

EQA for Evaluaciòn Independiente del Programa Páis, Ecuador (2010-2014)

Title of Evaluation Report: Evaluaciòn Independiente del Programa Páis, Ecuador (2010-2014)

OVERALL QUALITY RATING: Poor

Summary: The evaluation followed the Terms of Reference and was largely consistent with UNFPA quality requirements. Its conclusions and recommendations for most of the questions were well-supported. A major problem in the analysis was the lack of a clear connection between the output produced by UNFPA and the expected outcomes. To an extent this was due to problems with the evaluation matrix, in which outcomes were not well defined in measurable terms. Data acquisition on these results was not clearly defined or presented, although the evaluation suggested that 67 percent of the targets (which were themselves not well defined) were achieved. The evaluation suggested that improvements in the evaluation system to make the results more measurable will help evaluate subsequent periods.

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<p>1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting <i>To ensure report is user-friendly, comprehensive, logically structured and drafted in accordance with international standards.</i> Checklist of minimum content and sequence required for structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Acronyms; ii) Exec Summary; iii) Introduction; iv) Methodology including Approach and Limitations; v) Context; vi) Findings/Analysis; vii) Conclusions; viii) Recommendations; ix) Transferable Lessons Learned (where applicable) Minimum requirements for Annexes: ToRs; Bibliography; List of interviewees; Methodological instruments used. 				<p><i>Good.</i> The report includes all of the required sections/content specified in the criteria (acronyms; executive summary; introduction; context; findings/analysis; conclusions; recommendations). The methodology (including approach and limitations content), section 1.3, is folded into the introduction (chapter 1).</p> <p>The annex includes the ToR, resources/documents consulted (bibliography), list of interviewees, and the methodological instruments used (interview and focus group protocols).</p>

<p>2. Executive Summary <i>To provide an overview of the evaluation, written as a stand-alone section and presenting main results of the evaluation.</i> Structure (paragraph equates to half page max):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Purpose, including intended audience(s); ii) Objectives and Brief description of intervention (1 para); iii) Methodology (1 para); iv) Main Conclusions (1 para); v) Recommendations (1 para). Maximum length 3-4 page. 	<p><i>Good.</i> The executive summary is clear and comprehensive and includes all standard sections required. However, it is longer than necessary (4.5 pages), largely because the sections on Purpose, Objectives and Brief Description of the Intervention are too long. The section on methodology includes material on the UNFPA intervention that could have been in the section on Objectives.</p>
<p>3. Design and Methodology <i>To provide a clear explanation of the following elements/tools</i> Minimum content and sequence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explanation of methodological choice, including constraints and limitations; Techniques and Tools for data collection provided in a detailed manner; Triangulation systematically applied throughout the evaluation; Details of participatory stakeholders' consultation process are provided; Details on how cross-cutting issues (vulnerable groups, youth, gender, equality) were addressed in the design and the conduct of the evaluation. 	<p><i>Good.</i> The evaluation team provided a detailed explanation of the methodology, which was consistent with UNFPA requirements. Details were provided on the techniques and tools used for data collection (document review, interviews, focus groups, and field visits) and the sampling method (purposive and stratified sample). There were some difficulties in identifying outcomes in the evaluation matrix, which was noted by the evaluators, in that the indicators for outcomes was not clear. The triangulation method based on a combination of document reviews, interviews and observation was good. The selection of interviewees was done through a purposive stratified sample, but how this was done in practice was not clear, except that the evaluation team noted it was done according to UNFPA standards as outlined in the evaluation manual. Stakeholder consultation was both through the interviews and through review of the first draft.</p>
<p>4. Reliability of Data <i>To clarify data collection processes and data quality</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sources of qualitative and quantitative data have been identified; Credibility of primary (e.g. interviews and focus groups) and secondary (e.g. reports) data established and limitations made explicit; Disaggregated data by gender has been utilized where necessary. 	<p><i>Good</i> The sources of qualitative data used in the report were identified clearly in the annex of the report, and referenced in the body of the report. The report also listed the number of interviews; the authors identify 183 institutions and key informants. The size of the sample was adequate enough that, when considered together with the desk review, the data used could be considered credible and reliable.</p>

	<p>However, data does not seem to have been disaggregated by gender in the discussion of data collection (focus groups and interviews).</p>
<p>5. Findings and Analysis <i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i> <u>Findings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Findings stem from rigorous data analysis; • Findings are substantiated by evidence; • Findings are presented in a clear manner <p><u>Analysis</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpretations are based on carefully described assumptions; • Contextual factors are identified. • Cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results (including unintended results) are explained. 	<p><i>Poor</i></p> <p>The findings are structured around questions of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability. The evidence is not always convincing. Part of the problem is that the difference between outcomes and outputs is not always clear. In fact, what is called an output in the report is something that governments do, which would be, for UNFPA, an outcome. The connection between what UNFPA produces (its strategy) and the outcomes is not always clear. The evaluation states that 66.7% of identified targets were achieved, but it is not clear how that figure was obtained as information on what output indicators are is not provided, nor is a logical framework. Thus, the cause-effect links are weak. The findings on efficiency are good, but those on effectiveness do not stem from rigorous data analysis nor provide sufficient substantiating evidence.</p>
<p>6. Conclusions <i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conclusions are based on credible findings; • Conclusions are organized in priority order; • Conclusions must convey evaluators' unbiased judgment of the intervention. 	<p><i>Poor</i></p> <p>The conclusions relating to efficiency and relevance are based on credible findings. The conclusions on effectiveness are limited by the underlying weakness in the methodology for determining the relationship between outputs produced by UNFPA (its strategy, including advocacy, technical assistance and, presumably, funding of capacity-developing activities. The conclusions are not organized in priority order, but are clearly unbiased.</p>
<p>7. Recommendations <i>To assess the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations flow logically from conclusions; • Recommendations must be strategic, targeted and operationally-feasible; • Recommendations must take into account stakeholders' consultations whilst remaining impartial; 	<p><i>Good</i></p> <p>Most of the recommendations flow from the conclusions, particularly relating to South-South cooperation and the implementation of the evaluation system. They are reasonably targeted and feasible and take into account the consultations that took place either on the first draft or</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations should be presented in priority order 	during the field work. They are not, however, presented in priority order (they are all first priority).
<p>8. Meeting Needs</p> <p>To ensure that Evaluation Report responds to requirements (scope & evaluation questions/issues/DAC criteria) stated in the ToR (ToR must be annexed to the report).In the event that the ToR do not conform with commonly agreed quality standards, assess if evaluators have highlighted the deficiencies with the ToR.</p>	<p><i>Good</i></p> <p>The evaluation report was consistent with the ToR, which was annexed. It followed the expected procedures.</p>

Quality assessment criteria (and Multiplying factor *)	Assessment Levels (*)			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
1. Structure and clarity of reporting (2)		2		
2. Executive summary (2)		2		
3. Design and methodology (5)		5		
4. Reliability of data (5)		5		
5. Findings and analysis (50)			50	
6. Conclusions (12)			12	
7. Recommendations (12)		12		
8. Meeting needs (12)		12		
TOTAL		38	62	

(*) Insert the multiplying factor associated with the criteria in the corresponding column e.g. - if "Finding and Analysis" has been assessed as "good", please enter the number 50 into the "Good" column. The Assessment level scoring the higher number of points will determine the overall quality of the Report