

Organizational unit: Sierra Leone **Year of report:** 2022

Title of evaluation report: 7TH GoSL / UNFPA COUNTRY PROGRAMME (2020-2023) Final Evaluation Report

Overall quality of report: Very good **Date of assessment:** 2 February 2023

Overall comments: This is a very thorough evaluation of the 7th Country Programme. The evaluators appeared to consult with the range of CP stakeholders including direct and indirect beneficiaries, although the total number is not clear. The evaluation stands out for being meticulous in the citing of evidence and in interpreting the findings for all criteria. Selective use of participant quotes was a useful addition for reinforcing key points. As a result, the report provides readers with an extremely thorough assessment of the performance of the country programme and a solid set of recommendations for ongoing and future work. The evaluation design effectively incorporated cross-cutting issues, and had multiple questions on disability inclusion. These issues were all explored in the analysis although the extent of the work on disability inclusion could have been better reflected in the conclusions. A further concern is the extent to which the length and density of the report effects its overall usability. It is very text heavy with only minimal use of visual aids.

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 *Insert assessment level followed by main comments. (use 'shading' function to give cells corresponding colour)*

1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting	Yes No Partial		Assessment Level:	Fair
--	----------------------	--	-------------------	-------------

To ensure the report is comprehensive and user-friendly

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)?	No	The usual structure is followed and the report is well-written. However, more could be done to make the presentation user-friendly. The sections and subsections could be more clearly defined through better use of spacing, formatting of heading, and numbering (i.e., the methodology subsection is not defined by a number or an easily-distinguished heading). Most of the report is very text heavy, and there is not always space between paragraphs and there is minimal use of visual aids. The report is also in need of final proof-reading as some information in methodology appears not to have been updated from the inception report and a table on performance data (Table 8) appears to mistakenly show no results for Output 2.
---	----	---

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)	Partial	The report is about 76 pages, including the Executive Summary, which slightly exceeds the preferred length of 70 pages for CPEs. It should be noted that the typeface used is relatively small (Times New Roman 10 pt); if this was larger and the text was less dense, the document would be significantly longer.
---	---------	---

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	All required annexes are listed in the table of contents. These are attached with the exception of the ToR which is provided just a hyperlink which does not work.
---	---------	--

Executive summary

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 covers all of the expected elements (with Findings and Conclusions being combined), serving as a stand-alone section.
--	-----	---

5. Is the executive summary reasonably concise (e.g. with a maximum length of 5 pages)?	Yes	The summary is just under 4 pages.
---	-----	------------------------------------

2. Design and Methodology	Yes No Partial		Assessment Level:	Good
----------------------------------	----------------------	--	-------------------	-------------

To ensure that the evaluation is put within its context

1. Is the development and institutional context of the evaluation clearly described and constraints explained?	Yes	There is a thorough discussion of the county context and the UNFPA country programme.
--	-----	---

2. Does the evaluation report discuss and assess the intervention logic and/or theory of change?	Partial	Evaluators carefully explain their process for assessing the ToC in the introduction section and then provide an assessment of the ToC for each programme area. The reconstructed ToC for the CP is provided in Annex 6; although it follows good practice in setting out assumptions and risks, there is little to distinguish most of the output and outcome-level results (with both referring to improved or enhanced capacities).
--	---------	--

To ensure a rigorous design and methodology

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?	Yes	There is a complete discussion of the evaluation framework and matrix in the main text. It is noted that the number of questions was reduced from the 12 stated in the ToR to nine final questions. The evaluation matrix is comprehensive and covers all required elements. One column is dedicated to the main findings for each question.
--	-----	--

4. Are the tools for data collection described and their choice justified?	Partial	Standard data collection processes - document review, interviews, FGDs and site visits- are carefully explained and justified. However, some of the text is in future tense suggesting that it was pulled from the Inception Report and not adjusted for what actually was carried out.
--	---------	---

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	There is reference to a stakeholder map and that it was to be used to inform the sampling process. Although the actual map/listing is not provided, the main groups of stakeholders are described. Evaluators note that they will include 'as much as possible' various beneficiary groups including persons with disabilities, however it is not clear this was actually done. The intent to obtain input from CP staff, the evaluation manager, and 'stakeholders' (who are not defined) is clear but the text about validation processes is all in future tense. The introduction to the recommendations' section notes that CP stakeholders were consulted in their development.
6. Are the methods for analysis clearly described for all types of data?	Yes	Data analysis is addressed. Content analysis was used for qualitative data and documentary evidence, excel was used for financial information, and descriptive stats were used for quantitative data from secondary sources.
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 discussed, including one on the limitations of the sample and another on the limitations of the available datasets. Mitigation strategies were explained for all. Covid-19 was not identified as a limitation.
8. Is the sampling strategy described?	Partial	The sampling strategy, including the criteria, for individual and group interviews (which are presumably the FGDs) is well described, although the total number of respondents is not provided (the number of consultation sessions is). It is also not clear how the site visit locations were chosen and what the universe was for this.
9. Does the methodology enable the collection and analysis of disaggregated data?	Partial	It is not clear how this was done in respect to primary data collection. The evaluation respondents are disaggregated by general stakeholder group (including by direct and indirect beneficiaries) but not by gender or other factor. There is also no place allocated to this information in the data collection protocols. However, the evaluators clearly looked for this type of information from secondary sources as it is noted that disaggregated programme data was not readily available and the Country Context section provides extensive information disaggregated by gender, age, location, etc.
10. Is the design and methodology appropriate for assessing the cross-cutting issues (equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights)?	Yes	HRGE-responsiveness is explained in the methodology section. Three questions included a focus on young people and women with disabilities.
3. Reliability of Data		
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: Very good
<i>To ensure quality of data and robust data collection processes</i>		
1. Did the evaluation triangulate data collected as appropriate?	Yes	Triangulation processes are discussed under methodology. Findings are consistently supported by multiple sources and/or methods.
2. Did the evaluation clearly identify and make use of reliable qualitative and quantitative data sources?	Yes	The sources are mostly carefully described and appear appropriate. As mentioned in 2.7, the limitations, including in being able to generalize beneficiary responses to the whole population, are explained.
3. Is there evidence that data has been collected with a sensitivity to issues of discrimination and other ethical considerations?	Yes	It is noted that evaluators adhered to the UNEG Code of Conduct and Ethical Guidelines for evaluations. Ethical considerations are described including informed consent, confidentiality, and anonymity. Efforts to ensure gender and human-rights responsiveness of the process are also touched upon.
4. Analysis and Findings		
	Yes No Partial	Assessment Level: Very good
<i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i>		
1. Are the findings substantiated by evidence?	Yes	The evaluators consistently cite multiple sources and/or methods of evidence. Although the sources are sometimes generally stated (for example, "interviews and documents reviewed indicated . . ."), specific document citations are also provided. A notable aspect of this report is the extent that qualitative sources are identified by stakeholder group.
2. Is the basis for interpretations carefully described?	Yes	Findings are explained with substantial detail. This is most thoroughly done for Effectiveness where evaluators provide ample examples and discussion on outputs for each outcome. Selective use of direct quotes from evaluation participants is also useful for providing further perspectives.
3. Is the analysis presented against the evaluation questions?	Yes	This section is clearly organized by criteria, each starting with a boxed summary of findings, and the following analysis is then presented by evaluation question.
4. Are the cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results explained and any unintended outcomes highlighted?	Yes	Causal linkages are discussed throughout the Effectiveness section. There is also a specific subsection of Lessons Learned that addresses Unintended Consequences.
5. Does the analysis show different outcomes for different target groups, as relevant?	Yes	Although the differences are not quantified, the analysis does confirm that CP was successful in reaching populations in more remote and harder to access communities, as well as more vulnerable groups including persons with disabilities.

6. Is the analysis presented against contextual factors?	Yes	Context is mentioned throughout findings, frequently in regards to the delays caused by covid, the capacity/extent of ownership of government counterparts and other implementing partners, the extent of support from Parliament. An example of the latter is the discussion on the challenges and the windows of opportunities experienced by the interventions aimed at the elimination of FGM.
7. Does the analysis elaborate on cross-cutting issues such as equity and vulnerability, disability inclusion, gender equality and human rights?	Yes	Cross-cutting issues are considered across programme areas, and are especially evident in the assessment of the Adolescent and Youth component (i.e., the positive masculinity approach used in the PBF-supported project) and the GEWE component. In addition, EQ2 looks at the extent the office was able to respond to changes in national needs/priorities, such as covid, including those of vulnerable groups. There is also reference to CP-supported services reaching LGBTIQ populations. Further, EQ4 specifically focuses on the extent the CP has considered x-cutting issues, including disability inclusion, and EQ8 looks at the same issues but in the context of UNFPA's humanitarian response.
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?	Yes	Conclusions note the evaluation question from which they originated.
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?	Partial	This section spans four pages. The overall conclusion statements provide a higher-level overview of CP performance, however some of the explanatory text for each is at the findings-level and provides more information than needed. Given that the findings section of the report is very detailed, a more concise set on conclusions would be useful for readers. In terms of cross-cutting issues, Conclusion #1 notes that the CP "design was well adapted to the needs of the population, particularly the most vulnerable and marginalized". In terms of CP implementation, although gender issues are explicitly mentioned, disability inclusion is not; this would be expected given that the latter is part of several evaluation questions.
3. Do the conclusions appear to convey the evaluators' unbiased judgement?	Yes	Conclusions are linked to the detailed evidence provided in findings, and therefore do not appear biased.
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	Recommendations are well structured with the link to respective conclusions and evaluation questions clearly shown.
2. Are the recommendations targeted at the intended users and action-oriented (with information on their human, financial and technical implications)?	Yes	These are all targeted to the CO, with some also targeted to the regional office and/or headquarters. Each is followed by a brief description of operational implications, with the need for more resources frequently being brought out.
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	The recommendations appear impartial and adequately address further work needed in terms of GEWE and GBV. They do not explicitly address disability inclusion but the findings indicated that the CP was doing appropriate work in that regard.
4. Are the recommendations prioritized?	Yes	They are prioritized - either as high or medium - and the introduction to this section explains the timeframe for each level.
7. Gender		
	0 1 2 3 (**)	Assessment Level: 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?		<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 not explicitly highlighted as be part of objectives or scope. = 0</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) The assessment of GEEW is mainstreamed across 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) There are several relevant questions (under Relevance, Effectiveness, Sustainability, Coverage and Connectedness) = 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) The analysis of the ToC considers data availability and the suitability of the CP indicators for measuring outcome-level results = 3</p>

<p>2. Is a gender-responsive methodology used, including gender-responsive methods and tools, and data analysis techniques?</p>	<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 report is specific about the intent of the process being gender responsive, and several steps in this regard are identified including evaluators being briefed on culturally-appropriate practices. = 3</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 appears to have been used (including visits to safe spaces for GBV survivors and FGDs) although the sample is not stated. = 2</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) Sources and methods appear appropriately inclusive. = 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) Community-level rights holders, including the most vulnerable, were to be part of the sample (although the final sample is not given) and respondents are not gender disaggregated = 1</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) Ethical considerations are addressed but could go further in showing how comfort levels were assured so that women felt free to participate in mixed gendered FGDs. = 2</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) The context section includes a discussion on gender inequality, GBV and other relevant factors. = 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 is a solid analysis of the extent that the GEVE programme has addressed inequalities. The perspectives of duty bearers an rightsholder are apparent, as are the perspectives of female youth who participated in FGDs on their experiences with different aspects of the Adolescent and Youth programme. = 3</p> <p>c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described? (Score: 0-3) Unanticipated effects are not explicitly addressed, however there is an analysis of the covid response including the extent to which key programmes for women were maintained and the opportunities this provided for strengthening partnerships and sustainability . = 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) Several recommendations address GEEW. = 3</p>

(*) This assessment criteria is fully based on the UN-SWAP Scoring Tool. Each sub-criteria shall be equally weighted.
(**) 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	62	31	7	

Overall assessment level of evaluation report **Very good**

The evaluation integrates adequately cross cutting issues of gender equality, human rights and disability inclusion, even though is not included as part of the evaluation objective.

The evaluation effectively covered cross-cutting issues in its design and analysis. The main shortcoming is that the CP's substantial work on DI was not brought out in conclusions. It is also not clear if persons with disabilities or representative organizations were part of the final sample of evaluation respondents, as was intended in the design.

Consideration of significant constraints (e.g. COVID-19 or civil unrest)

The quality of this evaluation report has been hampered by exceptionally difficult circumstances: L. Yes M. No

If yes, please explain: