

# EQA for UNFPA Panama Country Programme

## Evaluation (2012-2015)



### Title of evaluation report: **EVALUACIÓN DEL PROGRAMA PAÍS DE PANAMÁ (2012 – 2015)**

**OVERALL QUALITY RATING: Poor**

**Summary:** The report is well structured with the exception of the executive summary which is too long. The evaluation is based on a limited number of questions covering the main areas of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability, and also draws lessons learned. There are some good elements of design and although the evaluators used a combination of data sources, they lack key details. The evaluators note that determining results was not always easy and one of the main recommendations for the next programme is to connect activities with expected results more clearly and collect results data more systematically. Contextual factors are identified in the findings but overall the findings lack analysis. Despite limitations with the findings, there are clear connections with both conclusions and recommendations.

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<p><b>I. Structure and Clarity of Reporting</b>  <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"> <li>• 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)</li> <li>• Minimum requirements for Annexes: ToRs; Bibliography; List of interviewees; Methodological instruments used.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Good</b>                      The report is structured according to recommended format. It contains all of the appropriate sections, including the Annexes. The executive summary is too long, but the other sections meet the requirements. There is a solid section on transferable lessons learned.</p>			

<p><b>2. Executive Summary</b>  <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"> <li>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.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Unsatisfactory</b>  The summary is not stand-alone, is much too long (15 pages), and does not explain the objectives or methodology. By explaining findings in great detail, as well as conclusions and recommendations, it does not meet the quality standards for evaluation reports. The full conclusions and recommendations from the main report have been included rather than just the main ones, also adding to length.</p>
<p><b>3. Design and Methodology</b>  <i>To provide a clear explanation of the following elements/tools</i>  Minimum content and sequence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explanation of methodological choice, including constraints and limitations;</li> <li>Techniques and Tools for data collection provided in a detailed manner;</li> <li>Triangulation systematically applied throughout the evaluation;</li> <li>Details of participatory stakeholders' consultation process are provided;</li> <li>Details on how cross-cutting issues (vulnerable groups, youth, gender, equality) were addressed in the design and the conduct of the evaluation.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Good</b>  The design describes a number of choices about how to approach the evaluation. It takes into account that the current results matrix does not show a clear connection between activities and expected results and that the evaluation will be formative rather than summative. The main sources of data are interviews, and focus groups as well as site visits and the basis for choosing these are clear. Of particular importance were the interviews and focus groups in the Comarca Ngäble Buglé. The presentation shows how there was a sequence of stakeholders consultations throughout, shown in Table 1. However, the list of persons interviewed (Annex 2) and participants in the focus groups (Annex 3) were not included in the report reviewed. The issues of gender and youth were addressed in the design since several of the UNFPA programmes were directed to the groups.</p>
<p><b>4. Reliability of Data</b>  <i>To clarify data collection processes and data quality</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sources of qualitative and quantitative data have been identified;</li> <li>Credibility of primary (e.g. interviews and focus groups) and secondary (e.g. reports) data established and limitations made explicit;</li> <li>Disaggregated data by gender has been utilized where necessary.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Poor</b>  While the data sources were clear, how representative they are is not clear since the list of persons interviewed, or the focus groups conducted, is not found in the report nor is there a summary of who was interviewed by type or location. Gender disaggregation was used (mostly for qualitative data) as required. Limitations were addressed, mostly in terms of time or availability of persons to be interviewed. Citations to sources used should have been provided for the data presented but are mostly missing.</p>

	<p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "... el Programa País orientó sus acciones con enfoque cultural en la comarca de Ngãbe Bugle ... fortaleciendo las capacidades del personal de salud (más de 40 profesionales de 22 establecimientos) (page 43);</li> <li>- "Según información disponible, 1.300 familias (al 2013) y 1.659 mujeres en edad reproductiva (en el 2012)" (page 44)</li> <li>-table 7 (page 46);</li> <li>-" Colon realiza un promedio de 30 consultas (pag 47)</li> </ul>
<p><b>5. Findings and Analysis</b>  <i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>  <u>Findings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Findings stem from rigorous data analysis;</li> <li>• Findings are substantiated by evidence;</li> <li>• Findings are presented in a clear manner</li> </ul> <p><u>Analysis</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interpretations are based on carefully described assumptions;</li> <li>• Contextual factors are identified.</li> <li>• Cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results (including unintended results) are explained.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Poor</b></p> <p>The findings are structured according to the evaluation questions, and within these by the programme areas. The presentation is clear although a box summarizing the findings at the end of each evaluation question would have been helpful. Contextual factors are identified throughout the analysis. A major constraint noted by the evaluators is that the result indicators were designed in way that prevents a causal connection between UNFPA output and the outcomes being established. The evaluators sought to overcome this through the interview process and while most findings flow from this analysis, some findings are not systematically substantiated by evidence. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ... a través de la información obtenida en entrevistas y grupos focales ... estas labores fueron percibidas y valoradas satisfactoriamente por la comunidad, permitiéndoles contar con información necesaria para establecer cuidados oportunos ... salud " (page 44). No indication of which focus groups or types of stakeholder interviews have informed this statement.</li> <li>- " ..resaltar que las evidencias generadas a lo largo del Programa País permitieron describir el contexto actual de las muertes maternas ..." (page 47).</li> </ul> <p>Another problem is that the report confuses the analysis of relevance with effectiveness criteria (example: "Los principales factores facilitadores para el logro de los productos del Programa País fueron la alta pertinencia en las</p>

	<p>estrategias y métodos de trabajo propiciados ... las cuales estuvieron altamente alineadas con prioridades de la Agenda ... - page 52) Overall, the report should have been less descriptive and more analytical.</p>
<p><b>6. Conclusions</b> <i>To assess the validity of conclusions</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conclusions are based on credible findings;</li> <li>• Conclusions are organized in priority order;</li> <li>• Conclusions must convey evaluators' unbiased judgment of the intervention.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Good</b> The conclusions are clearly linked to findings, and as well to recommendations. Conclusions are presented in a logical order and in order of priority which allows their importance to be assessed. While conclusions flow logically from the findings, they could draw further from the findings.</p>
<p><b>7. Recommendations</b> <i>To assess the usefulness and clarity of recommendations</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendations flow logically from conclusions;</li> <li>• Recommendations must be strategic, targeted and operationally-feasible;</li> <li>• Recommendations must take into account stakeholders' consultations whilst remaining impartial;</li> <li>• Recommendations should be presented in priority order</li> </ul>	<p><b>Good</b> The recommendations flow from and are clearly linked to the conclusions. In each recommendation, how the recommendation could be implemented operationally is explained. Recommendations clearly take into account the stakeholders consultations each is given a priority level.</p>
<p><b>8. Meeting Needs</b> To ensure that Evaluation Report responds to requirements (scope &amp; 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><b>Good</b> The evaluation follows the ToR and the questions specified therein and does not suggest any issues with the ToR.</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		
<b>TOTAL</b>		43	55	2

(\*) 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

**OVERALL QUALITY RATING: Poor**