



Organizational unit: **UNFPA Evaluation Office** Year of report: **2020**

Title of evaluation report: **Morocco Country Programme Evaluation (2017-2021)**

Overall quality of report: **Good** Date of assessment: **26 February 2021**

Overall comments: Provides a detailed look at the activities undertaken

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		<i>Insert <u>assessment level</u> followed by main <u>comments</u>. (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)</i>	
1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Fair
<i>To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly</i>			
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 and clearly presented. There are clear distinctions between sections.	
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)	No	The report with the Executive Summary exceeds the maximum length by 9 pages.	
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)?	Partial	The annexes are provided in a separate document and all required elements are included. However, it would be helpful for the table of the contents in the main report to include the list of annexes. It would also be helpful if the annex document was easier to navigate - the table of contents having page numbers and formatting that clearly distinguishes each annex - particularly as the ToR and evaluation matrix are very lengthy.	
<i>Executive summary</i>			
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 serves as a stand-alone document. It includes all elements with main results and conclusions being combined.	
5. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	Yes	It is a concisely written 3.5 page section.	

2. Design and Methodology	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Fair
<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	There is a thorough section on country context and UNFPA's response.	
2. Does the evaluation report discuss and assess the intervention logic and/or theory of change?	Yes	The results framework and theory of change are presented.	
<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?	Partial	An adequate overview of the evaluation framework is provided in the main report. The annexed evaluation matrix is very detailed; it includes the questions, hypothesis, indicators and findings; however data sources and methods are not specified.	
4. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Yes	The methods - document review, KIs and group discussions - are each described in terms of types of documents/stakeholders. Justification is briefly provided.	
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	Although different partnership activities are discussed under Efficiency, the report does not include a comprehensive stakeholder map. The consultation process did include evaluator interactions with a reference group which, it is noted, includes sharing of preliminary findings. However, it is unclear if there was consultation specifically on the recommendations. A wide range of stakeholders participated in the evaluation process, including rightsholders; the extent and range of groups consulted was commendable given the pandemic-related restrictions on travel and issues with internet connectivity.	
6. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	Partial	The analysis process is generally described and suggests that the evaluators looked for themes that emerged for each question (as per findings detailed in the evaluation matrix). There is no specific type of analysis identified.	
7. Are methodological limitations acknowledged and their effect on the evaluation described? Does the report discuss what was done to minimize such issues?	Yes	Three limitations are described and mitigation strategies for each are given.	
8. Is the sampling strategy described?	Partial	The sampling process is briefly described. It is noted that all implementing partners, UNCT partners and donors were interviewed, and that more geographic regions were represented because the missions were virtual. The selection of focus group participants, and how that had to be revised under travel restrictions is covered. However, it is not clear how the locations and interviewees of other partners benefitting from training were chosen.	
9. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Yes	In terms of evaluation participants, it is clear that some level of gender disaggregated data was collected as the breakdown of the total number of women and men interviewed is provided. The evaluators also highlighted efforts to include vulnerable groups as part of data collection and analysis.	
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 evaluation does look at the extent to which the needs of vulnerable and marginalized populations are taken into account. It is noted that the intent to include greater representation of rights holder groups, including those with disabilities, could not be realized due to pandemic restrictions.	

3. Reliability of Data	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Fair
<i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i>			
1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?	Yes	Multiple sources of data are used.	
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	Data sources appear reliable. Sources are identified in general in the main report, and more specifically identified in the annexes. The limitation section discusses reliability (i.e. where data was insufficient) and how this was addressed.	
3. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	No	The evaluation team collected data from vulnerable groups, but there is not a discussion of the ethical practices that were followed. UNEG is only mentioned in respect to the criteria covered; UNEG code of ethics is not referenced.	
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	There is some unevenness in the extent that sources are cited. Although in most sections this is carefully done - through footnoted documents sources and the specific stakeholder group interviewed - some evaluation questions this is less evident (EQ6 on Sustainability)	
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	There is clear attribution of the data backing up the findings.	
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	This is consistently done.	
4. Are cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Yes	Linkages are well established including through use of indicator tables for each of the main result areas. These show baseline, targets and extent of achievement.	
5. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Partial	The report is clear about the activities that target different groups but outcome data is not disaggregated; the evaluators attribute this to shortcomes in programme monitoring.	
6. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	Political, cultural, staffing and other factors that supported and hindered achievements are provided. Supportive factors included complementary work undertaken by the Belgian and other partners.	
7. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	This is well done. The evaluation has a focus on the extent vulnerable groups were reached, the involvement of men in communication and advocacy activities, the wide range of institutions and groups working on these issues, etc.	
5. Conclusions			
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level:	Good
<i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i>			
1. Do the conclusions flow clearly from the findings?	Partial	Each conclusion indicates the relevant evaluation question(s). Unusually, conclusions are organized by priority area - which makes the section less clear than if organized by criteria. Normally, conclusions for each criteria would be considered equally important.	
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	The conclusions present the overall strengths and challenges of the CP, and address the extent to which the CP was successful in addressing cross cutting issues including reaching those with disabilities.	
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	There is no evidence of bias.	

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 should the relevent conclusion(s) on which they are based.	
2. Are the recommendations targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Yes	Intended users (country office, partners, government) are specified. Sub-recommendations are at an operational level to support action.	
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	All criteria here are met.	
4. Are the recommendations prioritized?	Yes	They are organized into strategic and programmatic recommendations. There are two levels of priority. Of the 11, all but two are priority 1.	
7. Gender	0 1 2 3 (**)	Assessment Level:	Very good
<i>To assess the integration of Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women (GEEW) (*)</i>			
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) GEEW is implied as a focus area of the evaluation but is not explicitly stated in the evaluation objectives. = 1</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) GEEW is integrated into the multiple criteria. = 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) A dedicated question is included under Effectiveness = 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 is fully covered = 3</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) The methodology section includes a discussion of how these issues are addressed. One shortcoming is that the total number of evaluation participants is not gender disaggregated. = 2</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) An appropriate mixed methods approach is used with an adequate sample size given the limitations = 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) These conditions are met. = 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) Diverse stakeholders are included. It is clear that the intent was to have greater representation of the most vulnerable and what hindered this from happening. = 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) These issues were not discussed. = 0</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) There is a solid background section covering key gender issues, including GBV, that are relevant to the CP. = 3</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) There are several cases in which the perspectives of young people are brought out (from focus group discussions), although direct quotes would help amplify different voices. = 2</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3) A discussion on unanticipated effects is not apparent, however the evaluators note that the reporting systems do not seem to capture all achievements. =2</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 two recommendations that specifically address gender, including the need to re-strategize how GEEW can be better highlighted in the Moroccan context. = 3</p>
--	---

(*) This assessment criteria is fully based on the UN-SWAP Scoring Tool. Each sub-criteria shall be equally weighted (in correlation with the calculation in the tool and totaling the scores 11-12 = very good, 8-10 = good, 4-7 = Fair, 0-3=unsatisfactory).
 (**) 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	18	51	31	
Overall assessment level of evaluation report		Good		
	Very good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory

(*) (a) Insert scoring points associated with criteria in corresponding column (e.g. - if 'Analysis and findings' has been assessed as 'Good', enter 40 into 'Good' column).

OVERALL COMMENTS: Please explain the overall assessment.

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: