Title of Evaluation Report: Evaluacion del programa Pais de UNFPA en PANAMA

This report was compiled in collaboration with Beatriz Castellanos (Regional M&E Advisor: LACRO) and Sofia Guillot (JPO M&E: LACRO) as part of a training discussion on Evaluation Quality Assessment with the Evaluation Branch, Division of Oversight Services. This report is an agreed synthesis of the views of all participants.

Overall Assessment: The report structure is comprehensive but not user-friendly, with gaps in some sections and a lack of logical structure in some places. The Executive Summary does not include a clear overview of the main results of the evaluation and lacks some key details. The methodology is described but briefly and is incomplete and methodological choice is not explained and justified. Triangulation is not mentioned or applied throughout the evaluation. Sources of qualitative and quantitative data have been identified, but limitations are not clearly identified or alternative credible data sources identified. A significant proportion of the findings and analysis section is solely descriptions of activities rather than findings and analysis. Findings do not stem from rigorous data analysis, are not clearly substantiated by evidence and are not presented in a clear manner. The conclusions do not clearly link to findings and are not presented in a priority order or clustered. Recommendations are not specific and practical and not linked to findings and conclusions. The evaluators have responded to the ToRs although deficiencies have not been highlighted by evaluation report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Assessment criteria</th>
<th>Assessment Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Structure and Clarity of Reporting</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure report is user-friendly, comprehensive, logically structured and drafted in accordance with international standards.</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
recommendations) are not written appropriately but as findings. The evaluation mentions in the introduction that the evaluation is conducted after the end of the cycle but the date on the title page is covering only 4 years and UNFPA policy states that the CPE should be evaluated at this point.

### 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**

The Executive Summary is brief. It does not include a clear overview of the main results of the evaluation. This section lacks detail about methodology and conclusions. The reader would benefit from clearer identification of sections e.g using sub-headings (there are no sub-headings in this section). Overall the Executive Summary does not work well as a stand-alone 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.
- Whenever relevant, specific attention to cross-cutting issues (vulnerable groups, youth, gender equality) in the design of the evaluation

**Poor**

The methodology is briefly described but is incomplete and methodological choice is not explained and justified. Evaluation criteria are mentioned but not clearly explained and there seems to be some conceptual confusion. Criteria identified include: relevance/efficiency, effectiveness, causality, indicators, monitoring and evaluation. Potential sustainability is not mentioned as a criterion. Use of SWOT analysis is not mentioned in the methodology but is utilised. The logical framework for analysis not explained (how the evaluators will connect criteria to recommendations).

Evaluation questions are not organized under any criteria and are mixed with evaluation questions, the intended focus, and means of verification which confuses the reader. Triangulation is not mentioned throughout the evaluation. Limitations are identified but it is not clearly explained how they were resolved. Techniques and tools for data collection are not explained in detail. There is a list of methods used (such as interviews with stakeholders and focus groups) but the report seems to confuse focus groups with group interviews, and the questionnaire for seem to be the same for both.
### 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;

**Poor**

Sources of qualitative and quantitative data have been identified, but limitations are not clearly identified and there is no discussion of attempts to identify alternative data sources to improve amount of credible data available (“según percepción de entrevistados la proporción de instalaciones de salud con info para jóvenes son pocos”). The document does not contain references to other reports, and other UN agencies have not been interviewed. The fact that triangulation has not been utilized weakens credibility of data.

### 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.

**Poor**

A significant proportion of this section is solely descriptions of activities rather than findings and analysis. Findings do not stem from rigorous data analysis, are not clearly substantiated by evidence and are not presented in a clear manner (“la medición de eficacia no es posible por falta de baselines y targets pero el análisis de la ejecución presupuestaria y análisis de productos dan indicaciones sobre eficacia”), and cause and effect links between intervention and end result not always apparent.

Evaluation questions were not used to substantiate findings. Analytical methods are unique to the evaluation: products achieved are analyzed under 3 levels (low/acceptable/high) and then an average is calculated which is the level of effectiveness. SWOT analysis, the use of which is not explained in the methodology, is not related to previous evaluation criteria and is more descriptive rather than analysis based on evidence.

### 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**

The conclusions appear as findings and in many cases there is no judgment from the evaluators. Conclusions do not clearly link to findings and are not presented in a priority order or clustered under sub-headings.

Some conclusions are statements from the SWOT section and achievements.
### 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

Recommendations are not specific and practical (e.g. “strengthen UNFPA’s technical team to cover all initiatives”) and in some cases too broad. There is not clear link to findings and conclusions, with a recommendation on M&E despite the M&E system not being addressed in detail in the findings section.

### 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

ToRs are annexed to the report. The evaluators appear to have responded to the ToRs, although some requirements have not been met (interviews to diverse group of stakeholders including UN agencies). The ToRs do not follow quality standards but deficiencies have not been highlighted by evaluation report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality assessment criteria (and Multiplying factor *)</th>
<th>Assessment Levels (*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Findings and analysis (50)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Conclusions (12)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Recommendations (12)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Meeting needs (12)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Design and methodology (5)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reliability of data (5)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Structure and clarity of reporting (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Executive summary (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) Insert the multiplying factor associated with the criteria in the corresponding column e.g. if “Findings 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: Poor