

EQA for Madagascar Country Programme Evaluation (2008-2013)



External reviewer: Inoussa Kabore, Regional Chief Monitoring & Evaluation, UNICEF Regional Office for West & Central Africa

Overall Assessment: The report contains all required elements and is clearly **structured**, although it is recommended that the report is read alongside the annexes as they contain important additional information. The **executive summary** is concise and well-written, although inclusion of figures from the annexes would have complemented the main findings. The **methodology** explains the methodological choice, and limitations and mitigating efforts are described. However, some information is lacking on data collection methods (criteria for selection of field sites) and disaggregation of data. **Data** limitations have been acknowledged and taken into account in analysis. **Findings** are substantiated by evidence and analysis is detailed. **Conclusions** are clear and are linked to findings. The **recommendations** are well-described and sufficiently detailed to support their operationalization. The report meets the needs of the **ToR**, although additional information in the main report on the role of the steering committee would benefit the reader.

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. 		Good		
<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 		Good		

<p>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>	<p>The purpose and the intended audiences of the report are not clearly stated in the summary.</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. • Whenever relevant, specific attention to cross-cutting issues (vulnerable groups, youth, gender equality) in the design of the evaluation 	<p>Good The evaluation criteria are well described, and the methodology explains how the evaluation will assess the relevance and performance of the programme. The constraints of the methodological choice and limitations are clearly outlined, including the use of qualitative methods to complement the poor quality of monitoring data. The participatory methodology consisting of drafting the ToR and setting up a reference group are clearly described, although details on the role of the steering committee would have been appropriate. Information is provided on focus groups, individuals' interviews, and field observation. However, the disaggregation of qualitative data (gender, youth, beneficiaries and how many per segment) is not detailed in the report. Information is lacking on the focus groups members, individuals for interviews and the criteria of selection of sites for observation.</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; 	<p>Good The sources of data are clearly mentioned in the report. The evaluators' analysis of existing data, combined with primary data, recognizes and takes account of limitations. In terms of primary data, the use of focus groups to identify tendencies is made clear although this may be affected by the size of the groups (ranging from 3 to 7 participants per group), particularly given the programme data constraints and limitations described in the report.</p>
<p>5. Findings and Analysis <i>To ensure sound analysis and credible findings</i></p>	<p>Good The report has made a good effort at detailed analysis,</p>

<p>Findings</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>Analysis</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>and findings are substantiated by evidence. A reconstructed theory of change for the programme (p.14) provides a good basis for analysis. The limited quality of the data is well recognized in the report, and is taken into account in the findings. Findings are presented by programme components and include contextual factors. Triangulation is mentioned in the report, although its use in the presentation of the findings is not clear.</p>
<p>6. Conclusions</p> <p><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</p> <p>Conclusions are organized in priority order and are linked with findings, although the reader would benefit from reading the appendixes to more closely link the conclusions with the findings.</p>
<p>7. Recommendations</p> <p><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; • Recommendations must take into account stakeholders' consultations whilst remaining impartial; • Recommendations should be presented in priority order 	<p>Good</p> <p>The recommendations are well described with sufficient detail to support their operationalization. The recommendations are well linked with the conclusions although reference to the appendixes provides the reader with a stronger link. The recommendations are also presented in priority order.</p>
<p>8. Meeting Needs</p> <p><i>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).</i></p> <p><i>In the event that the ToR do not conform with commonly agreed quality standards, assess if evaluators have highlighted the deficiencies with the ToR.</i></p>	<p>Good</p> <p>The ToR for the evaluation are clear and meet required standards. The steering committee described in the report and its role (the extent to which it will not influence the independence of the evaluation) is an important issue that could have been addressed in the report. In addition, ethical considerations are not mentioned in the ToR or the main report, and should have been included.</p>

Quality assessment criteria (and Multiplying factor *)	Assessment Levels (*)			
	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Good	Very good
5. Findings and analysis (50)			50	
6. Conclusions (12)			12	
7. Recommendations (12)			12	
8. Meeting needs (12)			12	
3. Design and methodology (5)			5	
4. Reliability of data (5)			5	
1. Structure and clarity of reporting (2)			2	
2. Executive summary (2)			2	
TOTAL			100	

(*) 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