

Quality rating scale legend: Evaluation reports		UNSWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator - Overall scoring of gender EPI scale legend	
Exceeds requirements: 75–100%			
Meets requirements: 60—74%		11–12 points = Exceeds requirements	
Approaches requirements: 50–59%		8–10 points = Meets requirements	
Partially meets requirements: 25–49%		4–7 points = Approaches requirements	
Does not meet requirements: 0–24%		0–3 points = Missing requirements	
Evaluation title	Evaluation of Purchase from Africans for Africa (PAA) Africa Programme in Senegal’s Kédougou region from September 2013 to July 2016	Evaluation report number	DE/SENEGAL/2016/011
Type	Thematic / Activity	Centralised/ decentralised	Decentralised
Global/region or country	Senegal	PHQA date	August 2017
Quality rating – overall category		EPI – overall report category	
Partially meets requirements: 25–49%		4-7 points = Approaches requirements	
<p>The report uses clear and professional language to presents the findings of the evaluation in an impartial manner, based on a comprehensive analysis of evidence. Findings are presented in a balanced way, emphasising the programme's achievements and positive results, as well as shortcomings and challenges. The findings address the programme's (potential) influence on policy. Suggestions for improving the report include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The purpose and objectives of the evaluation should be stated clearly in the report.• Inclusion of impact as an evaluation criterion could be clarified. It is pertinently excluded from the evaluation terms of reference (ToR) and there is no impact statement or criteria in the log frame. However, in the ToR there are several evaluation questions related to "outcomes", which appear to refer to impact. If impact is to be included in the scope of the evaluation, it has to be based on a clear impact statement and indicators. The methodology for evaluating the programme's impact should be clarified. The sampling approach, in particular, should be explained in clear, simple terms and the associated limitations and implications should be clarified.• The methodology for evaluating the programme's efficiency should be clarified. There should be coherence between the definition of efficiency, the indicators outlined in the logical framework and evaluation matrix, and the narrative in the evaluation report (paragraphs 18 and 55 - 59).• The methodology section could be strengthened by providing a summary of the evaluability assessment findings, as this would clarify shortcomings of the Logical Framework and limitations around data availability. It would also provide an opportunity to tie together the revised logical framework, the evaluation criteria as they were applied in the evaluation and the final indicators against which the criteria were evaluated.• The conclusions should be elaborated to capture the essence of the evaluation and its key findings in a summative, perceptive manner.• While recommendations are numbered and a distinction is made between strategic and operational recommendations, there should be a logical flow from the key findings, conclusions and lessons learned to the recommendations.• The analysis and findings related to the programmes' Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (GEEW) dimensions and issues (including its design) should be consolidated and followed through in the lessons, conclusions and recommendations.• A lot of important information pertaining to the evaluation is contained in annexes. However, annexes are not optimally organised and/or referenced. An effort should be made to incorporate essential			

information from annexes into relevant sections of the main report, and/or to clearly reference annexes where this information can be found.

- The summary should provide a concise, coherent and perceptive overview of all aspects of the subject of the evaluation and the evaluation itself, including its purpose, objectives, methodology, key findings, conclusions and recommendations.
- The structure and length of the report should be reviewed to enhance readability. The sequencing of sections should be logical, and there should be continuity and coherence between the different sections. The headings of different sections and sub-sections should accurately describe the content of the relevant sections and sub-sections. The body of the report should be edited down to 50 pages, while shorter sentences and paragraphs should be used throughout.

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Approaches
The summary is succinct and contains an adequate overview of the evaluation methodology. However, the summary does not contain sufficient information about the programme itself. Key findings, messages and recommendations are not highlighted or prioritised clearly in relation to different users and the purpose of the evaluation. Long sentences and paragraphs affect the summary's readability.		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Partially
The overview provides a clear indication of the programme's main partners and key stakeholders. Where data is drawn from secondary sources to inform the overview, these sources are relevant and clearly referenced. It is confusing that the overview of the evaluation subject is provided under the sub-heading "Overview of the Evaluation", along with additional information on the implementation context. In general, too little information about the subject of the evaluation is provided. The subject type is not specified. There is no information on resource allocations to different components of the programme, how this changed during implementation and the implications of this for the programme and its results. Also, there is no assessment of the logical framework and how it was adapted for purposes of the evaluation. Some of this information is contained in annexes, or addressed in other sections of the report, but it is not incorporated in the relevant section, nor clearly referenced.		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Partially
The rationale and intended users of the evaluation are clear. While the purpose of the evaluation is not stated explicitly, it is clear from the description of the report's aims that there is an accountability and learning component to the evaluation (although the balance between these two components requires clarification). There is no clear distinction between the evaluation purpose and objectives. Reference to the uses of the evaluation, as outlined in the terms of reference, paragraph 6 (page 2), would provide further clarity on the scope and focus of the evaluation.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Partially
While most of the key elements of the evaluation methodology are included in the report, the manner in which they are dealt with often lacks depth and clarity. It appears that a lot of thought was put into designing the evaluation to allow for a comparison of outcome indicators between districts and schools that were included in the programme and those that were not.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A lot of important information about the evaluation methodology is contained in annexes. An effort should be made to incorporate essential information from annexes into the main report in a clear and concise manner, and/or to clearly reference annexes where this information can be found. • The evaluation matrix is generally comprehensive, but indicators for a large number of questions are not robust and often rely on only one source of data. This would jeopardise triangulation and depth of analysis. • The inclusion and definitions of impact and efficiency as evaluation criteria require clarification. In its current format, the logical framework does not support evaluation of the programme's impact. Care should be taken that there is coherence between the logical framework and evaluation 		

<p>matrix, in particular the extent to which the logical framework provides a clear, comprehensive outline of the programme's activities and results (outputs, outcomes, impact), as well as indicators to enable an evaluation of performance against the selected criteria.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The methodology for evaluating the programme's impact should be clarified. The sampling approach, in particular, should be explained in clear, simple terms and the associated limitations and implications should be clarified. The methodology for evaluating the programme's efficiency is confusing and should be clarified. There should be coherence between the definition of efficiency, the indicators outlined in the logical framework and evaluation matrix, and the narrative in the evaluation report (paragraphs 18 and 55 - 59). 		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Approaches
<p>Findings are impartially presented and substantiated by comprehensive analysis of evidence. Findings are presented in a balanced way, emphasising the programme's achievements and positive results, as well as shortcomings and challenges. The findings address the programme's (potential) influence on policy. However, there is lack of consistency between the evaluation questions as outlined in the evaluation matrix and those addressed in the analysis and findings. Findings are not triangulated consistently and data sources to inform a particular finding often vary from the sources identified in the evaluation matrix. WFP's contribution to results, as well as external and internal enablers and constraints for results, is not systematically identified.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Partially
<p>The conclusions deal with the programme's strengths/successes and weaknesses/failures, albeit in a very generic and incomplete manner. Lessons for the next phase of the programme are identified, although their implications are not always made explicit. The conclusions are inadequate - conclusions are dealt with in only two sentences which do not articulate the essence of the evaluation and its key findings in a strategic, perceptive manner. Most of the identified lessons are actually findings and conclusions specific to the subject. The associated learning (positive and negative) and implications for the next phase of the programme (and more widely) are not explained clearly.</p>		
CRITERION 7: GENDER	Category	Partially
<p>The evaluation methodology, analysis and findings demonstrate a clear awareness and efforts to address GEEW dimensions and issues relevant to the programme. Quantitative and qualitative information is used to analyse GEEW dimensions. However, the evaluation does not assess the extent to which the programme design incorporates and lends itself to the evaluation of GEEW objectives and principles. The analysis and findings related to the GEEW dimensions and issues of the programme are not followed through in the lessons, conclusions and recommendations. The evaluation does not deal with equity dimensions relevant to the programme.</p>		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Partially
<p>Recommendations are identified for each of the three components of the programme, i.e. agriculture, education and governance. Recommendations are numbered and a distinction is made between strategic and operational recommendations. Nevertheless, recommendations do not address all of the evaluation's objectives/expectations, in particular those relating to informing and influencing other PAA and similar programmes. The relationship between key findings, lessons learned and recommendations is not always clear. There are a lot of recommendations. They are not clearly prioritised and there is no indication of the timeframe for actioning recommendations - this is a major oversight given plans for the imminent scaling up of the programme. Some recommendations may not be realistic and the responsibility for actioning recommendations is not clear. Recommendations are dealt with in two sections of the report - under Key findings in section 4.1 of the report (paragraphs 90 - 98) and in a table in section 4.2. This is confusing, since the two sets of recommendations do not appear to be related.</p>		
CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Approaches
<p>The report uses clear and professional language to provide a balanced and objective overview of the evaluation's findings. Data sources are clearly referenced throughout. The readability and accessibility of the report is affected by its length (62 pages), as well as long sentences and paragraphs, and the use of highly technical language in places. It is further affected by the lack of consistency and continuity between</p>		

the findings, conclusions and recommendations, as well as the fact that key findings and messages are not clearly identifiable.

Criteria scoring scale legend – gender integration EPI
3 points = Fully integrated
2 points = Satisfactorily integrated
1 point = Partially integrated
0 point = Not at all integrated

1. Scope and Indicators	1
2. Criteria and Questions	2
3. Methodology	2
4. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations	1
Overall EPI score	6