

**Organizational unit:** Country Office Dominican Republic **Year of report:** 2016

**Title of evaluation report:** EVALUACION INDEPENDIENTE DEL PROGRAMA PAIS, 2012-2017 Republica Dominicana

**Overall quality of report:** **Good** **Date of assessment:** 12 Dec. 16

**Overall comments:** The evaluation report is structured around UNFPA standards and is well written, clear and comprehensive. The objectives, scope, and methodological approach are explained in detail, including data collection methods. A detailed and well-referenced contextual background is provided. While methodological constraints are detailed, strategies to mitigate them are limited. Data was triangulated to ensure quality and validity and is gender dis-aggregated where appropriate. The analysis is thorough, highlights the data sources and including a range of stakeholder perspectives. Conclusions flow logically from the findings and the recommendations - which are grouped, prioritized and manageable - are derived directly from the conclusions. The evaluation considered gender in its design, data collection, analysis and findings (where relevant) but no in-depth analysis of gender equality and the empowerment of women is conducted.

#### Assessment Levels

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

<b>Quality Assessment Criteria</b>	<i>Insert <u>assessment level</u> followed by main <u>comments</u>. (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)</i>	
<p><b>I. Structure and Clarity of Reporting</b></p> <p><i>To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the report easy to read and understand (i.e. written in an accessible non-technical language appropriate for the intended audience)?</li> <li>• Is the report focused and to the point (e.g. not too lengthy)?</li> <li>• Is the report structured in a logical way? Is there a clear distinction made between analysis/findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned (where applicable)?</li> <li>• Do the annexes contain – at a minimum – the ToRs; a bibliography, a list of interviewees, the evaluation matrix and methodological tools used (e.g. interview guides; focus group notes, outline of surveys)?</li> </ul> <p><i>Executive summary</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is an executive summary included in the report, written as a stand-alone section and presenting the main results of the evaluation?</li> <li>• Is there a clear structure of the executive summary, (i.e. i) Purpose, including intended audience(s); ii) Objectives and brief description of intervention; iii) Methodology; iv) Main conclusions; v) Recommendations)?</li> <li>• Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5-10 pages)?</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: right;">Assessment Level:</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Good</b></p>
		<p>Comment:</p> <p>The report is well written, clear and comprehensive; the language is appropriate for the specified intended audience. The annexes contain the minimum requirements of the Quality Assessment Criteria, in addition to a Code of Conduct for UN System Evaluations. The report is focused, direct, and structured in a logical manner; a clear distinction is made between sections, and all required sections are included.</p> <p>In terms of formatting, the report has occasional spelling errors or shifts in font size which detract from the professional look of the report. In addition, the two columns used in the Executive Summary continue into the body of the report. Given the maximum page length of 10 pages for the Executive Summary, the report would be made cleaner by simply using standard, one-column, formatting for these sections.</p> <p>In addition, the Annexes are poorly formatted, with multiple, varying and/or missing titles, making the section not clear. Annex 2 simply provides a link to another document and Annexes 3 and 4 appear to be missing. However, another Annex 3 is later listed as the Evaluation Matrix.</p> <p>The Executive Summary meets standards and at four pages (with double column formatting) it is within norms for length. Double formatting was maintained through half of Chapter I and after was standard single column.</p>

<b>2. Design and Methodology</b>	Assessment Level:	<b>Good</b>
<p><i>To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the evaluation describe whether the evaluation is for accountability and/or learning purposes?</li> <li>• Does the evaluation describe the target audience for the evaluation?</li> <li>• Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described?</li> <li>• Does the evaluation report describe the reconstruction of the intervention logic and/or theory of change?</li> <li>• Does the evaluation explain any constraints and/or general limitations?</li> </ul> <p><i>To ensure a rigorous design and methodology</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the evaluation approach and framework clearly described? Does it establish the evaluation questions, assumptions, indicators, data sources and methods for data collection?</li> <li>• Were the methods chosen appropriate for addressing the evaluation questions? Are the tools for data collection described and justified?</li> <li>• Is the methods for analysis clearly described?</li> <li>• Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their impact on the evaluation described? (Does it discuss how any bias has been overcome?)</li> <li>• Is the sampling strategy described? Does the design include validation techniques?</li> <li>• Is there evidence of involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation design? (Is there a comprehensive/credible stakeholder map?)</li> <li>• Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis</li> </ul>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>The report clearly describes that the evaluation is intended for accountability and learning, specifying the intended audience/users of the report's contents, and provides a detailed, and well-referenced, contextual background with explanatory charts to support the narrative. Finding some limitations with the intervention logic, the evaluation team propose changes to enhance clarity and reporting on impact, including the inclusion of indicators for their UNFPA's advocacy activities which were otherwise excluded as well as recommendations to ensure the UNFPA's outputs are more specific and clear. Methodological constraints and limitations are provided in detail, however strategies for how they mitigated these constraints are limited (p17.)</p> <p>The evaluators used document reviews, field visits, interviews and focus groups. While the composition of those interviewed is shown on page 17, no information on how interviewees were selected nor on who was selected for focus groups was provided in the text. There is considerable evidence of involvement of stakeholders, particularly through a diagram on page 15.</p> <p>There is a clear concern with gender equality in the design and in data collection (two-third of those interviewed were women).</p>	

<p>of disaggregated data?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights)?</li> </ul>			
<p><b>3. Reliability of Data</b></p> <p><i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did the evaluation triangulate all data collected?</li> <li>Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of qualitative and quantitative data sources?</li> <li>Did the evaluation make explicit any possible issues (bias, data gaps etc.) in primary and secondary data sources and if relevant, explained what was done to minimize such issues? I.e. did the evaluation make explicit possible limitations of the data collected?</li> <li>Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?</li> <li>Is there adequate gender disaggregation of data? And if this has not been possible, is it explained?</li> <li>Does the evaluation make explicit the level of involvement of different stakeholders in the different phases of the evaluation process?</li> </ul>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Assessment Level:</td> <td><b>Good</b></td> </tr> </table> <p>Comment:</p> <p>The evaluation used triangulation of data to ensure the quality and validity of data collected. Quantitative and qualitative data sources are identified clearly. The evaluation could have provided more information regarding potential issues of bias and gaps in data, which was cited as a potential problem in the findings section (p.58), though a general discussion of data collection limitations is included. Data collected is disaggregated by gender where appropriate. There was involvement of stakeholders in the design and analysis.</p>	Assessment Level:	<b>Good</b>
Assessment Level:	<b>Good</b>		

<b>4. Analysis and Findings</b>	Assessment Level: <b>Very good</b>
<p><i>To ensure sound analysis</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is information analysed and interpreted systematically and logically?</li> <li>• Are the interpretations based on carefully described assumptions?</li> <li>• Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?</li> <li>• Is the analysis transparent about the sources and quality of data?</li> <li>• Are possible cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained?</li> <li>• Where possible, is the analysis disaggregated to show different outcomes between different target groups?</li> <li>• Are unintended results identified?</li> <li>• Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?</li> <li>• Does the analysis include reflection of the views of different stakeholders (reflecting diverse interests)? E.g. how were possible divergent opinions treated in the analysis?</li> <li>• Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, gender equality and human rights?</li> </ul> <p><i>To ensure credible findings</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can evidence be traced through the analysis into findings? E.g. are the findings substantiated by evidence?</li> <li>• Do findings follow logically from the analysis?</li> <li>• Is the analysis of cross-cutting issues integrated in the findings?</li> </ul>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>The evaluators approached the questions systematically and mobilized reliable data to reach findings that showed the connection between what UNPFA produced and the results. The collected data is analysed in a systematic and logical manner that is relevant to the type of data available, with the assumptions underlying a finding presented where appropriate. Unintended results are identified clearly, and cause and effect links are described as they relate to the intervention, outputs and outcomes (intended and unintended), which the report refers to as outputs. For example, the report describes a series of changes in behaviors and attitudes of health personnel, which has helped to improve services and increase contraceptive use according to the respondents from interviews. These changes are described as outputs, when they are outcomes of capacity building efforts (p39).</p> <p>The analysis was thorough and always showed the source of data, including different perspectives of those being interviewed. A special effort was made to show unanticipated consequences. In addition, the evaluators included a counter-factual analysis, in which they asked what would happen if UNFPA had not acted in specific areas.</p> <p>Overall, this section presented a high quality and well-grounded discussion of results.</p>

<b>5. Conclusions</b>	Assessment Level:	<b>Good</b>
<p><i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are conclusions credible and clearly related to the findings?</li> <li>• Are the conclusions demonstrating an appropriate level of analytical abstraction?</li> <li>• Are conclusions conveying the evaluators' unbiased judgement of the intervention?</li> </ul>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>The evaluators have drawn clear conclusions, both positive and negative, from the findings and have presented them clearly. They include broad strategic conclusions and those flowing from the specific questions. They also draw lessons learned that are broadly applicable.</p>	

<b>6. Recommendations</b>	Assessment Level:	<b>Good</b>
<p><i>To ensure the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do recommendations flow logically from conclusions?</li> <li>• Are the recommendations sufficiently clear, targeted at the intended users and operationally-feasible?</li> <li>• Do recommendations reflect stakeholders' consultations whilst remaining balanced and impartial?</li> <li>• Is the number of recommendations manageable?</li> <li>• Are the recommendations prioritised and clearly presented to facilitate appropriate management response and follow up on each specific recommendation?</li> </ul>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>The recommendations are derived from the conclusions, are grouped and given priorities. Most are addressed to the Country Office. The number is manageable and address some main issues (like lack of funding and the need to improve the planning in RBM terms to narrow the focus of the Office.)</p>	

<b>7. Gender</b>	Assessment Level:	<b>Fair</b>
<p><i>To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW)<sup>1</sup></i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is GEEW integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and indicators designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data to be collected?</li> <li>• Do evaluation criteria and evaluation questions specifically address how GEEW has been integrated into design, planning, implementation of the intervention and the results achieved?</li> <li>• Have gender-responsive evaluation methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques been selected?</li> <li>• Do the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations reflect a gender analysis?</li> </ul>	<p>Comment:</p> <p>The evaluation looks at gender throughout, in its design, data collection and analysis. The evaluation team used a ‘Gender-Responsive Dashboard’ developed by the Evaluation Team Leader in order to guide the integration of GEEW into the evaluation scope, methodology and analysis. However, besides the self-declarative dashboard, there is no evidence of the actual integration of GEEW in the methods and tools for data collection (e.g., no evidence of integration of GEEW in interview protocols, etc.)The indicators used allow for a good data collection on gender equality issues and GBV, but not for a more comprehensive assessment of GEEW integration. Data is disaggregated by gender where appropriate. The findings include gender where relevant, but there is no in depth analysis of the GEEW integration.</p>	

<sup>1</sup> This assessment criteria is fully based on the UN-SWAP Scoring Tool, see Annex 7. Each sub-criteria shall be equally weighted (in correlation with the calculation in the tool and totalling the scores 11-12 = very good, 8-10 = good, 4-7 = Fair, 0-3=unsatisfactory). One question is if this criteria should be included in the overall evaluation quality assessment grid, or form a separate column and be assessed on its own.

### Overall Evaluation Quality Assessment

	Assessment Levels (*)			
Quality assessment criteria (scoring points*)	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	
<b>Total scoring points</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>7</b>	
<b>Overall assessment level of evaluation report</b>		<b>Good</b>		
	<b>Very good</b> ➔ very confident to use	<b>Good</b> ➔ confident to use	<b>Fair</b> ➔ use with caution	<b>Unsatisfactory</b> ➔ not confident to use

(\*) (a) Insert scoring points associated with criteria in corresponding column (e.g. - if 'finding and analysis' has been assessed as 'good', enter 40 into 'Good' column). (b) Assessment level with highest 'total scoring points' determines 'Overall assessment level of evaluation report'. Write corresponding assessment level in cell (e.g. 'Fair'). (c) Use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour.

**If the overall assessment is ‘Fair’, please explain<sup>2</sup>:**

- How it can be used?
- What aspects to be cautious about?

**Where relevant, please explain the overall assessment Very good, Good or Unsatisfactory<sup>3</sup>:**

Clearly written and presented report, with good discussion of methodology and findings that are logical (based on methodology) and consistent (with data collected). The findings section is much less repetitive than many other reports, providing clear answers to the evaluation questions without becoming redundant, presenting only what is needed for the users to improve the Country Programme in the next cycle. It is almost a model, even if a bit longer than others might have done.

**Consideration of significant constraints<sup>4</sup>**

The quality of this evaluation report has been hampered by exceptionally difficult circumstances:

yes

no

If yes, please explain:

---

<sup>2</sup> The purpose here is to clarify in what way the report can be used. This in order to assist the elaboration of a relevant Management Response and the wider use of the evaluation findings back into programming. When a report has been assessed as Fair, it is obligatory to fill this text box in.

<sup>3</sup> The purpose is, where relevant, to clarify for example severe unbalances in the report (for example, the report is good overall but recommendations very weak). Is optional to fill in.

<sup>4</sup> E.g. this should only be used in case of significant events that has severely hampering the evaluation process like natural disasters, evaluators falling sick, unexpected significant travel restrictions, etc. More ‘normal’ limitations should be mentioned under relevant section above.