GIJTR

Global Initiative for Justice,
Truth & Reconciliation

GIJTR EVALUATION RUBRIC TEMPLATE

This evaluation rubric was developed using data collected during the annual Consortium meeting (during a collaborative design session) and partner feedback on a draft document. After reviewing notes from the Consortium meeting, additional partner feedback after the meeting, and supplementary documents (e.g., quarterly reports, external reports), performance descriptors were developed for categories related to Consortium activities.

How to read this document

Each table is divided by the quality / level of results (3-high; 2-satisfactory; 1-low or negative). In each table, performance descriptors—at the level identified for that table (e.g., 3-high)—were developed for each category (e.g., forensics, human rights documentation). When reading this document, you will need to reference each table to see every level for each performance descriptor.

When reviewing, it might be easiest to print this document on one-sided sheets, so you can compare the descriptors in each table against one another. This way, you can line up Table 3 (high performance) next to Table 2 (satisfactory performance) and Table 1 (low).

Using rubrics

Please note: (1) This rubric should be seen as a menu of options, as a way to build a custom project-specific rubric. Each partner should choose the performance descriptors that are most relevant for their project. If a project is related to memorialization and community engagement, then it is likely that the partner would select a few performance descriptors in these categories. It is not necessary to select all of the performance descriptors in each category. Also, if a project is related to memorialization, but not human rights documentation; then the partner would not need to select a descriptor from the latter category. (2) The performance descriptors in the rubric act as a guideline to think about the quality of outcomes, not quantity. If performance is quantifiable, please include performance indicators in the project M&E Plan.

At the start of each project (or, at the start of each evaluation), project staff will choose the performance descriptors that are most relevant for their activities. Project staff can select as many, or as few, descriptors. However, if the descriptor is relevant, please select it. These qualitative criteria are meant to supplement the quantitative indicators in project M&E Plans. While some project activities can be judged using quantitative indicators, many of the Consortium's activities need to be assessed using qualitative terms. The rubric goes beyond simple indicators; it provides specific criteria to assess the quality of results / outcomes (i.e., how good is good).

When finalizing project documents, partners can include their indicators (w/ quantitative targets) in their project-specific rubrics. This would provide one comprehensive evaluation rubric, with quantitative and qualitative targets. The descriptors should be seen as benchmarks, or targets, which the evaluator can use to rate the quality or success of a specific project component. These descriptors should aid the evaluator in drawing conclusions about project quality or success (i.e., aiding the interpretation of valuing success).

If a project-specific rubric is developed at the start of a project, it can be refined during project implementation so the measures are reliable (similarly to indicators in an M&E Plan). The rubric should be finalized before the evaluation starts. Each performance descriptor can be measured using various methods (e.g., interviews, focus groups, participatory community consultations). When selecting performance descriptors, Partners should add text to make each phrase more descriptive, if needed. Clear

descriptors will aid evaluators and project teams in interpreting quality / success during the evaluation. Below, some text has been left highlighted, as those words or phrases likely need additional explanation from each Partner.

3- Performance is clearly very strong or exemplary in relation to the key area. Any gaps or weaknesses are not significant and are managed effectively. There is always or nearly always evidence of the following:	2 - Performance meets satisfactory expectations / requirements as far as can be determined. Less significant gaps or weaknesses are mostly managed effectively:	1 - Performance is low in relation to the objective. Does not meet minimum expectations / criteria:
Forensics		
• Documentation of processes and collection of evidence—e.g., ante-mortem interview, remains examination, excavations, exhumations, database, biological profile—exceed standard practice (possible to add certification or standard, or modify the list of processes). • Family members participate and meaningfully engage in the forensic investigative process. • Victims and affected communities believe that the forensics process is not only efficient and effective, but also legitimate. • Transitional justice mechanisms accept and use evidence from forensic investigative processes. • There is always evidence that contingency and risk mitigation plans are developed and used in cases where family members still believe loved ones are alive. See Community Engagement and	• Documentation of processes and collection of evidence—e.g., ante-mortem interview, remains examination, excavations, exhumations, database, biological profile—meet standard practice (possible to add certification or standard). • Family members are consulted during the forensic investigative process. • Victims and affected communities believe that the forensics process is efficient and effective. • Transitional justice mechanisms accept evidence from forensic investigative processes. • There is some evidence that contingency plans and mitigation plans are developed and used in cases where family members still believe loved ones are alive. See Community Engagement and	• Documentation of processes and collection of evidence—e.g., ante-mortem interview, remains examination, excavations, exhumations, database, biological profile—fall below standard practice (possible to add certification or standard). • Family members are not consulted during the forensic investigative process, or there is little evidence that this occurred. • Victims and affected communities do not believe that the forensics process is legitimate. • Transitional justice mechanisms do not accept evidence from forensic investigative processes. • There is little evidence that contingency plans and mitigation plans are developed and used in cases where family members still

Participatory Processes for additional examples. • See Self-care and Psychosocial Support for additional examples.	Participatory Processes for additional examples. • See Self-care and Psychosocial Support for additional examples.	believe loved ones are alive. See Community Engagement and Participatory Processes for additional examples. • See Self-care and Psychosocial Support for additional examples.
Memorialization		
• Community members report that memorialization enables a significant level of healing. • Community members report that memorialization provides a sense of closure. • Community members (those not directly experiencing the conflict; without memory of the conflict) demonstrate a strong understanding of the history of the conflict, the human rights abuses perpetrated, and the impact on victims. • See Community Engagement and Participatory Processes for additional examples. • See Self-care and Psychosocial Support for additional examples.	• Community members report that memorialization enables an adequate sense of healing. • Community members report that tensions / divisions have improved slightly. • See Community Engagement and Participatory Processes for additional examples. • See Self-care and Psychosocial Support for additional examples.	• Community members report that memorialization does little to provide healing or re-traumatizes survivors. • Community members report that the status quo is maintained or tensions / divisions have worsened. • See Community Engagement and Participatory Processes for additional examples. • See Self-care and Psychosocial Support for additional examples.
Community Engagement and Participatory Processes		
• Community participants feel their priorities and needs were included within the design and implementation of the project, in that they were meaningfully included in project design / needs	• Community participants feel many of their priorities and needs were included within the design and implementation of the project, in that they were included in project design / needs	• Project approaches and strategies do not meet or negatively affect community rights to justice. • Community participants feel that their understanding

assessments and decision-making processes. • Community participants feel that they have a new and helpful understanding of transitional justice processes. • Community participants are well informed and highly engaged in national or local truth, justice and reconciliation activities, in that they feel they were able to contribute meaningfully to these processes. • CSOs are highly engaged [select based on relevance: (i) in the project; (ii) in national or local TJ processes], in ways that maximize community participation and engagement. • Respondents (CSOs, communities, authorities) fully agree that trust has been built with traumatized communities. • [Select: (i) Projects; (ii) TJ processes] are inclusive of traditionally marginalized populations (e.g. ethnic minorities, rural populations). • [Select: (i) Projects; (ii) TJ processes] include intergenerational components.	assessments and decision-making processes. There is room for improvement regarding community inclusion in project design. • Community participants feel that they have an adequate understanding of transitional justice processes. • Community participants are informed of national or local truth, justice and reconciliation activities, but may not be meaningfully consulted or engaged. • CSO actions demonstrate sufficient support for community participation and engagement. • Respondents (CSOs, communities, authorities) somewhat agree that trust has been built with traumatized communities.	of transitional justice processes have not improved. • Community participants feel unwelcome or relegated during national or local truth, justice and reconciliation activities. • Information has been withheld or presented in ways that prevent meaningful community involvement.
Networking and Coalition Building		
• Participants have developed well-functioning working relationships between local authorities and community	• Working relationships between local authorities and community leaders have been developed, however, there is	• Communication and coordination efforts between local authorities and community leaders have

leaders, in ways that relationships will continue after the project ends. • Documenters (CSOs, communities, authorities) have developed well-functioning connections and working relationships, in that they are coordinating documentation efforts with other organizations. • Civil society actors network and build connections to form effective coalitions, which help to strengthen advocacy efforts calling for strengthened TJ processes. • Advocacy efforts lead to civil society actors being included in high-level TJ-related processes, negotiations, or consultations.	room for improvement in communication and coordination efforts. • Documenters (CSOs, communities, authorities) have developed connections and working relationships, but there is room for improvement in coordinating documentation efforts with other organizations. • Civil society actors start networking and building connections. There is evidence that actors are beginning to work on coordinated advocacy efforts calling for strengthened TJ processes.	been low, or they have stalled or deteriorated. • Documenters (CSOs, communities, authorities) have not engaged with other organizations, or working relationships have deteriorated due to competition.
Advocacy and Awareness		
• Community language and content are clearly evident in national or local truth, justice and reconciliation activities. • Victims and survivors meaningfully engage in advocacy efforts, in that they participate or lead messaging, campaigns, or meetings. • Influencers (e.g., media) have primarily published or broadcast positive materials on transitional justice processes. • CSOs / communities (those responsible for advocacy	• Community language and content are somewhat evident in national or local truth, justice and reconciliation activities. • Survivors' language and content are used for advocacy efforts, through messaging, campaigns, or meetings, but there is room to improve meaningful engagement and participation. • There is increased public awareness on the importance and benefits of human right	• Community language and content are scarcely used or not evident in national or local truth, justice and reconciliation activities. • Survivors' language and content are scarcely used or not evident in advocacy efforts, through messaging, campaigns, or meetings. • Influencers (e.g., media) have primarily published or broadcast negative materials on transitional justice processes.

initiative) perceive that advocacy plans have been effectively implemented. • CSOs / communities feel that they would be highly capable of undertaking advocacy and awareness work after the project comes to an end (without assistance from the project).	documentation and transitional justice processes. • CSOs / communities feel that they would be capable of undertaking advocacy and awareness work after the project comes to an end (without assistance from the project), but there is some doubt or room for improvement.	• CSOs / communities feel that they would not be capable of undertaking advocacy and awareness work after the project comes to an end (without assistance from the project).

Self-care and Psychosocial Support

• Participants are highly capable in identifying coping and self-care strategies, to address their experiences and those of other survivors. • There is always evidence that psychosocial services (as a project-related service) are available to support interviewees distressed by recalling events during project activities (documentation, support workshops). [Please note: this could be used as Level 3-High or Level 2-Satisfactory, depending on whether this is designed as a project requirement. If a requirement, please move this descriptor to Level 2.] • Participants identify extensive referral pathways and refer victims in need of follow-on services to these pathways. In most cases, participants are able	• Support workshops provide a safe space for survivors to reflect on their experiences. • Participants are capable of identifying coping and self-care strategies, to address their experiences and journeys, and those of other survivors. • There is mostly evidence that psychosocial services (as a project-related service) are available to support interviewees distressed by recalling events during project activities (documentation, support workshops). [Please note: this could be used as Level 2-Satisfactory or Level 1-Low, depending on whether this is designed as a project requirement. If a requirement, please move this descriptor to Level 1.]	• Survivors do not feel that support workshops provide a safe space to reflect on their experiences. • Participants are not capable of identifying coping and self-care strategies, to address their experiences and journeys, or those of other survivors. • There is evidence that psychosocial services (as a project-related service) are not adequately available to support interviewees distressed by recalling events during project activities (documentation, support workshops). [Please note: if the descriptor from Level 2-Satisfactory has been moved to this performance level, please delete this line.]

to track that victims use these referrals.		
Human Rights Documentation		
• Documenters are highly skilled in collecting statements / testimonies in systematic and standardized ways, including the use of a credible and standard tools according to international best practices outlined in PILPG's documentation handbook. • Documenters are well versed and confident in securely storing statements / testimonies in systematic and standardized ways that addresses digital and physical security challenges. • Documenters have established good working relationships to facilitate the ability to obtain location entry authorization. • Documenters always obtain informed consent, explain the purpose of documentation to respondents, and conduct interviews in an ethical manner. Within informed consent, documenters consult interviewees so they can provide input on how their testimonies are used. • Transitional justice mechanisms accept and use documentation (i.e., documentation meets evidentiary standards).	• Documenters demonstrate adequate skills in collecting statements / testimonies, but there is room for improvement. • Documenters demonstrate adequate skills in securely storing statements / testimonies, but there is room for improvement. • Documenters experience some trouble in obtaining location entry authorization, but overcome difficulties. • Community respondents have the expectation that a documentation process may not lead to immediate results or benefits. • Documenters always obtain informed consent.	• Documenters are not collecting statements / testimonies in systematic and standardized ways, for the most part. • Documenters are not securely storing statements / testimonies, for the most part. • Documenters do not obtain location entry authorization. • Community respondents have the expectation that a documentation process will lead to immediate results or benefits. • There is evidence that documenters do not always obtain informed consent.

Education		
• Materials (e.g., reports, toolkits, manuals, guides) formed by educators (involved in the project) are used in the national or local education system. • After training / workshops, educators incorporate innovative ways of including topics related to transitional justice and atrocities in lesson plans, in that they are drawing on training materials but bringing in their own new ideas.	• Education officials consult educators (involved in the project) for ideas on how to improve curriculum, lessons, guides, etc. • After training, educators incorporate topics of transitional justice and atrocities in lesson plans by drawing on training materials.	• Materials (e.g., reports, toolkits, manuals, guides) formed by educators (involved in the project) are not used in schools. • Education officials do not consult educators (involved in the project) for ideas on how to improve curriculum, lessons, guides, etc at the local or national level. • After training, educators do not incorporate topics of transitional justice and atrocities in lesson plans.