

EQA for UNFPA El Salvador Country Programme Evaluation (2012-2015)



Title of evaluation report: Evaluación del Programa País El Salvador 2012 - 2015

OVERALL QUALITY OF REPORT: Good

Summary: The report meets all of the minimum requirements in terms of structure but there are some issues with clarity of reporting. The executive summary exceeds the maximum length and does not function as summative, stand-alone document. The report provides a clear explanation of methodological choice, including a clear discussion of constraints and limitations, such as the focus of the results matrix on activities and outputs. Findings stemmed from analysis of the data collected by the evaluation team and cause and effect links between the intervention and its results are explained in detail. The conclusions are directly linked to targeted and operationally-feasible recommendations.

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	Good	Poor	Unsatisfactory
<p>I. 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>Poor</p> <p>The report's structure meets minimum requirements, including a list of acronyms, executive summary, introduction (including methodological approach and limitations), contextual factors, findings/analysis, conclusions and recommendations. The annex includes the ToR, a list of documents consulted (bibliography), list of interviewees, and methodological instruments used.</p> <p>However, there are errors, such as the list of acronyms does not include all acronyms used in the report. Furthermore, Annex 3 is entirely illegible due to formatting errors and Annex 11 is not included in the Table of Contents. Overall, the clarity of the report is weak. Often paragraphs are too long and the punctuation is sometimes out of place, thus making it difficult for the reader to follow the authors' line of reasoning.</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>Poor The executive summary contains a discussion of all required elements; however, at 6 pages, it exceeds the maximum length specified. The findings leading to the conclusions are not clearly presented and the recommendations are much longer, and more detailed, than necessary for a stand-alone document. This section also uses many acronyms, some of which are not found in the list of acronyms.</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 Methodological choice is explained in detail, including the desk review of relevant documents, as well as interviews, focus groups, and observation. The evaluators discussed the constraints and limitations associated with the methodological choice in detail (providing a separate sub-section for this purpose). For example, the evaluators identified the weaknesses associated with the results matrix and an inherent focus of indicators on activities/outputs rather than outcomes (p19). The selection of stakeholders to be involved in data collection is described clearly, with the evaluators taking a purposive sample (p18-19). The section also outlines the phasing of the evaluation methodology clearly (p22), and details of the participation of stakeholders through a review committee are also included. The cross-cutting issue of gender was also built into the design.</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 collection process is well explained in the methodology and the credibility of data is established throughout the findings and analysis sections; limitations are clearly presented.</p> <p>There is variation in the level of information on the sources of data: for example, some sources of qualitative and quantitative data are not identified in the earlier sections of the report (e.g. context) although some</p>

	figures/tables are clearly sourced (Table 5a/p33). However, this does not undermine the quality of this section.
<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 Findings stem from analysis of the data collected by the evaluation team. Cause and effect links between the intervention and its results are explained in detail. The discussion of causal links is supported by an identification and discussion of weaknesses in the results framework where necessary; for example, the report identifies the lack of indicators focused on quality of life changes amongst beneficiaries (p34). When causally linking the intervention to end results is not possible, the report presents triangulated sources of evidence that outputs are connected to outcomes (p38). The discussion includes reference to unintended results of the intervention; for example, the report describes the design of a municipal policy in Metapan arising from an UNFPA-initiated survey on the situation of migrants (p38).</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 are largely based on credible findings; however, an exception would be the 'key lesson learned' relating to the criminalization of therapeutic abortion which did not seem founded in the discussion contained within the findings and analysis section. Conclusions are prioritized, however are all given the status of 'priority level 1', so in effect not prioritised. Conclusions convey evaluators' unbiased judgment/discussion of the intervention, and linked directly to recommendations.</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; 	<p>Good Recommendations are directly linked to conclusions. They provide clear operational implications (strategic, targeted, feasible). They are mostly directed toward the next country programme which is appropriate, indicate clearly to whom they are directed and clearly take into account</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendations must take into account stakeholders' consultations whilst remaining impartial; • Recommendations should be presented in priority order 	<p>consultations with stakeholders. As with the conclusions, the recommendations are organized in priority order, however all recommendations are given the status of 'priority level 1', and therefore lack prioritization.</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 report conforms to the ToR. In particular, the report highlights the deficiencies of the evaluation's results matrix, which is not measurable or strategic, and the evaluators have included comments on how to strengthen indicators in this context (p65).</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		96	4	

(*) 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 OF REPORT: Good