EQA for UNFPA Swaziland 5th Country Programme Evaluation (2011-2015)

Title of Evaluation Report: Kingdom of Swaziland End-Term Evaluation of GoS/UNFPA 5th Country Programme

Overall Quality Rating: Good

Overall Assessment: The report is clearly written and logically structured; however, it does not include a stand-alone methodology section which undermines the overall clarity of reporting, although the content on methodology is well-explained, though more detail could have been provided. The executive summary is much too long and detailed. The discussion of data quality is light on detail regarding credibility but otherwise consistent with evaluation criteria. The findings clearly derived from the data being used and were clearly expressed. Conclusions and recommendations are grounded in a clear discussion of findings and analysis, and arranged in a presentable and user-friendly manner.

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	**Good**	**Poor**	**Unsatisfactory**
1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting *To ensure report is user-friendly, comprehensive, logically structured and drafted in accordance with international standards.* Checklist of minimum content and sequence required for structure: • 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.	**Good** The evaluation report contains all of the required sections and annexes, except for a separate/standalone section on Methodology which includes Approach and Limitations. Of particular interest in terms of report structure is two annexes containing detailed summaries of findings in terms of the expected results.			
2. Executive Summary *To provide an overview of the evaluation, written as a stand-alone section and presenting main results of the evaluation.*	**Poor** The executive summary is too long to be a self-standing document (13 pages			

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	**Good**	**Poor**	**Unsatisfactory**
Structure (paragraph equates to half page max): • 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.	double spaced/10 pages single-spaced). While it contains all of the required structure, it is difficult to read and there are numerous grammatical errors. Of the sub-sections, only the 'Purpose and intended audience' are under the maximum suggested length of one paragraph. The excessive length undermines the quality and usefulness of the section.			
3. Design and Methodology *To provide a clear explanation of the following elements/tools* Minimum content and sequence: • 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.	**Good** The report does not include a standalone Methodology section; rather this content is combined into the Introduction section but the content indicates that a methodology was developed that was appropriate. The design includes key evaluation questions of an appropriate number, as well as use of random sampling to select interviewees at the field level. A rationale for inclusion of study participants is offered, including some detail on cross-cutting issues including gender. Decisions not to host focus groups were explained (p3). A short discussion of the limitations associated with the methodological choice is included (p6). The report notes that stakeholder views were obtained through interviews, but there is no indication of stakeholder consultations on the findings, conclusions or recommendations. The content on methodology also describes the process by which triangulation was systematically applied throughout the evaluation so as to ensure independence, impartiality, and objectivity in results (p2). The limitations of choice are also discussed, including the fact that the evaluation involved field work during the Christmas season when it is difficult to interview people at length, and indicated how the evaluation team sought to mitigate this.			
4. Reliability of Data *To clarify data collection processes and data quality* • 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;	**Good** Sources of qualitative and quantitative data are identified in the Introduction (under sub-section on Methodology) and in the analysis. Limitations of data are made explicit in a brief discussion in the Introduction (under sub-Section on Methodology). The interviews were uniformly credible and the secondary sources were carefully chosen. There was an effort to use gender disaggregated data when it was relevant. However, the report does not			

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	**Good**	**Poor**	**Unsatisfactory**
• Disaggregated data by gender has been utilized where necessary.	include a stand-alone discussion of data sources and data quality.			
5. Findings and Analysis *To ensure sound analysis and credible findings* <u>Findings</u> • Findings stem from rigorous data analysis; • Findings are substantiated by evidence; • Findings are presented in a clear manner <u>Analysis</u> • 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.	**Good** The findings are structured by programme area and within that by questions. A brief summary is provided at the beginning of each theme's sub-section on findings/analysis, with detailed discussion included thereafter. In each case, the findings are clearly derived from the data being used and clearly expressed. In terms of evidence, milestones reached are indicated and explained (p26 on policies supported), outputs identified and explained (p27 on HIV prevention training), and target attainment described (p27 on SBCC interventions). Contextual factors are also discussed, as on p28 where the report identifies limits to programme achievements, specifically, "Whilst the programme had planned to ensure that 35/38 health facilities provide integrated SRH services in 2014, the 2013 Service Availability Mapping (SAM) revealed that only 16/36 health facilities are providing integrated SRH services in Shiselweni from a baseline of 27/38". Interpretations are based on carefully described assumptions (and contextual factors). Cause and effect links between the intervention and its end results are explained using verifiable indicators and baselines (as on p30 showing the relationship between UNFPA support and strengthened national systems for reproductive health commodity (MTR-SP Output 8) and 40, showing the relationship with Output 3.1: Strengthened national capacity to incorporate population dynamics and its inter-linkages with needs of young people, sexual and reproductive health (including family planning), gender equality and poverty reduction addressed in national and sectoral development plans and strategies (MTR-SP Outcome 1)). There is clear use of results matrices and it is clear from the report that there was effort to establish causal connections with UNFPA activities that were found to lead to achieving (or not) expected output and outcomes.			

Quality Assessment criteria	Assessment Levels			
	Very good	**Good**	**Poor**	**Unsatisfactory**
6. Conclusions *To assess the validity of conclusions* • Conclusions are based on credible findings; • Conclusions are organized in priority order; • Conclusions must convey evaluators' unbiased judgment of the intervention.	**Poor** While the conclusions are supported by data in the findings, they are expressed generally with only one conclusion per evaluation question, which is not good practice. They are not organized by priority order. The conclusions do convey the evaluator's unbiased judgment.			
7. Recommendations *To assess the usefulness and clarity of recommendations* • 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	**Poor** Almost all the recommendations are high priority, they are in effect not prioritised. Many of the recommendations are general and as a result, their operational feasibility is not clear. For example, more effort could be made to target recommendations towards the actor responsible for implementation (e.g. on p64 recommendation based on conclusion 5.21. does not adequately indicate which actors should be involved in joint decision-making, though it is implied). There is no evidence that the recommendations took into account stakeholder consultations. As the recommendations are clearly linked to the conclusions, they share their limitations.			
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.	**Good** The evaluation adhered to the terms of reference, but also summarized the many questions into a more useable number.			

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		74	26	

(*) 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