

Quality Checklist for the Make Way Tools

To support improving the intersectional advocacy tools

June, 2026

This quality checklist was developed to provide practical support to organisations that are using tools from the Make Way toolkit, to check the quality of the tools, and to adapt and improve them for their own purposes.¹

The Make Way toolkit is a package of materials that intends to enable organisations to undertake intersectional SRHR lobby and advocacy. Each tool in the toolkit has a different purpose. Some tools build a conceptual understanding of intersectionality or help clarify values. Others guide the user in applying the principles underlying intersectionality, in their approach to policy analysis, community engagement and communication.

This checklist can be used as a 'menu' of questions that one can select based on their objectives of the quality check, time available, and the level of experience with the tool(s) of the checklist user. The questions are structured around the following themes:

- A.** Do-ability (ease of use, accessibility, implementation process)
- B.** Intersectionality, and
- C.** Effectiveness.

The questions of the checklist can be answered by either the facilitators of a tool implementation process or by the participants in this process. It's about capturing their experiences with the tool(s) and their feedback on how to improve certain elements of the content of the tool(s) and/or implementation of the tool(s).

¹ The development of the quality checklist also links to one of Make Way's learning agenda questions: *"What is the quality of our intersectionalised tools? How can they be adapted to become more intersectional?"*, and it falls under the broader learning question *"To what extent have we operationalised intersectionality in advocacy for SRHR?"*.

Make Way tools - Quality Checklist

General information

Question	Answer
Make Way tool that was checked:	
Indicate if you answered the questions based on: • <i>Your overall experience with the tool (can be multiple cases of use)</i> • <i>A specific (advocacy) case</i>	
If you answered 'a specific (advocacy) case' in the previous question, please indicate which case this was:	
Name of your organisation:	
Date you responded to the questions:	
Your name:	
Your position:	
Describe if and with whom you responded to the questions:	

Checklist questions

A. DO-ABILITY

Ease of use:

1. Does the tool include a clear, step-by-step guide or manual for the facilitator, with examples and templates where necessary?
2. Is the tool easy to understand and use for people with different levels of expertise, education, and literacy, including people with limited advocacy experience?
3. Does the tool provide all necessary materials, e.g. guides, examples, etc., so that the facilitator can use the tool without external support?

Accessibility:

4. Can people with disabilities access and use the tool?
And if you have this information: what do people with disabilities think of the accessibility of the tool, i.e. translation to all languages, high contrasts, subtitles for videos, etc. and can they use the tool?

5. Is the language used in the tool simple, clear, and free of jargon?

This question is also important in case you worked with the (automatically) translated tools, through the Make Way website (<https://www.make-way.org>).

6. *Extra question on the design of the tool:*

Is the tool's design compatible with the Universal Design Principles?

(<https://dac.berkeley.edu/services/campus-building-accessibility/universal-design-principles>)

Implementation process:

7. How long does it usually take to implement the tool?

Approximate average time spent.

8. Is the length of the implementation process reasonable for the intended users/recipients?

If not, what is the ideal expected duration?

9. Does the tool provide guidance on how to shorten or extend the timeframe if users have different capacities or constraints?

10. Is the tool designed in such a way that implementing it works well for the intended objectives and/or in the intended situations?

11. Are there any barriers to implementing the tool?

These can be practical barriers such as having to mobilise groups of people to get together or finding the right moment of the day to organise a meeting due to competing schedules from different participants. Or, for example, operational barriers such as (high) costs related to implementing the tool, etc.

If yes, does the tool include guidance on how to mitigate these barriers so that different groups of participants/people can implement it?

12. How easily can the tool be adapted to different contexts?

Think of different cultural norms, rural vs. urban settings, language constraints, identities of the participants, etc.

13. Are there any steps in the implementation process that can be simplified or made more efficient, to better suit the users' context and capacities? If yes, which?

B. INTERSECTIONALITY

Note: The intersectionality questions below can be used to either check the quality of (1) the tool's manual/guidelines, or (2) the process of using/implementing it. Or both.

Specify which of your responses are about the quality of the manual/guidelines, or the process of implementing the tool.

1. How does the tool ensure diversity among participants?

For example, people working in different sectors, people with different (gender or sexual) identities, people from different ages, etc.

Note: To answer this question, it is important to know how the data on these indicators are disaggregated, so for example, what gender or sexual identities are considered and presented.

Consider the following questions to answer this question:

- a. Are voices of certain (groups of) people missed?
- b. Are specific gender-related or identity-related needs specifically considered, or overlooked?
- c. Are you aware of particular gender norms that may limit the participation of certain groups / participants?²

2. What is the process for ensuring meaningful engagement of diverse and marginalised groups in the implementation process of the tools, and in decision-making processes about the ways in which the tool will be implemented?

For example, youth being in the lead of the implementation process.

Note: With 'diverse and marginalized groups' we refer to: people who face challenges and discrimination due to a variety of factors, including their race, gender identity, sexuality, ability, socioeconomic status, age, religious background, etc.

3. How does the tool identify the challenges and different views that diverse and marginalised groups, of those participating in the tool, experience?

And how does the tool prioritise their voices in the implementation process?

4. Does the tool bring out power differentials?

If yes, how:

- a. Does the tool allow for identifying different levels of power between and within groups? E.g. between duty bearers and youth, or among a group of youth.
- b. Does the tool allow for addressing these power imbalances?
- c. Does the tool provide mitigation strategies to deal with these power imbalances?

5. Does the tool include questions that help identify harmful gender norms and power relations?

If so, does the tool also help to transform gender norms and power relations?

² For more information on a gender transformative approach, and definitions of concepts, please have a look at Rutgers' GTA: <https://rutgers.international/GTA>

6. **If data collection is a required step in the tool, does the tool guide users on how to best collect data for intersectional purposes?**

7. **How does the tool incorporate self-reflection for facilitators and participants to recognise their privileges, biases, and understand how this influences their perspectives and actions?**

8. **Does the tool pay (enough) attention to how structural factors are creating or worsening the issues experienced by marginalised groups?**
 For example, what are influences of the economic system, laws, religious and socio-cultural norms on inequalities or inequities between people, on social justice (issues), on harmful perceptions about people, etc.

9. **How does the tool propose solutions to address the root causes of the issues experienced by marginalised groups?**

10. **Does the tool include mechanisms for ongoing accountability as well as co-creation with marginalised groups as contexts evolve?**
 For example, regular check-ins, feedback loops, etc.

11. **What aftercare moments or reflection processes are included to ensure participant safety, to mitigate discomfort, and to handle sensitive information after using the tool?**
 E.g., the safe space used for implementing the tool might not be safe after all. How did you deal with this and followed up on the effects?
 Or e.g. people feel uncomfortable or otherwise personally affected after someone has shared a personal story. How did you deal with this, and followed up on the effects?

12. **How does the tool ensure that marginalised groups are benefitting in the long-term from its implementation?**
 I.e. is there a built-in accountability mechanism (e.g. follow-up interviews, or surveys) to confirm that improvements reach those groups?

13. **Does the tool explicitly help users understand intersectionality or equivalent concepts like 'leave no one behind' and apply these in practice? If yes, how?**
 Note: Due to sensitivities in some contexts or situations, the word 'intersectionality' is not always used explicitly, but instead a term like 'leave no one behind' is used. This should be considered when addressing this question.

C. EFFECTIVENESS

- 1. Are the goals of the tool, including the underlying logic/set of assumptions on how these goals will be reached, clear?**
- 2. Are the tools meeting their intended objectives in facilitating intersectional lobby and advocacy? How do you know that?**
Please add an example of (a) successful advocacy initiative(s) that can be directly attributed to the use of these tools.
- 3. What effects / changes have you noticed after using the tool?**
These can be both positive and negative effects, as well as intended and unintended changes.
- 4. Is there a built-in way to assess the tool's ongoing effectiveness?**
For example, periodic reviews, user feedback.
- 5. In what ways does the tool cover your organisation's needs, in terms of (advocacy) objectives?**
Has using the tool contributed to changing advocacy practices or policies in your organisation? If yes, in what way(s)?
- 6. Have other programmes / organisations successfully used the tool?**
If so, how did they use the tool, and what lessons did they learn? What adaptations did they make? How and why?