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Methodology

• 46 agriculture stakeholders selected using:
  – Purposive sampling from members of ENGEA
  – Snowball sampling (recommendations from stakeholders)
  – 2 rounds of interviews conducted
• 26 Evaluations collected and 7 promising methodologies identified
### Base Criteria Selection

- Out of 26 documents collected 10 were immediately not considered (updated evaluation, no data collection, country-level aggregate evaluation, portfolio review for public).
- 13 qualified for second round of criteria.
- Document type was an unexpected category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>Independence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Gender Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABCD</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABDISHE (CARE)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMDe MTE</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defar (Send a Cow)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Nutrition Response (GOAL)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINE MTE</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSPII EDRI Report PSNP 2013</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEED II MTE (ACDI/VOCA)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAD Final (not in yet)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMD MTE</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNWB (WFP)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIME MTE</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAES (Oxfam America)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE RISE (CARE)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGP II Social Assessment (GoE) 2015</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia Bee keeping (Oxfam GB)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAD (CARE) Outcome Mapping Process Report</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT PROJECT II - Social Assessment</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGP (GoE) Gender Analysis</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSF (CARE) gender analysis</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAD (CARE) VC gender analysis</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABCD documentation</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAD (CARE) Outcome Mapping Report</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4P documentation</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASIDP-II - Participatory Small-scale Irrigation Development Programme</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send a Cow - Household Methodologies</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Second round inclusion criteria

Rigor of Methods
- Quantitative Sampling
- Qualitative Treatment
- Evidence for Findings

Gender Included in Evaluation
- None
- Section on Gender
- Woven Throughout

Social Norm Change (Outcome)
- None
- Claimed
- Present
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WE-RISE</th>
<th>ABDISHE</th>
<th>GRAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>WE-RISE</strong> is designed to improve the quality of life for chronically food insecure rural women (CFIRW). The program seeks to increase agricultural productivity through income generating activities, support environments promoting women’s rights and gender-sensitive agricultural programming, and increase institutional capacity for improved gender-equitable programming at the global level. (vii)</td>
<td>The Ethiopian component is named ABDISHE (meaning hope for a woman in the local language) is aiming to Strengthening Women’s Livelihoods through Markets is contributing to the ultimate outcome of the LINKAGES program. The project aims to achieve three main result areas 1). Increased quantity and quality of food production and consumption by women, and men 2) Women and men are better able to manage and control their economic enterprises and 3) The policy and regulatory environment supports poor women’s and men’s more equal control of agricultural resources and market processes. (5)</td>
<td>Under a Strategic Objective to graduate 50,000 chronically food insecure households from the government's Productive Safety Net Program (PSNP) and increase each household’s income by $365 per year, the project has three components, to (1) increase economic options for targeted households through value chain development and access to capital from micro-finance institutions and village-based savings and credit groups, (2) strengthen household and community resilience through interventions targeting women's empowerment, nutritional status, climate change adaptation and household aspirations, and (3) strengthen the enabling environment to facilitate sustaining and replicating the impact of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTIVES</td>
<td>GENDER-RELATED FINDINGS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The AMDe development goal is: sustainably reduce poverty and hunger by improving the productivity and competitiveness of agricultural value chains that offer jobs and income activities for rural households. AMDe's work is structured around improving the competitiveness of six value chains: maize, wheat, sesame, coffee, honey, and chickpeas through technical and managerial assistance, increased access to finance, and private sector investment. (2)</td>
<td>The Evaluation Team finds that USAID gave <strong>inadequate attention to gender in the AMDe design phase, as four of the original five value chains have a strong export focus.</strong> While aligning with the AGP is important, USAID might have given increased consideration to the fact that with some notable exceptions, <strong>agriculture sector exports are generally dominated by men.</strong> The selection of other and complementary value chains focusing on domestic markets might therefore have afforded increased opportunities for women smallholders, traders, and agroprocessors. USAID also did not <strong>designate specific funds to support AMDe’s gender equity work.</strong> (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| The purpose of the project is to improve the productivity and production of smallholder farmers/pastoralists through strengthening the extension service delivery and its systems at selected Pastoralist/Farmer Training Centers (P/FTCs) in all regions of Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. | Although the intervention has much economic and social impact, the extent it reduced gender imbalance is not clear since the gender context was not established. Mainstreaming climate sensitive agriculture and gender in the program could address these issues in future programs. (55). |
Where is Gender?

**Project Objectives**
- What role does gender play in the project? Include at highest level possible.

**Expected Outcomes**
- How will we measure the impact of our program on gender?
- Have we considered how we will assess quantity AND quality of participation?

**Activities**

---

CIMMYT
Many evaluations had the same gender failures!

- Gender/context analysis are still not crucial for program designs.
- Programs are not adequately funding their gender components.
- Many evaluations do not properly include, or address and explain gender programming choices or outcomes.
  - Hypothesis is that gender project design is not evidence based or discussed with wider project staff (sidelined).
- Rare to have programs discuss gender as something that goes ‘beyond the project.’
Failing to learn

- Evaluations are not (currently) a strong mechanism for learning about gender - more of an audit/accountability to donors document
- If the SOW/TOR doesn’t explicitly ask to understand gender/social norm changes then only basic gender information captured.
- Even when program evaluations collect sex disaggregated data, they do not always, nor consistently report the results by sex
What is more important than what we learn is how we learn it!

• Internal documents had stronger gender learning present.
  – There is value in getting people/staff to reflect on gender and, in fact, they need to do this to learn;
  – When we talk to ourselves we learn in a different (more meaningful?) way.

• Dissemination!! Evaluation validation workshops are rare
  – limits wider learning and transparency.
How can we improve gender learning from evaluations?

- Place gender in the highest level possible, with indicators = increased accountability for gender.
- Design of project should account for social norms.
- Mixed methods evaluations generate the best learning around gender: quantitative tells the number and qualitative tells why and how.
- Improve the quality of qualitative analysis and reporting: this was often poorly done.
- The evaluation Statement of Work (ToR) must include a clear question on gender that creates beyond project learning.
Gender transformative methodologies.
We know what works

7 promising methodologies found during the interviews:

1. Gender Action Learning System (GALS)
2. Transformative Household Methodology
3. Family Life Model
4. Community Conversation
5. Rapid Care Analysis
6. Asset Based Community Development (ABCD)
7. Social Analysis and Action (SAA)
What do they have in common?
A plan for changing unequal relations

01 Use facilitators

02 Participatory tools

03 Work with men and boys/focus on social relations

04 Driven by communities
Why do they work?
Power

- In various ways
- Sometimes covertly
- Non-confrontational
Tackle social norms at multi levels

Policy/law/Strategy (GALS)

Community
(SAA, GALS, ABCD, RCA, CC)

Household
(THM, FLM, RCA, ABCD, SAA, GALS)

Self (?)
(a little from THM, GALS, ABCD, SAA)

Market
However,

- The data not being captured
- NGOs use these methodologies as practitioners
- If the data was captured and analyzed it would
  - reveal the pace of change
  - What norms are easy to change (and generate certain results)
  - What methodology for what context
- Need an action research project so we can analyze the data and map change pathways
Conclusion and key messages

- Use and improve these methodologies
- Improve the quality of gender in evaluations
- Disseminate gender learnings from evaluations
- Facilitate more internal reflection/learning sessions on gender
So how do we get to gender transformation in Ethiopia’s agriculture sector?

| Fund institutional strengthening/change management (gender) | • Study norms & capture data from methodologies  
• Expand innovation & opportunity structures/pathways from a gender perspective |
| --- | --- |
| • Commission more mixed methods research & evaluations & ask questions differently  
• Go beyond headship & apply intersectionality at design & analysis phase  
• Internal learning & evaluation dissemination |
Thank you for your interest!
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