UN WOMEN RAPID ASSESSMENT TOOL
To Evaluate Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment Results In Humanitarian Contexts
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Introduction

The 60th Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) and the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) both emphasised the centrality of gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) to humanitarian action, recognizing that the needs and vulnerabilities of women, men, girls and boys affected by crises and conflicts are distinct and often different.

Within humanitarian contexts, research shows that women's active participation in economic life makes peacebuilding and recovery efforts more sustainable. The Agenda for Humanity identified the core commitments necessary to catalyse action for achieving gender equality as:

- empowering women and girls as change agents and leaders;
- ensuring universal access to sexual and reproductive health and reproductive rights;
- implementing a coordinated global approach to prevent and respond to gender-based violence in crisis contexts;
- ensuring that humanitarian programming is gender responsive; and
- fully complying with humanitarian policies, frameworks and legally binding documents related to gender equality, women's empowerment, and women's rights.

Despite international commitments, gaps and challenges remain. While the humanitarian field has made strides in developing and using tools to assess the integration of gender equality in humanitarian programming such as the IASC gender with age marker (GAM) and the CARE gender marker, these tools have focused more on assessing the integration of gender in programme planning/design and monitoring and less in evaluating the gender responsiveness of results in humanitarian contexts.

The UN Women Independent Evaluation Service (IES) is developing and piloting a tool to assess progress on achieving GEWE in humanitarian contexts. This rapid assessment tool complements existing tools by including empowerment, economic wellbeing and decision-making aspects as well as providing an evaluative lens for the assessment of gender equality results. This is significant as evaluations of humanitarian responses have not always systematically assessed the results of interventions in terms of GEWE.

Few, if any, tools are user-friendly, focused on GEWE, and can be used by a range of stakeholders to provide real-time feedback. This tool could be used in conjunction with GAM as it offers an objective assessment based on multiple sources and validation. Its added value relies on its capability to measure economic well-being, leadership and participation aspects of humanitarian interventions not as part of the intended outcomes but as a result of the programme design and process.

---

3. GAM covers dimensions including gender analysis, participation, satisfaction, protection and GBV, benefits and accountability.
5. Women leadership and participation are key elements of UN Women's strategic objectives in humanitarian settings as captured in the LEAP expected outcomes.
UN Women’s work in humanitarian action is focused on ensuring that women and girls play a greater role and are better served by disaster risk prevention and humanitarian response and recovery efforts in order to support their empowerment and resilience. As part of this work, UN Women has identified three key areas central to supporting women and girls’ empowerment and resilience in humanitarian action:

- leadership and participation;
- protection and safety (in relation to overall protection and gender-based violence [GBV] more specifically); and
- economic well-being (in relation to livelihoods and income).

While often neglected, women’s leadership and participation in humanitarian action are central to the achievement of GEWE in humanitarian contexts. It is vital that women’s voices are heard in these contexts and that they have the ability to participate in and influence decisions that affect their lives. This is both a fundamental right and a means to ensure that systems can deliver on women’s needs and priorities. As such, women’s leadership and participation can be viewed as both a means and an end in making progress on women’s empowerment and rights. Women’s participation and leadership is relevant throughout the humanitarian project cycle because humanitarian crises affect women, girls, men and boys differently. Therefore, it is important that both men and women are equally represented.6

Within humanitarian protection principles, the first principle addresses people’s safety: enhance people’s safety, dignity and rights and avoid exposing them to further harm.7 Within people’s safety, addressing the gender disparities of people’s safety in humanitarian contexts principally includes addressing GBV.

GBV is a term used to describe any harmful act that is perpetrated against a person’s will, and that is based on socially ascribed differences between males and females. While men and boys can be victims/survivors of some types of GBV (particularly sexual violence), GBV has a greater impact on women and girls. In humanitarian contexts, crises or disasters, GBV can be exacerbated and become systematic.

Overcrowded displacement sites, access to basic services (health, education, Water and Sanitation for Health [WASH] facilities and food insecurity can place women, girls and boys at heightened risk of all forms of GBV. Heightened power imbalances also make women and girls more vulnerable to GBV and domestic abuse, in particular to intimate partner violence.8 Considerations of exposure to GBV and its mitigation is therefore needed across all sectors.

---

8 IASC Reference Group on Gender and Humanitarian Action.
The emphasis on economic empowerment and livelihoods is in response to gender inequality which is exacerbated by crises. Humanitarian crises have different impacts on women, girls, men and boys’ access to livelihoods, including the resources, assets, opportunities and strategies that people use to make a living.\(^9\) This can result in women taking on more unpaid care work, which in turn decreases their access to livelihood opportunities. Social and cultural norms may inhibit women’s ability both to work outside the home and to generate an income.\(^10\) Empowering women economically is therefore a concrete way of enhancing their self-reliance and resilience. Women’s empowerment is not only beneficial to them, but also benefits their families and the community at large.

The rapid assessment tool specifically focuses on evaluating results across these three key areas that UN Women and other humanitarian actors recognize as key elements to support women and girl’s empowerment.\(^11\)

---

**UN Women has identified key areas central to supporting women and girls’ empowerment in humanitarian action:**

**Leadership and participation**

Humanitarian crises affect girls, women, men and boys differently. It is therefore important that both men and women be equally represented.

**Protection and safety**

In humanitarian contexts, crises or disasters, gender-based violence (GBV) can be exacerbated and become systematic.

**Economic well-being**

Humanitarian crises have different impacts on the access by women, girls, men and boys to livelihoods, resources, assets and opportunities.

---


\(^10\) IASC Reference Group on Gender and Humanitarian Action.

\(^11\) [https://www.ghahandbook.org/#en/Section-A/Topic-3](https://www.ghahandbook.org/#en/Section-A/Topic-3)
The rapid assessment tool has two elements: a data collection tool (in Excel) and this accompanying guidance note. The rapid assessment tool provides a quicker assessment of progress on GEWE results than standard evaluations to enable humanitarian actors to make real-time adjustments to interventions when and where necessary.

Application of the tool within UN Women will contribute to strengthening monitoring and evaluation processes to further adapt humanitarian programming to results. It will also enhance the capacity of partners (including evaluators) to provide rapid, near-time assessments to ensure a gender-responsive and principled humanitarian response.

The tool is designed to collect data and analyse results during and after programme implementation across the three key areas related to women’s empowerment in humanitarian action:

**Leadership and participation:** Women’s meaningful participation in key consultative structures for decision-making and their influence on decisions at all stages of humanitarian action.

**Protection and safety:** Women’s physical safety and security, the ability of programmes to prevent, mitigate and respond to GBV; accessible and available services; and mechanisms to address and redress GBV.12

**Economic well-being:** Women’s participation in livelihood activities and formal employment, and their ability to generate a sustainable income over which they have control.

The tool assesses the extent to which these **three areas have been achieved as a result of a humanitarian project, the outcomes of which can be cross sectoral**. As such, the tool assesses the extent to which project design, implementation and monitoring processes are gender transformative. In **crisis settings, gender transformative results are not necessarily achievable at all times**; however, all projects must ensure they are not gender negative or gender blind.

---

The rapid assessment tool focuses on key aspects of UN Women’s humanitarian action interventions within the overall programme design and implementation of gender-responsive humanitarian responses. The tool can be used throughout the entire programme cycle. It can be used both at the end of a project or programme, or at key intervention milestones. The tool is designed to assess the degree to which an intervention has addressed the differential needs of men and women and to examine the degree of change achieved from a gender perspective.

The tool is relevant in both rapid onset crises and protracted crises. It can be adapted and used across different countries and regions. The rapid assessment toolkit covers programmes that deliver various types of outcomes, including livelihoods and economic recovery, GBV prevention and response, and women’s participation and leadership.

It is relevant for both sector-specific and multi-sector interventions.

The tool includes a questionnaire and indicators which are designed to assess the programmes being evaluated with a gender lens. The questionnaire and indicators can be adapted based on the programme being assessed and the context. For example, where programmes specifically target women, the user of the tool would choose not to include indicators looking at the ratio of men to women, but would instead focus the tool and indicators to evaluate the degree to which gender considerations were taken into account throughout the planning and design phases, in addition to beneficiary satisfaction with project implementation.

Who can use the tool? (intended audience)

The tool can be used as part of a broader evaluation exercise, as well as by humanitarian actors, including UN agencies and international and national Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs). In recognizing the efforts of humanitarian action to enhance the capacity of national actors, where possible, to prepare for and respond to humanitarian crises, this tool can also be used by civil society and national and local governments to support their efforts to assess the degree to which interventions and policies are gender sensitive.

The tool is organized according to the three areas presented in page 4. Each area includes guidance on key indicators, data collection tools and potential data sources that can be used to measure progress and results. Consequently, specialized knowledge of monitoring and evaluation is not required.
UN Women Rapid Assessment Tool

INTRODUCTION

The rapid assessment tool is developed in Microsoft Excel. This guidance document accompanies the Microsoft Excel file with step-by-step instructions on its use.

The tool's Excel file has two main tabs: 1. Dashboard and 2. Questionnaire.

TAB 1: DASHBOARD

The Dashboard is an assessment grid to be used after data collection preferably by external or internal Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E). Programme Officers are also encouraged to use the tool for real-time assessment of gender responsiveness of an intervention. The Dashboard ranks each indicator and supports the overall ranking of the intervention.

Step 1: The user ranks each indicator using the following scale: Yes, Mostly, Partly, No, Not Rated. Each indicator should be ranked on the basis of the matching questions from the questionnaire tab. On the basis of the ranking, a score is automatically calculated for each question.

Step 2: The user classifies the results according to the type of change advanced and its effectiveness in transforming gender relations: Gender transformative, Gender responsive, Gender sensitive, Gender blind or Gender negative (see page 13). The user can also provide feedback and make recommendations in the space provided.

As a result, an overall score based on the UNDP Gender Results Effectiveness Scale (GRES) is given to the intervention based on each section score (the user can apply their judgement to weigh the scoring if required). A constructive feedback box is provided to include qualitative information and suggested improvements for every score that is not rated as yes.

Screenshot of the Dashboard
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INTRODUCTION

The Questionnaire has been designed based on a thorough desk review of the three domains which the tool is based on, 1) leadership and participation; 2) protection and safety in relation to GBV; and 3) economic well-being (in relation to livelihoods and income). The questionnaire tab mirrors the dashboard and is divided into four parts:

1. **Basic information** (user's name, location, date, number of beneficiaries, etc.)
2. **Leadership and participation**, questions evaluate women’s participation throughout the humanitarian project cycle (process and outcome of participation)
3. **Protection and safety** (in relation to GBV)
4. **Economic well-being** (in relation to livelihoods and income).

---

**TAB 2: QUESTIONNAIRE**

The Questionnaire has been designed based on a thorough desk review of the three domains which the tool is based on, 1) leadership and participation; 2) protection and safety in relation to GBV; and 3) economic well-being (in relation to livelihoods and income). The questionnaire tab mirrors the dashboard and is divided into four parts:

1. **Basic information** (user’s name, location, date, number of beneficiaries, etc.)
2. **Leadership and participation**, questions evaluate women’s participation throughout the humanitarian project cycle (process and outcome of participation)
3. **Protection and safety** (in relation to GBV)
4. **Economic well-being** (in relation to livelihoods and income).

---

**SECTION 1: LEADERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION**

1. The programme is designed on the back of assessments that capture gender and age disaggregated data
2. The programme is designed on the back of assessments that capture gender and age disaggregated data

---

**SECTION 2: PROGRAMME BACKGROUND**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corresponding Indicator</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Type of answer</th>
<th>Type of collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>At least gender- and age-disaggregated information is available about the needs, capacities and preferences of the affected community</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Observation / Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Programme documents outline the main barriers to GRR and GBV</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Observation / Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Programme staff’s gender balance</td>
<td>Numerics</td>
<td>HR Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Programme management (e.g., number of women and men)</td>
<td>Numerics</td>
<td>HR Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>The programme includes gender expertise to support the programme teams</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Observation / Document review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**SECTION 3: RESOURCES REQUIRED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corresponding Indicator</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Type of answer</th>
<th>Type of collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>The programme is designed on the back of assessments that capture gender and age disaggregated data</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Desk Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>The programme is designed on the back of assessments that capture gender and age disaggregated data</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Desk Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**SECTION 4: HOW TO PROVIDE A RANKING IN THE DASHBOARD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corresponding Indicator</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Type of answer</th>
<th>Type of collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>At least gender- and age-disaggregated information is available about the needs, capacities and preferences of the affected community</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Observation / Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Programme documents outline the main barriers to GRR and GBV</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Observation / Document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Programme staff’s gender balance</td>
<td>Numerics</td>
<td>HR Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Programme management (e.g., number of women and men)</td>
<td>Numerics</td>
<td>HR Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>The programme includes gender expertise to support the programme teams</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Observation / Document review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Data sources and sampling

Three data collection methods are used. The most likely type of data source to collect information about the different indicators includes primary (interview/focus group discussions) and secondary data (document review). The available data could change depending on the context. The choice of data sources to use therefore needs to be flexible.

SECONDARY DATA: Programme documents, contextual information from available humanitarian data sets, quantitative databases and other relevant materials that exist prior to conducting the assessment.

PRIMARY DATA: Rapid key informant interviews and focus group discussions with programme beneficiaries and key stakeholders. Primary data constitutes the majority of the data to be collected.

Key informant interviews (KIIs): The final list of informants should be determined before the evaluation begins. Informants should be representative of the different programme stakeholders and include both internal and external stakeholders.

Focus group discussions (FGDs): FGDs should be conducted in accordance with humanitarian standards to ensure the safety and security of participants. The FGDs should be held in a private and neutral location. Space should be created to enable women, men, people living with disabilities, and young and older people to provide their input, separately if appropriate. Childcare facilities should be provided when necessary.

The questionnaire and indicators are designed to look at the programmes being assessed with a gender lens. They will need to be adapted based on the specific programme to assess and the context.

The selection of KIIs should be conducted through purposive sampling: targeting people thought to be best able to contribute to the evaluation process, and then via snowball sampling, whereby existing informants refer other interviewees. The selection of FGD participants is usually based on access and availability. The sampling for the rapid assessment tool could mirror that used by an ongoing evaluation, if being conducted. For more guidance on sampling, the ALNAP Evaluating Humanitarian Action can be consulted here.

Observations: The user can apply observation methods to capture insights as part of the data collection. The observations will then be used to triangulate the data collected. Observations will be recorded in the tool in the data tab.

Lesson from Bangladesh and Turkey pilots

The questionnaire provides a long list of questions that the user can select depending on the specific programme or response being assessed. Both in Bangladesh and Turkey, the programmes assessed specifically targeted women. We therefore chose not to include indicators looking at the ratio of men to women, but instead focused the tool and indicators on evaluating the degree to which gender considerations were taken into account throughout the planning and design phases, in addition to beneficiary satisfaction with project implementation.

As for any globally developed assessment, questions need to be contextualized. In the case of the pilots, questions were contextualized as a result of the desk review phase and prior to data collection.
Best practices in data collection

When collecting data to fill in the Dashboard, evaluation teams should ensure that:

- the data collection team is familiar with the basic concepts of gender equality, intersectionality, GBV and the guiding principles for GBV prevention and response, in addition to why a focus on empowerment is important in humanitarian action;¹⁸
- the team has received training on diversity sensitivity and the importance of respect for all persons regardless of their gender, religion, age, ability, identity, associations or occupation; ¹⁸
- the team reflects on the profile of the assessment sample: those who will be invited to participate in KIIs and FGDs. The team should also be able to speak the same language as the key interviewees and represent the same diversity of groups.
- teams include women and men with the understanding that the interview will be conducted by data collectors of the same gender as respondents, unless respondents prefer otherwise;
- the sample of respondents reflects the diversity of the target population (e.g. women, female heads of household, men, adolescent girls, adolescent boys, including persons with disabilities and their caregivers, elderly persons, self-identified LGBTQI individuals and individuals who may self-identify as engaging in survival sex/selling sex, or other specific groups given the context);
- the team is aware of the GBV referral pathways (including sub-population-specific pathways that have been assessed for sensitivity) as well as psychological first aid; ²⁰
- data collection tools are translated into local language(s) and reflect the preferred language, dialect, and cultural sensitivities of the targeted populations;
- the team is trained on the assessment tool and methodologies. Data collectors understand the rationale for the types of questions and analysis and will not attempt to collect sensitive protection or GBV related information unless adequately trained;

Lesson from Bangladesh and Turkey pilots

Data saturation²¹

As the tool is based on a qualitative approach, the robustness of the analysis is ensured by reaching data saturation. During the pilot, data was analysed on an iterative basis, meaning that we stopped asking some questions after no new insights emerged, especially for those questions that had already partially been answered by the desk review.

¹⁸- See key concepts in annex-section 3.
¹⁹- Should the team not speak the same language, translators may be used. It is important that translators understand their role is to translate word for word and not interpret answers. Ideally, translators should be external to the programme and not have a stake in the evaluation to ensure an unbiased translation. In highly sensitive cases, more than one translator can be used; the translator should ideally be the same gender as the participants.
²⁰- Refer to the GBV Pocket Guide, “How to support survivors of gender-based violence when a GBV actor is not available in your area” accessible here.
²¹- Data saturation refers to the point in the research process when no new information is discovered in data analysis, and this redundancy signals to researchers that data collection may cease. Faulkner S. & Al, 2017, Data Saturation.
Lesson from Bangladesh and Turkey pilots

Interview duration

Each interview lasted for about 50 minutes with the focus group lasting 45 minutes, which is deemed a suitable duration for data collection. It is important for the user to be familiar with the questionnaire as, to ensure the fluidity of the interview, the user may need to jump from one question to the next to allow informants to fully respond and to ensure an adequate flow to the discussion.

Data collection is planned with the respondents and the timing is based on their availability, and respondents are informed of the average time it takes to respond to the questionnaire and are informed that they are not obliged to participate and will not receive financial or material benefits for participating;

- FGDs and KIIs are conducted in safe, private and dignified settings that participants have had the opportunity to select. Steps should be made to ensure privacy and confidentiality; gender-segregated groups can be accommodated, as appropriate;

- the team should ensure safe data collection, storage, transfer and disposal, in line with UN Women data protection best practices;

- the team obtains informed consent from respondents before starting FGDs or KIIs.
UN Women Rapid Assessment Tool

Each indicator in the Dashboard is measured by the user on the basis of qualitative assessment (Yes, Mostly, Partly, No, Not Rated). Any assumption made by the user should be documented in the Dashboard to ensure that the qualitative assessment is as systematic as possible.

The indicators are phrased in such a way as to be applicable across contexts, yet the line between an indicator being partly or mostly met may be thin. To contextualize the information and inform judgment, the user can draw on the publicly available data on country contexts listed below. Depending on the context in which the evaluated programme/intervention is implemented, the user could then adjust the ranking as necessary.

a. Gender Gap Score from Global Gender Gap Report
b. Gender Inequality Index from UNDP

On the basis of each indicator measurement, a score per question will appear and the user is invited to make a judgment on the overall section, using the GRES. The GRES consists of five levels starting with gender negative to gender transformative results, as shown below:

- **Gender Negative**: Has a negative outcome that aggravated or reinforced existing gender inequalities and norms.
- **Gender Blind**: Fails to take into account the different socially constructed roles of women, men, boys and girls and fails to address each group’s diverse needs. They maintain the status quo and will not help transform the unequal structure of gender relations.
- **Gender Sensitive**: Recognizes gender differences and attempts to redress existing gender inequalities.
- **Gender Responsive**: Describes laws, policies, programmes and public services that are formulated and/or delivered in ways that take into account gender inequalities, and responds proactively to overcome and eliminate such inequalities in order to achieve gender equality, women’s rights and women’s empowerment.
- **Gender Transformative**: Attempts to redefine women and men’s gender roles and relations to create greater equality. These are interventions that seek to target the structural causes as well as the symptoms of gender inequality, leading to lasting changes in the power and choices women (and men) have over their own lives, rather than just a temporary increase in opportunities.

* The scale is adapted from the Evaluation of UNDP Contribution to Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment.
Lesson from Bangladesh and Turkey pilots

What to do if data is not available to answer some questions

Each indicator in the Dashboard is informed by multiple questions, so both pilots were able to fill out most of the indicators. In the case of Bangladesh, it was not possible to access the refugee camps so women’s views were not collected. This important limitation was acknowledged.

The weighting of the different sections (at the top of the Dashboard) can also be changed to give less weight to those areas which were not assessed as thoroughly.

Lesson from Bangladesh and Turkey pilots

Where to put the bar

Evaluating at the extent to which programme design and implementation processes and systems are gender transformative is different from assessing whether a programme is gender transformative as a result of its intended outcomes. Any outcome evaluation would require a more in-depth assessment and would only be applicable to programmes which have gender transformation as an intended objective. This would limit the breadth of programmes to which the tool would be applicable.

In a humanitarian context as difficult as the Rohingya response in Bangladesh for example, one can question the extent to which it is possible for a programme to be gender transformative. To what extent are women willing to be challenged about gender norms when even basic needs are far from covered and basic rights are being challenged? The UN Women Rohingya response was rated gender-responsive and the user’s opinion was that it could not have scored higher in the current circumstances.
### Resources required

**Physical resources:** The user requires a computer with Excel and Word to use the tool.

**Human resources:** If used by UN Women staff, time will be allocated for the rapid assessment exercise. The amount of time needed will depend on: the number of projects running; number of beneficiaries; variety of activities; locations; and logistical constraints. If the tool is being used by an external evaluator, internal resources will be mobilized to work with the evaluator.

**Time:** The tool has been designed to allow real-time adjustment to programmes. An evaluation in one location should take approximately two to three days from start to finish. The number of interviews and focus groups to carry out over the evaluation should be decided ahead of time and should reflect the context: a large programme with multiple sectors of intervention will require more interviews than a smaller programme with one sector of intervention, for example.

A general rule that can be used to plan the number of KII and FGDs is: one person can conduct either four to five KII a day, or two FGDs and one to two KII per day.

### Lesson from Bangladesh & Turkey pilots

#### Remote assessment

For the Bangladesh pilot, primary data collection took place remotely following the desk review phase. Due to visa issues followed by the COVID-19 situation, a field visit was not possible.

Some of the questions (noted as FGD in the questionnaire) were left out as we decided not to use UN Women staff’s perceptions of women’s views as a proxy for women’s views in the country. Another option would have been to use PDM or FGD results as a proxy but these were not available.

Remote assessment could be a way to save resources if PDM or FGD results about women’s views are already available as part of secondary data. In this case, it is important to make sure the completed tool is discussed in a participatory manner with the team on the ground before being finalized.
Economic well-being**

Economic well-being is defined as having present and future financial security. Present financial security includes the ability of individuals, families and communities to consistently meet their basic needs (including food, housing, utilities, health care, transportation, education, childcare, clothing and payment of taxes); and to have control over their day-to-day finances. It also includes the ability to make economic choices and feel a sense of security, satisfaction and personal fulfilment with one’s personal finances and employment pursuits. Future financial security includes the ability to absorb financial shocks, meet financial goals, build financial assets and maintain adequate income throughout a person’s lifetime.

Diversity sensitivity

Gender, together with age group, sexual orientation and gender identity, determines roles, responsibilities, power and access to resources. This is also affected by other diversity factors such as disability, social class, race, caste, ethnic or religious background, economic wealth, marital status, migrant status, displacement situation and urban/rural setting.

Empowerment of women

The empowerment of women concerns women gaining power and control over their own lives. It involves awareness-raising, building self-confidence, expansion of choices, increased access to and control over resources, and actions to transform the structures and institutions that reinforce and perpetuate gender discrimination and inequality.

Gender

Gender refers to the socially-constructed differences between females and males – and the relationships between and among them – throughout their lifetime. These differences are context and time-specific and change over time, within and across cultures. Gender, together with age group, sexual orientation and gender identity determines roles, responsibilities, power and access to resources. This is also affected by other diversity factors such as disability, social class, race, caste, ethnic or religious background, economic wealth, marital status, migrant status, displacement situation and urban/rural setting.

Gender-based violence

Gender-based violence (GBV) is an umbrella term for any harmful act that is perpetrated against a person's will and that is based on socially ascribed (i.e. gender) differences between males and females. It includes acts that inflict physical, sexual or mental harm or suffering, threats of such acts, coercion and other deprivations of liberty. These acts can occur in public or in private.

---

* Unless otherwise stated, the definitions are from the IASC Gender in Humanitarian Action Handbook: https://www.ghahandbook.org/#en/Section-Annexes/Topic-1

** Council on Social Work and Education.
Gender equality

Gender equality or, equality between women and men, refers to the equal enjoyment by women, girls, men and boys — of all ages, sexual orientations and gender identities — of rights, goods, opportunities, resources, rewards and quality of life.

It is important to differentiate between gender equality and gender equity. Gender equity relates to women, girls, men and boys having access to the rights, resources, services and opportunities, etc. defined by their specific needs. For example, health provision that is gender-equitable would include not only general comprehensive health care but also a wide range of services, such as reproductive health, that are essential for the specific differing needs of women and men.

In turn, gender equality means that all human beings are free to make their own choices without the limitations set by gender roles. Equality means that the diversity in behaviour, needs and aspirations of women and men is equally valued and considered.

Leadership and participation

Leadership and participation is relational and refers to women’s degree of influence on decisions that affect the collective. Different women might have different understandings of what it means to be involved in important decisions. This definition takes into account women in formal roles as well as women’s ability to influence important decisions while not formally holding a leadership role.*

This involves tangibly promoting the meaningful and safe participation, transformative leadership and collective action of women and girls of all backgrounds at all stages of humanitarian action, also reinforcing similar efforts in conflict prevention, peace building and state building activities.

Protection

Protection refers to all activities aimed at obtaining full respect for the intrinsic rights of all individuals in accordance with international law — international humanitarian, human rights and refugee law — taking into account differences in age, gender, minority or other backgrounds.

---

The following checklist should be used to prepare the evaluation and gather the necessary documents and people needed for data collection. Given the wide variety of contexts in which the tool will be used, the items on the checklist are not obligatory. The checklist can be adjusted ahead of the evaluation based on the available information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF DATA SOURCES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>□ List of current projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Project documents for each of the current projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ List of relevant committees and their members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key informants</td>
<td>□ UN Women staff actively working on projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Local staff engaged to work on projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Key relevant stakeholders (CSO members, UN agency staff, NGO staff, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Implementing partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus groups 6-8 participants</td>
<td>□ Committees (women) *or mixed if no women-only groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Women members of Camp Management Committees, if applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Community groups (women) *or mixed if no women-only groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Any other relevant committees (women or mixed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Beneficiaries for each project running (women and men)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDITIONAL NEEDS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>□ Translator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Focal point to organize KIIs and FGDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>□ Private room to conduct interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Drinks for FGD participants, if appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Consent forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>□ Internet connection (optional)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feedback on the use of the tool during the Turkey pilot

Pilot dates
This pilot had a double objective:

1. to test the newly developed UN Women rapid assessment tool and;
2. to collect and undertake the assessment in MUDEM-led women centre in Izmir. This centre is part of UN Women intervention in the Syria crisis in Turkey.

Secondary data collection started mid-January 2020 with a collection of programme and organizational documents, including monitoring reports and Standard Operating Procedures. Primary data collection took place between 17 and 19 February 2020 in Izmir, within the MUDEM-led women’s centre.

During the primary data collection period, a total of 13 informants were consulted (two from UN Women, seven from MUDEM and four external stakeholders) and two FGDs were conducted with a total of 13 women who had received services from the women’s centre over the past three months.

Short description of the programme assessed

Turkey is home to 3.6 million Syrian refugees, among which 46 per cent are women. Approximately, 150,000 Syrian refugees live in Izmir. As an industrial city, Izmir offers labour opportunities, but is also a gateway to Europe via the nearby Greek Islands.*

UN Women has been present in Turkey since 2012 and scaled up its operation in 2018. UN Women Turkey currently works across five different cities, including Izmir and Istanbul which is also home to the UN Women regional office for Europe and Central Asia; now a 25 personnel strong country team.

UN Women’s response in Turkey is structured around three components: one being the Japanese funded “Social and Economic Stabilization of Refugee Women and Adolescent Girls in Turkey”. The women’s centre which the assessment focuses on is part of this component. The women’s centre aims to:

• deliver gender responsive service provision to women (both refugees and non-refugees);
• provide livelihood support to women via vocational training and Turkish language classes; and
• provide opportunities for social cohesion via social events.

Since November 2019, when the services started, 311 women have benefited from at least one of the services provided.

Administration of the questionnaire

Each interview lasted for about 50 minutes, with focus groups taking 45 minutes, which is deemed a suitable duration for data collection. It is important for the user to be familiar with the questionnaire to ensure fluidity of the interview as the user may need to jump from one question to the next.

How the tool was modified as a result of the pilot

It became clear during the administration of the tool that assessing the extent to which programme design and implementation processes and systems are gender transformative is a very different question than that of a programme being gender transformative as a result of it being an intended outcome. Any outcome evaluation would require a more in-depth assessment and would only be applicable to programmes which have gender transformation as an intended objective. This would limit the breadth of programmes to which the tool would be applicable.

However, it is likely that throughout the assessment, the user will come across outcome-related information. It is therefore suggested that the user share some notes about outcomes and the extent to which they could contribute to gender transformation. This information should not be considered comprehensive, but anecdotal.

Some indicators and questions were reformulated to gain clarity. For example:

- Indicator 3.3 changed to “Sensitive personal data is safely collected, stored, transferred and disposed of.”
- The indicator “The effectiveness of GBV risk mitigation measures is regularly monitored” was mentioned twice.
- A question to inform indicator 1.2 “Do women and girls feel that their inputs are taken into consideration?” was deleted as it was redundant with one of the questions to inform indicator 2.2: “How satisfied are women with their level of influence over programme related decision making?”

The guidelines will be modified following the second pilot.

Feedback on the use of the tool during the Bangladesh pilot

Pilot dates

This pilot had a double objective:

1. to test the newly developed UN Women rapid assessment tool and;
2. to collect and undertake the assessment of UN Women Rohingya response in Cox’s Bazar.

Secondary data collection started mid-January 2020 with collection of programme and organizational documents, monitoring reports and Standard Operating Procedures. Primary data collection took place remotely between 2 and 20 March 2020. Due to visa issues followed by the COVID-19 situation, a field visit was not possible.

During the primary data collection, a total of seven informants were consulted (six from UN Women and one UN Women implementing partner).

Administration of the questionnaire went

Each interview lasted for about 50 minutes, which is deemed a suitable duration for data collection. It is important for the user to be familiar with the questionnaire to ensure fluidity of the interview as the user may need to jump from one question to the next. Using the three themes was useful to structure the discussion.

Because the data collection was conducted remotely, some of the questions (noted FGD in the questionnaire) were left out as we decided not to use UN Women staff’s perceptions of women’s views as a proxy of women’s views themselves. Another option would have been to use PDM or FGD results as a proxy, but these were not available.
How the tool was modified as a result of the pilot

For general comments, please refer to this section in the Turkey pilot above.

In a context as difficult as the Rohingya response, one can question the extent to which it is possible for a programme to be gender transformative. To what extent are women willing to be challenged about gender norms when even basic needs are far from covered and basic rights are being challenged? The UN Women Rohingya response was rated as gender-responsive and it was the user’s opinion that it could not have scored higher in the current circumstances. The completed tool highlights some areas that still need improvement.

The tool guidance will be modified following this second pilot to include consideration of:

- the possibility of administering the tool remotely;
- as each indicator is informed by multiple questions, even when women’s views are not collected, is it possible to complete most of the indicators? However, the relevance of the exercise then decreases;
- the importance of pre-selecting the relevant questions to contextualize them; and
- as the approach is qualitative, can the tool user stop asking questions on a given topic when it reaches data saturation?
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