

Title of evaluation report: Independent Country Programmatic Evaluation – Turkey 2011-2015 (Oct 2015)

OVERALL QUALITY RATING: Very Good

Summary:

The Independent Country Programmatic Evaluation report of Turkey is a solid, well-written report that meets, to a high standard, the quality assessment criteria, and should be considered an example of good practice for future country programme evaluation reports (a number of elements that are of note as good practice in this report are highlighted in the EQA grid with that purpose in mind). The report is well-written and logically structured, with a succinct executive summary. The report provides a clear explanation of the methodological choice, including coverage of constraints and limitations. Techniques for data collection are provided in a detailed manner, including an explanation of their systematic use of triangulation and details regarding the consultation of participatory stakeholders (e.g. timeline discussion). The focused and limited (seven) set of evaluation question helped sharpen the report findings and supporting data. The evaluation report contains a clear, albeit in-depth, presentation of the Findings in Section 4 - combined with the detailed analysis of the evaluation questions in the revised Evaluation Matrix (Annex 6) - that provides a solid basis for understanding the evaluation results and the Conclusions and Recommendations in Section 5.

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
I. 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: <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. 	Good The evaluation report is user-friendly, comprehensive and logically structured, adhering to the recommended structure. All the basic elements of the main report and the annexes are included. The organization of the detailed findings section is clear. The presentation of the conclusions alongside the recommendations aids the reader. The assessment criteria of “Transferable Lessons learned, which are to be included “where applicable”, is not explicitly presented in the report. However, the Executive Summary provides a brief synopsis of these lessons and the body of the report (Section 3: Context) explicitly addresses how the current programme can build on the lessons learned from the previous one and identified contextual factors that affected performance. While not required by the quality assessment criteria, the Key Facts: Turkey, accompanied by a map of Turkey showing the field visits, immediately prior to the Executive Summary provides very helpful information for understanding the report, and is recommended for the format of future reports.			

<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>Very Good</p> <p>The executive summary is a well-written, stand-alone section that provides a concise three page summary that is compliant with the recommended page limit. All the basic elements are included with a few notable additional helpful subsections, namely a Context section, which includes a purpose statement, and Findings (Section 4) which aids understanding the Conclusions and Recommendations. The intended audience was clearly cited. Methodological choices are discussed explicitly, including an overview of the tools used, the sampling methodology, triangulation, constraints and limitations (as well as mitigation strategies). Main findings, conclusions and recommendations are clearly presented.</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>Very Good</p> <p>Introduction provides a clear explanation of all the basic elements including: a purpose statement of the evaluation; an explanation of methodological choice and techniques and tools, triangulation, the consultation process and how the cross cutting issues were addressed. The report provides a clear explanation of the methodological choice, including coverage of constraints and limitations (e.g. limits of annual work plans, time constraints, geographic spread of programmes and beneficiaries, language alignment, etc.), as well as discussion of the measures taken to mitigate limitations/constraints (e.g. translators, review of additional secondary data, etc.). The activities and deliverables completed at each stage of the evaluation are described in detail. Evaluation questions are described, including discussion of the correspondence with criteria.</p> <p>Techniques for data collection are provided in a detailed manner, including an explanation of their systematic use of triangulation and details regarding the consultation of participatory stakeholders (e.g. timeline discussion). Purposive sampling is defined in detail: diversity of backgrounds, regions, levels of involvement with UNFPA were considered when selecting interviewees (p6).</p> <p>This discussion included a table detailing the type of interviewee/focus group participants (i.e. implementing partner, UNFPA staff, government agency, beneficiary), as well as which programmatic area that they were involved with (i.e. humanitarian assistance, gender equality, population and development, reproductive health).</p> <p>Cross-cutting issues were addressed in the design of the evaluation (i.e. included in the evaluation questions, indicators, and targeted questions within the interview guidelines). Interviews and focus group discussions were designed to take into</p>

	<p>consideration the interests as well as the education levels of the individuals/groups interviewed.</p> <p>Several positive features of the section were: a focused and limited (seven) set of evaluation question that helped sharpen the report findings and supporting data; a solid elaboration of the methods and tools, including the key questions and topics of the interviews and focus groups.</p> <p>The reasons for a rather short period for in-country work, including site visits, could have been provided, given the complexity of the programme and the influx of refugees who are also being served in addition to the primary target groups.</p> <p>Although not included as an element of the EQA grid, the detailed Context section provides an important precursor to understanding the Section 4: Main Findings as well as Section 5: Conclusions and Recommendations. This provides very helpful information for understanding the full report and is a good practice.</p>
<p>4. Reliability of Data</p> <p><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>Good</p> <p>Introduction section details the data collection processes and data quality issues that included all the basic elements of the EQA. This included identifying the data sources, the primary and secondary as well as the limitations and constraints, and is supplemented by the relevant annexes. However, sources of secondary quantitative data in the Context section are not consistently provided. The methodology section clearly identifies all other sources of data, including data limitations.</p> <p>Confusion between outputs and outcomes and their designation as part of interventions lead to some uncertainty for the reader as to the causal connection between the UNFPA programme activities and outcome results, For example, Annex 6: Evaluation Matrix of outputs of the Intervention includes process variables (local authorities and municipalities and imams were involved) (page 48) while others were labeled outputs (a symposium organized by Ministry of Health and Training Curriculum developed (page 48) when in fact that distinction is not clear; even while the outcomes of the same project noted (page 49) are supported by only tentative evidence. The fact the revised Evaluation Matrix deals with Indicators but without differentiating between outputs and outcomes or interventions does not help clarify this source of confusion.</p>

<p>5. Findings and Analysis <i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i></p> <p><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>Very Good</p> <p>Findings section presents sound analysis and credible findings. All the main elements of the EQA criteria are met. The analysis of programme performance and contributions clearly distinguishes between programme activities (e.g. p32 where each of the three main activity pillars are presented on an individual basis).</p> <p>In some areas, more reference to and engagement with supporting evidence would be useful; e.g., in discussion regarding the high ownership of CSO partners, evidence from CSO partner interviews is cited but not presented (p64). Whilst data is presented (e.g. Table 10 on demographics, p28), further engagement and presentation of data and primary evidence would improve the analysis and credibility of findings.</p> <p>The findings present an evidence-based approach that builds on the analysis while providing a constructive basis for formulation of the next programme cycle (e.g., the strategy for the 5th CP did not demonstrate a clear prioritization of the most vulnerable...; p33; government commitment to reproductive health and rights is weak, p36; a number of contextual factors have affected the implementation under the GE programme... p68).</p> <p>With regard to programmatic contributions as they pertain to the linkage between outputs, outcomes and interventions at programme and subprogramme levels, the cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results (including unintended results) are frequently explained, but there are some exceptions.</p> <p>In a number of instances the report draws a clear connection, such as: “the interventions supported by UNFPA ...have produced tangible results ...of improved access and utilization of material health and family planning services (p 42); and “UNFPA interventions have strongly contributed to expansion of related stakeholders (p 69); “the intervention under the GE programmatic area contribute to the establishment of cooperation and partnership among a side various of stakeholders to enable women to fully exercise their rights” (p 75). Other examples of cause and effect links between UNFPA intervention and end results include UNFPA actions are attributed to capacity growth and strong ownership of the results, with evidence provided in interviews cited (p62). In this example case, the links are explained, with reference to the geographic validity of ownership.</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>Very Good</p> <p>The conclusions include all the key elements and flow clearly from the solid Findings (and Analysis) in Section 4 as well as the Annexes, and are clearly presented. The conclusions function as distinct from the findings and recommendations, which aids the reader.</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; • Recommendations should be presented in priority order 	<p>Very Good</p> <p>Recommendations are organized and presented explicitly in priority order, with clearly defined 'Addressees'. Recommendations are based on credible findings; e.g. reference to the compliance to Minimum Initial Services Package (MISP) standards as evidence of effectiveness, but also a presentation of limitations/constraints due to "strong cultural barriers and the need for empowerment of women within the Syrian community" (p93). This balanced presentation of recommendations based on valid findings and a discussion of constraints demonstrates the evaluators' unbiased judgment. The addition of the "Operational Implications" provides an additional dimension that provides added value. Finally, differentiating between Strategic level and Programmatic level Conclusions and Recommendation makes their presentation in priority order reasonable.</p>
<p>8. Meeting Needs 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>Good</p> <p>The Users section of the ToR (Annex 1) combined with the Stakeholder Matrix (Annex 7) establishes a clear line between the needs of the various users and the evaluation issues addressed in the evaluation report. The requirements as per the ToR have been fulfilled by this report.</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	81	19		

(*) 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