

## Quality assessment

Table A. Overview of quality assessment by criteria for country programme evaluations (2012-2014)

		<i>Quality assessment by criteria</i>								<i>Overall quality assessment</i>
		<i>Structure and Clarity of Reporting</i>	<i>Executive Summary</i>	<i>Design and Methodology</i>	<i>Reliability of Data</i>	<i>Findings and Analysis</i>	<i>Conclusions</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Meeting Needs</i>	<i>Evaluation report</i>
2012	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	1	2	3	2	2	1	2	1	<b>2</b>
	<i>Poor</i>	5	7	4	7	10	8	8	4	<b>10</b>
	<i>Good</i>	8	5	7	6	3	6	5	8	<b>3</b>
	<i>Very good</i>	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	<b>0</b>
2013	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	<b>0</b>
	<i>Poor</i>	2	8	6	6	6	6	3	5	<b>6</b>
	<i>Good</i>	7	3	4	5	5	4	7	6	<b>5</b>
	<i>Very good</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
2014	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
	<i>Poor</i>	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	<b>0</b>
	<i>Good</i>	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	<b>3</b>
	<i>Very good</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>

Source: UNFPA Evaluation Office

The Evaluation Quality Assessment serves two main purposes: (1) to express an objective judgment both on the overall quality of an evaluation report as well as on each evaluation criterion used in the quality assessment (synchronic approach); (2) to assess the progress (or lack thereof) over time, either in the overall quality of UNFPA funded evaluation reports or for each specific quality criterion (diachronic approach).

As indicated in the table above, the scoring scale comprises four levels: (1) unsatisfactory, (2) poor, (3) good, (4) very good.

Each criterion has been associated with a weight (or a multiplying factor) which is proportionate to, and illustrates its relative importance as regards the overall quality of the report. The criterion 5 (Findings and analysis) is the most prominent of all 8 criteria as a good analysis and credible findings are considered the backbone of a good quality report.

The table presents the results of the quality assessment (performed by the Evaluation Office) of the country programme evaluation reports produced in 2012-2014 by criteria as well as the overall quality assessment of the evaluation reports.

For more information of the Evaluation Office quality assessment grid, visit <http://www.unfpa.org/admin-resource/evaluation-quality-assessment>

**Table B. 2014 Quality assessments (overall summaries) for country programme evaluations (2010-2014)**

<b>Region</b>	<b>Country Programme</b>	<b>Year of evaluation</b>	<b>Quality rating</b>	<b>Quality Assessment Summary</b>
Asia and the Pacific	<b>Afghanistan (2010-2013)</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>Poor</b>	The evaluation took place in a very difficult context: the evaluators were only able to conduct one site visit and for a large number of the CPAP indicators lacked data on baseline and/or endline results. One of the strengths of the report is the use of qualitative data to illustrate the activities and outputs of UNFPA programmes. Nevertheless, the evaluation report has major flaws. The structure of the report is not logical and hinders understanding. The evaluators did not develop a manageable list of fewer than ten evaluation questions, or sufficiently address the necessary criteria of Coordination and Added Value. Sources are insufficiently cited and there is no evidence of effort to validate information or assess the credibility of sources. Most of the analysis does not go beyond documenting programme activities.
Eastern Europe and Central Asia	<b>Tajikistan (2010-2015)</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>Good</b>	The report structure meets requirements and contains all required content. Methodology section clearly describes the evaluation methodology which was developed fully in line with UNFPA methodological guidance. Systematic triangulation of the evaluation findings was performed. Primary and secondary data collected by the evaluation team are thorough and the evaluators clearly explain sources of the information in the relevant annexes. Evaluation limitations associated with security issues and language limitations are explained. Data analysis is thorough and extensive, and the findings are detailed, and contextual factors and causal connection clear, although the section would have benefitted from efforts to make it more succinct. The conclusions are based on the findings and are organized in a logical order. Recommendations are logically connected with appropriate conclusions, although some lack sufficient specificity.
	<b>Uzbekistan (2010-2014)</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>Good</b>	The evaluation report is thorough, methodologically sound in the context of limitations, and answered the questions posed in the terms of reference with solidly-based findings that clearly led to conclusions and recommendations. The evaluation was careful to consult stakeholders in the design phase and was able to demonstrate the extent to which UNFPA had responded to the political context in which it worked. However, details of participatory stakeholders' consultation process are not provided in the report, and there is no summary disaggregation data by gender is present in the report. The evaluators made a successful attempt to show the causal connections between UNFPA activities and output and the outcomes intended to be obtained (even taking into account that what were often called output in programming documents were actually outcomes).

Region	Country Programme	Year of evaluation	Quality rating	Quality Assessment Summary
East and Southern Africa	<b>Angola (2009-2014)</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>Good</b>	The evaluation report is a thorough examination of the UNFPA programme from 2009-2014. This is the sixth programme in Angola and the evaluation showed clearly how much progress was obtained, particularly in sexual and reproductive health and gender equality. The report emphasises that there had been issues in the implementation of the population and development part of the programme. The data collection was carefully designed and was mostly qualitative, and the evaluators suggested in a number of places where there was an absence of credible quantitative data. Findings were thorough and structured according to the questions asked in the ToR. The recommendations, mostly directed to the UNFPA country office, were practical and organized by priority.
	<b>Comoros (2008-2014)</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>Poor</b>	This evaluation report has major problems in its structure and methodology. The evaluators appear to confuse conclusions and lessons learned, and the organization of the report including its structure and formatting is extremely illogical. The evaluation questions have also not been developed and recommended OECD-DAC evaluation criteria have not been used, and although efficiency as a criterion is mentioned, the evaluators do not analyze the programme's efficiency in the analysis section. Sources are very rarely cited and there is no indication that the evaluators considered the credibility of data or used triangulation. To a large extent, the evaluators use the interim evaluation in 2012 as their basis and have simply updated it. The large deficiencies in the ToR are not mentioned or ameliorated in the report.
	<b>Kenya (2009-2013)</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>Poor</b>	The evaluation report meets several UNFPA quality standards for final evaluation reports. However, the evaluation team failed to clearly specify the methodology, data collection and validation tools and techniques, which undermined the quality of the report. Furthermore, the analysis section of the evaluation is principally "activity-focused" rather than results (chain) focused. The conclusions and recommendations appear reasonable based upon the narrative presented in the report; however, due to the weaknesses outlined in the methodology and findings/analysis, the logic chain of results has been interrupted in such a way where it is not possible to say whether the conclusions are based on credible findings and whether recommendations reflect the evaluators own judgement or an unbiased interpretation of the results.
	<b>Zambia (2007-2010)</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>Poor</b>	The evaluation report is clear and comprehensive in addressing the issues within the scope of the evaluation and is in line with the Terms of Reference, but is not appropriately structured. The methodology is clearly described but the use of triangulation is not explained. Sources of data are not identified, and information is mostly limited to the list of documents reviewed and person interviewed. The lack of specific consideration of a number of criteria in the data reliability in the evaluation report undermines the findings, and overall there is a lack of sound analysis. While the recommendations flow from the findings, the weakness of the analysis undermines the recommendations.

Region	Country Programme	Year of evaluation	Quality rating	Quality Assessment Summary
Latin America and the Caribbean	<b>Colombia (2008-2014)</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>Good</b>	The evaluation report examines a complex programme over a six-year period, taking into account a complex context and some changes in orientation during the period. It builds on a thorough terms of reference and determines clearly expected results. Its design and methodology, primarily based on document analysis but also on extensive interviews from a purposive sample, produces data that can be triangulated to produce credible findings. In this, the evaluation does an excellent job of showing the causal connection between what UNFPA provides and the outputs achieved (in terms of the UNDAF and the UNFPA Country Programme). The volume of findings, in which there is a high level of detail, somewhat loses the larger picture in the many details, however. The conclusions are clear and the recommendations are designed to be clear and implementable, although some lack precision.
	<b>Ecuador (2010-2014)</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>Poor</b>	The evaluation report followed the terms of reference and was largely consistent with UNFPA quality requirements. Its conclusions and recommendations for most of the questions were well-supported. A major problem in the analysis was the lack of a clear connection between the output produced by UNFPA and the expected outcomes. To an extent, this was due to problems with the evaluation matrix, in which outcomes were not well defined in measurable terms. Data acquisition on these results was not clearly defined or presented, although the evaluation suggested that 67 per cent of the targets (which were themselves not well defined) were achieved. The evaluation suggests improvements in the evaluation system to make the results more measurable will help evaluate subsequent periods.
	<b>Mexico (2008-2012)</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>Good</b>	The evaluation report is clear, comprehensive, and logically structured, but would gain from a specific section addressing lessons learned. The design and methodology clearly details the objectives of the report and the data collection methods used, and how limitations were addressed, including for data. The bulk of data is derived from a review of documentary sources whereas the utilization of data from interviews and field visits is less visible in the analysis. In the findings and analysis, the issues of causality were well-describe, and careful attention to country context. There was a successful effort to identify unintended results, both positive and negative. In a few cases, the sections under findings are descriptive and the effort to substantiate findings is weaker. Certain conclusions do not seem to be based on credible findings. Recommendations are derived from the conclusions although some recommendations are not feasible or easily operational.

Region	Country Programme	Year of evaluation	Quality rating	Quality Assessment Summary
	<b>Paraguay (2007-2012)</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>Good</b>	A key strength of the report is that it is particularly effective in showing the linkage between the UNFPA programme, government priorities and the UNDAF, and findings are clearly linked to supporting analysis. However, the report lacks adequate detail on key methodological aspects, such as selection of interviewees and focus groups and the methodology for obtaining data is not well described, so that for many outcomes, the data source is not completely clear. Sources of qualitative data are also not provided. However, the findings are clear and evidence-based, and conclusion and recommendations are well-organised. The recommendations are clearly targeted, strategic and operationally feasible. There is also clear prioritization of the recommendations and their linkage to conclusions.
	<b>Venezuela (2009-2012)</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>Good</b>	The evaluation report has some issues with structure and clarity, despite abiding by the basic outlines provided in the quality assessment criteria. The executive summary is somewhat longer than normal and could have been condensed somewhat. The evaluation report contains a thorough collection of information from documentary, interview and focus groups, based on a realistic appraisal of the expected results of the programme. The methodology section was undermined by its brevity and an absence of information on how the sites for field visits and focus groups were selected. The findings are well-documented, although the extent to which they showed causal connections between UNFPA output (defined as under UNFPA control) and outcomes was uneven. The conclusions and recommendations flow from the analysis and are realistic.
West and Central Africa	<b>Benin (2009-2012)</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>Poor</b>	The evaluation report has very little credibility because it does not provide information on the methodology or data collected during the final evaluation, and very few data sources are provided. The report relies very heavily on the mid-term review (for example, the entire methodology section is a discussion of the findings of the mid-term review and how those are used to judge the progress of the UNFPA country programme over the last year) in which the evaluator participated. The chapter on effectiveness and efficiency is simply a discussion of the limitations of the logframe, and there is no discussion of the data collected or findings. Conclusions are not supported by analysis, and while the recommendations flow logically from the conclusions, they are unsupported by data or analysis.
	<b>Congo (Republic of) (2009-2013)</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>Poor</b>	The report is severely undermined by its structure. Discussion of the methodology lacks key details and several key instruments are not provided in the report. The evaluation does manage to incorporate a large amount of data from various of sources into a coherent analysis. However, the organization of the findings of the report, which separates the relevance and implementation of the programme from the main analysis and findings section, impedes its ability to draw logically-supported findings from the data. The evaluators also omitted a standard conclusions section, choosing instead to include a combined section on Lessons Learned and Recommendations and a section on Priority Areas for the next country programme. This results in an unfocused set of recommendations, some of which are targeted beyond UNFPA which is not appropriate.

Region	Country Programme	Year of evaluation	Quality rating	Quality Assessment Summary
	<b>Nigeria (2009-2012)</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>Good</b>	The report is comprehensive, logically structured and responds to the requirements outlined in the ToR. The report does, however, contain numerous grammatical and spelling errors which undermine the report's clarity. The executive summary gives a good overview of the main results of the evaluation. The design and methodology explains the objectives of the report, and limitations are addressed by triangulation of mixed-methods data collection. Sources of qualitative and quantitative data have been identified and supported by the annexes. Findings stem from rigorous data analysis and are substantiated by evidence. Conclusions are organized around program components (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability) and highlight key successes and gaps of the program. Recommendations cover difference aspects of the program, they are strategic, targeted and operationally-feasible. The conclusions and recommendations are well-written and logically flow from results and have an implicit priority order.
	<b>Sierra Leone (2008-2012)</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>Poor</b>	The evaluation report contains a rigorous and clear methodology to collect and triangulate data from a variety of quantitative and qualitative sources. The evaluators meet most of the needs of the ToR and point out deficiencies in its design when appropriate. The evaluators appropriately recognize that they cannot evaluate progress on many indicators laid out by the CPAP due to lack of baseline data, and use the data that they do have to determine whether UNFPA outputs are on track to achieve the unmeasured indicators. However, despite the use of data to establish progress towards outcomes, there is insufficient analysis of the causal relationship between UNFPA programs and outcome indicators, which are often measured nationally and may be influenced by many factors. Furthermore, few of the recommendations are actionable and strategic, and many are directed at the Government of Sierra Leone rather than UNFPA, which is not appropriate.

All quality assessment reviews are published by the Evaluation Office in the UNFPA evaluation database at:  
<http://web2.unfpa.org/public/about/oversight/evaluations/>