

Organizational unit: _____ **Year of report:** 2022

Title of evaluation report: EVALUATION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF GHANA/ UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND (UNFPA) GHANA 7th COUNTRY PROGRAMME (2018 – 2022)

Overall quality of report: Good **Date of assessment:** 20 April 2022

Overall comments: This is a thorough report that provides a comprehensive overview and analysis of Ghana's 7th Country Programme. To collect data, the evaluators used a mixed-methods approach that included document analysis, key informant interviews, and focus group discussions with rights holders, with the sampling process based on detailed stakeholder mapping. The annexed stakeholder map is thorough and organizes institutional stakeholders by CPAP output. The evaluation matrix is also well developed with detailed indicators and summarized key findings for each evaluation question. The methodology section is comprehensive and includes a good description of ethical considerations and of how the sampling strategy ensured a representative sample across different target groups. The findings are well organized and evidenced by ample and carefully sourced qualitative and quantitative data, including participant quotes. The 19 recommendations appear useful for guiding the next phase of the Country Programme, however a more succinct set would be more manageable, particularly for preparing a management response. The executive summary would also benefit from a more succinct presentation so that the main results and recommendations of the evaluation stand out more clearly while also providing insight on the amount of data that informed the process. In addition, it would be helpful if the conclusions in the executive summary and in the main body of the report, were all at a higher level showing the overall strengths, areas for improvement, and how to move forward.

The evaluation performs strongly in respect to disability inclusion. Disability is addressed as one of the cross-cutting themes and within two evaluations questions (under Relevance and Coverage), as well as in the subsection on ethical considerations which notes issues to attend to when disability related data was collected. Disability analysis is also reflected across the findings section and one of the recommendations focuses on disability.

Although this is a strong evaluation, particularly in terms of the methodological process and findings, it is suggested that an overall rating of Good would be more appropriate given that the Executive

Assessment Levels

Very Good	strong, above average, best practice	Good	satisfactory, respectable	Fair	with some weaknesses, still acceptable	Unsatisfactory	weak, does not meet minimal quality standards
------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------	---------------------------	-------------	--	-----------------------	---

Quality Assessment Criteria *Insert assessment level followed by main comments. (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)*

1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting

Yes No Partial		Assessment Level:	Fair
----------------------	--	-------------------	-------------

To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly

1. Is the report structured in a logical way? Is the report easy to read and understand (i.e. written in an accessible language appropriate for the intended audience) with minimal grammatical, spelling or punctuation errors? Is there a clear distinction made between analysis/findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned (where applicable)?	Yes	The report is logically structured with well-defined sections. The writing is clear and easy to understand, although there are a few, mainly grammatical errors. In future reports, evaluators should be encouraged to use rights based terminology, whereby the 'beneficiaries' of the interventions are acknowledged as 'rights holders' and those with responsibilities for implementing, administrating, funding and otherwise supporting the interventions are acknowledged as 'duty bearers'.
---	-----	---

2. Is the report of a reasonable length? (maximum pages for the main report, excluding annexes: 60 for institutional evaluations; 70 for CPEs; 80 for thematic evaluations)	Partial	The report is 73 pages (including the Executive Summary), slightly exceeding the maximum length of 70 pages allowed for CPEs.
---	---------	---

3. Do the annexes contain – at a minimum – the ToRs; a bibliography; a list of interviewees; the evaluation matrix; methodological and data collection tools used (e.g. interview guides; focus group notes, outline of surveys)?	Yes	Annexes are complete and include ToR, list of interviews, list of documents, evaluation matrix, ToC, stakeholder map, data collection tools, and CPE agenda.
---	-----	--

Executive summary

4. Is an executive summary written as a stand-alone section, presenting the i) Purpose; ii) Objectives, scope and brief description of interventions; iii) intended audience; iv) Methodology; v) Main results; vi) Conclusions and Recommendations?	Partial	The executive summary has all of the essential elements; however, the methodology is described in broad terms and does not address the number and types of stakeholders involved, or whether data was gathered remotely or in person. The conclusions, particularly the programmatic conclusions, include details normally placed in findings and could be more high-level.
--	---------	---

5. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	No	The executive summary is a little over 5 pages in length, which is slightly longer than the permitted length. The summary font size is one unit lower than the report body font size, making it shorter than it would otherwise be. In certain parts, it's also text-heavy, with multiple large paragraphs. Although the wording is clear, this section would be more accessible if it were presented in a more concise and less detailed manner enabling the key results and recommendations to stand out.
---	----	---

2. Design and Methodology

Yes No Partial		Assessment Level:	Very good
----------------------	--	-------------------	------------------

To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context

1. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?	Yes	The context of the evaluation including development challenges, national strategies, and the role of external assistance is clearly described in chapter 2.
--	-----	---

2. Does the evaluation report discuss and assess the intervention logic and/or theory of change?	Yes	The Theory of Change (ToC) of the CP is presented in Annex 5 and Figure 5. The ToC was reconstructed to include COVID-19 as a risk to programme implementation.
--	-----	---

<i>To ensure a rigorous design and methodology</i>			
3. Is the evaluation framework clearly described in the text and in the evaluation matrix? Does the evaluation matrix establish the evaluation questions, assumptions, indicators, data sources and methods for data collection?	Yes	The evaluation matrix is briefly described in the text and provided in annex 4. It includes evaluation questions by criterion, assumptions to be assessed, indicators, sources of information, and methods for data collection. Additionally, an extensive set of key findings are also detailed for each EQ in the matrix.	
4. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Yes	The data collection tools, which include key informant interviews (KIs), focus group discussions (FGDs), and document review, are clearly described and are based on the indicators within the evaluation matrix.	
5. Is there a comprehensive stakeholder map? Is the stakeholder consultation process clearly described (in particular, does it include the consultation of key stakeholders on draft recommendations)?	Yes	A detailed stakeholder map is provided in Annex 6, which organizes institutional stakeholders by CPAP output. The stakeholder groups consulted are also detailed in Table 3 and Table 4. It appears that key stakeholders had the opportunity to provide some input on the recommendations as the timeline indicates the ERG provided comments on the full draft report. The beginning of the recommendations section that there will be further discussions with the ERG to 'fine tune' them.	
6. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	Yes	Methods of analysis are clearly described. Qualitative data was analysed using the content and thematic analysis framework, whereas quantitative data was analysed using descriptive statistical methods.	
7. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? Does the report discuss what was done to minimize such issues?	Partial	The methodological limitations as well as their mitigations are described briefly, however, the mitigation measures could be further elaborated on to better understand how they were addressing gaps and limitations. For example, it is noted that "Restrictions related to COVID-19, requires that some data to be collected remotely and therefore depended on respondents having access to Internet and telephones enabling remote communication, which may limit engagement from participants residing in remote and less resourced settings". However, it is not clear how or if this limitation was mitigated.	
8. Is the sampling strategy described?	Yes	The sampling strategy was purposive and is described in section 1.3.4. Table 3 provides a list of institutions of the stakeholders and beneficiaries interviewed, whereas Table 4 provides zonal and gender distribution of the FGD participants across all the three implementation Zones. It is noted that female participants constituted two-thirds of the participants in the FGDs. Similarly, it is indicated that the sample was representative across different groups and CP components.	
9. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Yes	Evaluators have used an appropriate methodology to enable the collection of disaggregated data through extensive document review as well as broad stakeholder consultation through interviews and focus groups with different population groups. Evaluation participants are disaggregated by gender (for KIs, this is done in the annexed list of participants and for FGDs, this is done in a table in the methodology section).	
10. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights)?	Yes	Evaluators adopted an appropriate methodology to assess cross-cutting issues including equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human right. For example, it is noted that the team was sensitive towards special needs around issues such as GBV and disability-related work. Similarly, HRGE and disability is covered in ToC, results framework, and evaluation matrix. EQ9 focuses particularly on most vulnerable and marginalised groups (women and adolescents, and youth with disabilities).	
3. Reliability of Data			
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good
<i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i>			
1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?	Yes	Triangulation is clearly evident with the evaluation matrix showing different data sources for each evaluation question.	
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	Data sources are consistently identified and the reliability of sources is briefly discussed in the methodology section. It is noted that the team "checked the validity of data and verified the robustness of findings at each phase throughout the evaluation". Similarly, regular exchanges were conducted with the evaluation manager at the UNFPA Ghana CO and a debriefing was conducted with the CO and the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) at the end of the field phase.	
3. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	Yes	Ethical Considerations are clearly described under section 1.3.3 including discussion on the UNFPA and UNEG guidance that was followed, including the UNEG Ethical Guidelines and Code of Conduct. There is also a brief explanation of additional considerations made in conducting interviews where data on GBV and disability issues was collected. The data collection tools are included in Annex 5, and the introductory paragraphs make note of the ethical considerations followed.	
4. Analysis and Findings			
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good

To ensure sound analysis and credible findings			
1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	Yes	The findings are adequately backed up by primary as well as secondary/documentary evidences. Data sources are cited in report body as well as in footnotes.	
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	The basis for interpretations are described where applicable, for example under the sustainability criteria in findings, it is noted that "The CP7 was implemented through existing national and district structures and mandates. UNFPA's strengthening of existing structures ensured that the ownership of the programmes was assured".	
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The evaluators have organized the analysis by evaluation criteria and evaluation questions.	
4. Are the cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Yes	Causal linkages between outputs and outcomes are clearly shown. This is particularly evident under EQ3 (Effectiveness Criteria). There is a specific subsection on Unintended Effects (4.4.5) that focuses on adaptations made to programme delivery during the pandemic.	
5. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	Where possible, evaluators show differential outcomes for the various target groups such as people with disabilities and refugee girls.	
6. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	The findings are clearly shown against contextual factors. For example under the effectiveness section, it is noted that "There are difficulties applying the international standards at the national level in Ghana due to culture, stigmatization and protection laws. For example, reporting on gender violence and rape is mandatory by law, but this is not usually accepted at the field level".	
7. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	Under the relevance, effectiveness, and coverage criteria, the analysis expands on cross-cutting issues of vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality, and human rights.	
5. Conclusions			
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Fair
To assess the validity of conclusions			
1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?	Partial	The conclusions are clearly derived from the findings; they state the question(s) and criteria that each was founded on. However, although the strengths of the CP are reflected, this section would be more useful if the areas for improvement were more clearly articulated as well.	
2. Do the conclusions go beyond the findings and provide a thorough understanding of the underlying issues of the programme/initiative/system being evaluated and reflect as appropriate cross-cutting issues such as equality and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Partial	The conclusions address cross-cutting issues such as gender and vulnerability. However, they are very succinctly stated and could be expanded upon - particularly #6 and #13. As well, some of the programmatic conclusions are at the level of findings and/or are framed in the past tense and do not suggest how to move forward.	
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	There is no indication of bias given the conclusions' direct link to findings.	
6. Recommendations			
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Good
To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations			
1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	Partial	The recommendations are directly linked to specific conclusions through numbering, however sometimes the logic behind the connection is not clear. For example, recommendation 19 focuses on building momentum on providing assistance for the conduct of the first fully digital census, however, it is linked to conclusion 11 which speaks about issues related harmful/hegemonic masculinity, GBV, and social norm changes.	
2. Are the recommendations targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Partial	The recommendations are clearly directed toward intended users and provide information on the technical and financial implications of their implementation. However, there are 19 recommendations - good practice is to consolidate them into a maximum of approximately 12 to make them more manageable and to more easily facilitate the management response.	
3. Do recommendations appear balanced and impartial and address, as relevant, key cross cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability-inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	The recommendations appear to be balanced and impartial.	
4. Are the recommendations prioritized?	Yes	This is well done. The recommendations are all prioritized and provide the time-frame for their implementation.	
7. Gender			
	0 1 2 3 ^(98%)	Assessment Level:	Very good

To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) ^(*)

<p>1. Is GEEW integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and indicators designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data to be collected?</p>	<p>a. Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives? (Score: 0-3) This was not evident in the objectives or evaluation purpose, however, the thematic scope directedly addresses human rights and gender. (2)</p> <p>b. Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria? (Score: 0-3) Gender and human rights was mainstreamed into criteria including relevance, effectiveness, and coverage through the evaluation questions. (3)</p> <p>c. Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation? (Score: 0-3) There are dedicated evaluation questions (EQs) and assumptions addressing issues related to GEEW. (3)</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation assess whether sufficient information was collected during the implementation period on specific result indicators to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results?(Score: 0-3) This was done as part of the analysis of the Outcome Indicator for Population & Development, "Census conducted in line with new international standards". (p 48) (3)</p>
<p>2. Is a gender-responsive methodology used, including gender-responsive methods and tools, and data analysis techniques?</p>	<p>a. Does the evaluation specify how gender issues are addressed in the methodology, including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gender considerations and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex? (Score: 0-3) The methodology section describes how gender and inclusion were addressed, as well as how interviews took into account ethical consideration when gathering data related to GBV and disability. Evaluators disaggregated the FGD participants by location, programme type and gender and the KI participants were disaggregated by type and gender. (3)</p> <p>b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEEW considerations (collecting and analyzing both quantitative and qualitative data, and ensuring the appropriate sample size)? (Score: 0-3) The evaluation methodology used mixed methods appropriate for evaluating GEEW considerations, and ensured that there was representative sample across different groups. (3)</p> <p>c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility? (Score: 0-3) There is a specific sub-section on Data Validation and Analysis (1.3.6). Evaluators used a diverse range of data sources and applied appropriate methodology to ensure validity. (3)</p> <p>d. Do the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate? (Score: 0-3) The evaluation reached a diverse group of stakeholders (women, adolescents, youth, men, and most-at-risk population), however, the number of each is not specified. (2)</p> <p>e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality? (Score: 0-3) Ethical standards including their application are clearly described. (3)</p>
<p>3. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?</p>	<p>a. Does the evaluation have a background section that includes an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the issue or spell out the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality? (Score: 0-3) The country context section provides a solid description on issues related to human rights, gender equality, and SRHR, however, it would have been useful to also include an analysis on marginalized groups including people with disabilities and refugees. (2)</p> <p>b. Do the findings include data analysis that explicitly and transparently triangulates the voices of different social role groups, and/or disaggregates quantitative data, where applicable? (Score: 0-3) The findings reflect the voices and perspectives of different social groups, including by incorporating quotes of evaluation participants (rights holders and duty bearers) into the findings. (3)</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3) Section 4.2.5 under findings has a dedicated but brief section on unanticipated outcomes of the intervention related to COVID-19 pandemic, for example, it is noted that "Innovative Mobile Medical Clinics (MHC) were designed and deployed to remote areas providing access to SRH services to the hard-to-reach populations", however, the adolescents preferred outdoor activities over online sessions. (3)</p> <p>d. Does the evaluation report provide specific recommendations addressing GEEW issues, and priorities for action to improve GEEW or the intervention or future initiatives in this area? (Score: 0-3) There are several recommendations oriented towards addressing equity and inclusion. For example, recommendation 7 focuses on strengthening equity and human rights-based approaches and leaving no one behind for differentiated service delivery models to facilitate an effective response to the peculiarities of needs and diverse contexts of hard-to-reach populations and communities. (3)</p>

^(*) This assessment criteria is fully based on the UN-SWAP Scoring Tool. Each sub-criteria shall be equally weighted.

^(**) Scoring uses a four point scale (0-3).

Overall Evaluation Quality Assessment

Quality assessment criteria (scoring points ^{*)}	Assessment Levels ^(*)			
	Very good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
1. Structure and clarity of reporting, including executive summary (7)			7	
2. Design and methodology (13)	13			

3. Reliability of data (11)	11			
4. Analysis and findings (40)	40			
5. Conclusions (11)			11	
6. Recommendations (11)		11		
7. Integration of gender (7)	7			
Total scoring points	71	11	18	

Overall assessment level of evaluation report **Good**

The evaluation integrates adequately cross cutting issues of gender equality, human rights and disability inclusion, even though is not included as part of the evaluation objective.
 The cross-cutting themes, including disability inclusion, are adequately addressed.

Consideration of significant constraints (e.g. COVID-19 or civil unrest)

The quality of this evaluation report has been hampered by exceptionally difficult circumstances: Yes No

If yes, please explain: