

## Title of evaluation report: Morocco - EVALUATION FINALE DU 8EME PROGRAMME DE PAYS (2012 - 2016)

**OVERALL QUALITY RATING: Poor**

**Summary:** The evaluation is clearly organized and consistently well written, with a standalone executive summary. There are, however, two problems that limit the effectiveness of the report. First, although lots of high quality data was used, there are many sections with hardly any citations, making it difficult for a reader to assess the quality of the information on which the findings are based. Second, the program does not seem to have a logical framework defining the outputs and outcomes that are targeted by various activities, and the evaluators do not attempt to define outcomes based on the activities or the UNDAF goals. As a result, the evaluation is primarily focused on assessing whether UNFPA is on track to complete the activities (in terms of numbers of people trained, funds released, or reports produced) defined in the eighth country program, rather than whether these activities have actually achieved meaningful targets such as increasing understanding of SSR, detecting disease, or changing gender attitudes.

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<p><b>1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting</b></p> <p><i>To ensure report is user-friendly, comprehensive, logically structured and drafted in accordance with international standards.</i></p> <p>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></p> <p>The report includes all of the necessary sections and annexes. However, the report deviates from the requirements of the ToR (p23) in the length of the Results section. The Conclusions and Recommendations sections are combined but this is an effective strategy because it creates a strong logical link between the conclusions and recommendations.</p> <p>The evaluators created a number of non-standard acronyms (ex. PTA for Plan du Travail and BP for Bureau Pays) that they define in a list of acronyms but generally do not define in the text. This makes the report difficult to read as one needs to keep referring back to the list of acronyms at the beginning of the report. Some acronyms that are used are not on the list.</p> <p>The Results section of the report is particularly well organized by evaluation question and then by program component.</p>			

<p><b>2. Executive Summary</b></p> <p><i>To provide an overview of the evaluation, written as a stand-alone section and presenting main results of the evaluation.</i></p> <p>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>Good</b></p> <p>The executive summary serves as a stand-alone document and covers all of the necessary information in a way that is concise and clear. However, there is slightly too much detail provided on the methodology, while there could have been more information provided on the conclusions and recommendations.</p>
<p><b>3. Design and Methodology</b></p> <p><i>To provide a clear explanation of the following elements/tools</i></p> <p>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></p> <p>The evaluation is driven by nine appropriate evaluation questions that are adapted from the ToR.</p> <p>Most of the methodology is presented in sufficient detail, but the evaluators only briefly describe their strategy for sampling field sites to visit and stakeholders to interview. Although they mention criteria, they do not present a sampling frame details to show how representative the selected interviewees and sites actually are. It is clearly a purposive sample. (" La sélection des sites en dehors de Rabat s'est basée sur un échantillonnage dirigé, et a pris en considération le rôle et l'importance du partenaire et la représentativité des activités et des populations ciblées ")</p> <p>It appears that the evaluators only spoke to three small groups of program beneficiaries in two locations. In addition, most of the focus groups were done only in mixed-gender groups, which may have limited the content of the discussions.</p> <p>It is commendable that the evaluators discuss the processes that they put in place to pre-test their focus group guidelines and protect the rights of human subjects (p23).</p>

<p><b>4. Reliability of Data</b></p> <p><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></p> <p>The evaluators used both qualitative and quantitative data from their document review, interviews, and field visits. They state that they made an effort to compare the figures reported by the Country Office to reports reviewed and figures discussed during the interviews (p56). However, data is inconsistently cited across sections; for example, data is clearly cited in the section on HIV (p59) but not in the sections on early detection of cervical cancer (pp57-58) or gender equality (pp63-67). The lack of citations makes it difficult to assess whether triangulation was consistently used and how credible the data presented is.</p> <p>Appropriate attention is paid to disaggregate data by gender, which is one of the main programme areas.</p>
<p><b>5. Findings and Analysis</b></p> <p><i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i></p> <p><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 data analysis appears rigorous and thorough, and findings are substantiated with multiple types of evidence, mostly through the document analysis. The findings are nuanced and presented in a clear manner. This is limited by the fact that there is no clear results matrix for the programmes, in part because of changes in the strategies during the period being evaluated.</p> <p>The evaluators sought to develop results matrices and these are shown in the annexes, but they still tend to emphasize outputs. As a result, the analysis in most sections focuses only on outputs rather than outcomes. For example, the findings in the section on youth sexual and reproductive health end with a table of indicators used for monitoring the annual work plans of UNFPA's implementing partners (pp62-63) rather than going a step further to examine whether these outputs have been effective in increasing access to quality information and services or in achieving the UNDAF goals. As a result, cause and effect links between the interventions and their end results are not explained. The section on gender equality and gender based violence does this better (pp63-67) by going beyond the monitoring indicators to discuss how the services are perceived by beneficiaries and how the advocacy has affected local and regional policies. However, there is still insufficient discussion of the cause and effect relationship between UNFPA's advocacy and the noted policy changes (p66).</p> <p>In a few cases, contextual factors are mentioned (ex. vacancies in the Ministry of Women on p66).</p>

<p><b>6. Conclusions</b></p> <p><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></p> <p>Conclusions and recommendations are shown in the same section. The conclusions are clearly connected to the findings (by question). They generally follow the order of the questions (which is the structure of the findings) so they are not organized in priority order. The conclusions do not reflect biases of the evaluators.</p>
<p><b>7. Recommendations</b></p> <p><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></p> <p>The recommendations flow logically from the conclusions and are targeted. They are also prioritized, but almost all recommendations are high priority and they are not presented in priority order. The evaluators actually discuss the operational implications in detail, showing that the recommendations are operationally feasible mostly by the UNFPA country office. The extent to which the recommendations were consulted with stakeholders was not clear from the text.</p>
<p><b>8. Meeting Needs</b></p> <p>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></p> <p>The ToR is standard and the evaluation largely fulfills the criteria laid out in the ToR in terms of its design and focus. One deficiency, which is created by the ToR itself but exacerbated by the status of the country program, is that the evaluation occurs almost two years before the end of the country program and thus is greatly restricted in its ability to judge whether the program has been effective. Another shortcoming is that the evaluation is strongly focused on outputs rather than outcomes.</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>		45	55	

(\*) 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