EQA for Evaluación del Programa de País 2009-2013 del UNFPA Venezuela

Title of evaluation report: Evaluación del Programa de País 2009-2013 del UNFPA Venezuela

OVERALL QUALITY RATING: Good

Summary: The evaluation is generally well executed. It has a thorough collection of information from documentary, interview and focus groups, based on a realistic appraisal of the expected results of the programme. The methodology section was undermined by its brevity and an absence of information on how the sites for field visits and focus groups were selected. The findings are well-documented, although the extent to which they showed causal connections between UNFPA output (defined as under UNFPA control) and outcomes was uneven. The conclusions and recommendations flow from the analysis and are realistic. The executive summary is somewhat longer than normal and could have been condensed somewhat. The evaluation has some issues with structure and clarity, despite abiding by the basic outlines provided in the quality assessment criteria.

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.	*Poor* The structure of the report was mostly consistent with the quality assurance criteria in that it included the minimum content requirements: acronyms; executive summary; introduction; methodology; context; findings/analysis; conclusions; recommendations; lessons learned. The annexes were consistent with requirements, although it is not titled within the report nor in the table of contents. Moreover, the individual components of the annex are not labeled with a prefix 'Annex #'.			

	There are several incidents of the report retaining 'editing' notes (line shifts/spellcheck/grammar change); this report does not seem to be a final draft. Moreover, there are incidents of simple grammatical error. Additionally, the 'interview guide' was incorporated into the main body of the report; this is not necessary, and undermines the clarity of the report's flow to the reader. Other incidents of poor formatting include inconsistent chapter positioning, inconsistent use of fonts, tables and figures without headings, and unreadable graphics. These issues undermine the report's readability.
2. Executive Summary *To provide an overview of the evaluation, written as a stand-alone section and presenting main results of the evaluation.* 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.	*Poor* Most of the elements are present, but at 5.5 pages, the executive summary is too long, mostly because the conclusions and recommendations are presented at full length rather than summarized. The executive summary does not describe the report's intended audience, however this is detailed later in the 'Introduction'.
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.	*Poor* The report identifies/lists the methodological choices made, however there is no discussion of the constraints and limitations associated with these approaches. The main methods of acquiring data are document review (which was done by a large team) as well as focused interviews and focus groups. A conscious effort was made to triangulate and there were specific means for consulting with stakeholders. A weakness in the description was absence of information on how the sites for field visits and focus groups were selected and generally that the methodological section was very short. Moreover, cross-cutting issues (gender,

	vulnerable groups, etc.) were not adequately addressed in the methodological discussion. Cross-cutting issues are addressed in later sections, but the lack of detail in the methodology section is inconsistent with the quality assurance criteria.
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; • Disaggregated data by gender has been utilized where necessary.	*Good* The evaluation has been very careful to note where and how the data were obtained and was thorough in indicating where data came from primary sources. Data were disaggregated by gender when that was significant. Limitations of the data are not clearly made explicit.
5. Findings and Analysis *To ensure sound analysis and credible findings* Findings • Findings stem from rigorous data analysis; • Findings are substantiated by evidence; • Findings are presented in a clear manner Analysis • 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 were structured around the key questions, and were based on the data presented in the analysis chapter as well as in the context and strategy chapter. The analysis was uneven but taken as a whole the good rating is justified. While the term "output" in most cases referring to the CPAP would be considered outcomes, the analysis showed causal connections with UNFPA activities or funding in most cases. There is reference to and discussion of cause and effect links between an intervention and its end results. For example, a finding was that the government had adopted a new health policy that had been influenced by technical assistance of UNFPA. Another example of this type of discussion, is found on pages 65-66: in this section, the report explains that the increase in municipal capacity for sexual and reproductive health services is attributable to the activities of the UNFPA programme. However, the report should have substantiated these cause/effect links with more evidence (for example interview and focus group results). The report does this well in a few cases; for example, on page 68, where there is substantiation of links

	using evidence collected during focus groups with children and adolescents.
	The findings were also clear and explained in context. For example, under effectiveness, what is called an output (but is actually an outcome) on improvement of public health services at the national and local levels to reduce maternal mobility, the technical assistance and training provided by UNFPA is shown to have led to the training of 750 specialists and the adoption by the government of a protocol on emergency obstetric attention. The findings, both positive and negative, are based on the data collected from different sources. However, there are cases in which the report would do well to more clearly demonstrate the connection between findings and data collected.
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.	*Good* The conclusions were derived clearly from the findings. For example, the conclusion about UNFPA's capacity building efforts at the local level referred to findings made clear in the body of the report (page 111). They were structured by priority area, so priority order was not relevant. The basis for the judgments was clear and based on the data.
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	*Good* The recommendations flowed from the conclusions and the findings, although the specific connection was not always clear. They were organized in terms of broad areas (strategic positioning, programmatic areas and transversal themes), They were targeted and were assigned priorities. It is not clear how much they took into account the stakeholder consultations, although it is clear that they took into account interviews and focus groups.

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 undertook all of the elements called for in the ToR which itself was thorough.

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)			2	
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		94	6	

(*) 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