

EQUITABLE ACCESS AND PARTICIPATION: AN EVALUATION OF SAVE THE CHILDREN AUSTRALIA'S APPROACHES TO ADDRESSING GENDER EQUALITY

FINAL REPORT

August 25, 2015



This evaluation report was produced by Danka Rapic, an independent consultant, in June/August 2015. The opinions and statements presented here do not necessarily represent those of Save the Children.

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

ANCP	Australian NGO Cooperation Program
CO	Country Office
CRSA	Child Rights Situation Analysis
CSP	Country Strategic Plan
DFAT	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
ECCD	Good Start in Life – Early Childhood Care and Development
GBV	Gender-based violence
HDA	Health Development Army
HEW	Health Extension Worker
IMPACT	Improving Migrant Protection and Assistance for Children in Thailand
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MEAL	Monitoring, evaluation, accountability and learning
MNCH	Improving Maternal and Child Health Care in Amhara Region
MO	Melbourne Office
PNG	Papua New Guinea
PQ	Program Quality
SCA	Save the Children Australia
SC	Save the Children
SCI	Save the Children International
SETARA	Strengthening Education through Awareness and Reading Achievement

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Gender refers to socially constructed roles, behaviours, activities, and attributes that a given society considers appropriate for girls, boys, women, and men. (SC Gender Equality Toolkit)

Gender analysis means to collect, analyse and interpret data and information about the specific situations, roles, responsibilities, needs, and opportunities of girls, boys, women, and men, with the objectives of:

- Identifying the differences between them;
- Understanding why those differences exist;
- Taking specific action to adapt/harmonise a program so it meets the needs of girls, boys, women, and men in an equitable manner and, where possible, includes activities that address gender discrimination, GBV and discriminatory gender norms; and
- Monitoring and evaluating the progress achieved in closing identified gaps between girls, boys, women, and men in their ability to access and benefit fully from an intervention, as well as in reducing gender discrimination.

(SC Gender Equality Toolkit)

Gender audit is a participatory process and tool for identifying challenges to integrating gender in the organisation's systems and operations and in programs and projects. (Interaction Gender Audit Handbook)

Gender equality refers to the absence of discrimination on the basis of sex. (SC Gender Equality Toolkit)

Gender gap refers to the disproportionate difference between sexes in attitudes and practices. A gender gap can exist in access to a particular productive resource (e.g. land and education), in the use of a resource (e.g. credit and other services), or levels of participation (e.g. in government and in decision-making bodies). A gender gap is a form of gender inequality. (SC Gender Equality Toolkit)

Gender inequality refers to any discrimination on the basis of sex. (SC Gender Equality Toolkit)

Gender mainstreaming is the process of assessing the implications for girls, boys, women and men. It is a strategy for making girls', boys', women's, and men's concerns and experiences an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of policies and programs, so that all intended beneficiaries can equitably benefit from the intervention. The ultimate goal is to achieve gender equality, and special focus on the needs of women and girls is often required to ensure programming addresses the widespread discrimination faced by women and girls. The ultimate goal of gender mainstreaming is gender equality. It is also referred to as **gender integration**. (SC Gender Equality Toolkit)

Gender roles are behaviours, attitudes, and actions society feels are appropriate or inappropriate for a girl, boy, woman, or man, according to cultural norms and traditions. Gender roles are neither static nor universal but vary between cultures, over time, between generations, and in relation to other social identities such as social class, socio-economic status, ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion, ability, and health status. Gender roles may also shift with processes of urbanisation or industrialisation, and the fluid nature of gender roles requires careful and ongoing gender analysis. (SC Gender Equality Toolkit)

Gender sensitive describes an approach or intervention in which the different needs, abilities, and opportunities of girls, boys, women, and men are identified, considered, and accounted for. (SC Gender Equality Toolkit)

Gender transformative refers to approaches and interventions that utilise a gender sensitive approach and promote gender equality, while working with key stakeholders to identify, address, and positively transform the root causes of gender inequality for girls, boys, women and men. (SC Gender Equality Toolkit)

Gender unaware refers to approaches and interventions that are designed without any consideration of gender at all – they may inadvertently reinforce gender inequalities and miss opportunities in program design, implementation, and evaluation to enhance gender equality and achieve more sustainable project outcomes. (SC Gender Equality Toolkit)

Sex refers to the biological and physiological characteristics that identify a person as female or male. (SC Gender Equality Toolkit)

Table of Contents

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS.....	iii
GLOSSARY OF TERMS.....	iv
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
2. INTRODUCTION.....	4
2.1. Purpose of the Evaluation.....	4
2.2. Existing Gender Framework	4
2.3. Methodology and Limitations.....	5
3. KEY FINDINGS.....	6
3.1. To what extent did the project teams consider particular needs of girls and boys, women and men at the design phase when the project goal and objectives were being formulated? Were there any particular assumptions made?	6
3.2. How effectively are the selected projects engaging girls and boys, women and men?	8
3.3. How contextually and culturally relevant are the strategies adopted to promote gender in the selected projects according to the different stakeholders consulted?.....	11
3.4. What are the factors which act as enablers or constraints with regards to advancing gender equality in the different project contexts?	12
3.5. How clearly can Melbourne Office and Country Office project staff articulate how the selected projects are considering and addressing gender equality?	14
3.6. What evidence is there to suggest there have been any changes in attitudes among staff, partners or community members regarding the roles of girls and boys, women and men in society since the start of the selected projects?.....	16
4. CONCLUSIONS.....	17
5. RECOMMENDATIONS	18
5.1. MO Level recommendations.....	18
5.2. CO Level Recommendations	20
5.3. Project Level Recommendations	20

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

“Understanding and addressing gender relations is part of ensuring that every Save the Children program is effective, rights-based, and will do no harm. If gender dynamics are not addressed, we miss an opportunity for impact, at best - and at worst, we reinforce discriminatory norms that perpetuate the dominance of men and boys and restrict girls and women from fulfilling their equal human rights.”

Save the Children Gender Equality Program Toolkit

As a leading global children’s rights organisation, Save the Children (SC) aims to employ gender transformative approaches -i.e. transforming root causes of gender inequality - across programs, advocacy and organisation.¹ Evidence shows that even deeply rooted gender norms formed from an early age can be changed by alternatives to discriminatory gender norms and behaviours.² While striving for gender transformative programs, SC’s minimum standard is gender sensitive programming, which ensures that different needs, abilities, and opportunities of girls, boys, women, and men are identified, considered, and accounted for. Both gender sensitive and gender transformative programs contribute to the reduction of gender inequalities and to the realisation of children’s rights.³

Gender equality and female empowerment are universally recognised as core development objectives, crucial for the realisation of human rights, and instrumental in achieving effective and sustainable development outcomes.⁴ As such, international funding targeting gender equality and women’s empowerment tripled from USD 8 billion (nearly AUD 11 billion) in 2002 to USD 24 billion (almost AUD 33 billion) in 2012 globally. Furthermore, the funding for gender equality has increased annually as a percentage of total bilateral aid, from 27% in 2002 to 36% in 2012, most of which went to education and health.⁵ This fact is especially significant to SC because education and health are two of its areas of focus. The increased financing of gender activities is also reflected in the Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)’s strategic framework for the aid program. DFAT, a key SCA donor, invests half of its overall aid program in activities that have either a principal or significant objective of promoting gender equality and empowering women.⁶ The Government has also set a target requiring that at least 80 per cent of investments, regardless of their objectives, effectively address gender in their implementation.⁷ Along the same lines, a key outcome of the Third Financing for Development Conference (FFD3) held in Addis Ababa in July 2015 is the Action Plan for Transformative Gender Financing for Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment⁸ which further reaffirms international commitment to financing of this sector.

Considering therefore the existing environment for gender programming, the purpose of this evaluation is to determine how gender equality is considered in four Save the Children Australia (SCA) projects. The projects, funded by the DFAT’s Australian NGO Cooperation Program (ANCP), include: 1) Strengthening Education through Awareness and Reading Achievement (SETARA) in Indonesia; 2) Improving Migrant Protection and Assistance for Children in Thailand (IMPACT); 3) A Good Start in

¹ SC Gender Equality Principles, p. 3.

² SC Gender Toolkit, p. 26.

³ SC Gender Toolkit, p. 30.

⁴ *Addressing Gender in Programming*, (<https://www.usaid.gov/what-we-do/gender-equality-and-womens-empowerment/addressing-gender-programming>). Last accessed August 11, 2015.

⁵ <http://www.oecd.org/dac/gender-development/Short%20version%20-%20FINALFinancing%20the%20unfinished%20business%20of%20gender%20equality.pdf>

⁶ *Australia’s assistance for gender equality*, (<http://dfat.gov.au/aid/topics/investment-priorities/gender-equality-empowering-women-girls/gender-equality/Pages/australias-assistance-for-gender-equality.aspx>). Last accessed August 11, 2015.

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ <http://www.unwomen.org/~media/headquarters/attachments/sections/news/action%20plan%20on%20transformative%20financing%20for%20gewe.pdf>

Life – Early Childhood Care and Development (ECCD) in Papua New Guinea (PNG); and 4) Improving Maternal and Child Health Care (MNCH) in Amhara Region in Ethiopia.

Overall, the evaluation found that MNCH is the closest to a gender transformative project, with selected activities aimed at changing the root causes of gender inequality; IMPACT, SETARA and ECCD fall within the gender sensitive range, accounting for different needs of men and women, boys and girls with various degrees of success.⁹ Due to its focus on maternal and child health and prevention of child marriage, MNCH had the highest levels of gender integration across the project cycle of the four projects; however this is not necessarily reflected in staff capacity. All four projects were designed without a gender analysis; and IMPACT, SETARA and ECCD do not have any gender sensitive project goals or objectives. While a few ad-hoc strategies to deal with identified gender issues have been employed on these three projects, they are not a result of a larger gender strategy.

Significant external constraints to the promotion of gender equality across the projects are the male led societies with firmly entrenched gender roles in which the projects operate and low partner capacity in gender sensitive and gender transformative programming, Internal obstacles include lack of staff gender capacity and lack of gender resources. However, the main obstacle to the promotion of gender equality on the four projects appears to be weak internal systems for gender mainstreaming at the Melbourne Office (MO) and Country Office (CO) level. This is likely influenced by the lack of strong leadership on gender equality at the SC level, evidenced in the absence of gender policy at the global level (not including SC principles which lack accountability and commitments) and the exclusion of gender considerations in the current SCA strategic plan. SCA has struggled to provide strong gender support to its projects. This fact, along with the perceived lack of commitment to gender issues at the CO level, makes it difficult for projects to push the gender agenda forward. However, positive changes have been observed in Thailand and Ethiopia COs. Both COs have undergone gender audits, and recently finalised Country Strategic Plans that are inclusive of gender considerations. In addition, this evaluation found high levels of commitment of MO and project staff to developing their capacity for the implementation of gender equality programming. Following on to these positive findings, the fulfilment of the recommendations below will further assist SCA in its efforts towards gender transformative organisational and programmatic goals.

MO Level Recommendations

- Hire a gender advisor.
- Establish an SCA Gender Working Group.
- Conduct a gender audit.
- Develop SCA gender strategy and implementation plan.
- Ensure that existing gender equality values are an integral part of the new SCA Strategic Plan.
- Discuss approaching gender as a core issue, rather than a cross cutting issue.
- Promote and encourage the use of already existing gender tools, with the primary focus on the SC Gender Equality Program Guidance & Toolkit.
- Provide compulsory gender training for MO project teams (program managers, PQ staff and technical advisors).
- Promote and encourage systematic use of online depository of gender resources (OneNet).
- Strengthen gender integration in the proposal process.
- Ensure gender considerations are a part of new project reporting systems.
- Build linkages between SCA and ANCP reporting processes.
- Increase inclusion of gender requirements in job descriptions and recruitment.

CO Level Recommendations

- Hire a CO or regional level gender advisor.

⁹ It should be noted that in the gender sensitive range, SETARA and IMPACT are at the higher end, while ECCD is at the lower end, bordering gender unaware designation.

- Conduct gender audits.
- Develop Gender Sensitive Country Strategic Plans and CRSAs.
- Apply gender sensitive approaches in the selection of partners.
- Build gender capacity of current partners.

Project Level Recommendations

- Develop gender capacity of project staff.
- Apply gender sensitive approaches in the selection of project partners.
- Build gender capacity of current partners.
- Conduct gender analysis.
- Strive for gender balance in project staffing.
- Develop a gender action plan (SETARA, ECCD, MNCH).
- Consider developing gender sensitive indicators that go beyond sex-disaggregated data.
- Follow up with staff on how to implement the gender action plan (IMPACT).

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1. Purpose of the Evaluation

In June 2015, SCA hired a consultant to undertake an evaluation of four SCA ANCP projects - SETARA, IMPACT, ECCD and MNCH – in order to examine the extent to which gender equality is being meaningfully considered in each, and to analyse the relevance and effectiveness of the strategies adopted by each project to promote equitable access and participation.

The overall objective of this evaluation is to provide insight into how SCA-supported projects are considering gender throughout the project lifecycle and to draw out lessons to inform broader organisational programming practices in this area. The evaluation is intended to identify opportunities for shared learning on what is and is not working with regards to integrating gender across SCA programming. The findings from this evaluation will be used to develop a program gender capacity building strategy.

It is expected the findings from this evaluation will be applicable beyond the four ANCP projects being reviewed. **Lessons learned, good practices and challenges will be documented and used to inform SCA organisational thinking and practice in this area.**

2.2. Existing Gender Framework

SETARA, IMPACT, ECCD and MNCH are different in scope, size and location. What they do have in common is the framework that guides their approaches to gender equality.

SC's regional and global strategic framework for gender mainstreaming consists of two key documents: *Transforming Inequalities, Transforming Lives: Save the Children Principles¹⁰ for Gender Equality*, and *Engendering Transformational Change: Save the Children Gender Equality Program Guidance & Toolkit*, which is designed to put the Principles into practice in program strategy, planning, design, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, accountability, and learning. SCA's *Gender Equality Program Policy* provides guidance for gender integration in SCA programming. At the CO level, both the *Country Strategic Plan (CSP)* and *Child Rights Situational Analysis (CRSA)* can serve as vehicles for the promotion of gender equality.

Gender is also considered in SC's theory of change as follows:

- **Be the Voice:** Save the Children will be the voice for gender equality through our advocacy campaigns, and by promoting legislation and policies that support gender equality for girls and boys, women and men.
- **Build Partnerships:** Save the Children will build partnerships for gender equality by collaborating with government, private sector and civil society organisations who share a common vision for gender equality. We will work with all partners to identify and implement best-practice solutions for overcoming inequalities that affect the rights of girls and boys.
- **Be the Innovator:** Save the Children will be the innovator for high-impact and high-quality programming, by identifying and addressing the root causes of gender inequalities and thereby supporting girls and boys in fulfilling their equal rights.
- **Achieve results at scale:** Save the Children will achieve results at scale by promoting gender equality across our organisation through gender sensitive organisational policies and practices.¹¹

The majority of SC employees¹² globally have access to these and other gender resources via OneNet (<https://onenet.savethechildren.net/whatwedo/genderequality/>).

¹⁰ Save the Children's six gender equality principles include: 1) equality as a right; 2) addressing root causes; 3) holistic approaches; 4) meaningful participation; 5) independent & cross cutting; 6) collaboration and learning.

¹¹ SC Gender equality principles, p. 7

ANCP provides funding to accredited Australian NGOs to deliver community development projects in developing countries.¹³ It requires that “all NGOs incorporate measures to address gender equality and women’s empowerment in design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation and reporting of ANCP activities.”¹⁴ ANCP projects can also find guidance in the *DFAT/AusAID Promoting opportunities for all Gender equality and women’s empowerment Thematic Strategy*.

Finally, national level laws and policies can serve as useful guidelines within a local context. They vary from country to country, and may include documents such as gender equality laws, gender-based violence (GBV) laws, health, education or other sectoral policies, and poverty reduction policies.

2.3. Methodology and Limitations

A specific analytical framework and evaluation approach were developed and are presented here in brief.

The evaluation consisted of: 1) literature review of relevant background documentation (country documentation, policy documents, assessments, and ANCP documents related to project guidance) (Annex 1) and a desk review of project level documentation from each of the four projects including project design documents, monitoring and evaluation data, progress reports, case studies, etc. Selected documents were scored on a scale 0-3¹⁵ in order to quantify their level of gender considerations in each document (Annex 2); 2) Semi-structured interviews conducted with country and project level leadership and management, partners/stakeholders, and selected MO staff conducted via Skype in order to gain informants’ views on the successes and challenges of mainstreaming gender considerations on each project (Annex 3); and 3) An online survey was administered via Survey Monkey for the MO staff involved with the four projects (Annex 4). The list of all respondents is in Annex 5.

Key “gender terminology” used throughout this report includes: gender sensitive, gender transformative, gender mainstreaming, gender integration, and gender analysis. *Gender sensitive* means that different needs, abilities, and opportunities of boys and girls, and men and women, are identified, considered and accounted for; this is a minimum standard for SC’s work. *Gender transformative* refers to using a gender sensitive approach and promotion of gender equality, while working with key stakeholders to identify, address, and positively transform the root causes of gender inequality for women and men, girls and boys; this is the ideal for which SC strives in its programs, advocacy and organisation.

Gender mainstreaming is the process of assessing the implications of an intervention for girls, boys, women, and men and ensuring that their different concerns and experiences are a part of internal organisational frameworks as well as program and project design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. In other words, gender mainstreaming is the “process of gender equality integration.”¹⁶ As such, *gender mainstreaming* and *gender integration* are used interchangeably throughout this report.

Gender analysis refers to the collection, analysis and interpretation of data and information about the specific situations, roles, responsibilities, needs, and opportunities of girls, boys, women, and men.

The following limitations were encountered during the evaluation:

- Unavailability of selected project/country staff for interviews.
- Respondents with weak English skills were asked to fill out questionnaires translated by project staff or external national translators to their local language. The quality of translated an-

¹² Not all Pacific Staff have access to OneNet currently due to IT issues. PNG will gain access in the next 2 months with IT upgrades. Solomon Islands and Vanuatu will gain access in the next two years.

¹³ The Australian NGO Cooperation Program Fact Sheet, p. 1

¹⁴ ANCP Manual, p. 14

¹⁵ 0=none, 1=minimal, 2=moderate, 3=thorough

¹⁶ SC Gender Equality Toolkit, p. 9

swers was not always very good; this was especially visible in partner feedback, where all but one provided feedback via a questionnaire.

- Due to issues with partners in PNG discussed in more detail elsewhere in this report, no partner feedback was available for ECCD.
- The consultant received vastly different amounts of documents to review from each project. Combined with the varying number of staff interviewed on each project, some projects were able to provide better feedback than others, which may be reflected in the findings.
- The limited timeframe of the evaluation prohibited solicitation of feedback from project beneficiaries.
- A very small number of project staff or MO staff participated in the project design stage, limiting consultant's access to first-hand knowledge of that process.

While these limitations resulted in a smaller pool of quality information available for analysis, it is not possible to predict their implications on the findings and conclusions of this evaluation.

3. KEY FINDINGS

The key findings are presented in response to five key questions outlined in the terms of reference for this evaluation.

3.1. To what extent did the project teams consider particular needs of girls and boys, women and men at the design phase when the project goal and objectives were being formulated? Were there any particular assumptions made?

In order to answer this question, one must consider the participation of men and women, boys and girls in the project design stage and inclusion of their needs in project design, results logframe or M&E framework, and goals and objectives.

Stakeholder participation in project planning/design

Question 3 in the SCA proposal template asks about the participation of children and stakeholders in project development. All four project proposals state that men and women, and boys and girls participated in project consultations. However, none of them offer sex-disaggregated data accounting for the attendance in stakeholder consultations, nor a description of participation during such events. The proposals do not provide details about how many individuals participated in consultations (men/women, boys/girls), whether both men and women, boys and girls spoke up and shared their concerns and needs, and whether separate consultations with men and women, boys and girls were held (research¹⁷ shows that women and girls are frequently more likely to share their opinions in an environment where men are not present). There was also no information provided whether female moderators were available to lead discussions with women, which is often necessary in more rural and conservative areas. While none of the four proposals describe whether the stakeholder input influenced gender considerations in project design, an interview with a respondent from Ethiopia uncovered that concerns generated from meetings with community level women's groups and government representatives were instrumental in including child marriage as a key component in MNCH design.

Project/MO staff participation in project design/proposal writing

Most of the project staff interviewed for this evaluation did not participate in project design/proposal writing and were not able to provide much detail. Along the same lines, only two of MO staff who participated in the online survey were involved in proposal design of at least one of the four proposals. None of those involved were provided any gender capacity building before or during this process.

¹⁷ Numerous research conducted in settings ranging from schools to workplaces to community meetings shows that in mixed-sex settings, women are less likely to speak up than men. One example of such work is Karpowitz, C., and Mendelberg, T., *The Silent Sex: Gender, Deliberation, and Institutions*, Aug. 2014.

In general, SCA proposal processes are a joint undertaking by the MO and CO. In the case of ANCP round, the proposals are drafted by the CO based on their analysis of the situation, and then submitted to MO for review. At the MO, the parties involved in proposal writing generally include Program Quality (PQ) staff, project managers and thematic specialists, such as health advisors and education advisors. Since there is no dedicated gender expert at MO,¹⁸ gender input (Question 12 in the proposal template) is reportedly provided by “everyone”.¹⁹ This brings into question the quality of gender considerations in proposals. Another reported problem is that the MO does not have a set of proposal designs to which the proposal team can turn to. In fact, proposal writing is described as a reactive and complex process that requires full cooperation between the MO and the CO. Since gender expertise is lacking at the CO level as well, with no dedicated gender specialist in any of the four country offices, it is difficult to envision a scenario where high quality gender considerations are a part of the initial proposal. High staff turnover at the MO level mentioned by some respondents may also contribute to the quality of proposals, since it prevents continuous accumulation of organisational knowledge – gender or otherwise.

Gender Considerations in Project Proposals

The following general observations were made in regards to project proposals:

- No gender analysis was conducted in the proposal design stage. As *SC Gender Equality Program Guidance & Toolkit* states, “A gender analysis will be key to ensure that all programs are designed take into account the specific realities and needs of girls, boys, women, and men, which is a minimal requirement. Ideally, a gender analysis will also provide information that will engage program designers to redress existing gender gaps and inequalities.”²⁰ The absence of a gender analysis in the project design stage severely limits the potential for a gender sensitive or a gender transformative project.
- Since no gender analyses were conducted, gender-related assumptions made in SETARA, IMPACT and ECCD proposals were limited to the projected number of male and female project beneficiaries. MNCH goes a step further by including gender assumptions (for example, projected number of child marriages cancelled) as a part of its gender sensitive goals and objectives.
- SETARA, IMPACT and ECCD proposals did not identify any gender risks in their risk assessment and mitigation (Question 16).²¹ For example, the widespread gender-based violence in PNG was not listed as a risk in the ECCD proposal. In the SETARA proposal, gender implications related to natural disasters did not make it into the proposal’s mentioning of natural disaster contingency plans. The IMPACT proposal did not consider under-representation of migrant girls and women in accessing basic education, and boys in accessing protection welfare as risks in reaching equitable gender targets. Accounting for gender risks can prevent unintended consequences during project implementation.
- The current SCA proposal template is not conducive to fully embracing gender considerations. Gender is only explicitly mentioned in Question 12, where it is grouped with other cross-cutting issues such as disability, environment and child protection. This somewhat casual treatment of gender in the proposal template can send the wrong message to proposal writers as it implies that this is the only question where gender issues should be discussed. Several other questions lend themselves to discussing gender, but do not offer gender prompts.

¹⁸ Given that there is no gender advisor, gender-related advice is provided by the PQ team, which is under-resourced and unable to fully dedicate its time to gender mainstreaming.

¹⁹ While gender mainstreaming in theory involves all team/project/organisation members, it also means that there is a person or a team leading the process. In the specific case of proposal writing, no dedicated gender leadership at either the MO or CO level leads to unsystematic gender integration by individuals who could benefit from additional gender expertise and guidance.

²⁰ SC Gender Toolkit, p. 54

²¹ MNCH identified two gender sensitive risks: 1) Boys and men’s engagement might be minimally achieved; and 2) Absence of transitional home/foster care arrangement for girls who escaped child marriage.

In answer to Question 4 which asks whether the program aligns with relevant policies and documents; all four proposals state that they are in alignment with 1) SCA Priorities (Education, Health and Nutrition, Child Protection, and DRR/CCA; 2) SCI Global Initiatives; 3) Country Strategic Plans; 4) AusAID Country Strategy; and 5) National Government Policies and Plans relating to child protection, education and health, depending on the proposal. This question does not single out SC *Principles for Gender Equality* as one of the policies with which the proposal should be in compliance. In order to ascertain how well the projects are addressing the needs of men and women, boys and girls in the design stage, the four proposals were scored on a scale 0-3 using the methodology described elsewhere in this report.

Both SETARA and ECCD proposals paid minimal attention to gender concerns, therefore receiving a score of 1 (minimal). Similarly, the majority of interviewed SETARA and ECCD project staff were not involved in the project design, having joined the project after the projects had already started. Those involved in the project design did not receive any gender training prior to this stage. Both proposals address gender only in Question 12, giving lip service to gender discussion, focusing primarily on gender balance in different project activities. ECCD proposal in Question 12 simply states that the project gender plan will be based upon the gender analysis, to be conducted as a part of baseline activities. To date, no gender analysis has been conducted, and no gender plan has been developed.

The IMPACT proposal is rated a 2 (moderate). It provides some gender context not observed in either the SETARA or ECCD proposals. However, while it provides a brief overview of gender differences in participation in education opportunities in migrant communities, this information is not integrated in the overall project design. In other words, while some gender information is provided outside of Question 12, its existence does not find its way into project goals, objectives or outcomes.

Finally, the MNCH proposal received the highest rating, a 3 (thorough).²² This is mainly the result of the project's primary focus, which is maternal and child health and child marriage. This is the only proposal where significant references to gender are present throughout the proposal and are not limited to Question 12. It is also the only project with gender sensitive project objectives.

In conclusion, opportunities were missed to be more inclusive of the particular needs of girls and boys, women and men during formulation of project goals and objectives because this process is not set up to promote discussion and consideration of gender issues. This is evidenced in the absence of gender expertise during this stage, resulting in no gender assumptions, gender analyses, or identifying risks from a gender perspective. In general, gender considerations are addressed primarily as a response to Question 12 in the proposal template, and not as an integral part of the overall project design (except in the MNCH proposal).

3.2. How effectively are the selected projects engaging girls and boys, women and men?

All four projects engage men and women, boys and girls in their activities. For the purpose of answering this question, engagement is defined in terms of representation (numbers) and active participation of stakeholders and project beneficiaries throughout the project cycle. The evaluation considered how engagement is realised in the project design, implementation and M&E stage and how it is impacted by project reporting.

In the project design stage, engagement was assessed through the review of project proposals.²³ All four projects received input from diverse stakeholders to obtain their feedback and buy-in. MNCH consulted representatives from child-led school clubs, out-of-school adolescent and reproductive health clubs, village taskforce members, government representatives of zonal and woreda health, women's, children's, and youth affairs, and justice offices. It was from these conversations that the

²² The rating of 3 is awarded to the MNCH proposal because it has gone further in discussing gender issues and integrating them more successfully into overall project design than the other three proposals. However, there is still room for improvement here, so it is possible that it would not hold its high rating if compared to similar proposals which were able to consider gender in more inclusive ways.

²³ The few staff who did participate in project design only confirmed what was written in the proposals, without being able to provide additional information.

need for MNCH to have a stronger focus on strategy for prevention and response to child marriage arose.²⁴ IMPACT consulted with prospective partners, who in turn consulted with their networks, including the Education Service Area Office, migrant community leaders, migrant children, and the Social Development and Welfare Office. SETARA obtained feedback from key education, health, and emergency preparedness stakeholders, including district government officials, school supervisors, school principals, community leaders, teachers, and primary and early childhood education students. ECCD reports holding consultations with donor representatives, staff of 23 Save the Children centres, as well as conducting class observations in selected schools and learning centres. While it can be stated that men and women, boys and girls were engaged in consultations, no data was available about their representation (i.e. sex-disaggregation of participants) or their level of participation, as discussed in more detail in Question 3.1.

The assessment of effectiveness of engagement in the implementation stage was based on the review of project reports and on the feedback provided by project staff. The main obstacle in this process was the lack of understanding of “engagement” at the project level. All interviewed project staff display a basic understanding of the importance of engaging men and women, girls and boys in project activities. However, when asked to describe how their projects were accomplishing this, the overwhelming majority stated they 1) disaggregated data by sex; and 2) aimed for gender balance in the beneficiary population. This is the case even with MNCH, where a more thorough understanding of how engagement is accomplished within the context of reaching project objectives was expected. It should be noted that some respondents did provide examples of how they are addressing identified gender gaps in equitable engagement discussed in more detail below; however many of these activities have not been reported in project reports.

In order to assess how projects report on their engagement of men and women, boys and girls, the evaluation analysed their quarterly SCA reports, utilising the same scoring methodology used for project proposals in Section 3.1. The four projects are required to report to SCA on a quarterly basis as well as to ANCP annually. Internal quarterly reports to SCA MO staff are written and submitted by the CO project staff, and based on these, ANCP annual donor reports are prepared and submitted by the MO based staff to ANCP/DFAT.²⁵ Out of 10 complete SCA quarterly reports reviewed (including only full form reports, not short form or narrative or incomplete reports) across the four projects, the overwhelming majority were rated a 1 (minimal), which means that gender issues were addressed only in a superficial manner, referring to gender balance and sex-disaggregated data but not offering many specifics. As is the case with the proposal template, the SCA reporting template has a designated place to discuss gender - Question 7 (cross-cutting issues), which only requires bi-annual reporting. Considering that this is the only “official” space in the report template designated to discuss gender, the opportunities to do so in “Lessons Learned” and “Key Challenges” are missed. The sections can play a significant role when discussing effective engagement of men and women, boys and girls. The majority of statements regarding gender in Question 7 provide no added value to the reports because they do not discuss progress in any specific actions aimed at addressing gender gaps. As a result, to an outside observer reading these reports, it would appear that gender is only considered in the context of disaggregating data and trying to reach gender balance in project activities.

However, as previously mentioned, some interview respondents did offer examples of gender activities which were not included in their reports. An excellent example of such discrepancy can be found in SETARA’s Y2 Q1 report from 2014. The answer presented in Question 7 is a standard line about gender equality in participation and collection of sex-disaggregated data. However, during report review, which is visible in track changes, the MO reviewer asks the report writer to provide more details

²⁴ MNCH is the only project where there was enough information to determine that stakeholder input had direct impact on project design.

²⁵ During the writing of this report, the SCA reporting process has changed. Starting in October 2015, project quarterly reports to SCA will be replaced by quarterly discussions between CO and MO, as well as with bi-annual reports. Other changes involve the CO now completing the DFAT template Annual Plan, to be reviewed by MO before submission.

in this section. The response provides an in-depth explanation of strategies used to increase male participation during reading events, and recognising the importance of female leaders as role models, which resulted in female school principals and reading camp facilitators sharing their experiences at an event attended by the local government officials. These strategies represent ways to increase equitable engagement of project beneficiaries. However, if it were not for the questions from the MO requiring clarification, this information would have been lost. Therefore, improved reporting of activities which in some way aim to decrease identified gender gaps, regardless of whether they are a part of the initial project work plan, would enable an improved understanding of how the engagement of women and men, girls and boys is being achieved.

In addition to SCA quarterly reports, the evaluation considered projects' ANCP reporting requirements. The ANCP *ADPlan Project Form*, which requires information about projects' future activities during a specified time frame, asks that reporting projects designate their gender equality and women's empowerment activities in one of the three categories: 1) *Principle*: Promoting gender equality and empowering women is fundamental in the design and impact of the activity and is an explicit objective of the activity; 2) *Significant*: Promoting gender equality and empowering women is an important objective of the activity, but is not the principle reason for undertaking the activity; and 3) *Not targeted*: The activity is not targeted to promoting gender equality and empowering women, however, gender equality could be addressed by ensuing participation of women and girls or a gender analysis will be/ has been undertaken as part of the activity's design.²⁶

The review of ADPlan Project forms²⁷ uncovered inconsistency in two of the projects' gender designation from year to year. On IMPACT, gender inclusion in ADPlan Project forms is "significant" for 2014-2015, and "not targeted" for 2015-2016 ADPlan Project²⁸. On MNCH, gender is rated "principle" for 2014-2015 and "significant" for 2015-2016. It is rather curious that attention to gender issues for projected activities on these two projects is lower than in the previous year. This is especially an interesting development for IMPACT, since Thailand CO has taken visible steps to increase gender mainstreaming at the CO level.

The ANCP gender designation sets a "gender standard" for each project. This gender standard should be based on evidence obtained through data collection and gender analysis, and not on subjective assessment of the person filling out the ADPlan Forms (the forms are completed by the country project staff, and then reviewed by the MO). It is crucial that both the MO and project staff understand the implications of the ANCP gender standard and what needs to be done to accomplish it. Furthermore, the emphasis on the connection between the ANCP gender designation and SC/SCA's gender objectives (gender sensitive or gender transformative) can be an impetus for the project staff to think about practical applications of equitable engagement in decision-making and access, and to report on them accordingly.

Finally, in terms of monitoring and evaluation, none of the projects, apart from MNCH,²⁹ have gender sensitive goals and objectives. However, all four projects do collect sex-disaggregated data, which is presented in project design stage as numbers of estimated beneficiaries and in the implementation stage as numbers of actual beneficiaries of project activities. The main tool for tracking beneficiaries during project implementation is the project beneficiary tracker. The trackers seem to be a good tool for capturing sex-disaggregated data, and are made even more effective through reviews and com-

²⁶ ANCP manual, p. 38

²⁷ No ADPlan Project Forms were received from ECCD.

²⁸ The ratings provided in the AdPlan are not always consistent across projects and are often a subjective rating based on the views of the Country Office. The downgrading between the two AdPlan periods is not necessarily because there is less of a focus between 2014-15 and 2015-16 on gender inclusion, but because the implementation of the gender action plan was in its infancy.

²⁹ MNCH's goal is to contribute to the reduction of maternal and child mortality, and it has three gender sensitive through the achievement of the following objectives: 1) Improve access to quality maternal and child health services in three districts of North Gondar Zone; 2) Increase health-seeking behavior among women and girls in project implementation areas; and 3) Strengthen capacity of adolescent girls and families to delay first marriage above the age of 18 years. The review of MNCH reports found a combination of not meeting, achieving and exceeding its annual expected outcomes.

ments provided by the MO. The data from the trackers is used in project reporting, both to SCA and ANCP. However, sex-disaggregated data (i.e. representation) is only one part of engagement. Unfortunately, the other key component – active participation – is not measured by the projects. Additionally, the analysis of sex-disaggregated data is absent at the project level. For example, in a community meeting, indicators should measure not only that 10 men and 10 women participated, but also that 9 men and only 1 woman expressed their points of views and concerns. Furthermore, analysing the meaning of such findings will enable project teams to develop activities to address identified inequalities in their next annual project work planning cycle, and improve the overall quality of project activities. The challenges with collecting, measuring and analysing sex-disaggregated data are topics that should be addressed in project reports and discussions with MO.

In sum, the evaluation of effective engagement of men and women, boys and girls throughout the project cycle encountered challenges discussed above. The most effective way to combat these obstacles will be through increasing project staff's capacity in gender analysis, gender sensitive report writing and gender sensitive monitoring and evaluation.

3.3. How contextually and culturally relevant are the strategies adopted to promote gender in the selected projects according to the different stakeholders consulted?

Gender issues can often be controversial in the context of international development activities. As such, programs and projects often develop culturally relevant ways which take into account different stakeholders (e.g., the government, civil society, the donor community, the private sector) to maximise the potential impact of gender considerations on the project outcome. For example, strategies commonly used may include engaging men as agents of change, seeking buy-in from community leaders (especially in rural areas), or relying on local women's business or civil society networks' knowledge and influence. These strategies are usually borne out of gender analyses conducted in the project design stage. However, since the four projects are without gender analyses, no systematic gender strategies exist. Due to its focus, however, MNCH has been the most successful in promoting gender equality within the context of Ethiopia's cultural landscape. The evaluation noted two main strategies:

- **Using the existing government structure to implement project activities.** The Ethiopian government has been working to increase access to health services to its citizens; for example, its Health Development Armies (HDAs) and Health Extension Workers (HEWs) are crucial in delivering health services, particularly in the rural areas. MNCH has been working closely with these entities on maternal and child health issues. Additionally, because NGOs can't directly work on human rights issues,³⁰ working through government partners provides an opportunity for joint gender equality objectives and goals.
- **Engaging men.** MNCH's understanding of Ethiopia as a male-dominated society led to engaging men in areas culturally viewed as being "women's issues" (e.g., maternal and child health). The project works with male community decision makers (e.g. local level heads, religious leaders, school principals, police, security) to support improved access to health services for women and children, and delay of marriage to 18 years for young women. Additionally, MNCH engages men as change agents through the local radio program (GEMC), in order to address inequitable gender norms that ultimately affect gender equality and the health of women, girls and boys.

In addition, SETARA and IMPACT staff reported taking into account cultural considerations in their responses to gender-based cultural barriers in project implementation. In Indonesia, it is widely accepted that children's education is within the purview of their mothers. In order to combat this gender stereotype, SETARA attempted to engage men by 1) approaching those fathers who did participate in

³⁰ While the Government of Ethiopia has committed to elimination of Traditional Harmful Practices by 2025, it restricts international NGOs from public advocacy work or mass mobilisation around changing existing laws and policies.

their children's school activities and asking their assistance to recruit more fathers ; and 2) creating a selfie competition, so that the parents (fathers in particular) can take photos of themselves reading a book with their children. In Thailand, it is common for 12-13 year old girls from migrant communities to drop out of school in order to work. IMPACT addressed this problem by explaining to their parents how their daughters will have a better life if they stay in school.

Project partners were also asked for their take on the ways the four projects have employed contextually and culturally relevant gender strategies. Due to ECCD's issues with partners described elsewhere in this report, there was no partner feedback from PNG. All but one partner provided their input via written questionnaires, which required translation to and from the local language.

The most robust partner feedback came from Ethiopia, resulting from a one-on-one interview and a questionnaire. MNCH gender strategies mentioned included conducting research and supporting the beneficiaries in the areas of GBV, fistula, early marriage, and child and maternal health. Partners report observed changes in health seeking behavior as a result of the radio shows supported by MNCH, but no quantitative evidence was provided. IMPACT and SETARA partner feedback did not specify any gender strategies employed by the two projects.

In sum, MNCH, IMPACT, and SETARA took into account contextual and cultural nuances in their project design and implementation, albeit to a different degree. The information provided by ECCD did not reveal any specific culturally relevant strategies to promote gender equality.

3.4. What are the factors which act as enablers or constraints with regards to advancing gender equality in the different project contexts?

Despite the fact that the four projects are different in scope and are implemented in four different environments, they share some of the key enabling and constraining factors with regards to advancing gender equality. These factors can be divided into two groups: internal factors, which are related to the administration/management/policies of projects and can be addressed by CO or SCA; and external, which are a product of the country contexts and on which CO/SCA has minimal, if any, impact, at least in the short run.

The most often quoted enabling factor for the promotion of gender equality is national-level laws and policies (except by ECCD). While not specifically referring to national laws as enablers of gender equality, ECCD staff conveyed their disappointment in the fact that the project has not been able to cement their partnership with government entities, specifically the Department of Education and the Department of Youth and Community Development. Therefore, across projects respondents look to their government as key players in the promotion of gender equality. It should be noted, however, that while it is crucial that there is a strong gender equality legal framework set up by the government, transformational changes in gender inequality often begin at the family or the community level. In fact, the key constraint mentioned by all four projects and their partners is entrenched social and cultural norms that dictate gender roles.

A constraint observed through partners' questionnaires is generally low gender capacity at the partner level.³¹ Even accounting for potential deficiencies in translation, it is not likely that the feedback provided could have been more comprehensive. When asked about their gender capacity/experience, IMPACT partners discussed generic gender issues such as training on gender diversity, and gender sensitive recruitment process, but did not offer explanations about how they combat gender inequalities through their activities. One SETARA partner, for example, cites an appointment of one single female staff member to a decision-making position as 1) evidence of promotion of gender equality within the organisation; 2) evidence of an organisation's gender policy/strategy; and 3) evidence that there have been any changes in attitudes among organisation staff or community members regarding the roles of girls and boys, women and men in families, communities and more broadly since the start

³¹ MNCH partners seem to have the best understanding of gender issues and their implications within their own cultural context.

of SETARA. This is an example of gender being understood in very simple terms of representation of women, which can negatively impact any gender transformative programming.

The enabling and constraining factors in the promotion of gender equality on the four projects presented below have been identified by interview respondents or by the evaluation consultant.

Table 1. Enablers of gender equality

Internal to SC	External to SC
<p>Management/Administration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Country Strategic Plan is inclusive of gender considerations (IMPACT) • CO office provides a good working environment, provides equal training opportunities to male and female employees (IMPACT) • Ongoing gender audit (IMPACT) • Existence of gender action plan (IMPACT) • Good relationship with government stakeholders (MNCH) 	<p>Cultural:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Observed changes in the urban areas, where more women work and are becoming financially independent (IMPACT, ECCD) • Things are slowly changing in the urban and semi-urban areas, there are even some women on the community education committees (ECCD)
<p>Capacity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presence of gender expertise at CO level (PDQ director has gender background) (MNCH) 	<p>Government/Legal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National-level laws and policies inclusive of gender considerations (IMPACT, SETARA, MNCH) • Free basic education until 6th grade (SETARA)

Table 2. Key constraints to gender equality

Internal to SC	External to SC
<p>Capacity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of gender capacity at the project level (no gender specialist; no gender training for technical staff) (all projects) • Project staff don't know how to go about improving gender considerations in a practical way, and see gender as an extra burden on top of everything else they have to do. Linked to wider capacity of COs (all projects) • Lack of deep understanding of how gender equality should be linked with project goals, objectives and results (all projects) • The majority of project staff are not familiar with key SC gender tools/guidelines and have never used them in their work (all projects) • Low gender capacity of partners (all projects) (This factor can be considered both as internal and external) 	<p>Cultural:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entrenched social and cultural norms that dictate gender roles, especially in the rural areas (all projects) • Male-dominated societies resulting in lack of women in leadership positions at all levels (all projects) • Prioritisation of boys in higher education which requires a fee (SETARA, ECCD) • Gendered roles in education (teachers mostly women, school principals mostly men, need more men as teachers; master trainers are mostly men; low participation of fathers in their children's school activities) (SETARA) • Harmful traditional practices such as child marriage (MNCH) • 90% of overall population is uneducated. Most girls don't complete primary education, so they can't sit on community education boards. Most girls marry young, and then the husbands don't allow them to continue their

	<p>education. (ECCD)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When interventions/programs come to a community, women don't participate because of these entrenched attitudes (ECCD)
<p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of gender technical support at CO and MO level (all projects) Lack of gender sensitive processes during project design phase (gender analysis, gender inclusion in project goals, objectives, and results) (all projects) Lack of monitoring tools for gender equality (all projects) 	<p>Government/Legal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government limits international NGOs in working directly on rights-based issues (which includes gender equality) (MNCH) The government does not seem to want to partner with organisations unless there is an incentive for them (ECCD)
<p>Staffing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Underrepresentation of women in decision-making positions (MNCH) 	<p>Migration issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Migrant girls leaving school when they turn 12-13 years old (IMPACT) Lack of information, language skills within the migrant community (IMPACT)

As mentioned previously, since there were no gender analyses conducted in the design stage of any of the projects, there were no strategic approaches developed against the constraining factors. An exception is MNCH, where gender strategies for combatting child marriage and engaging men and boys in discussions around health issues were included in project design stage in order to achieve project goals and objectives.

SETARA and IMPACT both developed some ad hoc strategies as a response to external barriers, as described in more detail in Section 3.3. Project respondents stated that these strategies were successful, but provided no quantitative data to support these claims. If these strategies indeed are as effective as reported in terms of decreasing identified gender gaps, their inclusion in future annual work plans as measurable activities would contribute to moving these two projects from a gender sensitive to a gender transformative designation. No specific problem solving to overcome barriers to promotion of gender equality has been identified on ECCD.

Interestingly, all reported problem solving initiatives at the project level are aimed at the external barriers, which are much harder to tackle. An example of a project staff attempting to address internal barriers comes from SETARA, where requests have been made to MO for gender assistance; however, due to lack of resources, this assistance did not materialise.

3.5. How clearly can Melbourne Office and Country Office project staff articulate how the selected projects are considering and addressing gender equality?

Melbourne-based staff monitor gender integration on four projects through project quarterly³² and annual reports and field visits. As discussed earlier, gender activities are frequently missing from the reports, which presents a challenge for soliciting MO gender feedback. Additionally, due to MO staff's involvement with multiple projects and limited gender knowledge and skills, they are frequently unable to dedicate their time to project level gender considerations. Some initiatives by MO staff to elevate gender at the project level have been observed, however. For example, the IMPACT project manager worked with the project team to develop a gender action plan, and a PQ advisor shared the Gender Toolkit with the SETARA project manager.

³² Soon to be replaced with quarterly discussions and bi-annual reports.

As a part of this evaluation, nine³³ MO staff who work with one or more of the four projects completed an online survey. In it they were asked to rate their own gender skills and experience in terms of “poor”, “fair” and “excellent”. The overwhelming majority of the nine respondents believe their knowledge of gender analysis, gender integration, and gender sensitive M&E is “fair” or worse.

Table 3. MO Staff Self-Assessment of Gender Expertise

Answer Options	Poor	Fair	Excellent
Gender Analysis ("excellent" means you are experienced in conducting gender analyses)	1	6	2
Gender Integration in project design ("excellent" means that you are experienced with developing and implementing strategies to integrate gender in the project cycle)	2	4	3
Gender sensitive M&E ("excellent" means that you are experienced in developing gender sensitive indicators and have an understanding of how gender changes can be measured within the overall project M&E)	2	6	1

The majority of staff (78%) reports that they have not had any gender capacity building while with SCA. Those who have had it, received it over two years ago. The lack of training opportunities is reflective of the staff’s assessment of how gender is approached institutionally. Of those surveyed, 90% say there are no good systems/processes for sharing knowledge and lessons learned across SCA/SI projects. None of the 8 respondents who answered this question agree or strongly agree with the statement that the MO encourages, recognises or rewards good practice on addressing gender issues at the project level. One respondent states that this type of encouragement happened on only one occasion – when SCA was applying for DFAT accreditation, which required an existence of a gender policy. Generally speaking, absence of systematic support and prioritisation of gender by the leadership is a key constraining factor to gender sensitive and gender transformative approaches.

In terms of the existing SC/SCA gender documents (*SCA Gender Equality Program Policy*, *Gender Equality Toolkit* and *Gender Equality principles*), four out of 8 respondents reporting using the *SCA Gender Equality Program Policy*. As discussed elsewhere in this report, the *Gender Equality Toolkit* is an excellent tool which contains practical approaches to all aspects of gender integration at the project level. It is therefore unfortunate that only 22% of respondents report using it. Only one person reports using *Gender Equality Principles* in their work.

The MO staff was asked to rate CO-based project staff’s collective gender technical knowledge and skills³⁴ as “poor”, “fair” or “excellent.” IMPACT staff received the worst rating, although this is the only project with a gender action plan. The majority of project staff gender expertise is rated as poor (with the exception of MNCH staff, which is mostly rated as fair). It should be noted that despite MNCH’s gender transformative framework, the evaluation did not find its staff to have a higher level of gender expertise than staff of the other projects. Therefore, the higher rating given to MNCH staff by the MO staff may be in part due to the scope of their project.

The interviews with project staff found that the overwhelming majority appear to have a good understanding of theoretical meaning of gender equality. However, it was more challenging for them to de-

³³ Not all nine respondents answered all questions asked.

³⁴ Each project was rated by 3 MO staff involved with the project either during design, implementation or M&E.

scribe practical application of gender equality in their jobs or in relation to SC theory of change – i.e. “technical gender knowledge and skills” as termed in the MO staff survey described above. All project staff interviewed mentioned two main ways in which projects are reaching and benefitting men and women, girls and boys: 1) sex-disaggregation of data and 2) gender balance of project beneficiaries. An example of how gender equality theory does not penetrate practical approaches was an answer received from one respondent who implied that “engaging men” was done to achieve gender balance in the beneficiary population – not so that men can be agents of change of attitudes and behaviours regarding gender equality. An excellent description of how gender is approached at the project level was provided by an MO survey respondent: “There is an absence of the deep understanding of why it is important to target gender considerations in the first place – which goes beyond sex-disaggregating data and ensuring “equal participation”.”

The consensus of both MO and project staff is that the projects could “do better” in addressing gender considerations, which is in line with evaluation findings. The staff are aware of their own limitations, and, more importantly, would like to improve their skills. Project staff expressed an interest for gender training ranging from basic gender training (ECCD) to more advanced training in gender analysis and gender mainstreaming (SETARA, IMPACT, MNCH). The MO staff would also like to see more opportunities for the promotion of gender equality available to them as well, including training on gender integration in the project cycle (90%), gender analysis training (78%), gender sensitivity training (56%), and Community of practice (SC-wide knowledge sharing) (56%).

3.6. What evidence is there to suggest there have been any changes in attitudes among staff, partners or community members regarding the roles of girls and boys, women and men in society since the start of the selected projects?

The discussion about changes in community members’ attitudes should be prefaced by saying that measuring change in attitudes is a long-term process, and since these projects have only been in existence for a couple of years, it is unreasonable to expect evidence of significant changes.

The evaluation analysed monitoring and evaluation plans of the four projects, using the scoring methodology discussed earlier in this report. None of the projects’ M&E frameworks are currently using indicators to measure changes in people’s attitudes about gender roles and relations. SETARA and IMPACT were rated a 0 (none), ECCD a 1 (minimal), and MNCH a 2 (moderate). IMPACT proposal was rated a 2, so it is disappointing to see that despite this, the project’s M&E plan does not refer to gender even in a superficial way.

The evaluation identified the following constraining factors for gender sensitive M&E:

- Lack of gender sensitive M&E skills at the project level, resulting in no analysis of sex-disaggregated data. These skills are especially critical when training partners on data collection.
- Some projects have reported issues with collection of data in general, and specifically with gender sensitive data. ECCD reports lack of appropriate M&E tools, poor reporting skills, and difficulties in accessing data in remote areas. MNCH describes several challenges in collecting gender sensitive data, including: sensitivity of gender issues; need for confidentiality; gender is tied with individual rights and personal affairs of the participants; women are under the influence of cultural and social values; and women are often not interested in sharing ideas.
- There may be an issue with collecting age-disaggregated data, where it is not always possible to ascertain whether ‘men and women’ are actually adolescents. This can cause confusion in determining how ‘boys and girls’ designation becomes defined and distinct from ‘men and women’.

The evaluation did not uncover any evidence of changes in attitudes among project staff regarding the roles of girls and boys since the start of the four projects. Many of interviewed staff have previous work experience with organisations where gender was a more serious consideration than in their current positions. Some staff say their projects are not “gender programs” and not set up to change gender norms (IMPACT and ECCD, for example). This characterisation of a project is certainly a de-

parture from SCI's goals for gender sensitive and ultimately gender transformative programming. In other words, even though SCI/SCA may have policies and goals for gender mainstreaming, these messages do not filter through to project teams' priorities.

An exception is MNCH, which monitors the numbers of child marriages cancelled due to project initiatives. It can be argued that the cancellation of child marriage is an indicator of community members' changes in attitudes about the roles of girls and boys, women and men. While the arguments against child marriage is primarily presented from a health rather than girls'/women's empowerment perspective, aspects of the project work involving school clubs are empowering for girls as they enable them to exercise their rights not to be married or to report when they become aware of arranged marriages amongst their school peers in order to cancel the marriages. Additionally, MNCH's partner, Gondar Education Media Center, reports that radio programs on maternal and child health supported by MNCH have resulted in changes in health seeking behaviour of women, men, and children, based on self-reporting of radio group listeners. However, no quantitative evidence was provided in support of this claim.

The finding that there is little or no evidence that the majority of projects (MNCH being the exception) have induced attitudinal changes in stakeholders is an example of how the lack of gender considerations in the project design stage negatively impacts implementation and M&E.

4. CONCLUSIONS

This evaluation found that SETARA, IMPACT and ECCD projects are in the gender sensitive range, while MNCH can be considered as gender transformative. However, the gender transformative nature of MNCH is primarily based on its scope, and is not reflected in staff capacity and understanding of changing the root causes of gender inequality.

The main obstacle to thorough gender integration at the project level is the weak gender mainstreaming mechanism at the SCA. Combined with the minimal attention to gender displayed at the CO level, projects have been struggling to meaningfully apply SC gender principles beyond sex-disaggregation of data and striving for 50%-50% balance in beneficiary populations. A strategic organisational approach to gender mainstreaming supported by the SCA leadership and spearheaded by an MO based gender advisor is the first step in addressing this problem.

The most important finding of this evaluation, however, is the staff interest – both at the MO and project level – to strengthen their own capacity, to expand access to gender resources, and to develop gender knowledge-sharing systems across SCA. Investing in gender mainstreaming efforts may be a financial strain for SCA in the short-run; however, trends in international development funding (including DFAT) point to high donor priority for gender issues, especially in health and education sectors.

Finally, while it is significant to elevate gender considerations at the MO and project level for the sake of funding opportunities, it should be emphasised that initiatives that take into account the different needs and roles of women and men, girls and boys are more effective and sustainable. Decreasing or removing the barriers that prevent one sex from equal access to decision-making, economic opportunities, property, health and education leads to leveling the playing field, and ultimately to more inclusive societies. The recommendations presented in this report are applicable beyond the four ANCP projects reviewed here. Acting on them will increase SCA's overall gender capacity and its effectiveness in delivering high quality inclusive programs.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations presented here are based on the consultant's interpretation of evaluation findings as well as on the staff suggestions for addressing identified gaps in the promotion of gender equality. Although the primary focus of the evaluation were IMPACT, SETARA, ECCD and MNCH, the changes at the MO level are key for any meaningful change at the project level.

The process of gender mainstreaming consists of multiple parts, which work together and are frequently implemented simultaneously. A **systematic approach with an accountability mechanism** is necessary for this process to be successful. Evaluation respondents have expressed their concern that financial restrictions may prevent the bulk of the recommendations below from being implemented. This is a valid concern; however piece-meal and ad hoc attempts outside of a strategic gender framework sanctioned by the organisational leadership are rarely effective or sustainable.

The evaluation recommendations are presented below in a narrative form, followed by an implementation plan for their completion.

5.1. MO Level recommendations

- **Hire a gender advisor.** This is the **key recommendation** of this evaluation. The primary role of the MO-based gender advisor is to lead the gender mainstreaming efforts at the organisational level. This means spearheading and coordinating all MO-level gender activities (to be determined in a gender strategy/implementation plan), as well as being responsible for MO capacity building. S/he can also offer project-level gender technical assistance and capacity development, in concert with regional gender advisors. It should be noted that the presence of a gender advisor does not absolve the rest of the staff from being responsible for gender mainstreaming.
- **Establish an SCA Gender Working Group.** An internal Gender Working Group should consist of members of different teams across SCA, with Gender Advisor as the Chairperson.³⁵ The Group members should be gender focal points for their teams (regional and thematic).
- **Conduct a gender audit.** This process assesses to what extent gender has been mainstreamed in organisation's operations and programming.³⁶ Ideally, the audit should be conducted by the gender advisor. If this is not an option in the near future, other avenues should be considered such as hiring a consultant or even a highly qualified intern, if available (as is currently being done in Thailand), which would be a low-cost solution. Discussions should be held with other SC members (via ANFSC group) and COs to gather best practices and lessons learned from their experiences with gender audits.
- **Develop an SCA gender strategy and implementation plan.** The gender strategy should be based on the findings of the gender audit and serve as a road map for SCA's efforts to elevate gender to a higher level within the organisation with short-term, medium-term and long-term goals. Ideally, this strategy should be in concert with the broader SCA strategy. (See SC Canada's example here: <http://www.savethechildren.ca/document.doc?id=448>)
- **Ensure that existing gender equality values are an integral part of the new SCA Strategic Plan.** The Strategic Plan should be inclusive of gender considerations to confirm commitment to gender transformative values outlined in the *SC Gender Principles*. It should also make references to the gender strategy referenced above (or include it as an Annex).

³⁵ In case it takes a while to hire a gender advisor, the Gender Working Group can fill that role on a temporary basis. This should not however be considered a permanent solution given that Group members already have full time positions and do not have the time to devote themselves fully to gender mainstreaming. It would also be wise to speak to other SC Members to find out about their experiences and solutions for building their in-house gender expertise.

³⁶ The terms of reference for this evaluation were primarily focused on the programming side. A gender audit will however be able to assess and provide detailed recommendations for gender mainstreaming improvements in policy, staffing, advocacy, marketing, communications, human resources, financial resources, and the overall organisational culture (based on Interaction's Gender Audit Tool.)

- **Discuss approaching gender as a core issue, rather than a cross cutting issue.** Many respondents believe that designation of gender as a “cross cutting issue” makes it less effective because it simply falls through the cracks because there is a lack of leadership or management level ownership of it. As a core issue (SC thematic area), gender would have “a home” and an accountability mechanism. At the same time, other MO staff believe that the cross-cutting designation is not the problem, but rather the lack of accountability for it. Gender Advisor and the Gender Working Group should discuss this dilemma and decide the best approach going forward.
- **Promote and encourage the use of already existing gender tools, with the primary focus on the SC Gender Equality Program Guidance & Toolkit.** The Toolkit is an excellent tool which shows in practical terms how and why gender should be considered in project design, implementation and monitoring and evaluation. Unfortunately, the majority of evaluation respondents are unaware of its existence or have rarely used it. The Toolkit should be the starting point for MO and CO level staff gender capacity building and efforts should be made to share this toolkit with relevant MO and project level staff (perhaps via short online presentations for each of the relevant topics such as gender analysis, or gender sensitive M&E that can be always accessible on OneNet), before any resources are put into development of comprehensive gender trainings.
- **Provide compulsory gender training for MO project teams (program managers, PQ staff and technical advisors).** Basic training in gender, along with gender analysis, gender considerations in project design, implementation and M&E (as discussed in the previous recommendation) should all be a compulsory part of project teams’ professional development.
- **Promote and encourage systematic use of online depository of gender resources (OneNet).** Only a few respondents stated that they used OneNet for gender resources, yet the majority said they wanted more resources (any staff member can post resources on OneNet). Since OneNet seems to be a good vehicle to share resources across the SC world, efforts should be made to improve the gender section. This will require coordination among the SC Gender Equality Working Group members, so that each member is in charge of collecting and depositing resources on selected gender topics. Resources should be inclusive of best practices, lessons learned, case studies, practical guidebooks, online trainings, linked to relevant sectors. As this may require a significant amount a time, an intern might be a good option. The staff should be kept abreast of changes happening with OneNet so that they are aware of the existing resources.
- **Strengthen gender integration in the proposal process.** This evaluation found that gender considerations are usually addressed haphazardly during the proposal process since there is no official gender expertise or responsibility for gender issues. The following steps can be taken to remedy this situation:
 - ~ Prior to proposal writing, review examples of other SC projects which have successfully integrated gender (accessible in the OneNet gender folder or more convenient internal mechanism with SCA-only examples). Doing this for a while will enable the development of internal “gender” templates which can be used in the future.
 - ~ Ensure that gender analysis is conducted during the project design stage. Although the four evaluated projects did not include gender analysis in their design, proposals for year 2, year 3 and so on present an opportunity to be more inclusive of gender considerations, even though this is not as effective as having the considerations from the very beginning.
 - ~ Develop a mandatory gender checklist to be completed before signing off on the design of any project.
 - ~ Revise SCA Proposal Template, so that gender considerations go beyond Question 12. See Annex 7 for detailed recommendations for template revisions.
- **Ensure gender considerations are a part of new project reporting systems.** The new SCA project reporting system will consist of quarterly discussions with MO staff and bi-annual reports. The checklist for quarterly discussions should have detailed points of discussion regarding gender – for example, how specific activities are addressing identified gaps, how

those activities are being measured, and how obstacles are being addressed. Furthermore, the introduction of new bi-annual report template is an opportunity that gender is given more considerations than in the quarterly report template. A practical solution to this would be to add a gender-specific question in “Lessons Learned” and “Key Challenges” sections of the report, so that the report writers know that gender should be included throughout the report, not just in the designated “Gender” section. In addition, MO program staff should develop guidelines for project staff on gender sensitive reporting, which may be as simple as a one-page instructional sheet with “how-to’s” and good practices.

- **Build linkages between SCA and ANCP reporting processes.** It is important that all staff involved in these processes understand how reporting of gender activities in SCA quarterly discussions and bi-annual reports can help shape project gender designations in ANCP forms. SCA projects should aim to be at least “significant” (akin to SCA’s aim for a minimum threshold of gender sensitive). It should be noted that ANCP designations should be based on evidence, and not on subjective evaluation of report writers.
- **Increase inclusion of gender requirements in job descriptions and recruitment.** In the MO staff survey, 33% of respondents report having references to gender in their job descriptions; and 22% say that gender is included in their job performance evaluation criteria. Gender requirements for future hires will ensure a higher level of gender capacity at the MO level (this should also be a requirement at the project level). Gender considerations in job performance evaluation criteria may be a way to increase accountability for gender mainstreaming at an individual level.

5.2. CO Level Recommendations

- **Hire a CO or regional level gender advisor.** Every CO should have a gender advisor to serve as the main gender support to projects but also to develop gender capacity at the CO level.
- **Conduct gender audits.** PNG and Indonesia COs should conduct a gender audit to identify gender gaps within their organisations and to develop gender strategies for moving forward. This will be especially crucial for Indonesia, which is in the process of becoming a SC member country, and as such has a unique opportunity to deliberately and systematically mainstream gender into its operations and programs from the start.
- **Develop Gender Sensitive Country Strategic Plans and CRSAs.** The level of gender integration in these two guiding CO level documents can set the stage for approaches to gender equality at the project level.³⁷ Admittedly, many of the project staff interviewed are not familiar with these documents; therefore they should be included in new staff orientation packages.

5.3. Project Level Recommendations

- **Develop gender capacity of project staff.** MO gender advisor, regional gender advisor or program managers,³⁸ (after their own gender capacity has been improved), should provide capacity building to relevant technical project staff. These can be short but impactful “how to” trainings conducted during MO field visits, or via Skype or phone (as discussed in the MO recommendations, OneNet could be used to store and convey these presentations/trainings). Additionally, gender considerations should be integrated into thematic trainings and workshops lead by MO project team. Gender capacity building topics should include:
 - ~ **Gender-inclusive progress report writing.** If gender activities (i.e. activities that are in some way attempting to decrease observed gender gaps) are not discussed in SCA reports, then there is no official record of them being implemented. Understanding how to discuss and describe such activities more critically throughout the report, not just in the gender section, can lead to more in depth gender sensitive reporting after a couple of report cycles.

³⁷ Both CRSA and CSP guidelines include gender considerations.

³⁸ Someone within the project team should be designed as the ‘gender focal point’. Depending on the project and the time, project manager, program quality advisor or technical advisor could be the person in charge of gender.

- ~ **Gender in M&E.** As discussed above, the SC Gender Toolkit contains useful information about gender considerations in M&E. Many of the M&E personnel expressed an interest in gender sensitive M&E training, but they admit to not being aware of the Toolkit. It is possible that just by studying the toolkit would eliminate the need for a training. The M&E section of the Toolkit should be shared with partners who are in charge of data collection.
- ~ **Conducting a gender analysis.** Again, the Toolkit is a great starting point for understanding gender analysis. Although it is now too late for project design gender analysis for the four projects, gender analysis should also be an active part of project implementation, as it will contribute to inclusion of gender considerations in annual revisions of project plans.
- **Apply gender sensitive approaches in the selection of project partners.** SC's Theory of Change emphasises the importance of building "partnerships for gender equality by collaborating with government, private sector and civil society organisations who share a common vision for gender equality; and working with all partners to identify and implement best-practice solutions for overcoming inequalities that affect the rights of girls and boys."³⁹ As evidenced by this evaluation, partners with low gender capacity are not able to play a prominent role in the promotion and dissemination of SC gender values, which ultimately lessens a potential impact a project can have in transforming root causes of gender inequality. Therefore, to the extent possible, the partner selection process should consider their experience with gender mainstreaming; and their organisational structure to see if there is a gender balance in decision-making positions, or whether there is a gender policy or a gender strategy at an organisational level. A gender checklist should be created and used in the selection of future project partners. (this recommendations also applies to CO)
- **Build gender capacity of current partners.** Development of partners' gender capacity should be undertaken by the four projects. If feasible, partners could participate in relevant gender capacity training provided to project staff by MO program managers during their field visits. (this recommendation also applies to CO)
- **Conduct gender analysis.** Every new SCA project should conduct a gender analysis in the design stage. This will be the basis for their gender action plan.
- **Strive for gender balance in project staffing.** Gender balance on projects contributes to an inclusive work environment. Currently, on IMPACT, the majority of employees are female, while on MNCH, all six project staff are male. It is crucial to have women in decision-making positions, especially on a project such as MNCH that works on issues of maternal health and child marriage which mostly affects girls and where the majority of beneficiaries are women.
- **Develop a gender action plan (SETARA, ECCD, MNCH).** Although none of the four projects conducted a gender analysis in the design stage, SETARA, ECCD and MNCH should develop a gender action plan in conjunction with annual project planning going forward (IMPACT already has a gender action plan). The plan should contain a timeline for completion of actionable gender activities within the year, as well as gender sensitive performance indicators. A designated project staff (possibly an M&E officer) should be made responsible for ensuring that this plan is being implemented.
- **Consider developing gender sensitive indicators that go beyond sex-disaggregated data.** When it comes to gender sensitive M&E, the standard approach is to use sex-disaggregated data. However, this type of quantitative data does not measure qualitative changes in attitudes and behavior regarding gender norms or levels of participation. Therefore, projects should be more mindful when developing their M&E frameworks (especially in the design stage) about including such indicators. Furthermore, projects can also turn to ANCP gender indicators to measure women's empowerment, For example, ECCD could use the indicator "Number of women who are able to access training and other support services to enable them to participate in governance or other decision making processes at community and/or sub national level" and the indicator "Number of women assuming leadership roles or

³⁹ SC Gender Equality Toolkit, p. 35.

engaging collectively at local, national and/or regional level” are directly applicable to the project’s inability to recruit more women for community school boards. Being held responsible to these indicators can be an impetus for project developing strategies that go beyond simple “encouragement” of women’s participation. MNCH could add the indicator “Number of people exposed to awareness raising campaigns/activities in communities highlighting issues of violence against women including harmful cultural practices” to its M&E framework, which would contribute to collection of quantitative data on child marriage. In the same vein, an indicator to monitor changes in attitudes in health seeking behavior can be added.

- **Follow up with staff on how to implement the gender action plan (IMPACT).** As previously discussed, IMPACT is the only of the four projects with a gender action plan. The plan has laid dormant since its development in October 2014. The staff, along with relevant CO-level personnel should be encouraged to begin implementation.

Proposed Implementation Plan for Evaluation's Recommendations

Recommendation	Responsible Party	Priority
MO Level		
Hire a gender advisor.	Human Resources, Gender Working Group, senior leadership	High
Establish SCA Gender Working Group.	International Programs Leadership, Program Managers, PQ Staff, Technical Advisors	High
Conduct a gender audit.	Gender Advisor (may be also done by an external consultant or a well-qualified intern)	High
Develop SCA gender strategy and implementation plan.	Gender Advisor	High
Ensure that existing gender equality values are an integral part of the new SCA Strategy.	Gender Advisor, senior leadership	High
Discuss approaching gender as a core issue, rather than a cross cutting issue.	Gender Advisor, Gender Working Group	High
Promote and encourage the use of already existing gender tools, with the primary focus on the SC Gender Equality Program Guidance & Toolkit.	Gender Advisor, Gender Working Group	Medium
Provide compulsory gender training for MO project teams (program managers, PQ staff and technical advisors).	Gender Advisor, Gender Working Group	Medium
Promote and encourage systematic use of online depository of gender resources (OneNet).	Gender Advisor, Gender Working Group	Medium
Strengthen gender integration in the proposal process.	Gender Advisor, proposal teams	High
Ensure gender considerations are a part of new project reporting systems.	Gender Advisor, program managers, PQ team	Medium
Build linkages between SCA and ANCP reporting processes.	Gender Advisor, program managers, PQ teams, CO-based project managers and other relevant staff	Medium
Increase inclusion of gender requirements in job descriptions and recruitment.	Gender Advisor, Human Resources	Medium
CO Level		
Hire a CO or regional level gender advisor. Since Indonesia is currently undergoing significant changes in its structure, this activity may have to be delayed.	CO leadership	High
Conduct gender audits (PNG and Indonesia). Since Indonesia is currently undergoing significant changes in its structure, this activity may have to be delayed.	CO/regional gender advisor (may be also done by an external consultant or a well-qualified intern)	High
Develop Gender Sensitive Country Strategic Plans and CRSAs	CO Leadership, CO/regional gender advisor	High
Project Level		
Develop gender capacity of project staff.	CO/Regional Gender Advisor, relevant CO Project staff, MO Gender Advisor,	High



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender-inclusive progress report writing • Gender in M&E • Conducting a gender analysis 	MO Program Managers	
In cooperation with CO, apply gender sensitive approaches in the selection and capacity building of project partners.	CO/Regional Gender Advisor, relevant CO Project staff, MO Gender Advisor, MO Program Managers	Medium
In cooperation with CO, build gender capacity of current partners.	CO/Regional Gender Advisor, relevant CO Project staff, MO Gender Advisor, MO Program Managers	Medium
Conduct gender analysis.	CO/Regional Gender Advisor, MO Gender Advisor, proposal team	High
Develop a gender action plan (SETARA, ECCD, MNCH).	CO/Regional Gender Advisor, relevant CO Project staff, MO Gender Advisor, MO Program Managers	High
Consider developing gender sensitive indicators beyond sex-disaggregated data	CO/Regional Gender Advisor, CO Project M&E staff, MO Gender Advisor, MO Program Managers, MO PQ staff	Medium
Strive for gender balance in project staffing.	Gender Advisor, Human Resources, Heads of Development Programs	Medium
Follow up with staff on how to implement the gender action plan (IMPACT).	MO Program Manager, PQ Team	High

ANNEX 1: DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

ECCD

SCA ANCP Proposal, Oct. 2012
SCA ANCP Proposal ARoB, May 2015
PNG ECCD Baseline Report Outline
Translated Baseline Survey final
ECCD Beneficiaries tracker
ECCD Project Logframe
The State of Early Childhood Care & Development in Papua New Guinea: Situation Assessment Report, June 2013
ECCD Project Y2 Q1 Narrative Report
ECCD Project Monitoring & Evaluation Matrix
Risk and Mitigation Strategies for ECCD Program in Papua New Guinea
The National Research Institute, Papua New Guinea District and Provincial Profiles March 2010

SETARA

SETARA ANCP proposal w/attachments (Results Framework and Environmental Checklist)
Cross-cutting and Quality Issues Tool
SETARA data analysis
ANCP ADPlan Project 2015-2016
ANCP ADPlan Project 2014-2015
Quarter 1 report (August – October 2014)
Quarter 2 report (Nov 2014 – Jan 2015)
Quarter 3 report (May 31, 2014)
Country Visit Report No. IN023, Nov 2014
ANCP Project Annual Performance Report (2013-14)
SETARA Y2Q1 SCA Reporting Beneficiaries Tracker
Baseline Study Report Belu SETARA project NTT 2015

IMPACT

ANCP ADPlan Project 2015-16
ANCP ADPlan Project 2014-15
ANCP ADPlan Project 2013-14
ANCP Project Annual Performance Report 2013-14
SCA ANCP 2013-14 Short Reporting Template
Y1Q1 IMPACT report
Y1Q2 IMPACT report
Y1Q3 IMPACT report
Y2Q1 IMPACT report
Y2Q2 IMPACT report
Y2Q3 IMPACT report
SCA Case study
SCA Proposal
M&E Matrix
IMPACT Reflections Workshop 2015
Baseline 2nd draft report
Gender and Disability Plan Oct 2014
Annual Beneficiary Tracker
Q2 Beneficiary Tracker
Q1 Beneficiary Tracker

MNCH

2014 SCA ANCP Proposal
2013 SCA ANCP Proposal
Criteria for Selection of Mother Support Groups
L. Benson Trip Report
Transition Memo
SCA Annual Report, August 2014

SCA Reporting Template for period August 1, 2013-July 31, 2014
 SCA Reporting Template for period Feb to Apr.30, 2014
 Third Quarter Narrative Report April 2014
 Minutes on MNCH Year 1 3rd Quarter review meeting 28, April 2014 Sisay and Dereje
 ANCP Project Annual Performance Report 2013-14
 Ethiopia Change Process (EtCOSI) Update to Members, 12 May 2014
 ANCP ADPlan Project 2015-16
 ANCP ADPlan Project 2013-14
 ANCP ADPlan Project 2014-15
 SCA Reporting Template for period August 1st to October 31st 2014
 SCA Reporting Template for period November 1st to 31st January 2015
 SCA Reporting Template for period February 1st to April, 2015
 SCA Reporting Template for period November 1st to 31st January 2015
 SCA Reporting Template for period February 1st to April, 2015
 MNCH Mid-term Review (2015) PPT presentation
 Annex A – CRSA Summary
 2016-2018 Strategic Plan Ethiopia Country Office
 MNCH Workplan
 Ethiopia Risk Assessment
 MNCH Logframe
 ANCP MNCH project Indicator Performance Tracing Table (IPTT)
 Case Study: ANCP – Development Awareness Raising project: On Air
 Case Study: ANCP – Development Awareness Raising project: Social media photos
 Case Study: ANCP – Development Awareness Raising project: Giving Birth
 Case Study: ANCP – Development Awareness Raising project: Helping Healers
 Case Study: ANCP – Development Awareness Raising project: House to House
 Monitoring & Evaluation: Combating Child Marriage in North Gondar Zone of Amhara Region
 Revised LogFrame Matrix
 MNCH Handover Memo

Other documents

Addis Ababa Action Plan on Transformative Financing for Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment, July 2015
 AusAID, *Promoting opportunities for all: Gender equality and women's empowerment, Thematic Strategy*, Nov. 2011
The Australian NGO Cooperation Program Fact Sheet, March 2015
 Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, *ANCP Manual*, May 2014
 OECD DAC Network on Gender Equality, *Financing the unfinished business of gender equality and women's rights: priorities for the post-2015 framework*, March 2014
 Papua New Guinea Department of Education, *Gender Equity in Education Policy: Guidelines for Implementation*, 2002 (reprinted 2009)
 Results International (Australia), *Education for All: Or Just Those Easier to Reach. AusAID, World Bank and Asian Development Bank Approaches to Gender and Disability in Basic Education*.
 Save the Children, *Child Protection Outcome Indicators*, Dec. 2012
 Save the Children, *Child Rights Situation Analysis Guidelines*
 Save the Children, *Engendering Transformation Change: Save the Children Gender Equality Program Guidance & Toolkit*, 2014
 Save the Children (MEAL) system overview
 Save the Children, *Moving ahead on education: Save the Children's global education strategy to 2015: An overview for partners, donors, governments and civil society organisations*
 Save the Children, *Transforming Inequalities, Transforming Lives: Save the Children Principles for Gender Equality 2014*
 Save the Children Australia, *Child Protection Policy*, 2014
 Save the Children Australia, *Gender Equality Program Policy*, Nov. 2013
 Save the Children Australia, *Investing in Gender Equality, Enabling Positive Transformation* (ppt)
 ACDP Indonesia, *Policy Brief: Gender Equality in Education in Indonesia*, September 2013

ANNEX 2: DOCUMENT SCORING METHODOLOGY

This methodology outlines how selected “core” project documents – i.e., documents that are required and available from all four projects and serve as primary indicators of gender inclusion in the project cycle will be scored. These documents include:

- ANCP Project proposals
- Project Logframes and/or M&E Frameworks
- Reports and plans:
 - ~ ANCP Project Annual Reports
 - ~ ANCP ADPlan Project
 - ~ SCA Quarterly Reports
 - ~ SCA Bi-annual Reports
 - ~ SCA Annual Reports

An overall score of 0-3 assessing the quality of the incorporation of gender considerations will be assigned to each document as follows:

Score	Category	Definition
0	None	6. no gender dimension or discussion present
1	Minimal	7. brief/superficial mention of gender equality issues without specificity, context or elaboration, suggesting only “lip service” to gender concerns 8. for example, document would be ranked ‘minimal’ if it only mentions sex-disaggregated data or includes standard organisational statements about inclusion of gender concerns, but provides no further evidence of how this integration is to be achieved
2	Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • includes some specific detail related to gender concerns, provides references to Save the Children or national level gender tools and guiding documents, mentions gender expertise, or uses gender sensitive indicators that go beyond sex-disaggregation • document would be ranked ‘moderate’ if gender discussion clearly goes beyond ‘lip service’ to agency requirements
3	Thorough	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • gender concerns are given more detailed treatment than with ‘moderate’ ranking • includes multiple examples that demonstrate in-depth attention to gender analysis, awareness of the linkages between gender and theory of change, and the creative solutions to gender constraints within the local context • details how gender equality strategies are to be implemented and monitored

In addition, there are a number of documents which will be reviewed, but will not be included in the scoring process described above. The majority of these documents, while important, appear to consist of numerous ancillary products produced during project administration. As such, they are not the “core” documents responsible for guiding and evaluating the project from inception to completion. They can be categorised as follows:

- **Internal reports and memos** authored by MO staff visiting projects and offering reflection on different topics, and any type of internal memos or correspondence.
- **Beneficiary tracker documents.** These documents simply provide an accounting of sex disaggregated beneficiary data and attempts to further assess their “gender commitments” would not any value to the analysis. Additionally, the bulk of this data can be found in project reports, which are being scored.

- **Incomplete documents.** Some of the documents provided for review are only partially filled in, and therefore offer no value to the review process.
- **Documents unique to a particular project.** These may include case studies, baseline reports, gender and disability plans, etc.
- **Documents not authored by the four projects.** These include different SC and SCA guidelines, policies, tools, country strategies, CRSAs, national gender equality documents, etc. which are reviewed primarily for a contextual purpose.

ANNEX 3: QUESTIONNAIRES FOR PROJECT STAFF AND PARTNERS

Question Guide for Country/Project level respondents

Semi-structured Interview Questions: Country office management and project technical staff (approximately 1 hr – 1hr 15 min)

Background, gender capacity and access to resources

1. What is your job title and how long have you held it?
2. Can you briefly describe your duties and responsibilities?
3. What is your understanding of the meaning of gender equality?
4. How does your job encompass promotion of gender equality?
5. Please describe how gender equality is reflected in your project? In what ways does this relate to the various elements of Save the Children's theory of change?
6. During your employment with SC, did you participate in any Save the Children training related to 1)gender mainstreaming at the program/activity level or 2) gender sensitive project management/admin policies (for example, sexual harassment training)? If yes, was this training conducted by SC or an external training provider? Please provide details.
7. Can you name any of SCA/SCI documents/policies/tools for promotion of gender equality?
8. Do you refer to/use these documents/policies/tools in your work? If yes, how? If not, why?
9. In addition to the documents discussed above, are there any Save the Children country-level or project-level gender documents/policies/tools that you use in your work? If yes, please specify and describe how they are used to promote gender equality on your project.
10. What kind of capacity building/resources to increase the level of gender expertise on your project would you find useful (for example, gender training, existence of a gender specialist/focal point at the project/country level, gender working groups, etc.)?
11. Who do you approach for gender-related inquiries/assistance? Do you have access to HQ MO staff for this advice? If yes, please describe how this process works. If not, why can't you access MO staff for gender related assistance?

Project Cycle

Planning/Design

12. Describe your level of involvement in your project's planning/design.
13. Was a country Child Rights Situation Analysis (CRSA) completed prior to the project design stage? If yes, how was gender addressed in line with CRSA guideline requirements?
14. Was a gender analysis conducted in the planning/design stage? If yes, how were the findings incorporated in the project design? If not, what strategies did you use to consider the particular needs of girls and boys, women and men at the design phase?
15. Describe the involvement of any children in the planning/design of your project. What strategies were utilised to ensure that both sexes were represented? If not, why not?
16. Was there any gender training (for example, gender analysis, gender differences in risk assessment) provided to you in the project design phase? If yes, please provide details (topics, duration, etc.).
17. To what extent did the project planning/design stage consider existing gender national or sectoral policies and plans and structures or organisations at national, provincial or community level which support development and implementation of these policies and plans?

Implementation

18. Describe how women and men, girls and boys are engaged in project implementation?

19. Do women and men have equal access to training, paid jobs or other opportunities created through the project?
20. Please describe how women and men, boys and girls are involved in the decision-making process to plan and manage project resources/activities.
21. Is there equal representation of women, men, boys and girls in community level decision making bodies?
22. What are the main enabling factors for gender equality mainstreaming in project implementation? Please specify both country contextual factors (e.g. sociocultural, political, policy) and operational factors (e.g. organisational, administrative, management, financial, technical).
23. What are the main obstacles to gender equality mainstreaming in project implementation? Please specify both country contextual factors (e.g. sociocultural, political, policy) and operational factors (e.g. administrative/ management/ organisational / technical).

M&E

24. Who benefits from your project activities – for example, men and women, girls and boys? Please be specific.
25. How do you assess the impact of project activities and how this may differ for women and men, girls and boys?
26. Please list gender sensitive indicators used on your project.
27. Have M&E personnel been trained in gender sensitive M&E? If not, why not?
28. What are the challenges in collecting gender sensitive data?
29. What kind of evidence is there to suggest that there have been any changes in attitudes among your staff or community members regarding the roles and access to participation of girls and boys, women and men in families, communities and more broadly since the start of your project? If there is no evidence, why do you think that is?
30. How does your project budget for gender mainstreaming activities?
31. How are gender-related activities tracked from a financial perspective?

Partners and outreach

32. How were partners chosen for this project? Were there any gender-specific requirements?
33. What strategies do you use to promote gender equality values externally to your beneficiaries and communities in which your project operates?
34. Have you experienced any pushback in partners/counterparts/beneficiaries acceptance of gender equality values? If so, how have you handled those?
35. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Partners/stakeholders/government/civil society representatives (approximately 45 mins)

1. What is your job title and how long have you held it?
2. Describe your organisation's mission and goals.
3. Does your organisation have a gender policy/strategy?
4. Are you in any way involved in promotion of gender equality within your organisation? If yes, please describe.
5. Describe how your organisation works with Save the Children.
6. Describe any internal gaps (technical, financial, management, etc.) that your organisation may have in promoting equal access and participation during project implementation.
7. Have you informed SC about these challenges? If yes, how has SC supported you in addressing them? If not, why not?
8. What are some positive aspects of your working relationship with Save the Children as it relates to issues of equitable access and participation?
9. Describe the challenges/obstacles in your working relationship with Save the Children as it relates to issues of equitable access and participation. Can you recommend ways to address these challenges?
10. Describe the elements of your culture which are helpful to you in the promotion of gender equality.
11. What types of cultural obstacles do you face in the promotion of gender equality?

12. Please share any strategies that your organisation employs to address addressing root causes of gender inequality in your specific cultural context.
13. In your opinion, how contextually and culturally relevant are the strategies adopted by Save the Children to promote gender equality in participation and access?
14. Can you share best practices and lessons learned in your work on promotion of gender equality in x sector (health, education, trafficking).
15. Is there evidence to suggest there have been any changes in attitudes among your staff or community members regarding the roles of girls and boys, women and men in families, communities and more broadly since the start of project x? If yes, please describe.

ANNEX 4: MO STAFF ONLINE SURVEY

This survey will be administered via SurveyMonkey, an online survey tool.

This brief survey will contribute to the evaluation of Save the Children Australia's approaches to addressing gender equality. The survey will take up to one hour to complete and has been designed to gather your personal opinions, ideas and perspectives related to the promotion of gender equality on the projects you are involved and within the context of the Melbourne office. Your name will not appear in any report or be associated with specific comments or responses. The survey responses will be confidential and reviewed by the evaluation consultant only.

1. Are you male or female?
 - Male
 - Female
2. How old are you? _____
3. What is your job title?
4. How long have you held this job?
5. Are references to gender awareness or gender expertise included in your job description?
 - Yes
 - No
6. Are references to gender awareness or gender expertise included in your job performance evaluation criteria?
 - Yes
 - No
7. Have you received any type of gender-related capacity building during your time with SCA?
 - Yes
 - No
8. If yes, do you recall the topics of your training(s)? Please check all that apply.
 - Gender Analysis
 - Gender Mainstreaming
 - Gender sensitive M&E
 - Gender responsive evaluations
 - Gender in grant management
 - Using SC/SCA's policies and tools to promote gender equality
 - General gender awareness/sensitivity
 - Other: _____
 - I don't recall
9. On a three point scale, how would you rate your knowledge and skills in gender analysis? (The rating of "excellent" would mean that you are experienced in conducting gender analyses).
 - (1) Poor
 - (2) Fair
 - (3) Excellent
10. On a three point scale, how would you rate your knowledge and skills in including gender considerations in project design? (The rating of "excellent" would mean that you are experienced with developing and implementing strategies to integrate gender in the project cycle).

- (1) Poor
 - (2) Fair
 - (3) Excellent
11. On a three point scale, how would you rate your knowledge and skills in gender sensitive M&E? (The rating of “excellent” means that you are experienced in developing gender sensitive indicators and have an understanding of how gender changes can be measured within the overall project M&E framework).
- (1) Poor
 - (2) Fair
 - (3) Excellent
12. Were you involved in project planning/design of Strengthening Education through Awareness and Reading Achievement (SETARA) in Indonesia?
- Yes
 - No
13. Please describe if and how gender considerations were included in this stage of the project.
14. Were you involved in project planning/design of Improving Migrant Protection and Assistance for Children in Thailand (IMPACT)?
- Yes
 - No
15. Please describe if and how gender considerations were included in this stage of the project.
16. Were you involved in project planning/design of A Good Start in Life – Early Childhood Care and Development (ECCD) in Papua New Guinea?
- Yes
 - No
17. Please describe if and how gender considerations were included in this stage of the project.
18. Were you involved in project planning/design of Improving Maternal and Child Health Care (MCHC) in Amhara Region in Ethiopia?
- Yes
 - No
19. Please describe if and how gender considerations were included in this stage of the project.
20. On a three point scale, how would you rate collective gender technical knowledge and skills Strengthening Education through Awareness and Reading Achievement (SETARA) in Indonesia?
- (1) Poor
 - (2) Fair
 - (3) Excellent
 - Not applicable
21. Please explain why you chose the score in the previous question, if applicable.
22. On a three point scale, how would you rate collective gender technical knowledge and skills of Improving Migrant Protection and Assistance for Children in Thailand (IMPACT)?
- (1) Poor
 - (2) Fair
 - (3) Excellent

- Not applicable
23. Please explain why you chose the score in the previous question, if applicable.
24. On a three point scale, how would you rate collective gender technical knowledge and skills of A Good Start in Life – Early Childhood Care and Development (ECCD) in Papua New Guinea?
- (1) Poor
 - (2) Fair
 - (3) Excellent
 - Not applicable
25. Please explain why you chose the score in the previous question, if applicable.
26. On a three point scale, how would you rate collective gender technical knowledge and skills on Improving Maternal and Child Health Care in Amhara Region (MCHC) in Ethiopia?
- (1) Poor
 - (2) Fair
 - (3) Excellent
 - Not applicable
27. Please explain why you chose the score in the previous question, if applicable.
28. Do you have systems and processes for sharing lessons and good practice (including gender-related) across SC/SCA projects?
- Yes
 - No
29. If yes, please describe.
30. Do you have systems and processes for sharing lessons and good practice (including gender-related) externally?
- Yes
 - No
31. If yes, please describe.
32. What mechanisms do you use to provide gender-related support and resources to project staff? Please describe.
33. On a five point scale, please indicate how much you agree/disagree with the following statement: Good practice on addressing gender issues at the project level is encouraged, recognised or rewarded by the Melbourne office?
- (1) Strongly disagree
 - (2) Disagree
 - (3) Neither agree nor disagree
 - (4) Agree
 - (5) Strongly agree
34. Please explain the reason why you chose the score in the previous question.
35. Have you ever used SCA Gender Equality Program Policy?
- Yes
 - No

36. If yes, rate on a three point scale how often you use SCA Gender Equality Program Policy in your work with the SETARA Project?
- (1) rarely
 - (2) sometimes
 - (3) often
 - Not applicable
37. If yes, rate on a three point scale how often you use SCA Gender Equality Program Policy in your work with the IMPACT Project?
- (1) rarely
 - (2) sometimes
 - (3) often
 - Not applicable
38. If yes, rate on a three point scale how often you use SCA Gender Equality Program Policy in your work with the ECCD Project?
- (1) rarely
 - (2) sometimes
 - (3) often
 - Not applicable
39. If yes, rate on a three point scale how often you use SCA Gender Equality Program Policy in your work with the MCCH Project?
- (1) rarely
 - (2) sometimes
 - (3) often
 - Not applicable
40. Have you ever used SC Gender Equality Toolkit?
- Yes
 - No
41. If yes, rate on a three point scale how often you use SC Gender Equality Toolkit in your work with the SETARA Project?
- (1) rarely
 - (2) sometimes
 - (3) often
 - Not applicable
42. If yes, rate on a three point scale how often you use SC Gender Equality Toolkit in your work with the IMPACT Project?
- (1) rarely
 - (2) sometimes
 - (3) often
 - Not applicable
43. If yes, rate on a three point scale how often you use SC Gender Equality Toolkit in your work with the ECCD Project?
- (1) rarely
 - (2) sometimes
 - (3) often
 - Not applicable
44. If yes, rate on a three point scale how often you use SC Gender Equality Toolkit in your work with the MCCH Project?

- (1) rarely
- (2) sometimes
- (3) often
- Not applicable

45. Have you ever used SC Principles for Gender Equality?

- Yes
- No

46. If yes, rate on a three point scale how often you use SC Principles for Gender Equality in your work with the SETARA Project?

- (1) rarely
- (2) sometimes
- (3) often
- Not applicable

47. If yes, rate on a three point scale how often you use SC Principles for Gender Equality in your work with the IMPACT Project?

- (1) rarely
- (2) sometimes
- (3) often
- Not applicable

48. If yes, rate on a three point scale how often you use SC Principles for Gender Equality in your work with the ECCD Project?

- (1) rarely
- (2) sometimes
- (3) often
- Not applicable

49. If yes, rate on a three point scale how often you use SC Principles for Gender Equality in your work with the MCCH Project?

- (1) rarely
- (2) sometimes
- (3) often
- Not applicable

50. Which of the following would you identify as enabling factors to integrating gender in SETARA project planning/design, implementation and evaluation? Please check all that apply.

- project size
- staff capacity
- project culture/environment
- cultural context
- availability of financial resources for gender programming
- staff gender capacity
- availability of gender tools
- high priority for gender issues at MO level
- high donor priority for gender issues
- other, please specify: _____
- not applicable

51. Which of the following would you identify as enabling factors to integrating gender in IMPACT project planning/design, implementation and evaluation? Please check all that apply.

- project size
- staff capacity
- project culture/environment



- cultural context
- availability of financial resources for gender programming
- staff gender capacity
- availability of gender tools
- high priority for gender issues at MO level
- high donor priority for gender issues
- other, please specify: _____
- not applicable

52. Which of the following would you identify as enabling factors to integrating gender in ECCD project planning/design, implementation and evaluation? Please check all that apply.

- project size
- staff capacity
- project culture/environment
- cultural context
- availability of financial resources for gender programming
- staff gender capacity
- availability of gender tools
- high priority for gender issues at MO level
- high donor priority for gender issues
- other, please specify: _____
- not applicable

53. Which of the following would you identify as enabling factors to integrating gender in MCCH project planning/design, implementation and evaluation? Please check all that apply.

- project size
- staff capacity
- project culture/environment
- cultural context
- availability of financial resources for gender programming
- staff gender capacity
- availability of gender tools
- high priority for gender issues at MO level
- high donor priority for gender issues
- other, please specify: _____
- not applicable

54. Which of the following would you identify as obstacles for gender integration in SETARA project planning/design, implementation and evaluation? Please check all that apply.

- project size
- staff capacity
- project culture/environment
- cultural context
- lack of financial resources for gender programming
- lack of staff gender capacity
- lack of gender tools
- lack of support from MO
- low priority for gender issues at MO level
- low donor priority for gender issues
- other, please specify: _____
- not applicable

55. Which of the following would you identify as obstacles for gender integration in IMPACT project planning/design, implementation and evaluation? Please check all that apply.

- project size
- staff capacity



- project culture/environment
- cultural context
- lack of financial resources for gender programming
- lack of staff gender capacity
- lack of gender tools
- lack of support from MO
- low priority for gender issues at MO level
- low donor priority for gender issues
- other, please specify: _____
- not applicable

56. Which of the following would you identify as obstacles for gender integration in ECCD project planning/design, implementation and evaluation? Please check all that apply.

- project size
- staff capacity
- project culture/environment
- cultural context
- lack of financial resources for gender programming
- lack of staff gender capacity
- lack of gender tools
- lack of support from MO
- low priority for gender issues at MO level
- low donor priority for gender issues
- other, please specify: _____
- not applicable

57. Which of the following would you identify as obstacles for gender integration in MCCH project planning/design, implementation and evaluation? Please check all that apply.

- project size
- staff capacity
- project culture/environment
- cultural context
- lack of financial resources for gender programming
- lack of staff gender capacity
- lack of gender tools
- lack of support from MO
- low priority for gender issues at MO level
- low donor priority for gender issues
- other, please specify: _____
- not applicable

58. On a five point scale, please indicate how strongly you agree/disagree with the following statement: There are enough Save the Children resources available to on you how to include gender considerations in the project cycle.

- (1) Strongly disagree
- (2) Disagree
- (3) Neither Agree nor Disagree
- (4) Agree
- (5) Strongly agree

59. What types of resources would you like to see more of? Check all that apply.

- Training on gender analysis
- Training on gender integration in the project cycle
- Gender sensitivity training
- Guidebooks/toolkits

- Regional working groups
- Talks by external and internal experts
- Community of practice (knowledge sharing among Save the Children (project and HQ, grantees, donors, etc.) – online and in public fora (conferences)
- Other. Please specify: _____

60. Are there specific actions that you believe can be taken that will lead to more effective gender mainstreaming at each of the projects?

- Yes
- No

61. If yes, please specify these actions and the name of the project you are referring to here.

62. Are there any other comments you would like to add here that you feel were not addressed in the previous questions?

- Yes
- No

63. If yes, please do so here.

ANNEX 5: LIST OF EVALUATION RESPONDENTS

Respondent feedback provided via one-on-one interviews, questionnaires and online survey

Ethiopia

Sisay Mellse, Program Manager
Dereje Gebeyehu, MEAL Coordinator
Sefialem Zerie, Child Protection Coordinator
Genet Kebede, Health and HIV Advisor
Awoke Geto, project officer for Wogera Woreda
Atakilit Kefyale, Project officer for Dabat Woreda
Derbew Azanaw, project officer for Debark Woreda
Tigist Zeleke, Head of Women's Association for North Gondar Zone
Getnet Eshetu, Head of Gondar Education Media Center

Thailand

Khem Krairit, Project Officer
Nai Thanawattho, MEAL Coordinator
Ingo Chomwong, Senior Social Worker
Laura Deprez, Gender Intern
Tattiya Likhitvong, Deputy Manager of Foundation for Child Development (FCD)
Sribua Kanthawong, Project Coordinator (FCD)
Mongkol Suwansirisilp, Deputy Director of Foundation of Rural Youth (FRY)

Indonesia

Dragana Strinic, Acting Country Director
Marni Silalahi, Senior Program Officer for Literacy Boost
Lusi Margiyani, Education Advisor
Didiek Yuana, Project Manager
Madiatri Silalahi, MEAL Officer
Dedy Tarmizi, Chief Executive Officer, KPBK/ District Disaster Management Office
Etty Ekowati, Training Coordinator, Community Health Centre
Supendi, Primary school supervisor coordinator at Department of Education in Cilincing Sub-district

PNG

Andrew Ikupu, Early Childhood Specialist
Kumi Kiske, Project Manager

Melbourne Office

Lynne Benson, Head of International Development Programs
Bharath Mohan, Regional Portfolio Manager – South East and East Asia
Veronica Bell, Former Head of Program Quality

Lanie Stockman, PQ Advisor
Corey Williams, Program Manager – South Asia, Middle East and Africa
Georgina O'Hare, Program Manager, South East Asia
Reiko Take, Regional Portfolio Manager - Pacific
Nora Chefchaouni, PQ Advisor
Hannah Jay, Program Manager, South East Asia

Bridget McAloon, PQ Advisor
Anna Bauze, Health Advisor, Technical Services Team

ANNEX 6: PROPOSED CHANGES TO SCA PROPOSAL TEMPLATE

- *Question 3.* Have girls and boys and other stakeholders participated in project development? If yes, provide details. Details should include type of stakeholders, and observed participation in discussions.
- *Question 4.* Does the program align with the following? SCI Gender Equality Principles and/or SCA Gender Equality Program Policy can be added here as additional guiding policies with which the programs should be in alignment with.
- *Question 5.* Project Goal, SMART Objectives, Outcomes for 4 year project. Ensure that gender is considered in the proposed goals, objectives and outcomes. Refer to the Gender Equality Toolkit for guidance on gender sensitive indicators.
- *Question 10.* How will you monitor, evaluate and learn from this project? (e.g. baseline assessments, particular tools, mid-term review, budgeted external reviews etc.). How will you share the learning? References to gender sensitive M&E should be discussed here.
- *Question 13.* Is SC partnering with any other organisation(s) for this project? Partners should have a history of working on gender issues.
- *Question 14.* What is the in-country management structure for this project? Gender balance should be sought, especially in decision-making positions.
- *Question 15.* What specific technical skills and expertise will be required to deliver this project? Explain how this capacity will be provided. Key personnel should have gender expertise/experience.
- *Question 16.* Risk assessment and mitigation – there is almost always a gender risk in any type of international development work – especially in projects working at the community level with direct beneficiaries. Planning for gender risks should be an integral part of proposal design stage. Interestingly, not a single project has identified any gender-related risks.
- *Question 18.* Attachments – one of the required attachments here should be a gender action plan for the proposed project.