



Organizational unit:	Senegal CO	Year of report:	2023
Title of evaluation report:	EVALUATION OF THE 8th COUNTRY PROGRAM, SENEGAL 2019-2023		
Overall quality of report:	Very good	Date of assessment:	9 March 2023
Overall comments:	<p>The EVALUATION OF THE 8th COUNTRY PROGRAM, SENEGAL 2019-2023 report is a solid report that treats a substantial amount of data and complex concepts in a 67-page narrative document with a supporting annex of over 100 pages. The report's strengths include that it is structured in line with UNFPA guidance, and respects the ToR, with findings, recommendations, and conclusions that are linked and logically structured. Gender and other cross-cutting themes are included as a standalone criterion and are addressed in the findings, conclusions, and recommendations with associated data and evidence. While the report, for the most part, is quite strong there are a few shortcomings. Firstly, in some sections the data is overly dense and not well curated making it challenging for the reader to follow. The methodology section could have addressed how the UNEG ethical standards were incorporated and provided a more in-depth explanation of the data analysis approaches. Finally, the analysis would have benefited from respondent perspectives being more clearly articulated. The conclusions and recommendations are effectively presented. The evaluation also performs well in respect to disability inclusion. The methodology section briefly mentions that persons with disabilities were included as part of the LNOB approach and the subject is touched upon in the context section. There is a good analysis of extent to which the CP addressed DI under Relevance and the issues are then carried through to the conclusions and a recommendation.</p>		

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)

I. Structure and Clarity of Reporting	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good
--	----------------------	-------------------	-----------

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)?	Partial	The report is clearly structured, in accordance with UNFPA and professional standards, with an introduction, background, findings, conclusions, and recommendations section. There is an absence of a clearly labeled section on lessons learned, however the program components that were deemed effective by the evaluation team, those that were not, and the implications for this and other programs can be extrapolated. The report, while well written in some sections, is in others less easy to read and at times a bit overwhelming due to the lack of curation of how and what data are presented.
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)	Yes	This country program evaluation is 67 pages long in length for the narrative section, in accordance with UNFPA standards.
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	The CPE evaluation appendix is comprehensive and includes all data collection tools, a complete list of interviewees, a bibliography, and the ToRs.

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?	Yes	The executive summary includes all of the required information, although the description of what the programme actually does is somewhat general and the findings are somewhat complex in their descriptions.
5. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	Yes	The abstract follows the UNFPA guidelines of five pages.

2. Design and Methodology	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good
<i>To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context</i>			
1. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?	Yes	The institutional and political context is generally well-described.	
2. Does the evaluation report discuss and assess the intervention logic and/or theory of change?	Partial	The theory of change is covered in some detail, but the discussion is not particularly clear. The graphic depiction includes a problem statement, risks and assumptions, and shows the linear progression between outputs, outcomes and impacts. However, the articulation of program outputs is vague (i.e., the output on GBV is 'strengthened capacities to respond to GBV') and do not explain what the program did. As such, causal connections cannot easily be seen.	
<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 framework and matrix provide an overview of the evaluation questions, assumptions, indicators, and sources. The evaluation matrix also highlights the key findings and analyses that inform the evaluation report. <input type="checkbox"/>	
4. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Yes	This is discussed in the section on sampling, where the evaluators provide a table outlining the sample subgroups and the data collection technique that will be used for that subgroup.	
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)?	Partial	The sampling framework provides an overview of the stakeholders that were targeted by the evaluation, but a full stakeholder analysis is not provided outside the context of the sampling targets for the evaluation. Vulnerable communities are among the key stakeholders and the consultation process is also presented.	
6. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	Partial	The report highlights the conceptual model and method of data analysis and discusses approaches such as triangulation, but it could be a bit stronger and more thorough in terms of the content and trend analysis of data collected from interview and focus groups.	
7. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? Does the report discuss what was done to minimize such issues?	Yes	The challenges and limitations of the evaluation approach are highlighted, as well as the mitigation measures employed.	
8. Is the sampling strategy described?	Yes	The sampling strategy is described in detail in Section 1.3.2, and the data collection and methodology are entirely qualitative outside of the secondary data mining. Therefore, the sampling is purposive and targeted in nature.	
9. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Yes	The typology and gender of respondents and evaluation participants are clearly evident in the sampling approach, which also emphasizes data collection from vulnerable and marginalized groups.	
10. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights)?	Yes	The sample selection is very intentional about including women and other vulnerable and marginalized groups (including persons with disabilities), and the evaluation criteria and questions also highlight cross-cutting themes critical to the work of UNFPA's country program in Senegal in the report.	
3. Reliability of Data			
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Good
<i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i>			
1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?	Yes	Although the report uses a substantial amount of secondary data and highlights feedback from institutional actors and beneficiaries, the different sources are triangulated in the report.	
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Partial	The report presents qualitative and quantitative data. The document review, secondary data, and list of interviewees in the report are very thorough. However, the presentation of data was clunky and the perspectives of rightsholders could be more apparent.	
3. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	Partial	Although the report emphasizes the inclusion of marginalized groups, there is not a discussion of UNEG's ethical requirements or ethical considerations in the methodology section. However, the protocols show that attention was paid to anonymity, confidentiality and informed consent.	

4. Analysis and Findings	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Good
<i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>			
1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	Yes	The report uses a considerable amount of data, which is sometimes not presented in the most accessible way, but the main findings are well supported by qualitative and quantitative data. The evaluators also point out instances where data are not available in the report to support a conclusive analysis.	
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Partial	Although the explanations are clear in the evaluation matrix, in the main report there is considerable variation with the text being dense and difficult to follow in several sections.	
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	The analysis is organized by criteria and within each by question.	
4. Are the cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Partial	The analysis does not always show what the intervention produced and what was supposed to happen. In some questions, in relevance for example, it was not clear what UNFPA produced that could be connected with what was observed. There were more problems in effectiveness, in the main text, because the interventions were not well-described, although they were in the evaluation matrix in Appendix 1. There was use of terms like "almost significantly affected" or "quasi-sufficient contributions". The data shown in 4.4.1 on "capacities of health structures ... are heightened" is not clear and, like other in the findings section, usually use percentages with two decimals (115.13%) that gives a false impression of detail. There is also no explicit analysis of unanticipated outcomes, although there is a brief discussion on unexpected results during the pandemic.	
5. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	The report presents data that varies by gender, age, ability and various respondent typologies.	
6. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	The data in the report highlight how factors such as budget, context, political will, infrastructure, and related resources affected program outcomes and performance.	
7. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	The report successfully addresses gender and vulnerable/marginalized groups, including persons with disabilities, where relevance to the theme throughout the document.	
5. Conclusions			
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good
<i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i>			
1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?	Yes	The conclusions are well presented. They are organized according to the results by criteria and questions, allowing the reader to understand the relationship between the findings and	
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?	Yes	This section provides a higher-level analysis and explores program performance on all cross-cutting themes, including gender and vulnerable/marginalized groups.	
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	The conclusions appear to be based on data and the evaluator's unbiased review of the performance of the country program.	
6. Recommendations			
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Very good
<i>To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i>			
1. Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?	Yes	The recommendations, conclusions, and findings are all structured according to the evaluation question and criteria, so they are all logically structured and the interconnections are obvious to the reviewer. They also build on the findings and conclusions.	
2. Are the recommendations targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Yes	The recommendations are prioritized and the human, financial and technical implications are clearly identified.	
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	They are balanced and some recommendations focus on gender and vulnerable and marginalized groups.	
4. Are the recommendations prioritized?	Yes	Recommendations are prioritized according to UNFPA standards.	

7. Gender	0 1 2 3 ⁽ⁱⁱⁱ⁾	Assessment Level:	Very good
To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) ^(iv)			
1. Is GEEW integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and indicators designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data to be collected?	3		<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) 1 The thematic scope covers human rights and LNOB, but not specifically GEEW.</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) 3 Cross-cutting themes were a stand-alone criterion in this evaluation and were also addressed, where appropriate, under other questions and criteria.</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) 3 This issue is addressed in the criteria for cross-cutting themes.</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) 3 The report does highlight that there were some issues with the accessibility of data as it relates to gender equality and human rights where it presents an issue for the analysis.</p>
2. Is a gender-responsive methodology used, including gender-responsive methods and tools, and data analysis techniques?	2		<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) 1 There is reference to an inclusive approach to data collection but details are not provided on how the evaluation was designed to be gender-responsive.</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) 2 The evaluation was primarily qualitative, with secondary data used for the quantitative component.</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) 2 The report uses a wide range of data sources. However, the data is sometimes complex and difficult to track.</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) 2 The sampling framework takes into account gender and marginalized groups but does not provide clear targets for their inclusion.</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) 1 The evaluation does not explicitly address ethical considerations or UNEG guidelines, although the preamble to the data collection protocols includes reference to confidentiality, etc.</p>
3. Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?	3		<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) 3 The report includes a substantive section that explores gender in relation to the UNDAF, the SDGs and UNFPA's strategy in the Senegalese context.</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) 2 The report presents data on gender-specific indicators throughout the document, where relevant, although the voices of rightsholders could be more apparent.</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3) 2 This is addressed to some extent in the discussion of the CP response to the pandemic.</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) 3 The report includes at least 2-3 recommendations specifically related to gender and vulnerable groups.</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	49	51		
Overall assessment level of evaluation report	Very 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.

Cross cutting issues 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: