicators do not show aspects such as gender or ethnicity, which should ideally be taken into account in relation to the HRBA.


http://www.observatoriopoliticasocial.org/images/PDF/Biblioteca/biblioteca_2010/ONU_docs/Informes_relatores/Salud/2006_informe_del_relator_especial_sobre_el_derecho_a_la_salud_fisica_y_mental_2.pdf

This report by the Special Rapporteur on the rights of all persons to enjoyment of the highest possible level of physical and mental health introduces the use of indicators for more adequate monitoring of the rights to health, “as long as these are disaggregated by various elements, such as sex, race or ethnicity.” The Rapporteur states that the indicators are called on to perform an important function in the progressive measuring and monitoring of health, also warning that an excessive number of indicators should not be generated and that they must be simple in order for the data collection required for these to be within the capacity of most States. The indicators must centre attention on outcomes but also on the processes by which the outcomes are achieved.

The Rapporteur stresses no radical change is implied to existing methodologies, but that these can be used and adapted as far as is necessary. The operationalisation of these indicators will be built in the following manner: the horizontal axis will hold the structure, process and outcome indicators. And the vertical axis will indicate the basic legal context, the basic financial context, the national strategies and plan of action, participation, national institutions for human rights, aid and
international cooperation (for donors). Priority aspects will be:
1) Improvements to antenatal, birth, postpartum and newborn care
2) Provision of high quality family planning services
3) Elimination of unsafe abortion (high priority aspect)
4) Campaign against sexually transmitted infections, cervical-uterine cancer and other gynaecological diseases
5) Promote sexual health, in particular amongst adolescents.


This DAC report constitutes a review of evaluative experiences that have included gender equality within their analytical content to a greater or lesser degree. Their objective is to improve evaluation practice and development outcomes, concentrating analysis on three specific areas: the evaluation methodology produced to evaluate changes in gender equality, gender mainstreaming and the empowerment of women; the institutional perspectives and strategies for change put in place to approach recurrent obstacles to the transversalisation of gender; and improvements in general development outcomes due to gender analysis and gender mainstreaming.

The analysis consider 85 DAC donor evaluations completed between 1999 and 2002 made up of: 42 thematic evaluations centred on gender equality initiatives, gender mainstreaming and the empowerment of women and 43 general evaluations that include references to gender content. The document explores the main findings relating to the evaluation methodology used, the institutional perspectives and strategies of change implemented as well as advances made in the use of gender analysis.

The main findings state that gender indicators, baselines and monitoring information are not generally, gender-disaggregated. Similarly, the evaluations are characterised by very poor gender analysis centred more on the relative participation of women and men than on gender impacts. Furthermore, when gender mainstreaming is evaluated, the focus is placed more on institutionalisation of the gender perspective than on its impact on equality. Within the bosom of institutions and organisations, meanwhile, there is little training or experience in gender-sensitive evaluation.

Hunt and Brouwers state that the evaluation of gender equality content requires good evaluation design and implementation that translates into: a clear and simple objective, transparent design and systematic application of the data collection methods, well-defined evaluation criteria and gender-sensitive indicators.


The author indicates a series of historical, legal and political arguments on the links between the rights perspective and public policies. The text advocates a new social pact that develops the basis for a rights perspective within a context of change.
Although the analysis has certain legal weight, however, the reflection is not centred on aspects of the human rights perspective in cooperation.


The author describes a method of programming that can incorporate the rights perspective and sketches out the framework for a procedure for programming in practice. He outlines the fundamental notions of human rights that should be taken into account, such as those relating to rights bearers and duty bearers, before exploring the differences between the needs focus and the rights focus and providing a comparison of the principles.

In Chapter 4, the author introduces the theoretical constructs and tools that will be used to put the rights perspective into operation. Chapter 5 concentrates attention on the persons and communities who will be the ultimate recipients or depositaries of this perspective.

Chapter 6 develops a step-by-step application of this perspective, including experiences in the implementation of rights for children (seeking to define stages, examples and capacity gaps).

Chapters 7 and 9 give case studies from Tanzania, Mozambique and Zimbabwe. The document is completed with two important annexes: the first approaches project monitoring and evaluation, and the second refers to HRBA programmes in situations of conflict and emergency.

For the example of monitoring given in Annex 1, the author uses a table referring to State obligations under the given Convention or Treaty. The vertical axis of the table shows the type of obligation, which could be: respect, protection, facilitating fulfilment, the duty to offer direct assistance for realisation of the right. The horizontal axis establishes the rights of children: the right to food, health and care. The monitoring indicators built on the basis of these rights.


This essay reviews how modes such as intra-organisational policy can affect the translation of gender commitments into outcomes and suggests tools to analyse the degree to which intra-organisational resistance exists. It specifically targets the relationship between development interventions and their organisational context (enabling and of non-enabling factors), placing emphasis on the development of monitoring and evaluation indicators that can alert organisations to the needs, priorities and preferences of women and men.

Gender blindness in the planning processes and the current tendency to simply ‘add women and mix’ means it is essential to produce gender indicators that provide information on inputs, outcomes and objectives. In fact, these indicators can be viewed as a precautionary measure that can ensure the gender perspective does not become diluted during the implementation phase.

The essay also underlines the need to consider the production of indicators for the various and diverging realities in which an intervention can be framed. Distinction is made between the following indicators: those arising from research in the concrete intervention area (outsider indicators); of the agencies - to reflect how these perceive and measure their own objectives (agency indicators); or the beneficiary population - to collect data on how these perceive the changes produced by the development action (beneficiary indicators).
The rights-based approach can be used to sustain and build development policy and this document highlights the commitment of Spanish Cooperation to this approach in the observance and fulfilment of the international human rights frameworks promoted by the United Nations.

It shows how Spanish Cooperation is aware of the debate, of north-south dialogue, listening to the voice of the excluded in these processes and social debates.

Gender in Development is a sector and horizontal priority of the plan. Spanish Cooperation will use the Gender in Development perspective in all of its actions at all levels from strategic planning through to programming, management, monitoring and evaluation.

The author identifies seven main forms (perspectives) in which human rights can be applied for human development: holistic, human rights-based, social justice perspective, capacity perspective, the right to development (differentiating this from a HRBA), responsibilities and human rights education.

The article identifies the challenges faced by individuals working in development and defines the following steps for the translation of human rights theory into development practice:

1. Identify a human rights-based perspective. For example, define the rights in socio-economic terms, bearing in mind the notes given for the interpretation of the treaties by the entities responsible, referring to the obligations of the main human rights conventions centred in the obligation to respect, protect, promote, facilitate and provide, and the use of methods of participation.

2. Ensure the necessary balance of the cooperation model, valuing the need to use a human rights violations perspective.

3. Apply appropriate indicators and also reference criteria.

4. Apply a human rights perspective in development planning.

The online tool known as the ‘Moser gender analysis framework and participatory gender audit methodology’ can be used in planning and auditing to promote the emancipation of women and
the achievement of quality, equity and empowerment. If the Moser gender analysis framework is
used alone, the tool can be used for planning at all their levels of action (project, programme,
plan, policy) and to examine the points of departure for policies. If the Moser participatory
gender audit methodology is also used, the tool makes it possible to evaluate the degree of
progress in the adoption of gender mainstreaming.

This tool helps improve the visibility of the division of labour, gender needs, differences between
women and men in the access to and control of resources and decision-making, as well as the
degree to which policies, programmes and projects attend to the practical and strategic agenda
needs.

Participatory gender auditing, supported by the ‘Gender Audit Score Card’, collects information
relating to the integration of the gender perspective in country strategy, sector programmes and
specific activities aimed at the empowerment of women.

It identifies to what extent internal institutional responsibility is defined, whether capacities exist
and whether specific budgets are signed for the promotion of gender equality.

Information on the website explains how the Moser gender analysis framework can be applied
and the characteristics of the gender audit methodology.

impacto de género. Barcelona: Cooperación y AECID.


This publication is one of the key references in Castilian Spanish on how to evaluate gender impact
in cooperation for development actions. The document explains in pedagogical and practical terms
why a gender perspective is needed in evaluation, with concrete exploration of the relevance of
valuing gender impacts. It provides definitions of the significance of changes in gender relations and
provides information on specific tools to evaluate both steps forwards and backwards in gender
impacts.

The text includes examples on the use of various gender analysis tools (activity profile, matrix on
the access to and control of resources and benefits, a table of practical and strategic needs, amongst
others) to analyse impacts in various dimensions such as the use of time by both sexes, task
distribution between women and men, access and control of resources and benefits as well as
gender needs.

A group of quantitative and qualitative indicators are presented to measure the specific impact on
the empowerment (objective, economic and political) of women as a basic element for the advance
toward gender equity and human development.

UN (2006). Preguntas frecuentes sobre el enfoque de derechos humanos en la
cooperación para el desarrollo. Oficina del Alto Comisionado de las Naciones Unidas

http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/FAQsp.pdf

A question and answer format is used to resolve doubts relating to the United Nations HRBA.
Responses are given to basic questions such as the concept and nature of human rights and their
connection with development. The questions are illustrated with experiences in other countries
and on the issues of poverty. The document attempts to create a common metalanguage on the
Also, the annexes include references to international treaties and aspects of doctrine with this perspective. The document is completed with a selection of web references on the HRBA.


http://www.norad.no/en/Tools+and+publications/Publications/Publication+Page?key=109546

This report is the outcome of a review on the integration of the gender perspective in 263 evaluation report completed by the Norwegian Foreign Ministry between 1997 and 2004. It explores how the reports have incorporated this analytical perspective in evaluation design and implementation. It analyses how the gender perspective is included in the terms of reference, the evaluative design, the methodology used, the selection of individuals to interview and the composition of evaluation teams.

The main gender-related findings from a selection of 24 reports (centred on programmes with a specific focus on gender equality) are presented. Specific content includes the most relevant outcomes relating to: the incorporation of the practical and strategic needs of women in actions; the selection of women as a target group; the definition of appropriate activities for women; the inclusion of the participation objectives of women; the incorporation of gender content in implementation and evaluation. At the same time, the document analyses to what extent certain areas or sectors of cooperation have a more explicit gender outlook.

NORAD states that integration of the gender perspective into evaluation requires a change of perspective in the performance model for exercises as well as a clear understanding of the mechanisms that reproduce discrimination against women. Key issue include: the establishment of baselines with specific gender indicators; the existence of data collection procedures and capacities throughout the life cycle of the project; and the proposal of evaluation questions relating to this type of inequality in the terms of reference.

**ILO. (2007). Integrating gender equality in monitoring and evaluation of projects.**


In this guide, the International Labour Organisation (ILO) explains the importance of considering gender equality systematically in the monitoring and evaluation processes. In parallel, it explore the main gender-related concepts and the ILO mandate and policy on equality. Furthermore, it offers specific guidance on how to incorporate gender into project monitoring and evaluation.

Working on the basis that women and men have different roles, rights and responsibilities, the document emphasises the need to attend to the needs and capacities of both sexes in order to reduce gender inequality and, thereby, to improve the efficiency and impact of development policies. It underlines the need to deal with gender questions in evaluations in accordance with international standards of evaluative quality.

The guide presents a list of key questions to ensure inclusion of the gender perspective in the monitoring and evaluation system and to prove that gender is included throughout the evaluative process, as well as key evaluative questions linked to a group of six evaluation criteria: strategic relevance and aptitude, validity of design, progress and efficacy of the project, suitability and efficiency of use of resources, efficacy in management decisions, and the orientation and sustainability of impact.
Lastly, it lays out four recommendations to promote the inclusion of gender in evaluation: incorporating this perspective in project design; sensitisation and support for technical staff; establishing a support network; and facilitating learning.

**ILO. (1995). Integrating gender issues into the monitoring and evaluation of projects and programmes.**  

These guidelines are built upon the experience acquired by this international entity on the issue of gender equality and form part of a series of directives relating to their system for the design, monitoring, evaluation and presentation of reports. The aim is to offer ILO staff the concepts, analysis and instruments needed to include questions relating to women and equality into design, monitoring and evaluation.

The document is organised into two sections. The first presents the conceptual framework and the general ILO strategy on the promotion of equality between male and female workers and the main methods for the incorporation of the gender perspective in analysis and planning. Similarly, it explores the most important international regulations applying to women workers. The second section presents a series of checklists relating to the inclusion of gender content in programme planning and implementation (list 1), preliminary reports (list 2), self-evaluation reports (list 3) and independent evaluation missions (list 4).

Checklist 2 concentrates on evaluation materials, analysing the participation of women and men in development action. Checklist 3, meanwhile, looks closely at the evaluation, in gender terms, of efficacy, relevance, efficiency, sustainability and adequacy in terms of international work regulations. Checklist 4 aims to examine the finality and coverage, content and design, implementation, performance (dealing with efficacy, relevance, efficiency and sustainability) and adequacy in terms of international work regulations.

http://www.cidh.oas.org/countryrep/IndicadoresDESC08sp/Indicadoresindice.sp.htm

This explores the guidelines developed for the evaluation and monitoring of economic, social and cultural rights foreseen in the Additional Protocol to the American Convention on Human Rights in the Area of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. The study notes that despite the fact that these guidelines do not fit with the HRBA, they can facilitate inputs for evaluation design. The aim is to provide states parties and other organisations and civil society with a useful tool to serve as the basis for the presentation of reports, and also as a permanent evaluation mechanism for each State. It is clearly stated that this is not a methodologically accomplished document, but it is sufficiently broad and open to allow for the incorporation of adjustments and variations according to local and regional contexts.

The operationalisation process is presented in a matrix where structure, process and outcome indicators are considered in the horizontal axis of the table. Three categories are suggested to improve analysis and to better organise information:

1) Reception of the right: Related to the institutional apparatus and public policies. Aims to present relevant information on the form in which any right included in the convention is incorporated into the domestic regulatory system and public practices and policies. Aims to improve the level, the regulations that recognise this, as well as the operativity and regulatory
hierarchy.

2) State capacities: This category describes an aspect relating to instrumental technical and power resource distribution within the interior of the State apparatus.

3) Financial context and budget commitment (formerly part of the vertical axis of the matrix): Refers to the effective availability of State resources to execute public social spending and the manner in which this is distributed, even if measured in the usual manner.

Lastly, it is important to state that the matrix proposed in the document does not disaggregate by gender, ethnicity or any other category.
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This document is made up of three chapters that make links between human rights, the Millennium Development Goals and poverty. Chapter 1 explores the HRBA principles. Chapter 2 provides a detailed explanation of the principles of human rights in the process of the formulation, application and monitoring of a poverty reduction strategy. Eight directives are given to be considered in the process: identification of the poor; the international and national human rights framework; equality and discrimination; the establishment of goals; references and priorities; participation, monitoring and accountability; assistance and international cooperation; and, the integration of certain human rights regulations.

Chapter 3 focusses the HRBA on the poverty reduction strategy, integrating human rights regulations such as the right to work, to adequate food, adequate housing, health, education, personal safety and intimacy, and to equality of access to justice, freedoms and political rights.
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**Pautassi, L. (2010).** *El aporte del enfoque de derechos a las políticas sociales. Una breve revisión. United Nations-ECLAC-GTZ.*

http://www.eclac.cl/dds/noticias/paginas/7/37567/LauraPautassi_Derechos_polsoc.pdf

The author stresses the importance of considering the rights perspective throughout social policy by the State, stressing that this presents a challenge, above all in terms of a change in perspective in viewing the recipients as rights holders rather than beneficiaries of projects which, in turn, implies a series of obligations on the part of the State. The author mentions of the judicialisation of social policies as an example.
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Following the emergence of gender evaluations in international cooperation and the resistance of donor agencies and partner institutions and organisations to speak about feminist evaluations, this article reflects on the main differences between: a) adopting a focus on women in development or a gender in development perspective; and, b) backing a feminist evaluation.
According to the author, both the women and the gender in development perspective, are characterised by being centred on descriptions of the lives of women, rather than on transformation of the situation. Feminist evaluation, on the contrary, seeks to explain the causes of gender inequity and the related political change.

The author uses this standpoint to present the main characteristics of a feminist evaluation and its criticisms of the women or gender in development perspectives. However, she also recognises that these approaches can be incorporated into a feminist evaluation. She then explores how to combine elements of the feminist evaluation with the women or gender in development approaches through the evaluative experience of an intervention to improve the rights of sex workers, both male and female, in Namibia.

The methodological focus proposed is characterised by the recognition of the reflexivity and political nature of evaluation, the promotion of non-predetermined models and the inclusion of less powerful groups.


http://www.ideas-int.org/documents/file_list.cfm?DocsSubCatID=34

The evaluation and human rights arena is an intersection that the author attempts to clarify throughout the text. However, despite mention of an interdisciplinary approach, this is lacking in the analysis and commentaries.

The author also notes that in spite of the efforts of doctrine in the evaluation of human rights, these are still declarative principles that have not been adequately incorporated into the evaluation process.

The analysis of human rights adopts the categorisation laid out by Stephen Marks and uses this to examine projects where these categories have been incorporated, reaching the conclusion that there is no one single logic that can be applied to all cases in order to integrate human rights into an evaluation.

The author disagrees with evaluation by the DAC-OECD criteria, dismissing these as utilitarian evaluation criteria that do not adequately consider the human rights.

Porter makes a reasonable critical effort to unite the two apparently compatible concepts of human rights and evaluation that demonstrate clear tensions when attempts are made to do this in practice.

Programa de Seguimiento de Políticas Públicas en Derechos Humanos. (2010). *Protocolo para incidir en la gestión del seguimiento y evaluación de la política pública con enfoque de derechos en lo regional y local*. Bogotá: Ombudsman’s Office Colombia

http://www.defensoria.org.co/red/?_item=0009&_secc=00&ts=1

This document aims to evaluate the effectiveness of public policies designed and executed by the Colombian State in order to guarantee the respect, protection and realisation of human rights and to identify barriers to the concretion of these in Colombia. It views public policies from a pluralistic and negotiable perspective. The proposed monitoring and evaluation system has two dimensions: to provide possible evidence of barriers to realisation of the rights; and, to call attention on to the political and social responsibility of public administrations in the processes of the formulation and implementation of public policies from a human rights
perspective. The text consists of five chapters:

1. Chapter 1 provides the context for development and implementation of this protocol within the institutional framework of the Ombudsman’s Office.
2. Chapter 2 develops basic concepts for public policies, monitoring and evaluation from a rights perspective.
3. Chapters 3 concentrates on activities that allow review of the comprehensive management of public policies as an instrument to guarantee human rights.
4. Chapter 4 includes a hypothetical case analysis and
5. Chapter 5 contains the instruments for the application of this.

Revista Española de Desarrollo y Cooperación, 6, 95-112.

This article develops and broadens the discussion on evaluation criteria found in the 2001 MAEC second evaluation of Spanish Cooperation on the gender perspective. In relation to the gender analysis standpoint in particular, it presents a redefinition of the DAC criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, viability and impact) and stresses the importance of including a new criteria: quality of participation.

In order to move the focus of the analysis onto people and processes and away from the traditional emphasis of criteria on action, the author of focusses on questions such as: identification of the problems and needs of women; attention to gender inequality in the definition of objectives at the outcomes; evaluation of the contributions of women and the results for women; sensitivity to the interests and priorities of the various groups involved; the close relationship between rights and responsibilities of women and men.

Finally a brief overview is given of the main challenges facing the incorporation of a gender perspective in evaluation.

http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=980

This manual wishes to contribute to the systematic incorporation of the gender and human rights perspective into evaluation practice. It is based on the rules and standards of evaluation of the United Nations system (2005), and aims to cover gaps detected during review of the available tools.

It is built on the basis that there are synergies and common areas between the gender and human rights perspectives. Gender equality is a human right but is also a dimension of development. Human rights are inclusive but not limited to gender inequality. It assumes that both perspectives are guided by the principles of inclusion, participation and fair power relations.

It approaches the three phases of an evaluation: a) analysis of the evaluability of the gender and human rights dimensions and how to act in different scenarios; b) preparation of evaluation elements with a gender and human rights perspective; c) implementation of the evaluation, including production of the report and communication of results.

Chapter 1 explains how analysis must be made of the extent to which the gender and human
rights perspectives have been considered an intervention before the evaluation process is started. These outcomes, will shape the approach of the evaluation team, but they must always have the capacity to introduce these perspectives into the evaluation. The evaluability analysis, which is performed before the evaluation, can be used to introduce corrective measures.

Chapter 2 shows the importance of ensuring the incorporation of these perspectives from the planning phase. The evaluation leader must be qualified.

Participation is an unquestionable principle, but in practice this can be shaped by different factors; the hoped-for degree of participation must be analysed and established. Critical agents must participate in the analysis.

The evaluation criteria include the DAC-OECD ones of: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability; and the ALNAP criteria for the evaluation of humanitarian interventions. Furthermore, these perspectives apply other specific criteria, such as participation, social transformation, inclusion and empowerment.

To ensure interconnection between evaluation questions and criteria, any questions must be directly derived from the theory of change of the intervention. It is important to analyse any theories of change, whether explicitly or implicitly formulated, and to do this from the two perspectives.

Any intervention must have clear evaluation indicators and these must consider the two perspectives.

When selecting the evaluation team, there must be inbuilt capability on gender and human rights, not just in terms of knowledge, but also experience and ethical commitment covering both gender equality and human rights and how to complete the evaluation process.

Chapter 3 provides details of quantitative and qualitative techniques. As well as providing a solid and consistent data, the evaluation must maximise the participation of critical agents and ensure data from all interest groups are represented, especially the most vulnerable. In terms of qualitative techniques, the manual offers recommendations on how to introduce the perspectives: desk work, focus groups, interviews and surveys.

An evaluation report, compiled with a gender and human rights perspective must: a) contain sufficient and adequate information according to the terms of reference; b) explain how the participation of critical agents was guaranteed during the evaluation process; c) make specific recommendations on gender and human rights and the monitoring of their fulfilment; d) report on difficulties encountered in the evaluation process, the reasons for these and the benefits obtained (where these did not exist); e) include lessons learned in terms of the intervention and the evaluation process itself.

Return to index
stages. Chapter 4 offers guidance on how to ensure that human rights and gender equality perspectives can be integrated throughout the evaluation process as, for example, in the adaptation of methods or with the use of specific methods.

Chapter 5 explores the key elements to be considered in order to complete the evaluation report, including the presentation of recommendations, dissemination of the report and follow-up.

It is important to stress that this document provides the added value of a detailed description of the evaluation process.

http://www.unevaluation.org/HRGE_Guidance

This guide aims to provide tools to help international cooperation professionals improve the integration of the gender perspective and HRBA in the management and development of evaluations.

With this aim in view, the guide provides tools and advice on how to include both perspectives throughout the entire evaluation process, from the preparation of the terms of reference to the dissemination and use of the evaluation. Similarly, it presents references for further information on each of the issues.

The guide provides solid resources for the preparation stage: a checklist to evaluate evaluability useful in the production of terms of reference; a guide for management structure and reference groups; a guide on supporting the evaluation unit and centralised evaluation; a tool for stakeholder analysis; a guide and checklist for the production of terms of reference; concrete examples of terms of reference; redefinition of the classic DAC criteria; examples of evaluation questions on the gender issue; a summary of evaluatory perspectives and a guide to evaluation methods; and, a matrix for evaluation of the team profile, technical proposal and budget.

For the performance of an evaluation, it presents the UN Women guide of to quality criteria for evaluation reports. For the dissemination and use of the evaluation, it proposes a framework for dissemination and planning strategy and a guide to developing institutional response to the evaluation.

Madrid: Libros de la Catarata.

Personal sensitivity to the HRBA and the gender perspective and the will to adopt these two approaches in social interventions are determined by individual knowledge of each of these reference frameworks and the attitudes expressed toward these.

The authors describe a group of knowledge items and attitudes they consider indicators of the concept they describe as ‘sensitivity’ to HRBA and the gender perspective.

One of the main outcomes of their study is the finding that the acquisition of knowledge on these perspectives does not necessarily ensure their implementation. Alongside the conceptual aspects, training must contain other emotional elements that determine the disposition to adopt these perspectives during interventions. The many different interpretations of these perspectives constitute a limitation on potential for the application of these.
This study reaches the conclusion that 'the gender perspective must be made explicit in all phases of the intervention through the HRBA'. The document stressed the need to clarify the relationships and conceptual distinctions of both approaches as, where this does not take place, the gender perspective can become lost within the more global framework of the HRBA.

A paraphrase of the definition of sensitivity to HRBA and the gender perspective provided by Kim-Godwin, Clarke and Brown (2001) defines cultural sensitivity: 'sensitivity to these perspectives describes the knowledge, attitudes, perceptions and values expressed by the conscience of people, both of the rights and the role of social gender norms in their behaviour, as well as recognition of the people with whom they work in their social intervention processes as the subjects of rights whose choices and actions are being influenced by sociocultural expectations of femininity and masculinity'.

The authors have developed a tool to evaluate sensitivity to HRBA and the gender perspective that is made up of 39 items organised in sub-scales: 1) knowledge of HRBA; 2) attitudes to HRBA; 3) knowledge of the gender perspective; 4) attitudes to the gender perspective.

The outcomes after applying the tool to a sample of individuals are that: there is greater knowledge of gender perspective, though the HRBA; certain gaps were found in the understanding of the meaning, purpose and practical consequences of the application of both perspectives to social interventions.

In terms of attitudes, the tendency is to show a favourable opinion in terms of theoretical reference frameworks, but to express reservations in terms of practical application.

The rest of the book attempts to bridge gaps in comprehension of the two perspectives identified in the study in order to contribute to increased sensitivity toward these.

The authors identify the measurement of advances made as a challenge for the HRBA. One particularly important aspect is the typology of indicators presented in the Report on Indicators for Monitoring Compliance with International Human Rights Instruments (United Nations HRI/MC/2006/7). The authors present a table of structure, process and outcome indicators in accordance with the criteria of: progressive implementation, participation and inclusion, equality and non-discrimination, responsibility and accountability.

Chapter 4 is dedicated to the gender perspective, and the authors present a table showing the relationships between HRBA and the gender perspective. The concept of gender equality is inherent to that of human rights. The two are mutually reinforcing. From the HRBA, gender equality is constituted as a legal obligation, covered by the human rights norms.
evaluation to be completed; to analyse whether the human rights perspective has been incorporated into the cooperation proposal; and to evaluate whether the gender perspective has also been integrated into this.

The checklist therefore consists of three broad strands: evaluability, the HRBA and the gender perspective. A group of statements are established for each of these relating to four broad blocks: analysis of the target situation for the cooperation action; general and specific objectives; definition of an implementation strategy; determination of the monitoring and evaluation system. The checklist is completed by responding ‘yes’ or ‘no’ to each of these statements and by summing up the positive responses a separate value for each of the dimensions analysed.

The list is organised in four phases:

I. Situation analysis: International and national regulations; actors involved; subjects of rights and obligations; evaluating available capacities; identifying human rights violations. This can be done from a comprehensive perspective including: availability, acceptability, accessibility, quality, participation, sustainability.

II. Proposal of general and specific objectives: The objectives must be designed from the HRBA perspective.

III. Definition of the implementation strategy: Project implementation strategy. Detailed specifications of the strategies and activities considered sufficient for intervention on the situation. Consideration of the following human rights principles: Universality and inalienability; interdependence and interrelationship; equality and non-discrimination; participation and inclusion; accountability and the rule of law.

IV. Determination of the monitoring and evaluation system.

The gender section of the list specifically proposes analysis of: the baseline position of women and men, cultural differences, forms of organisation of women and men, the mechanisms and spaces for decision making in relation to the control of resources by sex, the types of work, access to services, gender interests, changes expected in relation to quality, equity of participation, gender training, amongst other dimensions.
**Glossary**

**Activity**: Actions taken or work performed through which inputs, such as funds, technical assistance and other types of resources are mobilised to produce specific outputs (OECD, 2002).

**Approach**: To focus attention or interest on an issue or problem based on a set of pre-existing assumptions in order to attempt to solve it appropriately. In this case, development initiatives are the target under the pre-existing assumptions of human rights and gender equality.

**Capacity Gaps**: The differences between the potential and real capacity of right-holders to fulfil their roles.

**Criterion**: A definition of the desirable or optimal situation for a project in a certain sphere of reality.

**Discriminate**: To treat a person or group of people unfairly on the grounds of race, religion, politics, etc.

**Duty-Bearers**: The actors directly responsible for the legal and moral duties associated with the fulfilment and effective development of the rights of individuals. We have adopted the definition used in programming (and not international human rights law), which includes both state and non-state actors in the category of “duty bearer”, i.e. any actor with either duties or responsibilities for a development intervention (UNDP, 2000; UNEG, 2011).

Right-holders and duty-bearers are not “labels” for specific individuals, but roles that individuals may take on (Jonsson, 2004). For example, businesses, parents, teachers and donor organisations have been identified as duty-bearers, in addition to the State.

**Evaluation**: A systematic process of gathering and analysing information for one or more of the following purposes (adapted from: Patton, 2008; Greene, 2007):

- To understand and attribute meaning to the events that take place in a programme or service.
• To judge, assessing the value or merit of an intervention.
• To allocate responsibility through public accountability.
• To promote social justice and equity.

**EVALUATION CULTURE:** A collection of knowledge, assumptions, values and customs broadly accepted by the institution in order to favour and assist the performance of evaluations, which implies understanding and accepting the outcomes, being flexible enough to assume change and accountability on praxis.

**EVALUATION QUESTIONS:** Requests for information that involve a value judgement, rather than a mere inquiry into a certain aspect of the programme or service.

**EXCLUSION:** A process by which individuals or groups are denied the possibility of full participation in the society in which they live.

**FEMINISM:** A social, cultural and political movement which aims to promote *de jure* and *de facto* equality between women and men.

**FORMATIVE EVALUATION:** Evaluation designed, performed and intended to support the process of improvement, and normally commissioned or performed by and delivered to, actors who can implement the improvements (Scriven, 1991:19).

**GENDER:** To define gender we must differentiate between the concepts of sex and gender. While the term sex refers to biological differences between men and women, the concept of gender describes the social categories assigned to each sex (feminine/masculine; femininity/masculinity; etc.), which shape a wide range of relationships between women and men and the individual behaviours of the two sexes. Gender categories are social constructs, which means there are no underlying biological, genetic, natural or evolutionary reasons for the distinctions conveyed by these labels.

**GENDER IN DEVELOPMENT:** The most common term used to refer to the application of the gender perspective in the framework of development initiatives. We consider “gender perspective” and “GID” as interchangeable and have treated them as synonyms.

**GENDER IN DEVELOPMENT APPROACH (GID APPROACH):** In the terminology of international cooperation, the gender perspective or gender in development approach (GID approach) is a way of analysing social reality with the focus on the various factors that feed and reproduce the existing inequality between men and women in order to transform and change these.
**GENDER MAINSTREAMING:** The gender mainstreaming strategy seeks to place gender equality-related issues at the centre of political decisions, institutional structures and the allocation of resources, including women’s and men’s perspectives and priorities when taking decisions on development processes and objectives.

**GENDER SYSTEM:** Gender is an organisational principle of society and is therefore reflected in the existence of a gender system that structures and reinforces the unequal relationships between women and men (Thurén, 1993). This inequality manifests itself in the different social positions and living conditions of women and men, as well as being reflected in spheres such as work (productive or reproductive, paid or unpaid) and power (authority, access to resources, control, decision-making, etc.).

A gender system transmits the idea of interdependence; gender categories are related concepts. In the words of Ward Hood and Cassaro, (2002:30): we cannot talk about women without talking about men and vice-versa.

**HUMAN RIGHTS:** Universal legal guarantees protecting individuals and groups against actions and omissions that interfere with fundamental freedoms, entitlements and human dignity. Human rights law attributes States (principally) and other duty-bearers certain duties and responsibilities and also forces them to abstain from certain other courses of action (UN, 2006:1).

1. The right to life, liberty and security of persons.
2. Freedom of association, expression, assembly and movement.
3. The right to the highest attainable standard of health.
4. Freedom from arbitrary arrest or detention.
5. The right to a fair trial.
6. The right to just and favourable working conditions.
7. The right to adequate food, housing and social security.
8. The right to education.
9. The right to equal protection of the law.
10. Freedom from arbitrary interference with privacy, family, home or correspondence.
11. Freedom from torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.
12. Freedom from slavery.
The list of rights set forth in this table does not exclude the other rights guaranteed by conventions/treaties, nor others of a similar nature that are based on the dignity of the person, such as the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the Convention on the Protection of Persons from Enforced Disappearance, the Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention (ILO No. 169), the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, among others. A similar piece of work produced by the Fundación Acción Pro Derechos Humanos (http://www.derechoshumanos.net/derechos/index.htm) classifies rights by type.

**HUMAN RIGHTS-BASED APPROACH (HRBA):** The human rights-based approach to development (HRBA) is a theoretical perspective which seeks to promote, respect and guarantee the population’s effective enjoyment of human rights, with a particular focus on the most vulnerable groups. Through an analysis of the inequalities at the heart of development problems, this approach seeks to redress the discriminatory practices and unjust distributions of power that impede development progress (UN: 2006).

The effective enjoyment of human rights is a basic condition for human development. From this perspective, cooperation initiatives should incorporate the promotion, protection and assertion of rights, either as specific objectives or as cross-cutting goals in projects focussed on other issues.

The HRBA can be incorporated at all stages of the process, including the analysis, programming, implementation and, of course, evaluation. The HRBA is a conceptual framework for the process of human development that is normatively based on international human rights standards and operationally directed to promoting and protecting human rights. It seeks to analyse the inequalities that lie at the heart of development problems and redress discriminatory practices and unjust distributions of power that impede development progress.

**IMPACT:** Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended (OECD, 2002).

13. The right to a nationality.
15. The right to vote and take part in the conduct of public affairs.
16. The right to participate in cultural life.

Source: UN.
**INDICATORS:** Indicators try to represent the concept or criteria to be measured as closely as possible, although they often settle for reflecting phenomena parallel or similar to the concept sought, contributing to the evaluation only in the form of an approximation to the information sought. Rutter et al. (2000:40) describe indicators as features that have indirect connections with causal processes but which do not form an inherent part of the mechanisms directly associated with causation.

**INPUTS:** The financial, human, and material resources used for the development intervention (OECD, 2002).

**INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS STANDARDS:** A broad definition of the meanings of rights based on the international legislation used as a reference model.

**INTERSECTIONALITY:** The superimposition of situations or conditions that may lead to exclusion—such as gender, ethnicity, phenotypic differences, social class, sexual orientation or any other distinguishing trait—on a single individual or group.

**METHOD:** Methods of inquiry include strategies on how to obtain valid, reliable, trustworthy information based on the different underlying paradigms or approaches of the inquiry.

**MINIMUM THRESHOLD:** The minimum threshold approach has a more specific and practical purpose: to help to design policy guidelines for the measures that the State should take to comply with the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). To this end, reference points, goals or quantitative standards are established that allow us to determine the minimum level of welfare or fulfilment of needs that is a prerequisite for fulfilling ESCR.

**OPERATIONALISATION:** A deductive process that uses the criteria, dimensions or aspects to be evaluated in the design of questions, indicators, measurement systems and the corresponding verification sources. The process passes sequentially and logically through several stages, working from the broad and most abstract to the more specific. This chain concludes with the design of indicators or a search for sources from which information can be extracted for each indicator (Ligero, 2011).

**OUTCOME:** The likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention’s outputs (OECD, 2002).

**OUTPUTS:** The products, capital goods and services which result from a development intervention; may also include changes resulting from the intervention which are relevant to the achievement of outcomes (OECD, 2002).
PATTERN OF RIGHTS: The system of relationships between right-holders and their claims and duty-bearers and their responsibilities (Jonsson, 2004).

POSITIVE DISCRIMINATION: Special protection given to a group that has historically suffered from discrimination—particularly on the grounds of sex, race, language or religion—so as to attain their full social integration.

PROCESS: A sequence of activities that generates value for beneficiaries in relation to a specified initial situation. A work chain is used to produce something that did not previously exist—a product, service, direction or change in the population (Ligero, 2011).

PROGRAMME THEORY: An explicit theory of how an intervention contributes to the intended or observed outcomes (Funnell & Rogers, 2011).

RESTITUTION OF RIGHTS: Initiatives that allow people or groups whose rights have been violated to once again fully enjoy them. A synonym of reparation or compensation.

RIGHT-HOLDERS: People who are the subjects of development processes and who have the rights and the capacities to exercise these.

(GENDER- AND HRBA-) SENSITIVE EVALUATION: The term “sensitive” refers to the capacity of the evaluation methods to incorporate the gender perspective and HRBA into their design. “Sensitive” is therefore a synonym for “incorporation capacity”. The title of this paper is perfectly replaceable with “Evaluation that incorporates the gender perspective and HRBA”.

There is academic debate as to whether the term “sensitive” is suitable for describing the major transformation implied with the introduction of the gender perspective and HRBA into evaluation. In the specific case of gender, numerous titles have been proposed, ranging from “women’s issues” to “women’s rights studies” and “feminist evaluation”. In Bheda’s consideration of terminology (2011), the term “gender” does not appear to raise resistance and allows access to and development of work with this perspective. We have therefore chosen the term “gender perspective” in preference to the others.

STAKEHOLDERS: In the field of evaluation, stakeholders are usually defined as the social actors who affect or are affected by the programme (Patton, 2008: 62).
STANDARD: An amount or level or manifestation of a criterion that indicates a difference between two levels of worth (Stake, 2006: 111).

SUMMATIVE EVALUATION: In terms of intentions, it is evaluation performed for, or by, any observers or decision-makers (but not the developers) who need evaluative conclusions for any reasons besides development. These evaluations can be carried out by a historian, a politician or an agency aiming for visible legal and fiscal accountability; by a researcher looking for trends or influences; or by a decision-maker in the area of financing or acquisitions (Scriven 1991:20-21).

TECHNIQUES: Specific information-gathering instruments.

VIOLATION OF A RIGHT: A failure by duty-bearers to meet obligations to right-holders in general, or specific groups of right-holders as specified under norms, treaties, conventions and national legislation. Failure to meet these obligations leaves right-holders unprotected and lacking guarantees, impeding human rights development as set forth in international human rights standards.

A right is violated when the right-holders cannot assert their claims and the duty-bearers cannot fulfil their obligations.

VULNERABILITY: Social vulnerability is a characteristic of groups of people and their living conditions where these influence their capacity to anticipate, address, resist and recover from the impact of a stressful situation or negative process.

VULNERABLE GROUPS: Groups of people experiencing full or partial violation of their rights. These groups experience political, social or economic circumstances that place them in a situation of greater risk or helplessness in the exercising of their rights and freedoms.
### Classification of Proposals and How to Coordinate GID and the HRBA Jointly

#### Classification of Proposals by Contribution to Sensitivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guarantee or contribute substantially to sensitive evaluation:</th>
<th>Contribute to, strengthen or continue efforts but do not by themselves guarantee a sensitive evaluation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Design evaluation strategies.</td>
<td>• Issues linked to choice of methodology and techniques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The evaluators’ outlook (commission).</td>
<td>• Fieldwork issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incorporation into the design (operationalisation and evaluation approaches).</td>
<td>• Judgement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Outcomes reporting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Can have a major influence on sensitivity:**

- Data interpretation and analysis.

#### How to Coordinate GID and the HRBA Jointly:

1. **Successive or in parallel.** One of the methods is applied first, and then the other. Two reflection exercises are carried out in unison and complementing each other.

2. **Understanding gender as mainstreamed into human rights.** Gender is understood as equal access by men and women to human rights.

3. **Considering gender equality as another human right.**
DIFFERENT APPROACHES AND GUIDELINES FOR PERFORMING GENDER- AND HRBA- SENSITIVE EVALUATIONS

1) COMMISSION. The culture of both the commissioning institution and the evaluation team includes the necessary expertise and a sensitive outlook; thus, it is inevitable that these will be incorporated into the evaluation process.

2) DEFINING THE UNIT AND EVALUATING THE DESIGN of the programme. The aim is to establish a priori whether the theoretical framework of a programme is reliable, sufficient and valid for consideration as a gender- or HRBA-based programme. The end product of this process is an analysis of the intervention’s underlying logic, a judgement as to the foreseeable transformative impact on reality and recommendations for improving or reinforcing the strategy adopted.

3) EVALUATION APPROACH. Each approach establishes criteria which define how to design and execute the evaluation, what are the products to be obtained, and what possibilities it offers.

3.1 THEORY OF CHANGE EVALUATION

Enables understanding of the mechanisms and links between processes and results, and contributes to the analysis of the programme’s causal relations and to explaining the keys to the intervention’s success or failure.

3.2 STAKEHOLDER-DRIVEN

Articulates participation processes between different stakeholders, placing particular emphasis on the most underprivileged groups. These models are appropriate for plural social situations, where different groups involved in the evaluation can be given legitimacy and bargaining power.

3.3 CRITICAL CHANGE

Has the purpose of social transformation, justice, and progress towards equality and democracy. This evaluation is aimed at groups in a greater situation of inequality or rights violation.

3.4 JUDGEMENT-DRIVEN, SUMMATIVE

Essentially used as a basis for making decisions concerning the programme (Patton 2008:114). Primary users, those requiring this type of evaluation, are usually political leaders, funders of the intervention, or other actors with decision-making capacity.

4) OPERATIONALISATION: Identification of questions, indicators or other measurement systems for responding to the questions.

a) Vertical work. Identification of questions based on the chosen evaluation approach. Questions: requests for information that involve a value judgement (criteria).

b) Horizontal work. Designing of information-gathering systems and indicators for responding to evaluation questions.

5) METHODOLOGY AND TECHNIQUES. Methods of inquiry include strategies on how to obtain valid, reliable, and trustworthy information based on the different paradigms on which the inquiry is based. Techniques and sources are the specific instruments for gathering information.

6) FIELDWORK: All the activities that must be carried out to apply the techniques or to compile data from secondary sources.

7) DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION. Explains how the development programme has achieved its effects and what influence it has had, both in the exercise of human rights and as regarding the situation of equity and gender equality. Favoured by: triangular data, participation of all evaluation team members in the analysis, validating findings and mentioning existing discrepancies.

8) JUDGEMENT. Sensitive evaluations should facilitate judgement regarding whether the programme contributed or not to a more egalitarian gender system, or a greater effective enjoyment of rights. This judgement should make it possible to classify programmes based on their degree of transformation of reality: a) transformative; b) preserve the status quo; c) damage or worsen the situation.

9) REPORTING OF OUTCOMES. To heighten the influence of communication: distinguish between the different levels of products, include decisions and actions carried out in other phases to maintain coherence regarding GID and HRBA, draft culturally sensitive reports, orient products towards use and to assist in understanding and changing ideas on the situation of gender and human rights.

The competence of the team is key. This strategy does not prescribe how to evaluate, but rather trusts the capacities of the evaluators, who are aware of and sensitive to these issues, and who will develop the specific strategies during the “evaluation journey”. Evaluation commissions must ensure that the team has the necessary skills.

Establishes an analysis logic considered sufficient to revise the HRBA and GID, although only the technical design of the intervention is being studied. Appropriate when there is a clear demand for evaluating design; for example, to decide between a series of programmes or to appraise the intervention’s theoretical consistency.

Set of methodological options that can be consciously used to design sensitive evaluations. If the evaluation design incorporates the perspectives, and work is subsequently done according to what has been established, then HRBA- and GID-sensitive evaluations will be guaranteed. Any of the methods, properly used, is in itself sufficient to make the evaluation sensitive.

A key phase in developing sensitive evaluations. Evaluation questions are the central elements in the investigation and need to reflect the rights- and gender-based approaches. Indicators are measurement systems to answer evaluation questions or criteria (they have no value in themselves if the questions they seek to answer are not known).

Methods are not in themselves more or less sensitive. The method should be the most suitable for the evaluation questions and context. The combination of the qualitative and the quantitative approach is currently considered the most complete form of investigation. Different institutions recommend using a multi-method (mix method) articulation in GID- or HRBA-sensitive evaluations.

It is especially advisable to be empathetic, sensitive and respectful when working with groups that are in disadvantaged situations. Propose schedules and spaces adapted to the actors and establish a relationship of equals between the evaluation teams and the informants.

The interpretation of data is another key stage in sensitive evaluation. The evaluation approach will enable sensitive analysis, but also “the gaze of the evaluators” may make it possible to obtain high-quality gender or equality analyses with data that is apparently blind to these sensitivities.

The evaluation should result in a evidence-based judgement on whether the programme is able to transform reality.
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