

Title of evaluation report: Evaluation of the Country Programme 2012-2016 in Senegal

OVERALL QUALITY RATING: *Good*

Summary: The evaluation is carefully defined and executed to show the extent to which the 7th CP has made progress in obtaining its expected results. The methodology for data collection is sound, including adequate attention to gender issues. The findings show a good causal connection between UNFPA output and the results observed. It identifies those areas where improvements can be made and uses a solid methodology to collect credible data.

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<p>1. 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:</p> <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. 				<p>Good. The report includes all of the required sections and is drafted clearly. The annexes are complete. There is a lessons learned section just before conclusions.</p>
<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>Good The executive summary is within the maximum length (four pages) and includes all of the required sections. It is stand-alone.</p> <p>The Executive Summary does not identify the intended audience of the evaluation. It includes a long section detailing the findings by domain in a way that is not well connected to the conclusions. Too much detail is shown in the findings, about geographic differences, which makes reading this part less fluid than might have been the case.</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>Good The design follows UNFPA standards and was clear. In determining who to interview and to include in focus groups, as well as site visits, the ToR requires a relatively rigorous purposive sample "à choix raisonné se fera à 2 niveaux (entre les régions et au sein de la région) pour couvrir toutes les catégories de cibles, les types et l'intensité des interventions" (Appendices p8). The authors took a sample after creating a mapping of stakeholders and selected a broad range of interviewees from many levels, domains, and regions. As a result, the findings are clearly representative. A systematic effort at triangulation was employed and a means to have participatory stakeholder consultation in the process was clear including an "atelier de partage" in which the team presented its provisional findings. This was not described in detail. Cross-cutting issues of vulnerable groups, youth, gender, and equality are not mentioned in the methodology section.</p>
<p>4. Reliability of Data <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 The data collected were reliable, given the systematic, if purposive, sampling. The evaluators break down data by gender when possible: for example, data on interviewees is consistently broken down by gender (p7). The evaluators are sometimes too vague in their discussion of the evidence. For example, on p23 they write that in the domain of Population and Development, "Le programme répond ainsi aux priorités nationales de suivi-évaluation des stratégies d'éducation, de santé, des politiques d'habitat, d'urbanisation, d'environnement, de protection sociale, etc." without specifying priorities or strategy documents.</p>

<p>5. Findings and Analysis <i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i> <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>Good The findings were organized by key question and within it by programme. In each case, the findings were clearly drawn from data analysis, most often broken down by geographical area and comparing targets with delivery in each case that can show the connection between observed results and UNFPA output. Contextual factors were clearly used and, to the extent possible given existence of baseline data, cause and effect links were shown. In analyzing differences by region, often the reasons were not as clearly analyzed as might have been desirable</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>Good The conclusions all flow from the findings. An innovative approach was to organize the conclusions in a matrix that showed strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and risks for the programme. They are not, however, organized in priority order, but rather by subject area.</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>Good The recommendations are connected clearly with the conclusions and are assigned either priority 1 or 2. Recommendation 2 is not assigned a priority or a responsible organization. The recommendations took into account the consultations at the completion of the field work.</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 The evaluation is consistent 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		
TOTAL		100		

(*) 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