Institutional
Scorecard
for Gender
Mainstreaming

The Commonwealth of Learning (COL) is an intergovernmental organisation created by Commonwealth Heads of Government to promote the development and sharing of open learning and distance education knowledge, resources and technologies.

Contents

Key Concepts and Terminology

Gender: The different social and cultural roles, expectations and constraints placed upon girls/women and boys/men because of their **sex** (the biological differences between them).

Gender analysis: Looking at the impact of development on girls/women and boys/men by separating data by sex, and understanding how work, for example, is divided, valued and rewarded. It examines how an activity, decision or plan will affect each gender.

Gender audit: Analysing and evaluating policies, programmes and institutions in terms of how institutions have made changes based on gender considerations and whether they are successfully meeting gender-related criteria.

Gender awareness: Understanding that socially and culturally determined differences between girls/women and boys/men based on learned behaviour affect their ability to access and control resources.

Gender balance (or **gender parity**): The equal participation of women and men at all levels of an organisation and in all areas of work.

Gender blindness: Failing to recognise that the roles and responsibilities of girls/women and boys/men are often determined by gender, which can affect quality of life.

Gender champions: In the workplace, managers and staff who spearhead, support and sustain gender equality and gender equality initiatives in their organisation, and support staff who focus on its technical aspects.

Gender equality: Equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities for everyone, regardless of their sex. It does not mean that girls/women and boys/men will become the same but that their interests, needs and priorities are considered equally important, while recognising the diversity of different groups of girls/women and boys/men. It is considered a human rights issue and a precondition and indicator of sustainable people-centred development.

Gender mainstreaming: The process of assessing the implications for girls/women and boys/men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in any area and at all levels. It is a strategy for integrating the concerns and experiences of both genders into the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of all policies and programmes so that everyone benefits equally. Its ultimate goal is gender equality.

Gender sensitive: Being sensitive to the different needs and experiences of male and female users of a programme. In an ODL context, it means producing courses or learning materials to meet the needs of all learners.

Knowledge Management (KM): A set of principles, tools and practices that enable the creation of knowledge and allow people in a specific context to share, translate and apply what they know to create value and improve effectiveness.

Knowledge Management Systems: Tools and practices to organise, store and make accessible the combined knowledge of an organisation.

Logical Framework Analysis (LFA): A planning and management tool used to present the key components of a plan, project or programme in a table or framework format.

Performance Measurement Framework (PMF): A plan to systematically collect relevant data, including information on baselines and targets, over the lifetime of a programme or project to assess and demonstrate its progress. It documents the major elements of the monitoring system and ensures that performance information is collected regularly.

Policy evaporation: Despite policy commitments to gender equality, gender-related and other policies often "evaporate" or fade into the background during the formulation and implementation stages. Similarly, a broad commitment to gender balance is often reduced to a "women's component," with a very small claim on project resources, or a focus on counting the number of women in projects.

Results-Based Management (RBM): A management strategy based on accountability and transparency that uses participatory input and makes the combined knowledge available to all to ensure plans, projects or programmes deliver results and improve performance.

Sex-disaggregated data: Information collected separately on girls/women and boys/men and used to see how girls/women are faring compared with boys/men.

Sexual harassment: Unwanted conduct of a sexual nature — from anyone, regardless of status — affecting the safety or dignity of women, men, boys or girls. It can be physical or verbal, and includes character assassination through graffiti or gossip that refers, accurately or otherwise, to a person's sexual behaviours.

The Institutional Scorecard for Gender Mainstreaming

Introduction

Gender equality is central to the Commonwealth of Learning's (COL) agenda of learning for sustainable development, and COL has adopted gender mainstreaming as an organisational strategy. By setting gender equality as a cross-cutting corporate goal, COL strives to ensure that both girls'/women's and boys'/men's (henceforth referred to as women and men) views, interests and needs influence planning, policies and programmes. Gender mainstreaming provides equal opportunities for women and men to participate in and benefit from COL's development interventions in open and distance learning (ODL).

COL also supports the institutional capacity of its partner institutions to mainstream gender equality in the planning, development, and monitoring and evaluation of learning programmes. As part of its 2015-2021 Strategic Plan, COL has designed an institutional scorecard to help its partners monitor the status of their gender equality integration efforts and to perform a comprehensive and systematic self-assessment and documentation of steps taken towards achieving gender equality through policies, programmes and projects over the term of the Strategic Plan. It is designed to enable partner institutions to measure and compare the status of gender mainstreaming within an institution periodically, monitor progress towards minimum standards and focus attention on formulating approaches and measures that will allow both women and men to shape, participate in and benefit from quality learning opportunities.

What Is an Institutional Scorecard for Gender Mainstreaming?

Institutional scorecards for gender mainstreaming (or gender scorecards) are a form of ongoing audits of a development organisation's policies and/or strategies to promote gender equality. A gender audit is a management and planning tool that examines the quality and effectiveness of gender-related organisational practices and systems. It allows institutions to take a comprehensive look at the status of its gender mainstreaming practices and to see what is working, what is not working and what gaps need filling.

Completing a gender scorecard is equivalent to conducting a gender audit. The scorecard provides a systematic approach to data collection and analysis of the process over a set time. It is an analytical tool for the collection of evidence-backed qualitative and quantitative data to measure the status of gender mainstreaming at any given point and apply lessons learned to strengthen ongoing and future gender programming. It should not be treated as a checklist.

COL's gender scorecard has been developed to help its partner institutions audit their gender mainstreaming efforts and create a more gender-balanced workplace culture. It has a capacity-building element and so can be an empowering experience for staff.

Purpose and Objectives

The institutional self-assessment tool has a twofold objective:

1. To ascertain whether gender equality results[1] have been attained.
2. To assess processes and strategies put in place to mainstream gender.

---

[1] Gender equality results refer to women's empowerment and equality of women and men, as defined in the Beijing Platform for Action (BPfA).

It therefore aims to capture the interdependence of the two critical components of gender mainstreaming — process and goal — and assess to what extent they strengthen or undermine one another.

When an institution looks at whether it has achieved gender equality, it can then look at whether its initial targets were gender-responsive, and if so:

- Were they appropriate for the particular context?
- Did they evaporate during the implementation phase?
- How can it set realistic gender equality targets in the future?

Most importantly, the presence — or absence — of a gender equality result can let an institution work backwards to re-examine its processes and strategies and evaluate their effectiveness and coherence. This may indicate whether internal processes have led to the intended results or not and so help define the gender mainstreaming process.

Completing the Gender Scorecard

The gender scorecard is designed to be used as a self-assessment tool by partner institutions' staff. The entire organisation must participate, because gender mainstreaming is also about changing attitudes. Staff with direct and active experience of any phases of gender mainstreaming — including but not limited to planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, reporting and knowledge management — may be suited to leading the gender audit process, but hiring an external gender expert is also an option.

Certain factors must be considered when completing the scorecard:

- **Existing gender mainstreaming activities, systems and processes.** If possible, an institution should assess its current gender mainstreaming efforts. The absence of a systematic gender mainstreaming approach should not discourage an organisation from conducting an internal assessment, but pre-assessing it could alert the organisation to its gender audit readiness level.
- **Political will.** Management's willingness to support the self-audit process will reflect the level of institutional and personal commitment to gender mainstreaming. The self-audit process requires staff participation at all levels and demands continuous buy-in from senior management (see InterAction, 2010, page 22). If senior management values gender equality integration, the funds and resources required for the audit are likely to be made available.
- **Concrete evidence.** Assessing an indicator and assigning it a score requires definitive, reliable data that support the rating. This can be challenging, especially if there is no baseline information or systematic ongoing data collection. The assessor should be able to indicate the specific evidence that was gathered and used for scoring.
- **Material and non-material resources.** Self-assessments are internal initiatives, but require significant staff time and resources and depend on management being supportive and willing to allocate the required time and resources. Both management and staff need to recognise the importance of adequate preparation and planning for this exercise.

Using the Institutional Scorecard for Gender Mainstreaming

The scorecard can be used by all institutions, whether or not they already have gender-responsive policies and mechanisms.

COL's scorecard comprises nine categories, each with performance indicators, four rating criteria per performance indicator and suggestions for the evidence base. The categories represent areas in which efforts towards gender mainstreaming either are or should be taking place in an organisation. In this

scorecard, they are ordered from more critical (core areas) to less critical (non-core areas) and are named to help organisations prioritise the core areas and then work on the others. The first four categories are considered core areas as they represent the foundational elements of a systematic gender mainstreaming approach. Without these firmly in place, gender mainstreaming implementation is highly likely to be haphazard and inconsistent, potentially jeopardising the achievement of gender equality. The core categories carry higher scores than the others. Address any weaknesses identified in any of the core categories first.

The core categories each have four performance indicators; the non-core categories each have three. Performance indicators each have four criteria, all of which have a specific and pre-determined value, referred to in this scorecard as points:

- "Exceeds minimum standards": 100 points
- "Meets minimum standards": 75 points
- "Needs improvement": 50 points
- "Inadequate": 25 points

All the criteria must be met for the stated number of points to be awarded. If you feel that you sit between two sets of points, select the lowest rating so that you and your institution can push harder for change.

The scoring system is included in the scorecard and in the section following the scorecard. Appendix 3 has a worksheet for keeping track of scorecard assessment and score calculations, complete with instructions and an example.

Only the maximum possible and minimum acceptable scores are shown in each category (aggregate level):

- Maximum score = "exceeds minimum standards": further action is not required.
- Minimum score = "meets minimum standards": further action is required where performance indicators are identified as needing strengthening.
- Anything below minimum acceptable score = "needs improvement" or "inadequate": further action is required where performance indicators are identified as weak.

Institutional Scorecard for Gender Mainstreaming

<table>
<tr>
<td colspan="2">

1. Leadership and Organisational Culture

Exceeds minimum standards: 100 points
Meets minimum standards: 75 points
Needs improvement: 50 points
Inadequate: 25 points

</td>
</tr>
</table>

1. Leadership and Organisational Culture	
Exceeds minimum standards: 100 points *Meets minimum standards: 75 points* *Needs improvement: 50 points* *Inadequate: 25 points*	*Max. possible points: 100 points x 4 performance indicators = 400* *Min. acceptable points: 75 points x 4 performance indicators = 300*

Evidence base: Example documents

• Board, management or staff meeting minutes • Gender equality and HR policy and implementation reports • Internal memos and directive emails • Multi-year strategic plan	• Organisation's website, intranet, blogs, social media posts or newsletters • Programme update/briefing notes • Publications on gender parity

1a. Senior managers are committed to gender mainstreaming

Exceeds minimum standards	Meets minimum standards	Needs improvement	Inadequate
Senior managers: • articulate the organisation's vision on gender mainstreaming at every opportunity, • take the lead as gender equality champions, and • encourage all staff to become gender equality champions by providing them with adequate support and incentives.	Senior managers articulate the organisation's vision on gender mainstreaming only at major or key events related to gender equality. Some senior managers: • volunteer to be gender champions, and • encourage staff to become gender equality champions but may not offer adequate support and incentives.	Senior managers: • articulate the organisation's vision on gender mainstreaming occasionally, • do not consistently encourage staff to become gender equality champions, and • are ineffective in their role as gender champions.	Senior managers: • rarely articulate the organisation's vision on gender mainstreaming, and • do not encourage staff to become gender equality champions. No senior managers are gender champions.

1b. Senior managers promote gender equality in all operations and communications			
Exceeds minimum standards	*Meets minimum standards*	*Needs improvement*	*Inadequate*
Senior managers: • provide guidance on gender mainstreaming processes in all programme and institutional[2] areas, and • explicitly state the organisation's commitment to gender equality in both internal communications and public engagements.	Senior managers: • provide guidance on gender mainstreaming within their programme area only, and • state their organisation's commitment to gender equality in either internal communications or public engagements only, but not always in both.	Senior managers: • provide only basic guidance on gender mainstreaming (e.g. they can define some gender terminology or explain what gender mainstreaming is and why it is important), and • promote gender equality either in internal communications or at public engagements only related to women.	Management are not knowledgeable enough to provide guidance on gender mainstreaming. Gender equality does not appear much in either internal or external communications.

1c. Organisation has a clear policy and/or strategy on equal representation of women in technical and senior positions (Employment Equity)			
Exceeds minimum standards	*Meets minimum standards*	*Needs improvement*	*Inadequate*
The organisation: • is implementing its policy and/or strategy on equal representation of women in technical and decision-making positions, and • has achieved 75% or more of its gender balance (gender parity) targets in technical and decision-making areas.	The organisation: • has a policy and/or strategy on equal representation of women in technical and decision-making positions, and • has met at least 50% of its gender balance targets for such positions.	The organisation: • has gender balance targets but no policy and/or strategy on equal representation of women in technical and decision-making positions, and • has barely met 50% of its gender balance targets for such positions and has no firm plans to meet them.	There is no employment equity policy or strategy. There are no gender balance targets for technical and decision-making positions.

---

[2] In this scorecard, "institutional area" refers to the organisational environment that supports gender mainstreaming processes (from policy and organisational culture to human resources). It goes beyond the programme area by striving to establish a conducive and enabling environment for gender mainstreaming in programmes.

1d. Staff at all levels understand gender mainstreaming and are supportive of the process

Exceeds minimum standards	*Meets minimum standards*	*Needs improvement*	*Inadequate*
At least 75% of staff at all levels can explain gender mainstreaming and their role in supporting it.	At least 50% of staff at all levels can explain gender mainstreaming and their role in supporting it.	Less than 50% of staff can explain gender mainstreaming and their role in supporting it.	Only programming staff can explain gender mainstreaming and their role in supporting it.

---

2. **Policy and Priority Setting**

Exceeds minimum standards: 100 points
Meets minimum standards: 75 points
Needs improvement: 50 points
Inadequate: 25 points

Max. possible points: 100 points x 4 performance indicators = 400
Min. acceptable points: 75 points x 4 performance indicators = 300

Evidence base: Example documents
- Gender analysis reports, action plans or implementation plans
- Gender equality policy or strategic plan
- Management and staff meeting minutes
- Organisation's website, intranet, blogs, social media posts or newsletters
- PMF, RBM or LFA
- Planning documents (e.g. strategic or monitoring and evaluation plans; sectoral policies and related studies)
- Policy documents (e.g. gender equality policy)
- Sectoral studies and reports
- Surveys or questionnaires on gender mainstreaming

2a. Policy documents include gender analysis relevant to sector and context based on up-to-date evidence

Exceeds minimum standards	*Meets minimum standards*	*Needs improvement*	*Inadequate*
Up-to-date evidence-based gender analysis systematically informs policies by sector and context.	Gender analysis is context-appropriate and systematically informs policies of priority sectors.	Gender analysis is weak/irrelevant and does not systematically inform any of the policy documents.	Policy documents are gender-blind or devoid of any gender equality perspectives.

2b. Gender equality is explicitly stated in all policy documents as development goals and critical goals that support the achievement of other development goals pursued by the institution and established internationally (e.g. MDGs, SDGs)

Exceeds minimum standards	*Meets minimum standards*	*Needs improvement*	*Inadequate*
Gender equality is recognised and explicitly defined as a programme goal and is integral to achieving other development goals. Policy documents systematically integrate gender equality results to address gender inequality in each programme area.	Gender equality is recognised and explicitly defined as a programme goal, but is not clearly linked to other development goals. Policy documents systematically integrate relevant gender results in at least one or two programme areas.	Stated gender results are defined in policy documents but not followed through as programme goals. Policy documents do not systematically integrate gender results in key programme areas.	Gender equality results are neither defined nor followed through as programme goals. Policy documents do not integrate gender results in any programme areas.

2c. Gender equality policy is updated and revised at least every five years to reflect current gender issues in relevant programme areas and operational context

Exceeds minimum standards	*Meets minimum standards*	*Needs improvement*	*Inadequate*
The gender equality policy: • is systematically reviewed at least every five years, and • addresses current and persistent gender inequality issues affecting women and men in all programme areas and operational contexts.	The gender equality policy: • is reviewed at more than five-year intervals, and • addresses key gender inequality issues affecting women and men in major programme areas and relevant operational contexts.	The gender equality policy: • is outdated and there are no plans to review it in the immediate future, and • addresses gender inequality issues that are no longer relevant to programme areas or operational contexts.	The organisation does not have a gender equality policy.

2d. Gender equality policy is used as a guidance document for all gender mainstreaming processes

Exceeds minimum standards	*Meets minimum standards*	*Needs improvement*	*Inadequate*
The gender equality policy: • is promoted and communicated evenly across the organisation, and	The gender equality policy is: • promoted and communicated in some, but not all, areas of the organisation, and	The gender equality policy: • has not been clearly promoted or communicated across the organisation, and	If there is a gender equality policy, it is: • poorly promoted throughout the organisation, and

• serves as the main reference guide for gender mainstreaming processes. Senior managers and staff have read the gender equality policy and can explain its key components.	• occasionally used as a reference for gender mainstreaming processes. Most senior managers and staff have read the gender equality policy but can explain only one or two of its key components.	• is not systematically used as a reference for gender mainstreaming processes. Senior managers and staff have read parts of the gender equality policy but cannot explain any of its components.	• a stand-alone document that does not guide the gender mainstreaming process. Senior managers and staff either do not know about the gender equality policy or have not read it.

---

3. Resource Allocation and Disbursement

Exceeds minimum standards: 100 points
Meets minimum standards: 75 points
Needs improvement: 50 points
Inadequate: 25 points

Max. possible points: 100 points x 4 performance indicators = 400
Min. acceptable points: 75 points x 4 performance indicators = 300

Evidence base: Example documents

- Any reports on implementation of policies equivalent to Employment Equity
- Gender budget line and codes

- Programme, evaluation, HR or general budgets
- Quarterly, monthly or annual programme, HR and progress reports

3a. Funding for gender equality initiatives is determined at programme planning stage and funds are disbursed accordingly

Exceeds minimum standards	*Meets minimum standards*	*Needs improvement*	*Inadequate*
Adequate funds: • are allocated at the planning stage for all gender equality initiatives, and • are disbursed as per programme plans.	Specific funding: • is set aside at the planning stage primarily for gender-related initiatives, and • is disbursed mostly on gender-related initiatives.	Funding for gender equality initiatives is often reallocated to and disbursed on other projects considered to be more urgent.	Funding for gender equality initiatives is insufficient and inconsistent.

3b. Monitoring and evaluation of gender equality initiatives is adequately financed

Exceeds minimum standards	*Meets minimum standards*	*Needs improvement*	*Inadequate*
All levels of monitoring and evaluation (e.g. mid-term and final evaluations) of gender equality are adequately funded.	Financing for monitoring and evaluation of gender equality initiatives is available for final evaluations at minimum.	Financing for monitoring and evaluation of gender equality initiatives is primarily available for projects with a large number of female beneficiaries.	Financing for monitoring and evaluation of gender equality initiatives is available on an ad hoc basis.

3c. Funds for Employment Equity policy implementation and gender expertise sufficiently meet planned and changing needs

Exceeds minimum standards	*Meets minimum standards*	*Needs improvement*	*Inadequate*
Sufficient funds are allocated at the planning stage and disbursed according to anticipated and changing needs related to the implementation of the Employment Equity policy and/or internal and external gender experts.	Sufficient funds are allocated at the planning stage and disbursed according to anticipated needs related to the implementation of the Employment Equity policy and/or human resources pertaining to either internal or external gender expertise. Additional funds may not be available to meet the changing needs of the above.	Funds are identified and sourced only as the need arises to implement the Employment Equity policy and/or to hire internal or external gender experts.	There are no funds allocated or disbursed to meet planned needs related to the implementation of the Employment Equity policy and hiring of internal or external gender experts.

3d. Reliable and accurate financial tracking system established to monitor allocated and disbursed funds on gender equality

Exceeds minimum standards	*Meets minimum standards*	*Needs improvement*	*Inadequate*
A financial tracking system shows exact amounts expended on gender equality initiatives.	The percentage of funds spent on gender equality initiatives can be reliably estimated.	Only funds spent on women-specific initiatives can be tracked.	No funds spent on any gender initiative can be tracked.

4. Capacity and Competence

Exceeds minimum standards: 100 points
Meets minimum standards: 75 points
Needs improvement: 50 points
Inadequate: 25 points

Max. possible points: 100 points x 4 performance indicators = 400
Min. acceptable points: 75 points x 4 performance indicators = 300

Evidence base: Example documents

- Gender training reports
- Organisation's website and intranet, blogs, social media posts or newsletters
- Programme meeting or progress, quarterly or monthly reports
- Surveys on Gender Scorecard or gender capacity

4a. Managers are knowledgeable about key gender issues affecting programme areas

Exceeds minimum standards	Meets minimum standards	Needs improvement	Inadequate
Managers have extensive training on gender awareness/analysis and key gender issues affecting their programme area.	Managers have participated in gender awareness/analysis training in the past five years.	Few managers have participated in gender awareness or analysis training. Managers' gender awareness/analysis training is from over five years ago.	Managers have never attended gender awareness or analysis training.

4b. Staff have a common understanding of gender equality and gender mainstreaming policy and processes

Exceeds minimum standards	Meets minimum standards	Needs improvement	Inadequate
Staff have extensive training in gender equality concepts/analysis and can define gender terminology and describe gender mainstreaming policy and processes.	Staff have had more than one training session on gender equality concepts/analysis and can describe some gender terminologies, but cannot define gender mainstreaming policy and processes.	Staff have basic training in gender equality concepts and gender analysis but cannot define gender terminology or gender mainstreaming policy and processes.	Staff have little or no knowledge of basic gender equality concepts, gender analysis or gender mainstreaming policy and processes.

4c. Staff understand their roles and responsibilities related to gender mainstreaming and achieving gender results			
Exceeds minimum standards	*Meets minimum standards*	*Needs improvement*	*Inadequate*
Staff can:	Staff can:	Staff cannot:	Staff cannot:
• describe their roles and responsibilities related to gender mainstreaming, and • define gender results (possibly with one or two concrete examples).	• describe their roles and responsibilities related to gender mainstreaming, and • define some of the gender results, but may not be able to provide concrete examples.	• fully describe their role and responsibilities related to gender mainstreaming, or • fully define gender results.	• explain their role and responsibilities related to gender mainstreaming, or • define gender results.
4d. Internal and external gender expertise and resources and tools (e.g. gender policy and gender mainstreaming guidelines) provided and readily accessible to staff on appropriate and varied platforms (in print or online)			
Exceeds minimum standards	*Meets minimum standards*	*Needs improvement*	*Inadequate*
Staff have access to internal gender experts and/or know to seek help from external gender experts for more complex gender-related technical support. The organisation has readily accessible gender resources, tools and references (including their gender equality policy) online and in various print formats.	Staff have reliable access to internal gender experts. The organisation: • has made some gender resources, tools and materials (including their gender equality policy) available either online or in print, but not both, or • has made some gender resources, tools and materials available in print and online, but these are very limited and may not include the gender equality policy.	Staff have inconsistent access to both internal and external gender experts for gender mainstreaming–related tasks. The organisation's gender resources and references are only available upon request, making them less easily accessible to all.	Staff do not have anyone with gender expertise (internal or external) to call upon. The organisation has not made gender resources and references accessible to staff.

5. Programming: Policy Implementation/Action Plan

Exceeds minimum standards: 100 points
Meets minimum standards: 75 points
Needs improvement: 50 points
Inadequate: 25 points

Max. possible points: 100 points x 3 performance indicators = 300
Min. acceptable points: 75 points x 3 performance indicators = 225

Evidence base: Example documents

- Implementation, programme or gender action plans
- PMF, RBM or LFA
- Policy documents, strategic plans, gender equality policy
- Project proposals
- Risk assessment forms or templates

5a. Implementation plans and project proposals systematically mainstream gender results as stated in policy documents and/or in updated gender analyses

Exceeds minimum standards	*Meets minimum standards*	*Needs improvement*	*Inadequate*
Clear links exist between policy documents and stated gender results in implementation plans supported by up-to-date gender analysis.	Implementation plans include gender results in some of the programme areas stated in policy documents or in updated gender analyses.	Implementation plans do not follow through with the same gender equality results stated in policy documents or in updated gender analyses.	No gender results are stated in implementation plans.
The project proposal development process systematically relies on implementation plans to address gender perspectives and explicitly integrate stated gender results.	The project proposal development process addresses gender perspectives and gender results, but not systematically enough to include stated results in implementation plans.	The internal system for integrating gender perspectives and explicit gender results into the project proposal development process requires revision and improved linkages to implementation plans.	There is no internal system for integrating gender perspectives and gender results into the project proposal development process, and so gender mainstreaming is compromised.

5b. Activities contribute to gender equality results stated in action plan/strategy

Exceeds minimum standards	*Meets minimum standards*	*Needs improvement*	*Inadequate*
The proposed activities are relevant and realistic enough to lead to the stated gender results in the action plan/strategy. During the implementation of activities, there are adequate and timely mechanisms in place to assess and adjust activities so that they lead to the stated gender results.	The proposed activities are somewhat relevant and realistic enough to lead to the stated gender results in the action plan/strategy. There are no mechanisms in place to assess and adjust gender-related activities during their implementation, but activities are always adjusted as required in time.	The proposed activities are EITHER relevant OR realistic enough to lead to the stated gender results in the action plan/strategy. There are no mechanisms in place to assess and adjust gender-related activities during their implementation, and adjustments are made on an ad hoc basis.	The proposed activities are not relevant or practical enough to lead to the stated gender results in the action plan/strategy. There are no plans to assess and adjust gender-related activities during their implementation.

5c. Risk assessment and mitigation take gender equality issues into consideration

Exceeds minimum standards	*Meets minimum standards*	*Needs improvement*	*Inadequate*
Risk management systematically ensures that gender equality issues are considered and appropriate gender-sensitive mitigation strategies are developed.	Risk management considers gender issues in gender-specific projects only but also ensures appropriate gender-sensitive mitigation strategies are developed.	Risk management identifies gender-related risks, but any mitigation strategies that are developed are ineffective or inappropriate.	Risk management does not consider gender issues and there are no gender-sensitive mitigation strategies.

---

6. **Partnerships**

Exceeds minimum standards: 100 points
Meets minimum standards: 75 points
Needs improvement: 50 points
Inadequate: 25 points

Max. possible points: 100 points x 3 performance indicators = 300
Min. acceptable points: 75 points x 3 performance indicators = 225

6a. Proactive measures to engage with partners on gender equality and issues facing boys in disadvantaged circumstances are in place

Exceeds minimum standards	*Meets minimum standards*	*Needs improvement*	*Inadequate*
Through discussions with partners, the organisation has established specific measures to encourage and support partners to address gender equality and issues facing boys in disadvantaged circumstances (e.g. sharing gender equality resources, gender training, incentives to reduce gender gaps in education). A formal partnership has been established with at least 75% of the organisation's partners to reduce gender inequality through joint programmes and projects.	The organisation is in the process of establishing measures to encourage and support its partners to address gender equality and issues facing boys in disadvantaged circumstances, although further discussions with partners may be needed or are pending. A formal partnership has been established with at least 50% of partners to work towards reducing gender inequality.	The organisation may have discussed with its partners how it could further support partners' efforts to address gender equality and issues facing boys in disadvantaged circumstances, but there are no related measures, or any plans to develop specific measures, in place yet. A formal partnership has only been established with 30–50% of the organisation's partners to reduce gender inequality through joint programmes and projects.	The organisation has not discussed with its partners how it could support their efforts to address gender equality and issues facing boys in disadvantaged circumstances and has no related measures in place. A formal partnership has been established with 0–29% of the organisation's partners to reduce gender inequality through joint programmes and projects.

6b. Managers and staff are competent enough to negotiate with partners on the need to promote gender equality or issues facing boys in circumstances where they are more disadvantaged

Exceeds minimum standards	*Meets minimum standards*	*Needs improvement*	*Inadequate*
Managers and staff have the capacity to negotiate with the organisation's partners on finding ways to address gender equality or issues facing boys	Managers and staff take the initiative to raise the organisation's partners' awareness of the need to address gender equality or issues facing	Managers and staff occasionally raise with the organisation's partners the need to address gender equality and issues facing disadvantaged boys, but have	Managers and staff lack the knowledge or skills to raise the organisation's partners' awareness of gender equality and issues facing disadvantaged

in circumstances where they are disadvantaged.	disadvantaged boys, but lack the capacity to negotiate with partners on these issues.	limited capacity to raise real awareness or negotiate with partners on these issues.	boys and/or to negotiate with partners on these issues.

6c. Established links and regular networking with women-led and women-focussed NGOs, associations, and international and regional bodies/committees on gender equality and issues facing disadvantaged boys

Exceeds minimum standards	*Meets minimum standards*	*Needs improvement*	*Inadequate*
The organisation routinely engages with women-led and women-focussed NGOs and associations.	The organisation has established a working relationship with few but key women-led and women-focussed NGOs and associations.	The organisation has an ad hoc relationship with women-led and women-focussed NGOs and associations.	The organisation has no links with women-led or women-focussed NGOs or associations.
Managers and staff attend meetings with and report to international and regional bodies/committees on gender equality and issues facing disadvantaged boys at least three times a year.	Managers and staff attend meetings with and report to international and regional bodies/committees on gender equality and issues facing disadvantaged boys at least once a year.	Managers and staff attend meetings with and report to international and regional bodies/committees on gender equality and issues facing disadvantaged boys at least once every two years.	Managers and staff have never attended meetings with or reported to international and regional bodies/committees on gender equality and issues facing disadvantaged boys.

---

7. **Monitoring of Plan Implementation**

Exceeds minimum standards: 100 points
Meets minimum standards: 75 points
Needs improvement: 50 points
Inadequate: 25 points

Max. possible points: 100 points x 3 performance indicators = 300
Min. acceptable points: 75 points x 3 performance indicators = 225

Evidence base: Example documents
- Action or implementation plans
- Final evaluation, needs assessment or planning reports
- Knowledge Management system
- Monitoring and evaluation and monthly, quarterly or annual progress reports
- Organisation's website
- PMF, RBM or logical models

7a. Institutional monitoring and reporting mechanisms systematically capture gender results and lessons learned			
Exceeds minimum standards	*Meets minimum standards*	*Needs improvement*	*Inadequate*
Monitoring and reporting systems include sex-disaggregated and gender-sensitive data collection and a description of lessons learned for future gender-related programming.	Monitoring and reporting systems include the collection of sex-disaggregated data; and if not, explain their absence as well as the lack of gender-sensitive information.	Monitoring systems are inconsistent about collecting sex-disaggregated data (and/or gender-sensitive information) and/or lessons learned from gender results.	Institutional monitoring plans do not include mechanisms for capturing results and lessons learned from gender results.

7b. Project planning and management tools such as an RBM or LFA systematically integrate gender equality results			
Exceeds minimum standards	*Meets minimum standards*	*Needs improvement*	*Inadequate*
An RBM or LFA integrates one or more gender results at the outcome level supported by actions and inputs that logically contribute to stated gender results.	An RBM or LFA includes at least one specific gender result at the outcome level supported by somewhat logically linked actions and inputs.	At least one gender result is stated in an RBM or LFA at the output level but is not supported by logically related actions and inputs or higher-level outcome.	No RBM or LFA integrates gender equality results at any level.

7c. Gender mainstreaming lessons learned are used to build an evidence-based Knowledge Management system			
Exceeds minimum standards	*Meets minimum standards*	*Needs improvement*	*Inadequate*
Lessons learned from gender mainstreaming inform the Knowledge Management system, thereby contributing to its reliability and effectiveness for future programme planning and implementation.	Lessons learned from gender mainstreaming are documented but are yet to contribute to a reliable and effective Knowledge Management system.	A Knowledge Management system is yet to be developed; or if it exists, gender mainstreaming lessons learned are not systematically integrated into it.	Lessons learned from gender mainstreaming are not integrated into any Knowledge Management system, or the latter does not exist.

8. Accountability

Exceeds minimum standards: 100 points
Meets minimum standards: 75 points
Needs improvement: 50 points
Inadequate: 25 points

Max. possible points: 100 points x 3 performance indicators = 300
Min. acceptable points: 75 points x 3 performance indicators = 225

Evidence base: Example documents
- Awards/press releases recognising staff's gender equality achievements
- Consultancy TORs and contracts
- Gender equality policy or strategic plan

- Organisation's strategic plan
- Senior managers' and staff's job descriptions
- Website and social media accounts

8a. Senior managers' and staff's job descriptions reflect organisation's commitment to promoting gender equality

Exceeds minimum standards	Meets minimum standards	Needs improvement	Inadequate
Job descriptions of all senior managers and staff explicitly include gender equality concerns and responsibilities.	Gender equality is included as a key assignment only in programme managers' and programme staff's job descriptions.	Gender equality is included as a key assignment in either senior managers' or staff's job descriptions but not in both.	No gender equality concerns and responsibilities are indicated in managers' or staff's job descriptions.

8b. Accountability system in place to keep track of all gender mainstreaming work by managers and staff

Exceeds minimum standards	Meets minimum standards	Needs improvement	Inadequate
Managers and staff are held accountable for implementing gender mainstreaming processes as part of their responsibilities. There is a system in place to recognise outstanding gender equality work communicated and implemented.	Managers are held accountable for carrying out at least one gender equality–related assignment as per their designated responsibilities.	Senior managers and staff are not consistently held accountable for carrying out gender equality–related assignments.	Senior managers and staff are not held accountable for carrying out gender equality–related assignments.

8c. Consultancy terms of reference (TORs) reflect organisation's commitment to gender equality policy

Exceeds minimum standards	*Meets minimum standards*	*Needs improvement*	*Inadequate*
TORs for all consultancies explicitly refer to gender equality concerns and responsibilities.	Only TORs for consultancies related to programme support include gender equality concerns and responsibilities.	Only consultancies with a specific gender equality focus have TORs that call for the inclusion of gender equality concerns and responsibilities.	Consultancy TORs do not indicate gender equality responsibilities and concerns.

9. **Employment Equity**

Exceeds minimum standards: 100 points
Meets minimum standards: 75 points
Needs improvement: 50 points
Inadequate: 25 points

Max. possible points: 100 points x 3 performance indicators = 300
Min. acceptable points: 75 points x 3 performance indicators = 225

Evidence base: Example documents
- HR monthly, quarterly or annual reports and progress reports
- HR policy and policy implementation reports
- Organisation's website, social media or other announcements on gender balance or equity

- Policy and training reports on workplace harassment and sexual harassment

9a. Organisation supports and promotes a work environment that recognises and values women and men equally, regardless of their positions and functions in the organisation

Exceeds minimum standards	*Meets minimum standards*	*Needs improvement*	*Inadequate*
Female and male managers and staff express high satisfaction with how they are valued and treated in terms of being equal. The informal organisational culture encourages and promotes mutual respect and collaboration among female and male managers and staff.	Female and male managers and staff express moderate satisfaction with how they are valued and treated in terms of being equal. The informal organisational culture strives to encourage and promote mutual respect and collaboration among female and male managers and staff but needs improvement.	Female managers and staff express feeling less valued than and treated unequally compared to male managers and staff. The informal organisational culture is inconsistent in encouraging and promoting mutual respect and collaboration among female and male managers and staff.	Female and male managers and staff do not feel valued and treated equally. The informal organisational culture neither encourages nor promotes mutual respect and collaboration among female and male managers and staff.

9b. Visible and measurable efforts exist towards creating an enabling and supportive institutional environment that respects work-life balance for both women and men at all levels of employment

Exceeds minimum standards	Meets minimum standards	Needs improvement	Inadequate
Work-life balance issues of concern to both female and male employees have been identified and included in the HR policy along with an adequate budget line. The informal organisational culture encourages female managers and staff to take full advantage of work-life balance policies (e.g. maternity and breastfeeding leave policies).	HR policy on some issues of work-life balance (e.g. maternity/paternity leave, childcare and breastfeeding) is in effect. The informal organisational culture is not fully supportive of female managers and staff taking leave related to work-life balance issues, especially maternity and breastfeeding leave.	HR policy includes some clauses on issues of work-life balance affecting mostly female employees and requires updating. The informal organisational culture is inconsistent in encouraging female managers and staff to take leave related to work-life balance issues, especially maternity and breastfeeding leave.	HR policy only includes basic work-life balance stipulations as required by national HR regulations and laws. The informal organisational culture puts pressure on female managers and staff not to take leave related to work-life balance issues, especially maternity and breastfeeding leave.

9c. Policy against workplace harassment, including sexual harassment, developed along with adequate training and communication plans

Exceeds minimum standards	Meets minimum standards	Needs improvement	Inadequate
A policy on harassment and sexual harassment in the workplace has been both developed and implemented. This policy includes all key elements of an effective harassment and sexual harassment policy, including clear instructions on grievances and complaint procedures and victim confidentiality. Training on the harassment and sexual harassment policy is man-datory for all managers and staff.	A policy on harassment and sexual harassment in the workplace has been developed and is either awaiting final approval or yet to be implemented. This policy includes, at minimum, clear instructions on grievances and complaints procedures. Training on the harassment and sexual harassment policy is mandatory for all managers and staff.	A policy on harassment and sexual harassment in the workplace is currently under review or being developed. This policy includes, at minimum, instructions on grievances and complaints procedures. Training on the harassment and sexual harassment policy is ad hoc.	Harassment and sexual harassment are not considered priority areas that need to be included in HR policy. There is no training planned on workplace harassment or sexual harassment.

Completing the Institutional Scorecard

Discuss the scorecard in detail with managers and staff at all levels before and during the institutional self-assessment process. You may find it useful to form an assessment team with personnel from various departments, including an in-house gender expert if you have one, to collectively discuss the assessment process and scoring. Allow plenty of time for the assessment process.

Before you begin:

- Read over all nine scorecard categories.
- Familiarise yourself with the performance indicators and associated ratings.
- Make a list of all the documents that you need to conduct the scorecard assessment. Note any that are missing or unavailable, or may be more difficult to access.

Note the following points:

- **Document review:** Evidence gathering involves conducting a document review, which means examining the contents of the documents and seeing the extent to which standards are met, and then using the Document Review Form (Appendix 1) to document your key observations.
- **Survey questionnaire:** With the approval of senior management and your supervisor, email or distribute a printout of the questionnaire (Appendix 2) (revised as needed) to all staff and management. Give your colleagues at least two weeks to complete it, and send out one or two reminders closer to the deadline. This survey can be adapted to suit the specific needs of your organisation.
- **Interviews:** If the survey response rate is lower than you had hoped, try to arrange one-to-one interviews with key managers and staff to go over the scorecard and ask them which standard they think each performance indicator meets. Studies have shown that we tend to rate our own work higher than others do. Your role, as the assessor, is to challenge each response and encourage your interviewees to respond critically and honestly to give your organisation a more realistic picture of where it currently stands in the gender mainstreaming process and increase its chances of improving.

To determine the scores:

- The categories in the scorecard have performance indicators that are assessed and rated along four criteria or standards, each with their own values or points. The category score is obtained by multiplying the points by the number of indicators. Your role as the assessor is to determine the rating for each performance indicator and then write the points in the appropriate box in the Gender Mainstreaming Scorecard Worksheet (Appendix 3). If there is any uncertainty about a rating, opt for the lowest. Begin with the four core areas and then move on to the others.
- Assess and rate each performance indicator with the help of the documents you have gathered, along with any survey responses and interviews. If your assessment sits between two standards, use the lowest one.
- Use the worksheet to note key observations and comments about each category and performance indicator, how you arrived at your rating, which evidence bases you used, any recommendations, timelines for action items, and who is tasked with any action items.
- Scores are only required at the category level, and not the performance indicator level. Calculate the score for the category by using the formula indicated in the scorecard and the

worksheet. The score will help you identify which areas to prioritise for follow-up actions. For the first four categories, a score lower than 300 means gender mainstreaming efforts in these categories "need improvement" or are "inadequate." (For more detailed instructions and an example, see the worksheet.)

- If you obtain the maximum score for a category, your organisation has nothing to improve on in that category. If your score for a category is midway between the minimum and maximum scores, your organisation has to improve in a few areas, the details of which can be found in the performance indicator rating criteria section for that category. If your score is below the minimum, you should refer to the category's rating criteria section to determine where the shortfall is and how to counteract it.

- Follow-up actions are recommendations based on the scorecard assessment and conclusions. Look at the score and rating criteria section, and then recommend actions related to "meets minimum standards." If the score is at "meets minimum standards," look at "exceeds minimum standards." These standards provide you with possible follow-up actions to suggest, although you may need to adapt them according to your organisation's needs. Your ultimate goal is to move up to "meets minimum standards" or "exceeds minimum standards."

Rating Mechanism and Definitions

Exceeds minimum standards: This means that an organisation has made significant investments in gender mainstreaming in a given performance indicator. Each indicator has its own specific key criteria. There may be a very limited need for follow-up actions for indicators qualifying for this first criterion, although further actions to surpass this standard are always encouraged.

Meets minimum standards: This means serious strides have been made towards improving gender mainstreaming through policies and programmes, but more follow-up on key unmet conditions would be beneficial. Follow-up actions can be developed from the "exceeds minimum standards" section and should be noted on the worksheet.

Needs improvement: This means that the organisation still has significant work to do in promoting and achieving gender mainstreaming. A rating of "needs improvement" would be entered in the worksheet, along with decision justification, follow-up recommendations and other key information. Recommendations for what can be done in order to reach the next rating up can be derived from the "meets minimum standards" and "exceeds minimum standards" criteria. The organisation should take a measured and step-by-step approach to strengthening gender mainstreaming, because the process requires a series of complex factors to align and work together over a considerable period of time.

Inadequate: Organisations scoring as "inadequate" in any indicator may have attempted to mainstream gender but may also have faced grave challenges (e.g. lack of resources, lack of technical knowhow, uncertain political will, unstable organisational culture or lack of a uniform vision on gender equality). A rating of "inadequate" would have to be followed up with evidence-based assessment observations and follow-up recommendations noted in the worksheet. Actions to be recommended for follow-up would be best drawn initially from "meets minimum standards" and then gradually from "exceeds minimum standards."

Future Use of the Gender Scorecard

An annual self-assessment may be sufficient for most organisations and would contribute to the creation of a reliable baseline, which would go a long way in helping adjust policy and programming to reduce gender inequalities.

By compiling annual scores, an organisation would be able to monitor and adjust its gender-related investments and inefficient procedures within reasonable timelines while simultaneously improving its female and male management and staff's morale and competency levels in gender mainstreaming.

Appendix 1: Document Review Form

The document review form[3] is an optional tool to use with the Institutional Scorecard for Gender Mainstreaming to help you systematically assess documents from a gender perspective.

Example documents
The documents listed below are only examples. You may need to use different documents for your purposes.

Evaluation criteria
Evaluation criteria include key factors to look out for when reviewing documents through a gender equality lens. The list is more of a guide than a checklist. Not all the criteria will be found in all documents; some documents will have more gender equality content than indicated in the list; others may include only one or two — or even no — elements that can be deemed satisfactory, relevant or important enough. You can add more information under "other" if you find additional factors that you think are critical to the scorecard assessment process.

Comments
This column will help you keep track of observations during the self-assessment process.

Document Review Form

Example documents	*Evaluation criteria*	*Comments*
• Strategic plan (multi-year, annual) • Programme/project planning • Annual work plans • RBM, LFA • Monitoring and evaluation plans • Annual reports • Quarterly/monthly progress reports	• Analysis of gender roles, needs and constraints • Analysis of institutional and regulatory issues affecting girls/women, boys/men • Cultural constraints and regulatory barriers affecting girls/women, boys/men • Analysis of gender risks • Examples of gender issues specific to certain sectors (issues affecting girls/women as well as vulnerable boys) • Sex-disaggregated data and their implications • Specific interventions or measures and targets to remove gender barriers and support gender equality • Sex-disaggregated targets • Sex-disaggregated indicators for monitoring purposes • Gender-sensitive or qualitative indicators to capture changes in attitudes related to gender equality • Funding for interventions to reduce gender inequalities • Other:	

[3] Adapted from ITAD and Triple Line Consulting Ltd., 2009. *OHCHR performance in gender mainstreaming*.

Example documents	Evaluation criteria	Comments
• Financial documents (budgets, financial reports and statements)	• Budget lines dedicated to gender equality initiatives • Budget lines assigned to cross-cutting issues (e.g. gender equality), and percentage or dollar amount allocated and/or spent on gender equality interventions • Financial codes assigned to gender equality interventions • Other:	
• HR policy documents (HR policy implementation reports; progress reports; monthly, quarterly or annual reports) • Job descriptions • Terms of reference • Organisation's publications on gender balance • Organisation's website, social media accounts, announcements on employment equity	• Clause on employment equity • Gender balance targets for management and technical positions • Maternity/parental leave, breastfeeding • Work-life balance policy • Policy on harassment, sexual harassment • Include requirements for knowledge of and/or capacity on gender equality • Include gender equality responsibilities and concerns • Other:	

Appendix 2: Staff Survey Questionnaire

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this short survey.[4]

Your organisation is conducting a self-assessment of its gender mainstreaming status to determine how it has performed so far and how it can move forward with more focus on gender equality. The following questions will ask about your thoughts and personal experience related to gender mainstreaming in your organisation. The purpose of gathering staff perceptions on the status of gender equality in the organisation's programmes and processes is to create a baseline. Staff surveys provide important information — primary data — that complements data collected through document reviews — secondary data. Furthermore, because staff perceptions provide primary data, they can be used to verify if the secondary data convey similar information or not, enabling the assessor to identify possible gaps in the available information.

For each statement, reflect on how much you think your organisation is doing that activity. Tick the box that most reflects your belief, using the rating scale of 1 to 5: 1 means you think the organisation is not doing that activity or is doing it only to a very small degree and 5 means you think your organisation is doing that activity to a great degree. Your scores, combined with those of your colleagues, will contribute to identifying strategies to increase your organisation's gender equality practices. The final two questions ask for your suggestions and opinions. The answers to these questions will be collated, analysed and synthesised.

Your responses will be kept confidential and anonymous. You are not required to include your name.

---

[4] Adapted from InterAction, *The gender audit handbook: A tool for organizational self assessment and transformation* (Washington, DC: InterAction, 2010).

	1 (to a small degree)	2	3 (to a moderate degree)	4	5 (to a great degree)
1. Does your organisation have a written gender policy affirming a commitment to gender equality?					
2. Are proactive measures taken to recruit or promote women into senior management positions?					
3. Is gender taken into account during strategic planning?					
4. In your organisation, do men have an easier time establishing personal and professional networks within the organisation than women?					
5. Are staff in your organisation committed to implementing the gender policy?					
6. Are gender equality goals and objectives included in programme/project design?					
7. Is gender taken into account during policy development or strategic planning?					
8. Are proactive measures in place to recruit or promote women into senior management positions?					
9. Do gender equality initiatives in your organisation have their own sufficient budget?					
10. Do programme/project planning, monitoring, evaluation and advisory teams in your organisation consist of members committed to gender equality?					
11. Is gender awareness included in your job description?					
12. Do you feel you have the necessary knowledge, skills and attitudes to carry out your work with gender awareness?					
13. Is there training of project and programme staff in integrating gender equality into planning and analysis?					
14. Is there a person or division responsible for gender issues in your organisation?					
15. Are gender equality objectives and results included in programme/project design?					
16. Do your organisation's programmes and projects contribute to empowering women and girls or boys in areas where they are more disadvantaged and to reducing gender inequalities?					
17. Do your organisation's programmes have gender-sensitive sector-specific indicators?					
18. Are sex-disaggregated data collected for programmes and projects?					
19. Do women and men in your organisation feel equally valued and respected?					
20. Does your organisation reinforce gender-sensitive behaviour and procedures to prevent and address sexual harassment?					

21. Please describe any successes or challenges you have experienced in integrating gender concerns in programming or other aspects of work in your organisation.

_____

_____

_____

22. What do you think your organisation should do to mainstream gender equality?

_____

_____

_____

About you

1. Are you ☐ female ☐ male ☐ other (please check appropriate box)

2. Age: ☐ 21-30 ☐ 31-40 ☐ 41-50 ☐ 51-60 ☐ 61-70 ☐ 71+

3. How many years have you worked at your organisation? _____

4. What is your position in your organisation?
☐ administrative staff ☐ support staff ☐ programme staff ☐ management ☐ other

Thank you for your participation!

Appendix 3: Gender Mainstreaming Scorecard Worksheet

This worksheet is presented in the same order as the scorecard, but is designed to help the assessor stay aware of the various elements of the self-assessment process (e.g. ratings assigned to performance indicators, evidence base used, comments and observations, recommendations). Instructions on how to complete the worksheet are listed below. An example of how to fill it out is shown on the shaded worksheet, immediately before the blank worksheet.

The worksheet includes total scores for each category. Focus your initial gender mainstreaming efforts on the first four (core) categories. You can then work on the remaining five categories.

Only the maximum possible and minimum acceptable scores are provided at category level (aggregate level).

Example of how a category score is obtained:

Reference	How to obtain the total score for each category
Category 1 Maximum possible score: Max. points (100) x No. of performance indicators in category = 100 x 4 = 400 Minimum acceptable score: Min. points (75) x No. of performance indicators in category = 75 x 4 = 300	Category total points (or Total Score): Add up points assigned to each criterion in Category 1 For example: 75 + 100 + 50 + 25 = 250

At the end of the worksheet, add up the scores from all the categories to find the final overall score for your organisation — to give you an understanding of how your organisation's overall gender mainstreaming efforts rate — or look at them individually. Focus on the four core categories first and identify areas of action if the score is below the maximum possible.

The following two pages show how points could be assigned first to performance indicators and then to the overall category. They also show how the other columns could be filled out.

Category and Performance Indicators	Assessment Rating (Select applicable criterion based on your assessment)	Score Points (Mark criteria points at indicator level. Add these up and put total score for each category in the top (shaded) category row)	Evidence Base Consulted (Per indicator)	Comments/ Observations	Recommended Remedial Actions	Action Timeline	Person/ Department Responsible
1. Leadership and Organisational Culture *Category 1:* *Max. possible points: 100 points x 4 performance indicators = 400* *Min. acceptable points: 75 x 4 = 300*		**Category 1 Total score = 75+100+50+25 = 250**	_Comments on Total Score:_ *250 is below the total minimum acceptable points for Category 1. The organisation will need to take action to improve 1c and 1d, as these have the lowest ratings. Remedial actions and related information are noted in the respective performance indicator rows.*				
1a. Senior managers are committed to gender mainstreaming	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points	-	Management or staff meeting minutes, internal memos, announcements on website, press releases, staff survey (interviews)	Managers strongly committed to gender mainstreaming, but unable to provide appropriate guidance or support	• Interview or survey managers about how they can be supported to develop their role in promoting gender mainstreaming • Promote, explore with management how more managers could champion gender mainstreaming	3 months from now: 30 April 2016	Gender focal person to collaborate with Programme Manager
	Meets min. standards: 75 points	75					
	Needs improvement: 50 points	-					
	Inadequate: 25 points	-					
1b. Senior managers promote gender equality in all operations and communications	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points	100	Above documents + programme meeting minutes, directive emails	Evidence shows programme managers meet first rating criteria for this performance indicator	No action required	-	-
	Meets min. standards: 75 points	-					
	Needs improvement: 50 points	-					
	Inadequate: 25 points	-					

1c. Organisation has a clear policy and/or strategy on equal representation of women in technical and senior positions (Employment Equity)	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points	-	Strategic plan, gender policy, HR policy and reports, job ads	• No policy/ strategy on equal representa-tion of women • Gender targets exist, but no plan for achieving them • No data available on gender targets achieved so far	• Develop policy/strategy on equal representation of women in technical and decision-making positions • Develop plan for meeting gender targets • Collect data on gender targets	June 2016 (within 6 months)	HR Director, with support from Gender focal person
	Meets min. standards: 75 points	-					
	Needs improvement: 50 points	50					
	Inadequate: 25 points	-					
1d. Staff at all levels understand gender mainstreaming and are supportive of the process	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points	-	Staff meeting minutes, staff survey	• Not all staff able to describe gender main-streaming or how they can support it • Programming staff can explain gender main-streaming but are not sure about the role they play in the gender mainstream-ing process	• Increase all staff's awareness of gender mainstreaming and their respective roles in the process through brief awareness sessions and interactive online courses or other training • Provide specific training on how programming staff can develop confidence in gender mainstreaming	8 months from today	• Programme Manager • Gender focal person
	Meets min. standards: 75 points	-					
	Needs improvement: 50 points	-					
	Inadequate: 25 points	25					

Blank Worksheet

Category and Performance Indicators		Assessment Rating	Points	Evidence Base Consulted	Comments/ Observations	Recommended Remedial Actions	Action Timeline	Person/ Department Responsible
1. Leadership and Organisational Culture *Max. possible points for Category 1: 100 points x 4 performance indicators = 400 Min. acceptable points for Category 1: 75 points x 4 performance indicators = 300*			Category 1 Total score =	*Comments on Total Score:*				
1a. Senior managers are committed to gender mainstreaming	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points							
	Meets min. standards: 75 points							
	Needs improvement: 50 points							
	Inadequate: 25 points							
1b. Senior managers promote gender equality in all operations and communications	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points							
	Meets min. standards: 75 points							
	Needs improvement: 50 points							
	Inadequate: 25 points							
1c. Organisation has a clear policy and/or strategy on equal representation of	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points							
	Meets min. standards: 75 points							

women in technical and senior positions (Employment Equity)	Needs improvement: 50 points						
	Inadequate: 25 points						
1d. Staff at all levels understand gender mainstreaming and are supportive of the process	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points						
	Meets min. standards: 75 points						
	Needs improvement: 50 points						
	Inadequate: 25 points						
2. Policy and Priority Setting *Max. possible points: 100 x 4 = 400* *Min. acceptable points: 75 x 4 = 300*		Category 2 Total score =	Comments on Total Score:				
2a. Policy documents include gender analysis relevant to sector and context based on up-to-date evidence	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points						
	Meets min. standards: 75 points						
	Needs improvement: 50 points						
	Inadequate: 25 points						
2b. Gender equality is explicitly stated in all policy documents as development goals and critical goals that support the achievement of other development goals pursued by the	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points						
	Meets min. standards: 75 points						
	Needs improvement: 50 points						
	Inadequate: 25 points						

institution and established internationally (e.g. MDGs, SDGs)							
2c. Gender equality policy is updated and revised at least every five years to reflect current gender issues in relevant programme areas and operational context	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points						
	Meets min. standards: 75 points						
	Needs improvement: 50 points						
	Inadequate: 25 points						
2d. Gender policy is used as a guidance document for all gender mainstreaming processes	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points						
	Meets min. standards: 75 points						
	Needs improvement: 50 points						
	Inadequate: 25 points						
3. Resource Allocation and Disbursement *Max. possible points: 100 x 4 = 400* *Min. acceptable points: 75 x 4 = 300*	Category 3 Total score =	Comments on Total Score:					
3a. Funding for gender equality initiatives is determined at programme planning stage and funds are disbursed accordingly	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points						
	Meets min. standards: 75 points						
	Needs improvement: 50 points						
	Inadequate: 25 points						

3b. Monitoring and evaluation of gender equality initiatives is adequately financed	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points						
	Meets min. standards: 75 points						
	Needs improvement: 50 points						
	Inadequate: 25 points						
3c. Funds for Employment Equity policy implementation and gender expertise sufficiently meet planned and changing needs	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points						
	Meets min. standards: 75 points						
	Needs improvement: 50 points						
	Inadequate: 25 points						
3d. Reliable and accurate financial tracking system established to monitor allocated and disbursed funds on gender equality	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points						
	Meets min. standards: 75 points						
	Needs improvement: 50 points						
	Inadequate: 25 points						
4. Capacity and Competence *Max. possible points: 100 x 4 = 400* *Min. acceptable points: 75 x 4 = 300*		Category 4 Total score =	Comments on Total Score:				
4a. Managers are knowledgeable about key gender issues affecting programme areas	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points						
	Meets min. standards: 75 points						

	Needs improvement: 50 points						
	Inadequate: 25 points						
4b. Staff have a common understanding of gender equality and gender mainstreaming policy and processes	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points						
	Meets min. standards: 75 points						
	Needs improvement: 50 points						
	Inadequate: 25 points						
4c. Staff understand their roles and responsibilities related to gender mainstreaming and achieving gender results	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points						
	Meets min. standards: 75 points						
	Needs improvement: 50 points						
	Inadequate: 25 points						
4d. Internal and external gender expertise and resources and tools (e.g. gender policy and gender mainstreaming guidelines) provided and readily accessible to staff on appropriate and varied platforms (in print or online)	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points						
	Meets min. standards: 75 points						
	Needs improvement: 50 points						
	Inadequate: 25 points						

5. Programming: Policy Implementation/Action Plan *Max. possible points: 100 x 3 = 300* *Min. acceptable score: 75 x 3 = 225*		Category 5 Total score =	Comments on Total Score:					
5a. Implementation plans and project proposals systematically mainstream gender results as stated in policy documents and/or in updated gender analyses	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points							
	Meets min. standards: 75 points							
	Needs improvement: 50 points							
	Inadequate: 25 points							
5b. Activities contribute to gender equality results stated in action plan/strategy	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points							
	Meets min. standards: 75 points							
	Needs improvement: 50 points							
	Inadequate: 25 points							
5c. Risk assessment and mitigation take gender equality issues into consideration	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points							
	Meets min. standards: 75 points							
	Needs improvement: 50 points							
	Inadequate: 25 points							
6. Partnerships *Max. possible score: 100 x 3 = 300* *Min. acceptable score: 75 x 3 = 225*		Category 6 Total score =	Comments on Total Score:					
6a. Proactive measures to engage with partners	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points							

on gender equality and issues facing boys in disadvantaged circumstances are in place	Meets min. standards: 75 points						
	Needs improvement: 50 points						
	Inadequate: 25 points						
6b. Managers and staff are competent enough to negotiate with partners on the need to promote gender equality or issues facing boys in circumstances where they are more disadvantaged	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points						
	Meets min. standards: 75 points						
	Needs improvement: 50 points						
	Inadequate: 25 points						
6c. Established links and regular networking with women-led and women-focussed NGOs, associations, and international and regional bodies/committees on gender equality and issues facing disadvantaged boys	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points						
	Meets min. standards: 75 points						
	Needs improvement: 50 points						
	Inadequate: 25 points						
7. Monitoring of Plan Implementation *Max. possible score: 100 x 3 = 300* *Min. acceptable score: 75 x 3 = 225*		Category 7 Total score =	Comments on Total Score:				
7a. Institutional monitoring and	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points						

reporting mechanisms systematically capture gender results and lessons learned	Meets min. standards: 75 points						
	Needs improvement: 50 points						
	Inadequate: 25 points						
7b. Project planning and management tools such as an RBM or LFA systematically integrate gender equality results	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points						
	Meets min. standards: 75 points						
	Needs improvement: 50 points						
	Inadequate: 25 points						
7c. Gender mainstreaming lessons learned are used to build an evidence-based Knowledge Management system	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points						
	Meets min. standards: 75 points						
	Needs improvement: 50 points						
	Inadequate: 25 points						
8. Accountability *Max. possible score: 100 x 3 = 300* *Min. acceptable score: 75 x 3 = 225*		Category 8 Total score =	Comments on Total Score:				
8a. Senior managers' and staff's job descriptions reflect the organisation's commitment to promoting gender equality	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points						
	Meets min. standards: 75 points						
	Needs improvement: 50 points						
	Inadequate: 25 points						

8b. Accountability system in place to keep track of all gender mainstreaming work by managers and staff	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points						
	Meets min. standards: 75 points						
	Needs improvement: 50 points						
	Inadequate: 25 points						
8c. Consultancy terms of reference (TORs) reflect organisation's commitment to gender equality policy	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points						
	Meets min. standards: 75 points						
	Needs improvement: 50 points						
	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points						
9. Employment Equity *Max. possible score: 100 x 3 = 300* *Min. acceptable score: 75 x 3 = 225*		Category 9 Total score =	Comments on Total Score:				
9a. Organisation supports and promotes a work environment that recognises and values women and men equally, regardless of their positions and functions in the organisation	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points						
	Meets min. standards: 75 points						
	Needs improvement: 50 points						
	Inadequate: 25 points						

9b. Visible and measurable efforts exist towards creating an enabling and supportive institutional environment that respects work-life balance for both women and men at all levels of employment	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points						
	Meets min. standards: 75 points						
	Needs improvement: 50 points						
	Inadequate: 25 points						
9c. Policy against workplace harassment, including sexual harassment, developed along with adequate training and communication plans	Exceeds min. standards: 100 points						
	Meets min. standards: 75 points						
	Needs improvement: 50 points						
	Inadequate: 25 points						
OPTIONAL Total Overall Score: Sum of all Total Category Scores *Total Overall Max. Score = 3,100* *Total Overall Min. Score = 2,325*		Total overall score =	Comments on Total Overall Score:				

References

Commonwealth of Learning. (2009). COL's corporate policy on gender. Retrieved from
http://hdl.handle.net/11599/710 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0 CC BY-NC-ND)
InterAction. (2010). *The gender audit handbook: A tool for organizational self assessment and transformation*.
Washington, DC: InterAction.
ITAD and Triple Line Consulting Ltd. (2009). *OHCHR performance in gender mainstreaming*. Retrieved from
www.itad.com/projects/ohchr-performance-in-gender-mainstreaming

Permissions obtained
Permission obtained to use: ITAD Ltd. Document Review Form