The African Journal of Monitoring and Evaluation

Gender Responsive Monitoring and Evaluation (GRME) Approach: Principles, Practices and Process

Author(s): Isaac Odhiambo-Abuya[1, 2]
[1] Department of Management Science and Project Planning, University of Nairobi;
[2]Center for Policy Projects

2025: Vol 3(1), pp. 373-395
@The Author(s), 2025
Reprints and permissions:
The Regional Center for Project Management and Evaluation Training
eISSN 2958-9436

Received: 30/08/2025, Revised: 02/11/2025, Accepted: 16/11/2025

Copyright: © The Author(s), 2025. Published by The Regional Center for Project Management and Evaluation Training. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Gender Responsive Monitoring and Evaluation (GRME) Approach: Principles, Practices and Process

Isaac Odhiambo- Abuya
Department of Management Science and Project Planning,
University of Nairobi
Center for Policy Projects

ABSTRACT

Gender-Responsive Monitoring and Evaluation (GRME) is quite a crucial framework that aims at ensuring development interventions are equitable, effective and sustainable. The conceptual investigation of GRME presented in this paper provides the description of the main principles, practices, and processes of this systemic and innovative solution. It upholds that GRME is a paradigm shift from the gender-neutral M&E, because it not only advocates for the disaggregation of data by gender, but acting as an active force in posing inquiries regarding power structures, social norms, and structural imbalances. It demonstrates that the application of specific practices, such as gender-responsive stakeholder analysis, development of indicators, and data collection are informed by the concepts of intersectionality, social justice, and empowerment in a cyclical planning and utilization process. The study concludes that GRME is needed in ensuring meaningful accountability to the promise of gender equality and provides helpful evidence to transformative programming and policy. Finally, it summarizes certain areas of concern relative to the field, and gives recommendations on the ways in which the theoretical foundation and working practice of GRME can be strengthened to produce maximum impact.

Keywords: Gender-Responsive Monitoring and Evaluation (GRME); Gender Equality; Social Justice; Intersectionality; Feminist Evaluation; Empowerment; Gender-Sensitive Indicators

INTRODUCTION

The concept of gender-responsive monitoring and evaluation (GRME) has become an inevitable approach to development and government policies in the 21st century. Its key role is to make sure that programs and interventions are effective, as well as fair and inclusive by closely monitoring gender-path specific effects (Morgan et. al. 2024; Fardela et. al. 2023; Wrobelwski & Stadler, 2024). This model goes beyond aggregate measures of success and ensures that stakeholders are responsible to deliver results across diverse gender groups as well as to uncover the institutional forces that continue to uphold inequality (Morgan et. al. 2024; Fardela et. al. 2023). GRME offers the toolkit that is necessary in the times when gender equality is evolving, and ambitious global agendas such as Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) assume transforming the idea of gender equality into social change (Leal Filho et. al. 2022; Zickafoose et. al. 2024).

The urgency of such a focused approach is dramatically exposed by the reported shortcomings of gender-neutral or gender-blind policies (Radjabova, 2022; Greaves and Ritz, 2022). These mostly well-meant, yet undifferentiated interventions frequently do not help to overcome underlying disparities and in most instances, actually contribute towards or even heighten the existing disparities (Kalbarczyk et. al. 2025). A gender-blind perspective threatens to conceal the divergence needs and experiences as well as power structures between individuals that influence their access to resources, level of decision-making, and derivation of development programs (Radjabova, 2022; Greaves & Ritz, 2022). This means that to produce fair and sustainable results, one must adopt a conscious and subtle approach that considers and is proactive in dealing with these complexities (Leal Filho et. al. 2022; Zickafoose et. al. 2024).

GRME, thus, is a paradigm shift in the approach and philosophy of M&E. A transformative practice that involves a gender perspective in the whole cycle of M&E, not just a technical add-on, is required (Morgan et. al. 2024; Fardela et. al. 2023; Wrobelwski & Stadler, 2024). GRME creates the evidence needed by setting up evaluations with a constructive design to reveal the different impacts of interventions on women, men, girls and boys and gender minorities (Kalbarczyk et. al. 2025; van Rensburg and Mapitsa, 2017). It allows and ensures that the goals of development do not marginalize anyone and the investments in social progress really serve to create a more fair world of all people (Leal Filho et. al. 2022; Zickafoose et. al. 2024).

Conceptualizing Gender Responsive Monitoring and Evaluation

The GRME conceptualization must extend beyond a mere definition of gender-responsiveness to express the transformative nature of the concept as an innovative practice in the M&E discipline. GRME is fundamentally a meditated procedure that incorporates the unique requirements, priorities, and experiences of women, men, and gender minorities into all the phases of M&E in order to identify the gendered effects of programs and policies (Kalbarczyk et. al. 2025; van Rensburg & Mapitsa, 2017; Morgan et. al. 2024; Sprooule, Podems & Negroustoueva, 2025). It includes a purposeful gathering and processing of the sex- and gender-disaggregated data, the implementation of the gender-sensitive indicators, and a rigorous study of the power relationships in order to comprehend how an intervention influences individuals in different ways. The long-term goal is to leverage this fined insight to achieve better future results and promote increased gender equality (Morgan et. al. 2024).

The core difference between GRME and traditional M&E is that it is very specific to power relations. Conventional M&E tends to work on the basis that there is a homogeneous group of beneficiaries which may overlook serious differences. GRME, by contrast, explicitly takes into account how the power relations between and among various gender groups play an important role in determining who gains access to resources, who makes decisions, and who eventually gains benefits of a program (Kalbarczyk et. al. 2025; van Rensburg & Mapitsa, 2017; Morgan et. al. 2024). Making these dynamics visible, GRME will go past the simple counts of participation and start to analyze whether an intervention is undermining or perpetuating the structural inequalities in place.

GRME is a methodologically operationalized activity, meaning that its postulations are translated into action by the use of key practices. The fundamental element is the planning and application of sex- disaggregated indicators and gender-sensitive data collection instruments. This is not just about tallying the number of male and female individuals involved but the alteration of the gender norms, access to and control of resources, and leadership positions (Morgan et. al. 2024). In the absence of such disaggregated data, it is difficult to see the gender-specific effects, and interventions cannot be precisely designed to respond to the special challenges of various groups.

Moreover, it is impossible to conceptualize GRME without the principle of meaningful participation. It makes sure that different stakeholders especially women and others who represent the marginalized gender groups not only serve as a source of data, but also as an agent of M&E process itself (Kalbarczyk et. al. 2025; van Rensburg & Mapitsa, 2017; Morgan et. al. 2024). They can be involved in the design stage all the way to the interpretation of the findings so that the questions guiding the evaluations will be pertinent, data collection approaches will be suitable, and the findings should be based on their life experiences. This participatory aspect is essential to the validity, applicability and eventual usefulness of the assessment (Elia et. al. 2022; Cornish et. al. 2023).

To put it in other words, GRME can be imagined as a revolutionary process that takes M&E off a technically neutral game and makes it an ethical endeavor that seeks social equity (Morgan et. al. 2024). It is a model that actively incorporates a gender lens throughout the entire M&E cycle detecting the problematic differences, breaking the unequal power relations, and producing evidence to create more inclusive and efficient policies (Kalbarczyk et. al. 2025; van Rensburg & Mapitsa, 2017; Morgan et. al. 2024; Sprooule, Podems & Negroustoueva, 2025). This way, GRME will make sure that the intervention of development and policy will not cause more harm but will positively affect society by making it fairer and more equal among all genders.

Principles of Gender Responsive Monitoring and Evaluation

GRME has on its principle a set of steering philosophies that make the process more transformational as opposed to being only technical in the pursuit of gender equality. These are not isolated technical steps but interlocking tenets through which M&E systems are designed in a deliberate manner that can uncover, measure and offer remedies to gender-based gaps (Kalbarczyk et. al. 2025; van Rensburg & Mapitsa, 2017). They provide the ethical and methodological entry point on how the gender perspective can be incorporated into the full M&E cycle, such as planning, data collection and analysis, and the utilization of findings. . With these central principles, GRME goes beyond recording the inequity to confronting the power structure and social norms that entrench these inequities and, through these efforts, guarantee that development interventions will

result in more fair and just outcomes across the genders (Morgan et. al. 2024; Sproule, Podems & Negroustoueva, 2025).

Intersectionality Analysis

Intersectionality analysis stands as a principle pillar of GRME that requires the abandonment of binary comparison of men and women in simplistic ways. It acknowledges the fact that gender functions are not independent but are defined within other social identities and power structures like race, ethnicity, age, disability, class, and geographical placement and formulate the unique compounded experiences of privilege and disadvantage (Phoenix & Pattynama, 2006; Weldon, 2008; Morgan et. al. 2024). An example is a program that seems to be helpful to women in general, but an intersectional analysis might show that the gains are being reaped by urban, educated women, at the same time that it conceals the ongoing exclusion or further marginalization of rural, indigenous or women with disabilities. Devoid of this fine-grain perspective, M&E systems will tend to bolster the status quo, where interventions are designed on the experience of the most privileged members of a gender group (Block et. al. 2023; Corrigan, 2024; Morgan et. al. 2024).

This principle dictates that both the collection and analysis of data is supposed to be conducted in a methodological way. It involves the collection of information that is not disaggregated on the basis of sex alone but rather on the basis of other social stratifiers to give the insights into the experiences of different subgroups receiving the same intervention (Bose, 2012; Buncher & Daston, 2022). This implies the design of surveys, interview guides and focus group discussions that are proactive in investigating these overlapping identities (Weldon, 2008; Morgan et. al. 2024). This phase ought to then be followed by an analytical reading of the data that tries to unveil these strata of effect not by only posing the question, 'How are women affected?' but under 'what circumstances', and 'why'?

Finally, intersectionality will change GRME not toward the attainment of gender parity on a nominal basis, but toward substantive equity (Sheilds, 2008, Morgan et. al. 2024; Bose, 2012). It assures the evaluation involves the full breadth of gendered experiences and offers the evidence base of designing policies that are actually inclusive. By recognizing the difference among the gender categories, GRME will be in a position to select interventions more specifically, dedicate resources to those individuals who are most isolated, and hold programs responsible in ensuring that no one is left behind hence satisfies the primary development promise of equity to everyone (Sheilds, 2008, Morgan et. al. 2024; Bose, 2012; Buncher & Daston, 2022).

Gender Mainstreaming

Gender mainstreaming is the strategic principle that implements gender responsiveness throughout the whole project and M&E lifecycle (Morgan et. al. 2024; Waal, 2006; Bishop-Sambrook, 2000). It is not an isolated activity but an organized way of making sure that all the needs, experiences and impacts on each gender be included in all the stages, starting with the initial design and planning and up to the implementation, monitoring, and the final evaluation. This principle states that gender considerations should be not a post-note or a separate chapter in a report, but a key aspect of how an intervention is conceived, handled and evaluated. In a gender mainstreamed project, the goals related to gender equality will be included in the main objectives and will be assigned a budget and specialized expertise (Morgan et. al. 2024; Waal, 2006).

In the context of the M&E process, gender mainstreaming would be to incorporate gender-related questions into the main evaluation structure. It implies that all the M&E elements, including the analysis of the logical framework or the essential evaluation questions are reviewed with a gender perspective (Morgan et. al. 2024; Waal, 2006; Bishop-Sambrook, 2000; Bustelo, 2003). As an illustration, rather than measuring the 'number of beneficiaries who were trained', a mainstreamed M&E system would enquire, 'what are the barriers to participation by the various gender groups?' and "how is the training content responsive to the knowledge gaps and opportunities of women, men, and gender minorities?'. The data collection methods and tools are also evaluated to one of making sure they are accessible and suitable among everybody (Waal, 2006; Bishop-Sambrook, 2000).

Gender mainstreaming is potent because it can bring about sustainable institutional change. When effectively putting into practice, the onus on gender equality moves off a single gender focus point on feminine issues to the entire project staff and managers to promote ownership in the organization (Waal, 2006; Bishop-Sambrook, 2000; Bustelo, 2003). In the case of M&E, it makes sure that the very structure of the system will generate gender-conscious evidence in a consistent manner (Morgan et. al. 2024). This information then informs adaptive management in such a way that real-time corrective measures are applied to achieve gender equity and the contribution that the project makes to gender equality is tracked systematically and reported and learnt as opposed to being used as an allegation or an accidental finding tool.

Equality and Non-Discrimination

The two ethical power engines of GRME are the principles of equality and non-discrimination, as these directly connect the practice with the human rights-based approach to development (McCrudden, 2004; Morgan et. al. 2024; Moeckli, 2017; Ramcharan, 2017). Equality is a principle that enables programs to be assessed directly regarding their effect on each gender and actively combats disparities and unfair treatment. This is operationalized by the necessity to collect and analyze the disaggregated data in terms of sex and other applicable factors and, thus, be able to identify the differences associated with genders regarding participation, access to resources, control over benefits, and final results (McCrudden, 2004; Ramcharan, 2017). The mission is to be judged not by overall outcomes but by the lessening of disparities among the various gender groups.

Equality is the active opposite of non-discrimination. It dictates that GRME should stop measuring disparities and to actively explore and question the discriminatory practices as well as the unfair power relations that generate them (Moeckli, 2017; McCrudden, 2004; Ramcharan, 2017). This principle requires evaluators to enquire about the reasons behind these inequalities scrutinizing formal and informal institutions, social norms, and partisan policies which generate and sustain disadvantage. As an example, non-discrimination guided M&E (Eriksen, 1960, Zang, Wu, & Wu, 2017; Morgan et. al. 2024) would not simply observe that women are less involved in community meetings, they would enquire and report on the social norms that limit their oratorical contributions in community meetings or that the timing of community meetings conflict with their caring duties.

These principles combined make GRME a justice instrument. They require that assessments should not merely report the manifestation of inequity but identify the causes of inequity E (Eriksen, 1960, Zang, Wu, & Wu, 2017; Morgan et. al. 2024). This provides credible grounds in pushing the policy and structural change to destroy the discriminative barriers. GRME would hold those in power accountable by ensuring the realization of the right to non-discrimination is being

fulfilled and by actively reinforcing fairness and not inadvertently tolerating and even encouraging the very injustices they are designed to eradicate (Eriksen, 1960, Zang, Wu, & Wu, 2017; Morgan et. al. 2024).

Inclusivity and Social Justice

Inclusivity and social justice are the general concepts that define the ultimate aim and moral need of GRME. Inclusiveness presupposes efficient inclusion of various participants, in particular, women and underrepresented genders into the M&E process (Scanlan, 2012; Agarwal, 2022; Morgan et. al. 2024). This is not merely about utilizing them as data sources but it is about actively involving them in formulating evaluation questions, analyzing data and validation of findings. This principle recognizes that the people who are directly affected by the inequalities have a different insight of what is causing the inequalities and how the inequalities can be reduced and so their involvement is crucial in defining the relevance, accuracy, and adequacy of the assessment.

In terms of methodology, inclusivity demands the application of participatory data collection procedures, the provision of secure and free space to express, and in some situations, create an ability among the marginalized groups to participate in the M&E procedure effectively (Benda, Montague, & Valdez, 2020; Abouzaglo, Patel, & Annaswamy, 2025; Yu et. al, 2025). It even questions power relations in the evaluation itself, and attempts to change the role of participants, making them not passive objects of the evaluation but active participants of assessment. The process itself may be empowering, as it confirms the experiences and voice of people who are commonly silenced.

The greater vision that inclusivity fulfills is social justice. The central value is that GRME should help to make the society much more just and equitable by targeting the underlying causes of gender inequality (Scanlan, 2012; Agarwal, 2022; Morgan et. al. 2024; Abouzaglo, Patel, & Annaswamy, 2025; Yu et. al, 2025). A social justice oriented GRME model is an active analysis of programs impacting power relationships, either disrupting or affirming detrimental norms, and helps redistribute resources and opportunities. It utilizes findings of M&E in advocating transformational change so interventions do not merely ameliorate the situation within a state of continuing injustice, but instead actively seek to transform the social and political structures that underlie gender-based discrimination and inequality (Scanlan, 2012; Agarwal, 2022; Morgan et. al. 2024; Abouzaglo, Patel, & Annaswamy, 2025; Yu et. al, 2025). By so doing, GRME will be an agent for a fairer world.

Practices of Gender Responsive Monitoring and Evaluation

GRME practices constitute the fundamental transformation of the theory into practical methodologies that facilitate the whole process of evaluation. The practices facilitate a systematic approach of having a gender approach integrated in all M&E processes, starting at the planning set up, to end-up utilization of the results (Bowman & Sweetman, 2014; Morgan et. al. 2024). They make sure that M&E is not just a technical exercise, but an instrument that would transform, identify and solve gender inequalities. These practices would allow organizations to produce strong evidence regarding the differences in the influence of interventions on women, men, girls, boys, and gender minorities, which would allow them to develop more equitable and effective programming and policies (Bowman & Sweetman, 2014; Morgan et. al. 2024).

The methodical implementation of GRME practices criticizes the default method in gender-blind M&E, which can easily conceal the individual experiences and needs of different genders. The practices are intertwined and interdependent forming a holistic accountability and learning system with respect to gender equality objectives (Bowman & Sweetman, 2014; Morgan et. al. 2024; Phillips & Hamberg, 2016; Hawkes, Buse & Kapilashrami, 2017). They need an active and purported effort to examine the consequences of power relations, social norms, and structural limits on the outcomes of programs. It is strict adherence to the GRME practices, after all, that enables an organization to claim with certainty that its activity is not merely effective but also fair and inclusive, which leads to sustainable development and being beneficial to all societal members (Guidance, UNICEF, 2019; Morgan et. al. 2024).

Integration of Gender into the M&E Framework

Incorporating gender into the M&E system is the core practice that makes gender considerations not an unrelated bipolar spectacle but a mainstream, cross-cutting core component of the whole system of M&E (Bowman & Sweetman, 2014; Morgan et. al. 2024; Ludgate, 2019). . This is a method that involves a critical re-assessment and re-organization of the core M&E framework such as the theory of change, logical framework and evaluation questions with specific reference to gender equality objectives. It involves going beyond a mere checkbox of gender to evolving gender-specific targets and analysis to all the levels of the results chain which includes the inputs and activities up to outcomes, consequences, and effects (Guidance, UNICEF, 2019; Bowman & Sweetman, 2014; Morgan et. al. 2024; Ludgate, 2019). This fundamental integration ensures that the system is developed to be sensitive to capture gender changes and disparities.

Integration entails the critical evaluation of every element of the framework using a gender lens. In the case of the theory of change, it involves challenging the assumptions that portray the occurrence of change among various gender groups and making sure that change pathways are realistic and applicable to all (Guidance, UNICEF, 2019; Bowman & Sweetman, 2014; Morgan et. al. 2024; Ludgate, 2019). Within the logical framework, it involves establishing gender-sensitive indicators and outlining gender-disaggregated targets of all outcomes of interest. In addition, the general nature and extent of the evaluation should be outlined, with a focus on knowing the role of the intervention towards gender equality (Gutierrez-Montes et. al. 2020; (Morgan et. al. 2024; Ludgate, 2019). This type of careful integration ensures that gender is not an accidental issue, but on the contrary, it is ingrained in the DNA of M&E.

The outcome of this practice is the creation of an M&E framework, which will be an effective tool of gender equality accountability and learning. It provides a disaggregation of gender-responsive success through a roadmap and instruments of how to measure success (Bowman & Sweetman, 2014; Morgan et. al. 2024; Ludgate, 2019). The absence of such integration can readily lead to either the omission of gender factors in implementation, or even analysis of the results, which can lead to an assessment that fails to raise significant questions of equity and power. Organizational architecture of a gendered-integrated approach implies that the M&E process can produce evidence to inform more equitable and transformative programming (Morgan et. al. 2024; Ludgate, 2019).

Conduct a Gender-Responsive Stakeholder Analysis

Another practice is known as gender-responsive stakeholder analysis and can aid in understanding the different dimensions of social and power dynamics connected to the environment within which

an intervention takes place (Gumucio et. al. 2018; Alvarez et. al. 2010; Morgan et. al. 2024). This discussion transcends beyond what is a simple list of stakeholder groups and provides a detailed perspective of how gender and its interplay with other social components such as age, class, the ethnicity, and disability impact individuals and their groups along with their interests, influence, and vulnerability. It particularly charts out the various roles, resources, decision-making accessibility, and limitations that women, men, girls, boys, and gender minorities have with regard to the project (Gumucio et. al. 2018; Alvarez et. al. 2010; Götzmann & Bainton, 2021; Nikghadam-Hojjati et. al. 2025). This subtle insight is a precursor to the creation of M&E process that is inclusive and equitable.

A gender-responsive stakeholder analysis methodology should be participatory and gender-sensitive itself (Götzmann & Bainton, 2021; Nikghadam-Hojjati et. al. 2025; Amacker et. al. 2017). It uses power-interest matrices that are disaggregated according to gender, gender-intensive focus group discussions and in-depth interviews that involve gendered experiences of power and exclusion. The analysis aims at answering the following important questions: Who are most marginalized and why? What are the obstacles to the participation of the various gender groups? Who are the voices that are normally listened to during community decision-making, and who are those ones that are silenced? This mechanism contributes to finding not only direct beneficiaries but also those who may be negatively impacted by the intervention and this way, it is possible to design the M&E system in such a way that a wide range of views and impacts can be included (Bowman & Sweetman, 2014; Götzmann & Bainton, 2021; Nikghadam-Hojjati et. al. 2025).

The results of a gendered stakeholder analysis have a direct impact on the overall procedure of M&E. They guide the choice of culturally suitable and secure methods of data collection and make certain that instruments are available to any gender group (Götzmann & Bainton, 2021; Nikghadam-Hojjati et. al. 2025; Amacker et. al. 2017). They assist to determine what stakeholders are required to validate findings and involve themselves in reference groups. Finally, this practice can make sure that the evaluation is not an attempt to reinforce the opinions of the most influential individuals but rather it is intentionally structured to seek, appreciate and amplify the opinions and experiences of the most marginalized people so as to produce more relevant, legitimate and effective evaluation findings (Guidance, UNICEF, 2019; Götzmann & Bainton, 2021; Nikghadam-Hojjati et. al. 2025; Morgan et. al. 2024).

Develop Gender-Responsive Indicators

Gender-responsive indicators are specialized procedures that can bring measurement beyond the regular number counts into an understanding of the changes in gender relationships and equality (Morgan et. al. 2024; Amacker et. al. 2017). The indicators are meant to gauge transformative elements of a program, including the change of power relations, control over decisions, resource control and change of damaging gender norms. In contrast to generic indicators, they are tailored specifically to show whether an intervention is targeting the underlying factors of gender inequality or is only operating on the periphery (Morgan et. al. 2024; Amacker et. al. 2017; Miletto, Pangare & Thuy, 2019; Kalbarczyk et. al. 2025).

The development of these indicators requires profound knowledge of the situation and the gender inequalities the intervention will solve. It is the process of creating SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound) indicators that are, nevertheless, gender-sensitive (Miletto, Pangare & Thuy, 2019; Kalbarczyk et. al. 2025). As an illustration, rather than the 'number of people who underwent business training', a gender-responsive measure would be 'the

percentage of female education graduates who indicate higher influence in household financial decision-making' or 'a decrease in the number of hours per week that women and girls report spending on unpaid domestic care'. Such indicators may both need a combination of quantitative and qualitative data to enable a complete picture of change (Bowman and Sweetman, 2014; Miletto, Pangare & Thuy, 2019; Kalbarczyk et. al. 2025).

Gender responsive indicators are essential in measuring progress towards gender equality goal in a meaningful manner. They can offer the proof to embrace whether a project is empowering women, challenging discriminatory traditions, or advancing more egalitarian relationships (Morgan et. al. 2024; Amacker et. al. 2017). Lack of such indicators prevents the knowledge of whether gender equality results are being realized and assessments risk reporting superficially the number of people participating, but fails to capture the underlying, transformative changes revealing that gender justice is really being met (Gutierrez-Montes et, al. 2020; Miletto, Pangare & Thuy, 2019; Kalbarczyk et. al. 2025).

Collection of Sex-Disaggregated Data

The sex-disaggregated data collection is an indispensable and fundamental activity in GRME. It is the simplest necessity to any serious gender analysis because aggregated data necessarily conceals the dissimilar results, experiences, and consequences of an intervention on both males and females (Doss, 2014; Hawkes et. al. 2022).. The method entails gathering and documenting data in a structured fashion that enables the separation of findings by sex, which offers the necessary raw material to establish gaps, disparities, and trends (Morgan et. al. 2024; Doss & Kieran, 2014; Doss, 2014; Hawkes et. al. 2022).

This practice must be implemented with care and uniformity of all the data collection processes and instruments. All applicable information, such as the beneficiary registration and attendance documents, survey results, and outcome evaluation must be structured in a manner that they can be collected and recorded in a sex-disaggregated form (Doss & Kieran, 2014; Doss, 2014; Hawkes et. al. 2022). This involves having questions, database fields and reporting template contain a field of sex with clear instructions on how this may be gathered in a respectful and ethical manner. It can make simple comparisons, including determining whether an equal number of men and women are using a health service, or whether agricultural production is low in households headed by men compared to those headed by women (Bowman & Sweetman, 2014; Doss, 2014; Hawkes et. al. 2022).

Although sex-disaggregated data in itself cannot be used to account why disparities exist, it is the pivotal initial step that is an indicator of where further research is necessary. Gender inequalities become visible and measurable as a result of the evidence base, and the debate is no longer on anecdote, but rather on fact (Morgan et. al. 2024; Doss & Kieran, 2014; Doss, 2014). Therefore, regular, line-by-line compilation of sex-disaggregated data is the least form of accountability in development and governmental policy implicating agencies in comprehending and mitigating the various forms in which their operations impact men and women (Guidance, UNICEF, 2019; (Morgan et. al. 2024; Doss & Kieran, 2014; Doss, 2014; Hawkes et. al. 2022).

Use of Gender-Sensitive Language

Gender-sensitive language is a very important practice that creates an atmosphere of respect, inclusion and precision across the M&E process (Hetjens & Hartmann, 2024; Garad et. al. 2023;

Morgan et. al. 2024; Qizi, 2021). It is a practice in which carefully and deliberately selected words in all data collection tools, communications, and reports are used to guarantee the absence of gender bias and stereotypes and accommodating all gender identities. It acknowledges the idea that language is not neutral. It may either support some of the harmful patterns or defy them and can either make individuals feel visible and respected or sidelined and misrepresented (Guidance, UNICEF, 2019; Morgan et. al. 2024; Hetjens & Hartmann, 2024; Garad et. al. 2023; Qizi, 2021).

Practically, this will involve not using the term 'man' to symbolize all of humanity nor using default masculine pronouns such as 'he' or 'his' to signify a generic human being. Rather, they are supposed to apply gender-neutral expressions like 'they', 'participants', 'beneficiaries', or 'the farmer' (Hetjens & Hartmann, 2024; Garad et. al. 2023; Qizi, 2021). Also, questions are to be asked in ways not to presuppose gender roles; such as asking 'What is the profession of your husband?' but rather question them on something like 'What do members of your household do to generate income?' This practice is done to make sure that the experiences of people with different gender identities or non-traditional roles are not erased in the very design of the tool (Hetjens & Hartmann, 2024; Garad et. al. 2023; Morgan et. al. 2024; Qizi, 2021).

The effect of gender-sensitive language goes beyond political correctness to the quality of the data itself. When people are taken care of by the use of language that tries to capture their realities and take into account their identities, chances are high that people will freely participate in and be honest about the M&E process (Hetjens & Hartmann, 2024; Garad et. al. 2023; Qizi, 2021). On the other hand, exclusionary or stereotypical language may bring about distrust and result to non-response or biased response. Thus, the use of gender-sensitive language is a prominent methodological choice that will result in valid, reliable, and comprehensive data, which reflect the experiences of all the individuals (Bowman & Sweetman, 2014; Hetjens & Hartmann, 2024; Garad et. al. 2023; Qizi, 2021).

Collection of Gender-Disaggregated Data

The body of gender-disaggregated data is a development and elaboration of the custom of gathering sex-disaggregated data. It also recognizes that gender is a social and personal identity, not necessarily binary (male/female) and that to see the complete picture of the impacts of an intervention, we need data that exemplifies this spectrum (Kitada et. al. 2023; Colaço & Watson-Grant, 2021; Swaminathan & Niyati, 2022). The practice is expected to reflect the experiences of transgender, non-binary, and these other gender-diverse individuals, whose realities remain entirely hidden in traditional M&E systems that only capture biological sex (Morgan et. al. 2024; Kitada et. al. 2023.

Such a practice needs to be done with careful, ethical and contextually sensitive methods of data collection. It is associated with giving reaction choices on surveys that are more inclusive like 'non-binary', 'self-describe', or 'prefer not to say', in addition to the existing male and female gender categories. It requires training of enumerators to make inquiries about gender identity in a respectful manner and maintain confidentiality and safety of all respondents since gathering such information can endanger participants working in a setting where gender diversity is stigmatized or even criminalized. The principle of work should always be based on the idea of 'doing no harm' and trying to make marginalized groups visible (Kitada et. al. 2023; Colaço & Watson-Grant, 2021; Swaminathan & Niyati, 2022).

The importance of gathering gender-disaggregated data is immense on the progress of inclusivity and equity (Kitada et. al. 2023; Colaço & Watson-Grant, 2021). It helps organizations to recognize and address the distinct barriers and opportunities posed by gender minorities making programs unintentionally exclusionary and harmful to these groups. When they actively seek to record this data, M&E systems can begin to achieve a more realistic and fair depiction of the whole community and give the evidence base to develop truly comprehensive and inclusive policies and services that do not leave anyone behind (Guidance, UNICEF, 2019; Kitada et. al. 2023; Swaminathan & Niyati, 2022).

Use of Culturally Relevant and Evidence-Based Methods

The application of culturally relevant and evidence-based practices is one of the practices that make the GRME process both respectful and rigorous (Domenech-Rodríguez, & Wieling, 2005; Linan-Thompson, Lara-Martinez, & Cavazos, 2018; Roysircar, 2009). It acknowledges that data collection methods cannot be generalized without addressing local gender norms, cultural practices and communication patterns. What might be effective in one setting would be inappropriate or even adverse in another, especially when using with different gender groups on sensitive subjects (Gumucio et. al. 2018; Linan-Thompson, Lara-Martinez, & Cavazos, 2018; Roysircar, 2009).

The practice involves preliminary context analysis by M&E practitioners to understand the local gender dynamics (Domenech-Rodríguez, & Wieling, 2005; Linan-Thompson, Lara-Martinez, & Cavazos, 2018; Roysircar, 2009). As an example, some cultures might find it inappropriate that women can talk in mixed-gender environments. In these instances, all-mixed gender focus groups would still suppress female voices, whereas separate female groups mediated by a woman would prove a culturally appropriate and methodologically correct change. Equally, data should be gathered at a suitable time and place that respects the gendered division of labor. For example, having a meeting during a time that the women have been engaged in cooking and looking after the children would effectively exclude them (Morgan et. al. 2024; Domenech-Rodríguez, & Wieling, 2005; Linan-Thompson, Lara-Martinez, & Cavazos, 2018; Roysircar, 2009).

Use of evidence-based approaches implies that the strategies used to collect data should be those that have proven effective in the context of collecting gender-sensitive data (Domenech-Rodríguez, & Wieling, 2005; Morgan et. al. 2024; Roysircar, 2009). This may involve participatory rural appraisal (PRA), body mapping, or storytelling that can readily bring forward nuances, which would be overlooked with standard surveys. This practice guarantees that the data obtained is not only ethically acquired but is also of high-quality, credible, and accurately representative of the varied gendered experiences in society by integrating cultural relevance with methodological rigor (Bowman & Sweetman, 2014; Linan-Thompson, Lara-Martinez, & Cavazos, 2018; Roysircar, 2009).

Incorporation of Intersectionality

Intersectionality is a sophisticated method of analysis that helps to avoid the simplification of the analysis of gender and shows the multidimensionality of discrimination and privilege (Rodrigues et. al. 2023; Kelly et. al. 2021; Bailey et. al. 2019; Qureshi et. al. 2022; Morgan et. al. 2024). It is rooted in the realization that gender does not exist in a vacuum but is bound by other social categories like race, ethnic group, age, disability, sexual orientation and socioeconomic status to form distinct and intersecting systems of disadvantage and advantage. A superficial analysis of women as one group could lead to distortion of the acute marginalization women experience, such

as indigenous women, women with disabilities, or elderly women (Gutierrez-Montes et. al. 2020; Qureshi et. al. 2022; Morgan et. al. 2024).

To bring intersectionality to operational in GRME, data collection and analysis have to be designed in a way that explicitly investigates the intersections. This implies going beyond sex-disaggregation to gather data disaggregated by other pertinent social variables where applicable and ethically correct (Bailey et. al. 2019; Qureshi et. al. 2022; Morgan et. al. 2024). This is followed by the cross-tabulation of these variables to study the difference in outcomes between specific subgroups. As an example, rather than simply comparing men and women outcomes, an intersectional analysis would compare outcomes in young urban men, older rural women, disabled girls, and so on, to recognize which populations were being better served and which were being left behind (Bailey et. al. 2019; Qureshi et. al. 2022; Morgan et. al. 2024).

The strength of intersectionality inclusion is that it yields more accurate, fair and efficient programming (Bailey et. al. 2019; Qureshi et. al. 2022). It can be used to reveal the barriers affecting the most marginalized subgroups among the broader gender categories, and in this way, it will give the evidence that can be used to target the interventions and resources more efficiently. The practice underlines that GRME supports the commitment to social justice by revealing those compounded inequalities that tend to be concealed under the broad data analysis and championing the solutions that would support the most vulnerable people from being excluded (Morgan et. al. 2024; Rodrigues et. al. 2023; Kelly et. al. 2021; Bailey et. al. 2019).

Gender Responsive Monitoring and Evaluation Process

GRME process is an organized flow of interrelated stages of work that systematically introduces a gender approach to all of the intervention lifecycle stages. It is a process that turns the thoughts and actions of GRME into a roadmap which practitioners can modify and follow, starting with theoretical planning, and progressing to final application of findings into adaptive management and transformative change (Morgan et. al. 2024; Maramba & Bamberger, 2001; Kalbarczyk et. al. 2025; van Rensburg & Mapitsa, 2017). The GRME process, contrary to a linear checklist, is usually repetitive and recursive, with learnings during one stage being used to inform and improve the next phase. It also ensures that gender equality is not an isolated objective but a lens by which the entire parts of M&E is conceptualized, analyzed and implemented. This holistic approach is essential to going beyond an analysis that is superficial to understanding and redressing the gendered aspect of development outcomes and, therefore, ensuring that projects have positive effects towards the advancement of equity and empowerment of all genders (Morgan et. al. 2024; Maramba & Bamberger, 2001).

Gender Responsive Stakeholder Engagement

Gender Responsible Stakeholder Engagement is a structural and recurrent process which begins once an intervention has been initiated and persists throughout M&E cycle. It involves actively defining and examining the stakeholders and interacting with them in a manner that directly appreciates and addresses the different interests, capability and power relations that may arise because of gender (Gottzmann & Bainton, 2021; Morgan et. al. 2024; Mulema, Cramer & Huyer, 2021; Tiravanhu & van Rensburg, 2018). It goes beyond the invitation of women to meetings to the empowering and safely integrating them in decision making processes. This will require an initial gender-sensitive stakeholder analysis so as map the effects that the program has on different women, men, girls, boys, and gender minorities and how each has distinct barriers to engagement

and the extent to which they can influence the outcomes. It is essential that this knowledge on dynamics leads to the establishment of inclusive and transformative engagement processes that do not reproduce already existing inequalities (Götzmann & Bainton, 2021; Morgan et. al. 2024).

This form of engagement will necessitate a specially developed methodology to overcome the challenges of gender. This can require special spaces of consultation for women and marginalized gender groups where they can give their views without any form of restrictions due to their family commitments and limited mobility (Götzmann & Bainton, 2021; Tirivanhu & van Rensburg, 2018). It also involves capacity-building the marginalized communities to participate efficiently, perhaps through some training on the rights and foundations of the M&E system. It also entails ensuring that feedback mechanisms are safe, confidential and open to ensure that the stakeholders feel that their input would be valued and taken into action without fear of being victimization or retaliation. This intentional practice will guarantee that M&E process will be grounded on the lived experience of everybody and thus enhance the validity, relevancy and precision of the assessment (Morgan et. al. 2024; Mulema, Cramer & Huyer, 2021).

It is difficult to overvalue the significance of good gender-responsive stakeholder engagement, and its impact on the quality and usefulness to the entire M&E system cannot be overestimated (Götzmann & Bainton, 2021; Morgan et. al. 2024). Genuine collaboration of the stakeholders, particularly the marginalized ones, in the formulation and establishment of evaluation questions, interpretation of data and confirmation of the results create more credible evidence that is more contextually rooted. The process promotes a sense of ownership and accountability, which heightens the chances of evaluation recommendations being put in place. Finally, a gender-responsive engagement converts the M&E process into a shared learning experience, rather than an external extractive excursion, which strengthens the communities and makes the interventions sensitive to unique needs and aspirations of all genders (Mulema, Cramer & Huyer, 2021; Tirivanhu & van Rensburg, 2018).

Gender Responsive M&E Planning

Gender Responsive M&E Planning comes in as the strategic step where the outline of the whole evaluation is established, which incorporates the concept of gender into its very structure (Morgan et. al. 2024; Kalbarczyk et. al. 2025; Tirivanhu & van Rensburg, 2018; Dazé & Dekens, 2017). The steps conducted in this process are defining the purpose, scope, and important evaluation questions through a gender prism, such that the assessment process is created at the start to examine gender disparities and encourage equality. One of the key elements of this planning is the creation of a gender-responsive results framework consisting of a theory of change clarifying how the intervention is likely to alter gender relations, power dynamics, and access to resources to various groups. The framework goes beyond presuming a homogenous effect and voluntarily charting out the channels upon which change shall be realized to women, men, girls, boys, as well as to gender minorities (Tirivanhu & van Rensburg, 2018; Dazé & Dekens, 2017).

The planning process also involves the intelligent choice of gender-sensitive indicators and the development of respective data collection strategies (Morgan et. al. 2024; Kalbarczyk et. al. 2025). These indicators should be able to gauge variations in gender norms, gender participation in decision-making, possession over assets, and benefits, and burdens distribution (Wokadala, 2016). The plan should specify how the data will be disaggregated not just in terms of sex but also in terms of other intersecting issues like age, disability and ethnicity where it is possible. Moreover, it entails giving gender analysis adequate resources, budget, and time, and the availability of

gender expertise in the evaluation team. A full-fledged gender-readable M&E plan also incorporates an effective communication plan on how to communicate findings to all stakeholders in formats that can be easily accessed so that the evidence produced can lead to a change (Morgan et. al. 2024; Kalbarczyk et. al. 2025; Tirivanhu & van Rensburg, 2018; Dazé & Dekens, 2017).

Gender Responsive M&E Plan is an important accountability instrument because it establishes clear expectations towards what the intervention will accomplish with gender equality and how it will be gauged (Kalbarczyk et. al. 2025; Tirivanhu & van Rensburg, 2018). It offers a methodological guide to data collection and analysis so that gender will not be thought about later in the implementation. The plan can help managers and other stakeholders effectively monitor progress because gender equality goals can be systematically tracked with the help of a clear baseline and gender sensitive targets. Such proactive and deliberate planning is thus imperative in making sure that the M&E system is structurally in place to generate the required evidence that can be used to inform learning, enhance program effectiveness and showcase accountability of gender equality promises (Morgan et. al. 2024; Kalbarczyk et. al. 2025; Tirivanhu & van Rensburg, 2018; Dazé & Dekens, 2017).

Gender Responsive M&E Data Collection

Gender Responsive M&E Data Collection refers to the process of collecting information systematically by adopting methods and instruments that are specifically determined to record the differentiated experiences and outcomes of all gender groups (Morgan et. al. 2024; Wokadala, 2016; Kalbarczyk et. al. 2025; Tirivanhu & van Rensburg, 2018; Dazé & Dekens, 2017; Maramba & Bamberger, 2001). The practice invigorates the planning process by utilizing methods that are responsive to gender standards and power hierarchies to guarantee the safety, comfort, and informative presence of respondents. It includes the strict gathering of sex- and gender-disaggregated data as a bare minimum, but much more than that to use a combination of quantitative and qualitative that can reveal the 'why' behind the numbers (Tirivanhu & van Rensburg, 2018; Dazé & Dekens, 2017; Maramba & Bamberger, 2001).. The questionnaires should be constructed with items that delve into gender roles, time allocation, and decisional authority, whilst the qualitative research instruments such as the focus group discussion and in-depth interviews should be framed in a manner that elicits the gendered experiences that are more subtle (Wokadala, 2016; Kalbarczyk et. al. 2025)

This process should be implemented with the consideration of the context and the application of culturally specific and ethically appropriate methods (Morgan et. al. 2024; Maramba & Bamberger, 2001).. An example of this is using female enumerators to interview women about sensitive issues, using single-gender focus groups to facilitate open discussion, and arranging the data collection exercise at a time and in a location that does not create a burden or danger to the respondents. It also prescribes the use of gender sensitive language in all data collection tools to eliminate reinforcing stereotypes and to ensure that all respondents feel that they are recognized and respected (Kalbarczyk et. al. 2025; Tirivanhu & van Rensburg, 2018; Maramba & Bamberger, 2001).. The best way is to ensure informed consent and confidentially especially in gathering information about issues pertaining to gender-based violence or other stigmatized issues, which will meet the ethical principle of do no harm.

The merits of the whole GRME process will depend on the quality of gender-responsive data collection. In the event that data is gathered through biased means or does not reflect the viewpoints of marginalized gender to a satisfactory extent, further analysis and conclusions will

be erroneous (Dazé & Dekens, 2017; Maramba & Bamberger, 2001). Gender-disaggregated, ethically gathered, high-quality data is the necessary foundation of evidence base to find out inequalities, determine their causes, and evaluate the gendered effects of an intervention (Wokadala, 2016; Maramba & Bamberger, 2001). This process thus prepares the basis of believable and practical analysis, so that evaluators can go beyond the generalizing about beneficiaries to specific knowledge on how a program impacts various subgroups, which is the foundation of evidence-based, gender-transformative programming (Morgan et. al. 2024; Maramba & Bamberger, 2001).

Gender Responsive M&E Data Analysis

The pivotal stage involves Gender Responsive M&E Data Analysis, wherein the data collected would be interrogated to identify the gendered pattern, disparities and meanings in the information. It is not merely disaggregating data by sex, but a process that requires using a gender lens to make sense of the results and posing targeted questions regarding how and why changes among women, men, and gender minorities are different (Kalbarczyk et. al. 2025; Tirivanhu & van Rensburg, 2018; Dazé & Dekens, 2017; Maramba & Bamberger, 2001). It involves analyzing the data to find evidence of power relations change, of gender norms and resource access. Intersectional analysis is a method used in this analytical step, in which data should be cross-examined across all other social factors, such as age, class, and disability, to analyze how multiple identities can inform experience and outcomes without making the most marginalized in gender groups appear invisible. (Morgan et. al. 2024; Kalbarczyk et. al. 2025).

The analysis of the methodology is a combination of statistical and qualitative interpretation. Quantitatively, it involves the comparison of means, proportions and trends between various gender groups in order to detect significantly different rates in participation, benefits and knowledge gains (Morgan et. al. 2024; Wokadala, 2016). Thematic analysis of interview and focus group transcripts is qualitative that involves finding recurrent themes on gendered constraints, opportunities and unintended consequences. The process aims to describe the quantitative 'what' in terms of the qualitative 'why', specific to the social norms, structural barriers and power mechanisms that caused the specified results (Wokadala, 2016; Dazé & Dekens, 2017). An example is that the analysis would not only report that the women were less involved, but would also explore whether the lower involvement is as a result of timing, location, cultural limitation, or household decision-making dynamics.

Gender-responsive data analysis has the strength of turning raw data into effective decision-making evidence (Morgan et. al. 2024; Tirivanhu & van Rensburg, 2018). In the absence of this analytical prism, results of evaluation can become gender-blind, concealing inequalities and resulting in weak or even dangerous responses. Detailed gendering analysis enables the identification of the primary causes of inequalities, which offer insights needed to develop specific interventions (Dazé & Dekens, 2017). It features an intriguing narrative that describes who is getting advantages, those who are left out and why in a subtle insight on the overall impact of the program. The process is, as such, invaluable in the development of knowledge needed to modify programs, champion policy adjustments, and, eventually, transformative and just results to everyone (Morgan et. al. 2024; Kalbarczyk et. al. 2025).

Gender Responsive M&E Data Utilization

One of the key processes in the GRME circle is Gender Responsible M&E Data Utilization in which the findings are translated into actionable learning, adaptation and accountability (Maramba & Bamberger, 2001). It is a process that involves strategically communicating and using evidence to support programmatic decisions, policy advocacy and strategic planning with a clear aim of promoting gender equality. It goes further than merely spreading reports but also helping to encourage dialogue with stakeholders, such as policymakers, program managers, and society members, about what the gender-disaggregated results imply and what to do with them (Wokadala, 2016; Kalbarczyk et. al. 2025; Tirivanhu & van Rensburg, 2018; Dazé & Dekens, 2017). With proper utilization, the extensive work done in the process of collecting and analyzing data in a gender-responsive manner results in practical changes in intervention design and delivery.

One of the important features of this process is the adaptation of communication products to various audiences to ensure maximum impact (Morgan et. al. 2024; Kalbarczyk et. al. 2025; Tirivanhu & van Rensburg, 2018). Community members may participate in this by providing community members with the visual posters, having community meetings, or radio broadcasts about the findings with emphasis on the meaning of the findings to the community members. In the category of program staff and program managers, it will entail giving specific and practical suggestions on how the project activities can be adjusted in ways that are more responsive to gender gaps (Tirivanhu & van Rensburg, 2018; Dazé & Dekens, 2017; Maramba & Bamberger, 2001). To donors and policymakers, it will imply that they generate influential policy briefs that will employ the gender analysis to champion wider changes in systems. Moreover, it is a process that involves incorporation of findings into organizational learning systems so that the lessons on what works in enhancing gender equality are recorded and institutionalized in future programming (Dazé & Dekens, 2017; Maramba & Bamberger, 2001).

The successful completion of the entire GRME initiative will be reflected in the level at which data is used to create positive change (Morgan et. al. 2024; Maramba & Bamberger, 2001).. Failure by findings to exit the shelving truck renders the process to be fruitless. Utilizing gender response adequately bridges the feedback cycle by having evidence about gender disparities translated into action to address them. This gives rise to a culture of responsibility, in which organizations have to be held responsible in gender equality endeavors, and one of responsive management, in which programs are adjusted in response to evidence (Morgan et. al. 2024; Wokadala, 2016; Kalbarczyk et. al. 2025; Tirivanhu & van Rensburg, 2018; Dazé & Dekens, 2017; Maramba & Bamberger, 2001). Through strict enforcement of this last process, organizations are able to make sure that their M&E activities help in producing more effective, equitable, and transformative results, thus achieving the very essence of GRME (Morgan et. al. 2024; Wokadala, 2016; Kalbarczyk et. al. 2025).

Conclusion and Recommendations

This study identified that Gender-Responsible Monitoring and Evaluation (GRME) represents a paradigm shift upon which M&E ceases to be a technocratic endeavor, but a revolutionary practice that is essential to achieve gender equality and social justice. The explanatory synthesis of the principles, practices and process of GRME demonstrates that power is not vested in any of the above elements but it is the combination of all these that work. The principles of intersectionality, social justice, and empowerment provide the ethical compass, the development of gender-responsive indicators and intersectional analysis provides the practice, and the implementation is

a cyclical process and structured approach. They create an inclusive and effective system which assists organizations to move beyond recording the disparities between genders to actively making sense and addressing the root causes of the disparity in question within the framework of power and social constructs.

This discourse demonstrates that GRME is not some fringe offshoot, but a fundamental concept of effective, just and sustainable development in the 21st century. In a world where the global goals of Sustainable Development are being made and the world becomes more conscious about the intersectionality of inequalities, GRME can provide the desired level of methodological rigor and moral reasoning to ensure that interventions 'Do no harm'. It places a larger role of M&E in pushing change and learning in an upward and in a transformative framework giving marginalized populations an advantage and by making their experience inform policies and programs. The deliberate incorporation of gender lens in the entire M&E lifecycle is thus a development precondition that in reality does not leave anyone behind.

Still, conceptualization and implementation of GRME have serious challenges to be taken into consideration. The lack of the consistent, theoretical background of GRME itself is one of the principal gaps. Even though the current methodological approach relies on the familiar theoretical frameworks of feminism, human rights, and intersectionality, the specific methodology of GRME might be improved by a more integrated approach to the theoretical approach that would reveal how it is transforming and what such transformations have in common with the general social theory. Additionally, good practice is often hindered by methodological tensions, most notably, the issue of developing quantifiable yet context-sensitive indicators, and ethical concerns of collecting safe and meaningful data about gender minorities and sensitive topics like power dynamics.

Based on such findings, several recommendations may be proposed. First of all, there is an urgent need among the scholars to enhance the theoretical background of GRME. Future research should be based on the establishment of a powerful theoretical framework that could represent the key concepts and mechanisms of GRME and turn it into an academic discipline, instead of a collection of best practices. Second, methodologically, there is a need to create more flexible instruments and provisions to conduct intersectional analysis and to enumerate transformative changes in gender power relations which are often difficult to measure. Research is also required to explore new ethical forms of data collection of marginalized gender groups.

The most important recommendation for practitioners and organizations is the institutionalization of GRME through systematic provision of capacity building and resource allocation. This means not just embarking on one-off training interactions but instilling gender expertise in M&E teams and ensuring that adequate budgets are allocated towards gender sensitive data collection and analysis. Organizations should develop and implement strict policies that must be applied such that all projects include the principles and practices of GRME and have the support of senour management. Finally, incentivization, and demand of GRME must be offered to donors and policymakers not as a reporting requirement, but as a prerequisite for funding. This means providing long-term investment according to the iterative process of the GRME and delivering value in the display of transformative gender impacts relative to the traditional measures of effectiveness and scale. With these suggestions, the development community will be able to strengthen the practice of GRME and therefore achieve its full potential.

References

Abouzaglo, S., Patel, D., & Annaswamy, T. (2025). Inclusivity in Design: Integrating human-centered methodologies in disability research. *Disability and Health Journal, 101840*.

Agarwal, V. (2022). Communicating for social justice in health contexts: Creating opportunities for inclusivity among marginalized groups. *Frontiers in Communication, 7*, 1008533.

Alvarez, S., Staiger Rivas, S., Tehelen B, K., Garcia, C. X., Manners, G., & Biermayr Jenzano, P. (2010). Demand analysis report: gender-responsive participatory research.

Amacker, M., Schlaepfer, I., Bigler, C., & Graf, A. (2017). The development of gender-responsive indicators: Towards a participatory approach. *Kvinder, Køn & Forskning*, (1), 97-106.

Bailey, J., Steeves, V., Burkell, J., Shade, L. R., Ruparelia, R., & Regan, P. (2019). Getting at equality: Research methods informed by the lessons of intersectionality. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 18*, 1609406919846753.

Benda, N. C., Montague, E., & Valdez, R. S. (2020). Design for inclusivity. In *Design for health* (pp. 305-322). Academic Press.

Bishop-Sambrook, C. (2000). The logical framework as a tool for gender mainstreaming in university. *Gender and Education, 12*(2), 239-247.

Block Jr, R., Golder, M., & Golder, S. N. (2023). Evaluating claims of intersectionality. *The Journal of Politics, 85*(3), 795-811.

Bose, C. E. (2012). Intersectionality and global gender inequality. *Gender & Society, 26*(1), 67-72.

Bowman, K., & Sweetman, C. (2014). Introduction to gender, monitoring, evaluation and learning. *Gender & Development, 22*(2), 201-212.

Buncher, A., & Daston, M. (2022). The intersectionality of race, disability, gender, and employment through the Project SEARCH lens. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 56*(3), 223-229.

Bustelo, M. (2003). Evaluation of gender mainstreaming: Ideas from a meta-evaluation study. *Evaluation, 9*(4), 383-403.

Colaço, R., & Watson-Grant, S. (2021). A global call to action for gender-inclusive data collection and use.

Cornish, F., Breton, N., Moreno-Tabarez, U., Delgado, J., Rua, M., de-Graft Aikins, A., & Hodgetts, D. (2023). Participatory action research. *Nature Reviews Methods Primers, 3*(1), 34.

Corrigan, P. W. (2024). Benefits and challenges of addressing cultural intersectionality for program development and evaluation. *Psychiatric Services, appi-ps*.

Dazé, A., & Dekens, J. (2017). *A Framework for Gender-Responsive National Adaptation Plan Processes*. International Institute for Sustainable Development.

Domenech-Rodríguez, M., & Wieling, E. (2005). Developing culturally appropriate, evidence-based. *Voices of color: First-person accounts of ethnic minority therapists, 313-333*.

Doss, C. (2014). Collecting sex disaggregated data to improve development policies. *Journal of African Economies, 23*(suppl_1), i62-i86.

Doss, C., & Kieran, C. (2014). Standards for collecting sex-disaggregated data for gender analysis: A guide for CGIAR researchers.

Elias, M., Kandel, M., Mansourian, S., Meinzen-Dick, R., Crossland, M., Joshi, D., ... & Winowiecki, L. (2022). Ten people-centered rules for socially sustainable ecosystem restoration. *Restoration Ecology, 30*(4), e13574.

Eriksen, C. W. (1960). Discrimination and learning without awareness: a methodological survey and evaluation. *Psychological Review, 67*(5), 279.

Fardela, R., Marsa, A. R., Suhery, L., & Maulana, M. F. (2023). Monitoring application system development and evaluation of "pupr" department of gender leading activities implementation. *J-Icon: Jurnal Komputer dan Informatika, 11*(1), 103-110.

Garad, R. M., Bahri-Khomami, M., Busby, M., Burgert, T. S., Boivin, J., & Teede, H. J. (2023). Breaking boundaries: Toward consistent gender-sensitive language in sexual and reproductive health guidelines. In *Seminars in reproductive medicine* (Vol. 41, No. 01/02, pp. 005-011). Thieme Medical Publishers, Inc.

Götzmann, N., & Bainton, N. (2021). Embedding gender-responsive approaches in impact assessment and management. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal, 39*(3), 171-182.

Greaves, L., & Ritz, S. A. (2022). Sex, gender and health: mapping the landscape of research and policy. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19*(5), 2563.

Gumucio, T., Huyer, S., Hansen, J., Simelton, E., Partey, S. T., & Schwager, S. (2018). Inclusion of gender equality in monitoring and evaluation of climate services.

Gutierrez-Montes, I., Arguedas, M., Ramirez-Aguero, F., Mercado, L., & Sellare, J. (2020). Contributing to the construction of a framework for improved gender integration into climate-smart agriculture projects monitoring and evaluation: MAP-Norway experience. *Climatic Change, 158*(1), 93-106.

Hawkes, S., Buse, K., & Kapilashrami, A. (2017). Gender blind? An analysis of global public-private partnerships for health. *Globalization and Health, 13*(1), 26.

Hawkes, S., Pantazis, A., Purdie, A., Gautam, A., Kiwuwa-Muyingo, S., Buse, K., ... & Verma, R. (2022). Sex-disaggregated data matters: tracking the impact of COVID-19 on the health of women and men. *Economia Politica, 39*(1), 55-73.

Hetjens, D., & Hartmann, S. (2024). Effects of gender sensitive language in job listings: A study on real-life user interaction. *Plos one, 19*(8), e0308072.

Jansen van Rensburg, M. S., & Mapitsa, C. B. (2017). Gender responsiveness diagnostic of national monitoring and evaluation systems-methodological reflections. *African Evaluation Journal, 5*(1).

Kalbarczyk, A., Krugman, D., Elnakib, S., Hazel, E., Luo, A., Malhotra, A., & Morgan, R. (2025). Towards a common understanding of gender-responsive monitoring and evaluation for health programs and interventions: evidence from a scoping review. *SSM-Health Systems, 100059*.

Kelly, C., Kasperavicius, D., Duncan, D., Etherington, C., Giangregorio, L., Presseau, J., ... & Straus, S. (2021). 'Doing'or 'using'intersectionality? Opportunities and challenges in incorporating intersectionality into knowledge translation theory and practice. *International Journal for Equity in Health, 20*(1), 187.

Kitada, M., Johannesen, E., Ojwala, R. A., Buckingham, S., Sun, Z., Rodríguez-Chaves, M., ... & Schofield, C. (2023). Barriers to the collection of gender-disaggregated data in ocean science. *Human Factors in Management and Leadership, 71*.

Leal Filho, W., Kovaleva, M., Tsani, S., Țîrcă, D. M., Shiel, C., Dinis, M. A. P., ... & Tripathi, S. (2022). Promoting gender equality across the sustainable development goals. *Environment, Development and Sustainability, 1*.

Linan-Thompson, S., Lara-Martinez, J. A., & Cavazos, L. O. (2018). Exploring the intersection of evidence-based practices and culturally and linguistically responsive practices. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 54*(1), 6-13.

Ludgate, N. (2019). Monitoring, evaluation, learning (MEL) framework: version 01.

Maramba, P., & Bamberger, M. (2001). A gender responsive monitoring and evaluation system for rural travel and transport programs in Africa. *SSATP (Sub-Saharan Africa Transport Policy Program, The World Bank and Economic Commission for Africa) Working Paper*, (55).

McCrudden, C. (2004). Equality and non-discrimination. *Available at SSRN 568341*.

Miletto, M., Pangare, V., & Thuy, L. (2019). *Gender-responsive indicators for water assessment, monitoring and reporting* (Vol. 1). UNESCO Publishing.

Moeckli, D. (2017). Equality and non-discrimination. In *Equality and Non-Discrimination under International Law* (pp. 53-70). Routledge.

Morgan, R., Kalbarczyk, A., Decker, M., Elnakib, S., Igusa, T., Luo, A., ... & Malhotra, A. (2024). Gender-responsive monitoring and evaluation for health systems. *Health Policy and Planning, 39*(9), 1000-1005.

Mulema, A. A., Cramer, L. K., & Huyer, S. (2021). Stakeholder engagement in gender and climate change policy processes: Lessons from CCAFS.

Nikghadam-Hojjati, S., Marchetti, E., Gustavsson, M., Ferrada, F., Oliveira, A. I., Halvarsson Lundqvist, A., ... & Andreica, L. (2025). Gender-Responsive Research and Innovation: Issues and Initiatives. *Sustainability, 17*(13), 6215.

Phoenix, A., & Pattynama, P. (2006). intersectionality. *European Journal of Women's Studies, 13*(3), 187-192.

Phillips, S. P., & Hamberg, K. (2016). Doubly blind: a systematic review of gender in randomised controlled trials. *Global Health Action, 9*(1), 29597.

Qizi, K. S. O. (2021). Teaching Gender-Sensitive Language And Gender-Biased Terminology. *The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations, 3*(09), 28-33.

Qureshi, I., Gogoi, M., Al-Oraibi, A., Wobi, F., Pan, D., Martin, C. A., ... & Nellums, L. B. (2022). Intersectionality and developing evidence-based policy. *The Lancet, 399*(10322), 355-356.

Radjabova, A. M. (2022). From Gender Blindness to Gender Equality Policy. *International Journal of Social Science And Human Research, 5*(3).

Ramcharan, B. G. (2017). Equality and nondiscrimination. In *Equality and Non-Discrimination under International Law* (pp. 29-52). Routledge.

Rodrigues, I. B., Fahim, C., Garad, Y., Presseau, J., Hoens, A. M., Braimoh, J., ... & Straus, S. E. (2023). Developing the intersectionality supplemented Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR) and tools for intersectionality considerations. *BMC Medical Research Methodology, 23*(1), 262.

Roysircar, G. (2009). Evidence-based practice and its implications for culturally sensitive treatment. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 37*(2), 66-82.

Scanlan, M. (2012). The role of an epistemology of inclusivity on the pursuit of social justice: A case study. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 25*(8), 1067-1086.

Shields, S. A. (2008). Gender: An intersectionality perspective. *Sex Roles, 59*(5), 301-311.

Sproule, K., Podems, D., & Negroustoueva, S. (2025). CGIAR Science Group Evaluations: Gender Equality and Social Inclusion.

Swaminathan, M., & Niyati, S. (2022). Gender Disaggregated Data in Agriculture. In *Engendering Agricultural Development* (pp. 15-27). CRC Press.

Tirivanhu, P., & Jansen van Rensburg, M. (2018). Assessing gender responsiveness of the Government-wide Monitoring and Evaluation System in South Africa. *Development Southern Africa, 35*(2), 163-178.

U. N. I. C. E. F. Guidance. (2019). On Gender Integration in Evaluation.

Waal, M. D. (2006). Evaluating gender mainstreaming in development projects. *Development in Practice, 16*(2), 209-214.

Weldon, S. L. (2008). Intersectionality. *Politics, gender and concepts: Theory and methodology, 193-218*.

Wokadala, J. (2016). Gender responsiveness diagnostic report of national monitoring and evaluation systems in Uganda.

Wroblewski, A., & Stadler, B. (2024). Gender-Monitoring: Relevanz von Monitoring für reflexive Gleichstellungspolitik.

Yu, J., Elliott, M., Curtis, M., Pontin, D., Wallace, S., & Wallace, C. (2025). Promoting Inclusivity in Research: Lessons From Four Group Concept Mapping Studies. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 24*, 16094069251329732.

Zhang, L., Wu, Y., & Wu, X. (2017). Achieving non-discrimination in data release. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining* (pp. 1335-1344).

Zickafoose, A., Ilesanmi, O., Diaz-Manrique, M., Adeyemi, A. E., Walumbe, B., Strong, R., ... & Dooley, K. (2024). Barriers and challenges affecting quality education (Sustainable Development Goal# 4) in sub-Saharan Africa by 2030. *Sustainability, 16*(7), 2657.