Guidance
Document

UNEG
United Nations Evaluation Group

Guidance on Integrating Disability Inclusion in Evaluations and Reporting on the UNDIS Entity Accountability Framework Evaluation Indicator

January 2022

Table of Contents

Boxes

Tables

Acronyms

CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
HR	Human Rights
ILO	International Labour Organisation
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OHCHR	Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights
OPD	Organisation of Persons with Disabilities
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UN Women	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
UNDIS	United Nations Disability Inclusion Strategy
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund

Introduction

1.   **Fifteen percent of the world's population is estimated to be living with a disability**[1]. Each person living with a disability has faced different barriers to their participation and inclusion in the development humanitarian and recovery continuum. Such barriers may be based on identity (age, gender, ethnicity, location and race), attitudes, or physical and communication limitations. These different factors can intersect with and amplify how members of a society relate to persons with disabilities, resulting in greater marginalization and discrimination.

2.   Launched by the UN Secretary- General in June 2019, the **United Nations Disability Inclusion Strategy (UNDIS)**[2] provides the foundation for sustainable and transformative progress on disability inclusion through all pillars of the United Nations' work (see Box 1 and related terminology in UNDIS)[3]. The Strategy requires the development and implementation of a consistent and systematic approach to disability inclusion in all areas of operations and programming, internally and externally (UNDIS).

3.   The Strategy consists of a system-wide policy and two accountability frameworks - one an entity accountability framework with 15 performance indicators[4] and the other a UN country team accountability scorecard. Both are aligned and focus on four core areas:

> **Box 1: Definition of Disability Inclusion**
>
> The meaningful participation of persons with disabilities in all their diversity, the promotion and mainstreaming of their rights into the work of the Organization, the development of disability-specific programmes and the consideration of disability-related perspectives, in compliance with the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD).

a.   Leadership, strategic planning and management;

b.   Inclusiveness;

c.   Programming; and

d.   Organizational culture.

4.   Evaluation is one of four indicators under programming. While the guidance provided in this document is specific to the entity accountability framework, the concepts also apply to the UN country team accountability framework.

5.   In 2014, the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) published Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation[5]. It was prepared by the UNEG Gender Equality, Disability and Human Rights Working Group which commissioned the development of this guidance on integrating

---

[1] https://www.who.int/teams/noncommunicable-diseases/sensory-functions-disability-and-rehabilitation/world-report-on-disability

[2] https://www.un.org/en/content/disabilitystrategy/assets/documentation/UN_Disability_Inclusion_Strategy_english.pdf

[3] Ibid, UNDIS Annex 1.

[4] https://www.un.org/en/content/disabilitystrategy/assets/documentation/UN_Disability_Inclusion_Strategy_Entity_Technical_Notes.pdf

[5] http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1616

disability inclusion in evaluations. Disability needs to be integrated when considering human rights and gender equality (HR & GE) in evaluations, and vice-versa. This is a step towards addressing multiple and intersecting vulnerabilities[6] to contribute to better evaluations and improved results.

6.   This Guidance is intended for use by evaluation managers and evaluators. It builds on an analysis of resources and good practices available at the time of writing. A review of the first self-reporting survey of the UNDIS in 2020 for indicator 10 established the baseline, and determines goals that are both realistic and aspirational[7].

1. Why evaluation is critical to disability inclusion

7.   Evaluation is an important tool to capture the extent of disability inclusion across the work of the UN. Strengthening disability inclusion in evaluations, for both mainstreamed and targeted interventions (see Box 2), will help the UN system to promote institutional accountability and learning, thereby contributing to the implementation of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) and the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), including the core commitment to leave no one behind.

8.   The ´Nothing About Us Without Us´ motto of the disability movement requires meaningful consultations with persons with disabilities and organisations of persons with disabilities (OPDs)[8], resulting in better evaluations, and improved programmes and processes. Without it, they remain invisible.

Box 2: Twin-Track Approach

The UN's twin-track approach to mainstreaming disability, recognizes the need for a) integrating disability-sensitive measures into the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of all policies and programmes and b) providing disability-specific initiatives to support the empowerment of persons with disabilities. The balance between mainstreaming strategies and targeted support should be tailored to address the needs of specific communities, but the overall goal should always be to integrate and include persons with disabilities in all aspects of society and development (UNDIS).

---

[6] http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/reflections/Marginalized_Groups.pdf

[7] https://www.un.org/sites/un2.un.org/files/undis_sg_report_2020_english.pdf. *67% of* reporting *agencies report that the target is missed, 31% that they are approaching, 2% that they are meeting the target, and none that they are exceeding the target* (p.18)

[8] https://www.un.org/sites/un2.un.org/files/un_disability-inclusive_consultation_guidelines.pdf

9.   Common arguments for not integrating disability inclusion in evaluations and suggested ways forward are presented in Box 3.

Box 3: If we know disability inclusion matters, why are we not doing it?

Reason 1: Disability inclusion is to be integrated in evaluations of disability targeted projects only.

Way forward: UNDIS requires disability inclusion be integrated in both mainstreamed and targeted initiatives (twin-track approach). A disability perspective should be incorporated in the evaluation of both types of initiatives. If an initiative did not consider disability inclusion in its design, the evaluation can focus on recommendations for the future integration of disability inclusion in upcoming phases or similar activities.

Reason 2: To integrate disability inclusion in evaluations, you need a disability expert.

Way forward: While a disability expert will enrich the evaluative exercise, demonstrable sensitivity and reference to available tools and guidance, as well as consultation with the UNDIS focal point in each agency, is a useful place to start building experience.

Reason 3: There are no OPDs in Country X.

Way forward: More and more countries have OPDs who can provide a good overview of the situation, as well as data, contacts, methodologies, services etc. Only in certain limited/ specific situations OPDs may not be available e.g. in a newly established refugee camp, or they may only represent particular sub-populations. In such cases, persons with disabilities outside of the OPDs who bring particular perspectives should be consulted.

Reason 4: Consultations with most vulnerable and hard-to-reach populations, including persons with disabilities, are too costly and/or time-consuming.

Way forward: Consulting with persons with disabilities and their representative organizations is a must. The presumed high cost and time investment - which is often not the case- is not a justification for not engaging with persons with disabilities. Providing accessible venues or sign language interpretation for meetings is a matter of good planning which with OPDs can assist. Good planning would allow for Focus Group Discussions to last longer if needed.

Reason 5: Donors are not asking for it.

Way forward: More donors are explicitly asking for disability inclusion, and the UN Secretary General asks for this in the UNDIS as well as in the Cooperation Framework guidelines as part of the commitment to leaving no one behind. It is still considered a quality criterion and an obligation to the State Parties to the CRPD.

Reason 6: Disaggregated data on persons with disabilities is often scarce and not reliable.

Way forward: Whilst true to some extent, OPDs can provide accurate estimations. If big data sets are not available, smaller data sets provide good enough quantitative data, whilst focus group discussions provide good qualitative data. In the total absence of data, evaluations can highlight areas where the collection and analysis of disability data be improved to feed into the new cycle of designing and programming.

2.   What is the evaluation indicator?

10.   The UNDIS Entity Accountability Framework evaluation indicator assesses the extent to which an entity considers disability inclusion in all phases of the evaluation process and in every type of evaluation. It can be mainstreamed through all evaluations and/or addressed through disability-specific evaluations. Both are equally important. The indicator has a scaled rating system with requirements being approached, met or exceeded (see Table 1). If an entity does not undertake evaluations, it should rate this indicator 'not applicable.' UN entities are required to report annually based on the assessment of their evaluation guidance and reports.

Table 1. Indicator 10 on Evaluation

APPROACHES REQUIREMENTS	MEETS REQUIREMENTS	EXCEEDS REQUIREMENTS
10.a.i. Evaluation guidelines contain guidance on how to address disability inclusion	**10.b.i.** Evaluation guidelines contain guidance on how to address disability inclusion and **10.b.ii.** Disability inclusion is mainstreamed effectively throughout the evaluation process and reflected in the terms of reference, inception and evaluation report(s)	**10.c.i.** Evaluation guidelines contain guidance on how to address disability inclusion and **10.c.ii.** Disability inclusion is mainstreamed effectively throughout evaluation process and reflected in the terms of reference, inception and evaluation report(s) and **10.c.iii.** Meta-analysis of evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations relating to disability inclusion is performed at least every five years

3.   How to approach, meet and exceed requirements

11.   To **approach the requirements** of the UNDIS Entity Accountability Framework, an entity's evaluation guidelines must contain guidance on how to address disability inclusion through the following six elements:

   a.   The ToRs of evaluations pay adequate attention to disability inclusion.

   b.   Evaluation teams must have knowledge and/or experience of disability inclusion, where relevant.

c.   Evaluation questions should cover different aspects of disability inclusion.

d.   Stakeholder mapping and data collection methods should involve persons with disabilities and OPDs.

e.   Evaluation findings and analysis should provide data and evidence on disability inclusion.

f.   The conclusions and/or recommendations must reflect their findings on disability inclusion.

12.   To **meet requirements**, in addition to fulfilling the above, entities must comply with the disability inclusion components of these guidelines when drafting the evaluation's TORs, implement them, and produce evaluation reports (see Section 4 below).

3.1.   TORs of evaluation pay adequate attention to disability inclusion

Explanation from UNDIS Technical Notes

13.   Disability inclusion should be considered in the TOR of evaluations, including for those that do not have a specific focus on disability inclusion. The evaluation office or commissioner should conduct scoping exercises to assess how each evaluation can best cover disability inclusion.

UNEG Guidance

14.   As evaluations are asked to cover increasingly cross-cutting topics (gender, youth, human rights, climate risk, etc.), it is important not to lose sight of the aggregate. Addressing persons with disability in evaluation TORs is fundamentally about leaving no one behind, and reaching those furthest behind first. Evaluation TORs, especially for programmes and entities that do not specifically address persons with disabilities, should always take an intersectional[9] approach to assessing disability inclusion.

Key considerations

- Background information should include a brief description of how the policy, strategy, project/initiative took cross-cutting issues into account in its design and implementation, including disability inclusion.

- An assessment of disability inclusion in the evaluation should be included in the purpose and objectives.

- Under the scope, specify that the evaluation will integrate cross-cutting issues, including disability inclusion, throughout the methodology and all deliverables, including the final report.

---

[9] https://www.unwomen.org/sites/default/files/2022-01/Intersectionality-resource-guide-and-toolkit-en.pdf

- Include disability inclusion as relevant under the existing OECD-DAC criteria[10], so that it is looked alongside critical cross-cutting issues to meet the central imperative of leaving on one behind.

- Disability inclusion should be included in the evaluation questions, either as a stand-alone question or incorporated into broader evaluation questions.

- The methodology should specify that the data collection, analysis and presentation be responsive to diversity and non-discrimination, including disability inclusion issues. The evaluation therefore should be designed so that it factors in for reasonable accommodations: e.g., longer time for focus group discussions/ key informant interviews (FGDs/KII), additional support to sign participation, accessibility considerations.

Resources and examples of current practices

- The UNFPA Guidance on Disability Inclusive Evaluation[11] includes a TOR template and a quick and easy reference for mainstreaming disability inclusion in evaluations.

- The ILO Evaluation Office has revised its checklist on writing the evaluation TORs (March 2021)[12] to better cover gender equality and disability inclusion issues.

- OHCHR's TOR for evaluations model states: *"the purpose of the evaluation is to assess the project and produce recommendations in terms of these evaluation criteria… Gender and human rights integration– the degree to which a gender and human rights perspective has been integrated in the programme, and the degree to which the results obtained have contributed to gender and human rights principles of non-discrimination and equality, with emphasis on women rights and disability inclusion.*" Under the objectives it has: *"to identify areas of strength and areas of weakness in the planning and achievement of results – including in the area of gender and human rights integration"*.

- The methodology section of Sightsaver's TOR's for the evaluation of an inclusive education project supporting children with disabilities requires: *'the consultant/team will ensure that the evaluation is carried out in a manner that fully engages all stakeholders and partners in ways that maximize their ability to contribute meaningfully. Including the perspective and participation of children with disabilities in the evaluation is a must'*.

- The UN Women Evaluation Handbook[13] has a chapter on 'Developing an evaluation TOR' (pg. 47). While it focuses on gender equality, the guidance can be adapted to disability inclusion.

---

[10] https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm

[11] https://www.unfpa.org/sites/default/files/admin-resource/2020_Guidance_on_Disability-Inclusive_Evaluation_FINAL.pdf

[12] https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746814.pdf

[13] https://www.unwomen.org/en/digital-library/publications/2015/4/un-women-evaluation-handbook-how-to-manage-gender-responsive-evaluation

- The Early Lessons and Evaluability of the UN COVID-19 Response and Recovery MPTF[14] included under its specific objectives to '*assess the relevance of the Fund from early experience including gender equality, human rights, disability inclusion, and leave no one behind (LNOB) principles'*.

- The overall articulation of scope/objectives of the Evaluation of the Joint Programme 'Enhancing Resilience and Acceleration of the SDGs in the Eastern Caribbean' commissioned by WFP, ILO, UNDP, UNICEF and UN Women states: *"The evaluation will assess to what extent: (I) Joint programme design, implementation, and monitoring have been inclusive of persons with disabilities (accessibility, non-discrimination, participation of organizations of persons with disabilities, data disaggregation); (ii) Joint programme effectively contributed to the socio-economic inclusion of persons with disabilities by providing income security, coverage of health care, and disability-related costs across the life cycle"*.

3.2. *Evaluation teams have knowledge and/or experience of disability inclusion where relevant*

Explanation from UNDIS Technical Notes

15.   Consider having at least one evaluation team member or reference group member who has knowledge and/or experience of disability inclusion (UNDIS Focal Point or Disability Expert in each agency)[15]. Such knowledge will assist the evaluation team frame appropriate questions on disability inclusion and prepare sound analysis and findings.

UNEG Guidance

16.   UNEG recommends that, for programmes with or without targeted interventions on disability inclusion, the evaluation team should collectively demonstrate knowledge and experience on disability inclusion. It is also advisable to include in the evaluation reference group at least one umbrella organization or association representing diverse groups of persons with disabilities (OPD). For programmes with a specific focus on disability inclusion, at least one evaluation team member and one or more reference group member(s) should have experience and expertise in disability inclusion.

Key considerations

- Create a **database/mailing list** of evaluators with knowledge and experience of disability inclusion to share internally, as well as other agencies and entities.

- In the **profiles** for the selection and recruitment of evaluation team members in the evaluation TORs, require knowledge and experience of integrating human rights, gender equality and disability inclusion in evaluations. Identify those with knowledge of

---

[14] https://www.sddirect.org.uk/media/2268/english-situation-report-opds-covid-19-report-final.pdf

[15] More than 70 entities have UNDIS focal points. As indicated, evaluation teams should contact their UNDIS focal point in their entities. The list is continuously updated so it is not useful to share a list here. However, if evaluation teams are not sure about who their entity focal point is they can email disabilitystrategy@un.org for latest details and contacts.

participatory methodologies and experience facilitating groups that include people of various social status or vulnerabilities.

- When **screening** and/or interviewing candidates for an evaluation consultancy, look for experience in evaluations related to vulnerable groups; disability-mainstreamed and targeted interventions; training courses on gender and human rights mainstreaming in evaluation; knowledge of UNEG guidance in these areas, etc.

- Invite the **UNDIS focal point** or disability expert in each agency to participate in the reference group, or at least consult them when the evaluation TORs are being prepared.

Resources and examples of current practices:

- Specific to disability inclusion, the TOR for the Joint End of Term Evaluation of the *Economic empowerment of youth with disabilities in Uganda* and *Livelihoods for youth with disabilities in Uganda*, by Sightsavers, requires the evaluation team to have:

  - Considerable expertise in social and economic programming and working with people with disabilities/marginalized people in a lower middle-income country (LMIC) context, preferably in East Africa.

  - Knowledge and understanding of gender equality and women's rights.

  - Experience of working with people with disabilities, preferably youth. Sensitivity and awareness when working with youth with disabilities.

  - Clear evidence of ethical ways of working and strong ethical approach to data collection, analysis and use.

- The International Disability Alliance worked with Eviance Canada on the evaluation of their former Disability Catalyst Programme, funded by the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID)[16], and included a person from an OPD as an evaluator.

- The Disability Inclusion Helpdesk[17] provides research and advice to the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office and other UK government departments on disability inclusion in policy and programming, including evaluations.

3.3.   *Evaluation questions cover different aspects of disability inclusion*

Explanation from UNDIS Technical Notes

17.   Evaluation questions, mainstreamed across the different evaluation criteria or under a specific criterion, can throw light on both the extent and the quality of disability inclusion.

---

[16]
https://www.internationaldisabilityalliance.org/sites/default/files/2020.07.24_ida_disability_catalyst_programme_final_evaluation_report_final.pdf

[17] https://www.sddirect.org.uk/our-work/disability-inclusion-helpdesk/

UNEG Guidance

18. Table 2 outlines a set of indicative evaluation questions from different resources integrating considerations for persons with disabilities grouped according to the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria. For mainstreaming interventions, instead of adding new questions, disability inclusion can be added to existing questions (see **in blue** in the questions below). The questions can be adapted to the evaluation exercise; made more context specific; and include an extra criterion, i.e., on gender and human rights (disability inclusion)/ equity and inclusion, as needed.

Table 2. Indicative evaluation questions	
Relevance	To what extent has the agency/programme ensured that the various needs of marginalized and excluded populations, including women and girls, adolescents and youth, **persons with disabilities** and indigenous communities, been taken into account in both the planning and implementation of the agency-supported interventions?
	Were interventions accessible to **persons with disabilities**?
Coherence	How does the programme align with other plans, programmes and priorities in the area of disability inclusion?
	Were programme outputs specifically focused **on persons with disabilities** designed to complement national programmes or those of local OPDs?
Efficiency	To what extent does the allocation of resources reflect the needs of vulnerable and marginalized groups, prioritizing those most marginalized, including **persons with disabilities?**
	Was procurement related to the implementation disability inclusive?
Effectiveness	To what extent did the agency/initiative support the elimination of barriers to access (e.g., political, social, economic, legal, physical and attitudinal) to services, rights, information for vulnerable and marginalized populations (e.g., women, adolescents and youth, **persons with disabilities**, indigenous communities, sexual diversities), particularly those within groups that are furthest behind?
	Did the design of the response include targets for disability inclusion? Were they met?
Sustainability	Were partners made aware of the importance of the inclusion of **persons with disabilities** in the project?
	Were OPDs included as partners to facilitate the identification of **persons with disabilities**, and ensure their voices be reflected in intervention planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation?
Impact	Has the programme improved outcomes for **persons with disabilities?**
	Did **persons with disabilities** experience any unintended impacts?

Resources and examples of current practices

<div style="float:right; border:1px solid; padding:10px;">

Box 4: Specific questions on Gender and Human Rights (disability inclusion) from OHCHR's model of evaluation TOR

- Did the programme plan results contribute to gender equality and disability inclusion?

- Were the choices made as to results and strategies relevant to the integration of a gender and disability inclusion perspective?

- Were women and persons with disabilities consulted during the planning process?

- Has the programme monitoring data been disaggregated by sex, age and disability?

- Do the benefits of the programme accrue equally to women and persons with disabilities?

- Were results in the areas of gender equality, women's rights and disability inclusion achieved?

</div>

- The OECD-DAC now also includes a criterion of "coherence´ with specific reference to integrating disability inclusion"[18].

- Annex 5 of the Interagency Standing Committee (IASC) Guidelines on Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action provides output level indicators. Annex 6 of the Guidelines sets out evaluation criteria using OECD-DAC criteria definitions, and applies them from a disability-related perspective.

- UNFPA's *Guidance on Disability Inclusion in UNFPA Evaluations* shows how disability inclusion can be added to existing questions under each criterion.

- OHCHR´s model of TOR for evaluations includes a sixth criterion on gender and human rights (disability inclusion) with specific questions (see Box 4).

- Sightsavers has produced its own evaluation criteria guidance note, following the revision of the OECD/DAC criteria in 2020. Going forward, Sightsavers will include an additional optional criterion of Equity and Inclusion to be used when it was felt that the other criteria alone wouldn't sufficiently address aspects relating to gender equity and disability inclusion: ´The extent to which the human rights and needs of a diverse range of stakeholders have been addressed, and intersectionality considered. This includes persons with disabilities, women, and people from other marginalised groups. ´

- In 2016, UN Women evaluated a project on women's economic empowerment and safe spaces. Interviewees were asked specific questions on disability inclusion. While the majority believed that persons with disabilities had been involved in the project, a closer analysis confirmed that the project had benefited very few persons with disabilities and most safe spaces were not inclusive of or accessible to persons with disabilities. The

---

[18] https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/sites/543e84ed-en/1/3/4/index.html?itemId=/content/publication/543e84ed-en&_csp_=535d2f2a848b7727d35502d7f36e4885&itemIGO=oecd&itemContentType=book - section-d1e3084 "Evaluators can consider the intervention's compatibility with inclusion and equality norms and standards at a national or institutional level for the implementing institutions and perspectives of local organisations, such as grassroots indigenous peoples' groups and disabled people's organisations. Assessment of coherence can provide useful insights into the value and coherence of activities that aim to reduce exclusion, reach marginalised and vulnerable groups, and transform gender inequalities."

findings led to specific recommendations on disability inclusion. UN Women added a criterion on accessibility to future assessments of similar projects.

- The Real Time Evaluation of UNICEF´s response to Cyclone Idai in 2019[19] included specific questions in the TOR on disability: To what extent was the affected population, including persons living with disability, adequately identified, targeted and reached by UNICEF and partners? To what extent have gender and disability dimensions been integrated in the needs assessments, planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, as well as in recovery planning?

3.4. Evaluation stakeholder mapping and data collection methods involve persons with disabilities and their representative organisations

Explanation from UNDIS Technical Notes

19. Persons with disabilities and OPDs can enrich an evaluation by providing first-hand information on their situation and experience.

UNEG Guidance

20. A mixed methods approach to data collection is recommended, ensuring that both the methods chosen (e.g., focus groups, interviews, documentary review, etc.) and the ways in which they are applied are gender-sensitive, disability-inclusive and human rights-responsive.

21. Consulting with persons with disabilities and OPDs is paramount. This section provides key considerations on different aspects of stakeholder mapping and data collection, recommending resources for further guidance and referring to the seven principles of Universal Design *'to consider the breadth of human diversity across the lifespan to create design solutions that work for all users'* [20] (see Box 5). Many persons with disabilities will not be identifiable and may not elect to disclose their disability so it is important to make consultations and events as inclusive as possible. The **social model and human rights-based approach to disability** requires society (rather than persons with disabilities) take the steps necessary to ensure accessibility and inclusion.

---

[19] https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340808091_Independent_Real-Time_Evaluation_of_UNICEF%27s_response_to_Cyclone_Idai_in_Mozambique_Malawi_and_Zimbabwe

[20] https://inclusiveevaluation.com/?p=1

Box 5: The Seven Principles of Universal Design

1.   Equitable Use: The design is useful and marketable to persons with diverse abilities.

2.   Flexibility in Use: The design accommodates a wide range of individual preferences and abilities.

3.   Simple and Intuitive: Use of the design is easy to understand, regardless of the user's experience, knowledge, language skills, or current concentration level. Eliminate unnecessary complexity.

4.   Perceptible Information: The design communicates necessary information effectively to the user, regardless of ambient conditions or the user's sensory abilities.

5.   Tolerance for Error: The design minimizes hazards and the adverse consequences of accidental or unintended actions.

6.   Low Physical Effort: The design can be used efficiently and comfortably, and with a minimum of fatigue.

7.   Size and Space for Approach and Use: Appropriate size and space is provided for approach, reach, manipulation, and use regardless of user's body size, posture, or mobility.

Key considerations

- Explore **pre-existing data** sources - Consult a range of population based data sources as a starting point to identify incidence and location of persons with disabilities (population based data frequently underestimates the incidence of disability due to poor country identification and reluctance to self identify) including: global reports on disability, such as the World Report on Disability; census based data; data from community health programmes, hospitals, community based rehabilitation and disability services; education data including from the Ministry of Education, mainstream schools, inclusive education resource facilities and special schools; data from government ministries responsible for social affairs, disability inclusion and health issues; data from OPD umbrella organisations and local OPDs[21].

- Locate **diverse study participants** and provide accessible recruitment materials:

  o Collaborate with gatekeepers to recruit hard-to-reach participants and communities.

  o Ensure evaluations seek representative samples of the community. This would mean that among community participants, approximately 15% would have a disability, and therefore 1 to 2 persons with disabilities should be included in different age and gender appropriate group discussions (e.g., a group discussion with women should include at least one woman with disabilities). Where this is not possible it needs to be made transparent in the evaluation report so that the gap can be addressed in future evaluation efforts.

---

[21] Some OPDs serve a specific group of persons with disabilities -for example, the visually impaired – so it is worth meeting with more than one OPD where possible.

- o Seek to understand community practices and cultural norms regarding disability to ensure targeting persons with disabilities does not put participants at risk.

- o Provide consent forms in accessible formats including in braille, easy-to-read information, large print, audio description and sign language interpretation.

- Ensure disability in disaggregated data:

- o The Washington Group Short Set on Functioning[22] includes a set of six questions[23] which can be included in surveys to identify who does and does not have a disability for the purpose of disaggregation.

- o In cases where disability-disaggregated data may not be available, community perceptions may still be useful. All participants, regardless of their disability status could be asked if: a) they believe persons with disabilities in their communities could access programmes or faced particular barriers to access; b) they think programme/intervention design was relevant to the most vulnerable members of their communities, including persons with disabilities; and c) they think the programme/intervention had a different impact on the most vulnerable members of their communities, including persons with disabilities, etc.

- o When deciding what personal data to collect make sure to meet human rights standards, particularly in relation to anonymity, confidentiality and Do No Harm.[24]

- o Don't disclose information on a person's impairment unless the person has agreed to data disclosure and the information is relevant to the evaluation's content and purpose.

- Ensure accessibility and reasonable accommodation:

- o Consider using various accessible formats (sign language interpretation, braille, large print, easy-to-read, etc.)

- o Use language that is simple and concise. Avoid pejorative language, euphemisms, jargons and idioms.

- o For physical / in-person meetings, consider whether the meeting location is accessible to all participants. Make a quiet space available as needed.

- o For digital/virtual meetings, evaluate the platform's accessibility options, using its capabilities document or a third-party accessibility auditor.

- Conduct **separate** FGD / data collection exercises that focus on persons with disabilities when analysis has flagged that person with disabilities experience specific risks or accessibility gaps.

---

[22] https://www.washingtongroup-disability.com

[23] https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/washington_group/WG_Short_Measure_on_Disability.pdf

[24] https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/HRIndicators/GuidanceNoteonApproachtoData.pdf

UNEG Guidance on Integrating Disability Inclusion in Evaluations (2022)

22.   A checklist for online **surveys** is presented in Box 6

Box 6: Checklist for online surveys

•   Did you examine the digital accessibility options that the platform you selected offers for surveys?

•   Is your survey structure clear and logical?

•   Do you have a plain language version? If the survey is available in other languages, do the translations also use plain language?

•   Does it take less than 20 minutes to complete? Can respondents complete it at their pace?

•   Have you used standard questions for disability disclosure?

•   Did you offer alternatives to completing the questionnaire online? For example, can respondents submit Word versions of the questionnaire? Did you hold focus groups or use facilitators?

•   Did you hold the survey open for long enough?

•   Will you be able to send the results to those who have responded, and in an accessible format?

•   Did you ask persons with disabilities for feedback? Did they test a draft of the survey? Did you invite them to suggest the best way to disseminate the survey and reach persons with disabilities?

Resources and examples of current practices

- Recommendations from the UNDIS Guidelines on Consulting Persons with Disabilities[25] explain why and when to consult with persons with disabilities, and how consultation works in practice and building partnerships.

- OHCHR´s model of ToR for evaluations stipulates that ´it should be appropriate to involve all the key stakeholders, without discriminating against some groups or individuals, and allow for guaranteeing the meaningful participation of all stakeholders, with particular focus on women and persons with disabilities. The methodology section of the inception, draft and final reports should clearly explain how the evaluation was specifically designed to integrate HR & GE issues, including data collection methods, data sources and processes, sampling frame, participatory tools, evaluation questions and validation processes'[26].

- The UNDIS Disability-Inclusive Communication Guidelines[27] includes practical checklists and tips on developing inclusive content and to creating accessible content, with resources and a glossary.

---

[25] https://www.un.org/sites/un2.un.org/files/un_disability-inclusive_consultation_guidelines.pdf

[26] This is based on the UNEG Guidance Integrating Human Rights and Gender in Evaluations (Chapter 7 of the guidance has contents related to data collection methods to ensure participation of vulnerable groups).

[27] https://www.un.org/sites/un2.un.org/files/un_disability-inclusive_communication_guidelines.pdf

- The Christian Blind Mission's (CBM) publication "Inclusion Made Easy: A quick programme guide to disability in development"[28] provides more detailed guidance on the above points for locating persons with disabilities.

- CBM´s Digital Accessibility Toolkit[29] provides more detailed guidance on the above points on digital accessibility.

- CBM´s Disability and Gender Analysis Toolkit[30] provides more detailed guidance on the above points for gathering information for staff surveys (see Step 2 in the toolkit) within the wider guidance on doing a disability and gender analysis and provides useful templates.

- The IASC Guidance[31] has a whole chapter on Data and information management (Chapter 4). Annex 2 provides other tools for disaggregating data. Annexes 3 and 4 contain potential sources of secondary data as well as considerations when accessing secondary data (i.e., how is the concept of disability understood, is stigma a factor, are data up to date etc.).

- UN Disability-inclusive Language Guidelines[32]

3.5.   Evaluation findings and analysis provide data and evidence on disability inclusion

Explanation from UNDIS Technical Notes

23.   Evaluations should collect information and evidence on inclusion of persons with disabilities; disaggregate data by sex, age and disability, as well as other identity markers where relevant; and identify the impact of programmes on persons with disabilities.

UNEG Guidance

24.   UNEG guidance for the preparation of evaluation reports already proposes to include a specific section on gender equality in an evaluation report, that can also used for disability inclusion. The evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations should describe the analysis and interpretation of data on HR & GE, specific findings on HR & GE-related criteria and questions, strengths and weaknesses of the intervention regarding HR & GE, and specific recommendations addressing HR & GE issues[33].

---

[28] https://www.cbm.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Publications/cbm_inclusion_made_easy_a_quick_guide_to_disability_in_development.pdf (pp 30-34)

[29] https://www.cbm.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Publications/CBM-Digital-Accessibility-Toolkit.pdf

[30] https://www.cbm.org/fileadmin/user_upload/CBM_disability_and_gender_analysis_toolkit_accessible.pdf

[31] https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/2020-11/IASC%20Guidelines%20on%20the%20Inclusion%20of%20Persons%20with%20Disabilities%20in%20Humanitarian%20Action%2C%202019_0.pdf

[32] https://iseek.un.org/system/files/disability_inclusive_language_guidelines_final_for_release.pdf

[33] http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1616

Key considerations

- The **evaluation report** could include a specific section to examine the extent to which disability inclusion, as well as gender and human rights, have been incorporated into the design and processes of the programme (e.g., differential effects on different groups including persons with disabilities and assessing unintended results) and how the programme's achievements have contributed to the goal of leaving no one behind. Nevertheless, it is strongly recommended to discuss these issues in each section of the report, and then a specific section may not be necessary.

- While not all UN departments and agencies implement programmatic activities, and therefore do not report on integrating disability inclusion in their programmes, evaluations must still consider integration of respect for gender equality and disability inclusion in their evaluation procedures and practices[34]. In addition to specifically examining how persons with disabilities have been included, other ways to ensure disability inclusion are to ensure that facilities, infrastructure, goods and services have considered accessibility.

Resources and examples of current practices

- The UN Development Coordination Office (DCO) promotes the use of the UNEG Norms and Standards at the country level to ensure that the Cooperation Frameworks and UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF) evaluations apply the UNEG standards, which require evaluation data be disaggregated by disability and other social criteria. For example, there are numerous references to disability in the UNEG/ DCO Guidelines for the Evaluation of the UNSDCF[35].

3.6. Conclusions and/ or recommendations of evaluation reflect their findings on disability inclusion

Explanation from UNDIS Technical Notes

25.   The conclusions and/or recommendations of evaluations should reflect fully the data and evidence they have collected on disability inclusion. The management response should address all recommendations, including those on disability inclusion.

UNEG Guidance

26.   Whether disability inclusion should be included in the conclusions and/or recommendations should logically stem from the analysis in the findings section.

---

[34] https://undocs.org/ST/AI/2021/3. The administrative instructions on evaluation (ST/AI/2021/3) for UN Secretariat entities, now require all entities to "ensure the integration of respect for gender equality and disability inclusion in evaluation procedures and practices.

[35] http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/3737

Key considerations

- **Conclusions** should go beyond the findings and provide a thorough understanding of the underlying issues of the programme, policy or strategy being evaluated and reflect as appropriate cross-cutting issues such as equality, vulnerability, disability inclusion, and HR & GE.

- **Recommendations** should be balanced and impartial and address, as relevant, key cross cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, HR & GE.

- The **management response** should address all recommendations, including those on disability inclusion.

- If data and evidence on disability inclusion/ persons with disabilities were not available, it should be specifically highlighted so that corrective measures can be taken in the future.

- A**ccessibility to the evaluation report,** including conclusions, recommendations and the management response, should also be considered.

Resources and examples of current practices

- In 2013, UNICEF conducted a global Evaluation of UNICEF Programmes to Protect Children in Emergencies[36]. Among other matters, the evaluation examined how far UNICEF programmes included children with disabilities and recommended specific actions to strengthen their inclusion. UNICEF's management response subsequently outlined measures that it would take to implement the report's recommendations.

- The evaluation of Norway's approach to promote the rights of persons with disabilities[37] played a role how the country enhanced its priority to disability (with new funding allocated and demonstrated leadership e.g., co-hosting the Global Disability Summit).

27.   An entity will **exceed the requirements** if, in addition to addressing the criteria above, it completes at least once every five years an analysis/synthesis of the aggregated findings, conclusions and recommendations from a series of evaluations to examine to what extent they have addressed disability inclusion. This will enable the entity to assess the extent to which it has achieved disability inclusion and take any remedial action that is required.

Key considerations

- **Material collection**: Gather all relevant findings from all types of evaluation reports, including project evaluations, thematic evaluations and global/regional/country evaluations. Entities may also consider, as deemed relevant, internal audits, evaluations

---

[36] https://www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main/evaluation-of-unicef-programmes-to-protect-children-in-emergencies-synthesis-report.pdf

[37] https://www.norad.no/globalassets/import-2162015-80434-am/www.norad.no-ny/filarkiv/vedlegg-til-publikasjoner/mainstreaming-disability-in-the-new-development-paradigm-evaluation-of-norwegian-support-to-promote-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities.pdf

and reviews. Many UN agencies post their evaluation and audit reports on their evaluation portal. Where relevant, include results of external evaluations and audits provided by the UN system oversight from the website of the Office of Internal Oversight Services of the UN[38], the Joint Inspection Unit[39] and the Board of Auditors[40].

- Analysis and database building: Build the structure of the meta-analysis database in a spreadsheet format. Prepare a table by thematic or geographical scope and extract all the conclusions, recommendations, lessons learned and good practices from the evaluations conducted during the period. Under the Disability Inclusion criteria, identify the most recurrent and/or relevant information, which can then be analyzed and synthesized in a report.

- Build a database focusing on what questions were asked by the selected evaluations: in which "sectors" or themes, in which contexts, in what kind of programme; it would look at methods, key informants/participants, stage (mid-term/formative, final), and evaluation level (corporate, regional, country office). Use this evidence base to spot examples of good practices and other examples of missed opportunities.

Resources and examples of current practices

- In 2016, UNDP conducted an organization-wide evaluation of disability inclusion in its programmes[41]. Undertaken by UNDP's Independent Evaluation Office, it assessed UNDP's contribution to disability-inclusive development between 2008 to 2016, a period that aligned with UNDP's strategic plans and began when the CRPD came into force.

- ILO's 2021 ex post meta-analysis of development cooperation evaluations 2020-2021, entitled "Decent work results and effectiveness of ILO operations", coded project evaluations to determine extent of disability inclusion perspective using criteria for "unsuccessful, partly successful, successful and highly successful"[42].

4.   UNDIS Annual Reporting Process

28.   To assess performance, each entity will review/assess the quality of the integration of disability inclusion in evaluation reports produced during the year in question. This guidance suggests a binary method where each of the six elements of the indicator be marked with a "yes" or a "no". At least four of the six elements should be met to meet the overall requirement (see Table 3).

---

[38] https://oios.un.org/node/26355

[39] https://www.unjiu.org/content/reports-notes

[40] https://www.un.org/en/auditors/board/auditors-reports.shtml

[41] http://web.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/thematic/disability.shtml

[42] https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_822238.pdf. See Section 2.6.2 on disability inclusion.

Table 3. Scoring the quality of integration of disability inclusion in evaluation reports	Yes	No
The TOR of evaluations pay adequate attention to disability inclusion		
Evaluation teams have knowledge and/or experience of disability inclusion, where relevant		
Evaluation questions cover different aspects of disability inclusion		
Evaluation stakeholder mapping and data collection methods involve persons with disabilities and their representative organizations		
Evaluation findings and analysis provide data and evidence on disability inclusion		
The conclusions and/or recommendations of evaluations reflect their findings on disability inclusion		

29.   Evaluations conducted or managed by both central evaluation offices and decentralized evaluation functions can be included in the assessment. The general recommendation is to include all centralized/corporate evaluation reports. Entities with a decentralized evaluation function can either include the total universe of decentralized evaluations or a relevant sample of evaluations, accurately reflecting the different types of evaluations. Entities with an established quality assessment and meta-evaluation system are encouraged to include the total universe of evaluations for the year under review.

30.   To minimize sample bias, entities selecting a sample of evaluations for meta-evaluation should aim to select a representative sample. Selection criteria should include:

- Evaluation managed/conducted by both central evaluation offices and decentralized evaluation functions;

- Balance in terms of mid-term versus final evaluations;

- A mix of evaluation types: project, programme, policy, outcome, impact, evaluation of normative work, strategic, etc.;

- A balanced mix of topics, themes and sectors;

- Widespread geographical coverage; and

- Interventions where disability inclusion is the primary focus of the interventions.

On 10th March 2022, the UNEG Gender, Human Rights and Disability Inclusion Working Group organized an Evaluation Practice Exchange session to launch the UNEG Guidelines for Disability Inclusion in Evaluations and Reporting on the UNDIS. The session featured:

1. An introduction and overview of the guidance;

2. Remarks from the Executive Office of the Secretary General UNDIS Secretariat; and

3. A panel discussion with UN evaluators on utility and application of the guidance in evaluations.

The recording of the session can found on the UNEG YouTube channel: https://youtu.be/dG7l5yilo2g

Learn more about UNEG