9.10. Annexe 10 Methodology for evaluation


METHODOLOGY FOR EVALUATION
Prepared by Aleksandar Panovski, the ReSPA expert

The evaluation methodology applied a mixed-method approach and had both summative and formative characteristics. In line with the mixed-method approach, the evaluation applied both qualitative and quantitative research methods as presented in Table 1 below to identify the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and estimated impact of the Strategy, its fitness for purpose and coherence, and also to bring a set of conclusions and recommendations to help strategically plan next cycle of PAR 2023-2030.

Table 1 Evaluation criteria and corresponding methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Stakeholder mapping;</td>
<td>- Structured desk analysis of four specific objectives under which interventions are implemented;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Systematic documentary review applying structured tools;</td>
<td>- Analysis of results data from the PAR Strategy monitoring and reporting systems;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mapping of available contextual analyses including those related to targeted areas within the PAR Strategy</td>
<td>- Mapping of risk analysis undertaken/mitigation measures implemented;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Technical analysis and testing of strategies; and</td>
<td>- Semi-structured interviews with MPA staff and other stakeholders engaged in the implementation of the Strategy;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Semi-structured interviews with MPA staff and other stakeholders engaged in the implementation of the Strategy;</td>
<td>- Focus group discussions and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Focus group discussions and</td>
<td>- Questioner and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Relevance matrix.</td>
<td>- Partial contribution analysis to determine progress against intended results and pathways generated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Efficieny and fitness for purpose | - Systems analysis of management and coordination structures;  
- Systems analysis of strategies;  
- Financial analysis of spend per strategy/intervention;  
- Analysis of results data from the PAR Strategy monitoring and reportingsystems;  
- Focus group discussions  
- Questioner and  
- Semi-structured interviews with MPA staff and other stakeholders engaged in the implementation of the PAR Strategy. |
| --- | --- |
| Sustainability | - Systematic documentary review, applying structured tools;  
- Semi-structured interviews with MPA staff and other stakeholders engaged in the implementation of the Strategy;  
- Questioner and  
- Focus group discussions. |
| Impact | - Systematic documentary review, applying structured tools;  
- Analysis of results data from the PAR Strategy monitoring and reportingsystems;  
- Analysis of national indicator data;  
- Semi-structured interviews with MPA staff and other stakeholders engaged in the implementation of the Strategy;  
- Questioner and  
- Focus group discussions. |
| Coherence | - Systematic documentary review, applying structured tools;  
- Analysis of results data from the PAR Strategy monitoring and reportingsystems;  
- Analysis of national indicator data;  
- Semi-structured interviews with MPA staff and other stakeholders engaged in the implementation of the Strategy;  
- Questioner and  
- Focus group discussions. |

To respond to the effectiveness and impact-related evaluation questions, in particular, Evaluator applied contribution analysis, as a tool to arrive at conclusions about the main contributions of the Strategy and its components. The evaluator gathered as much insight as possible from performance measures and utilized the qualitative data collection methods to assess the engagement and results of the Strategy. For the contribution analysis, Evaluator utilized a grounded theory approach to qualitative analysis, rooted in the constant comparative method (CCM) and theoretical sampling¹.

The analysis was conducted against the analytical framework in the following ways: across the analytical fields, which were drawn from the Evaluation Matrix; common trends, contradictions and differences were sought out and

¹ This type of methodology draws out the variations and similarities between the units of analysis (institutions, strategies, components) through comparison within and between units.
explored. The different pathways of contribution at different levels of results were tracked, identified and triangulated; explanatory factors related to the operating space, environment, design of the Strategy and implementation of related interventions were assessed; information gaps were identified and reported.

The evaluation was based on thorough triangulation, complementarity and interrogation to ensure the validity and reliability of the analysis. This evaluation utilized two types of triangulation, method triangulation and data sources triangulation, to highlight any inconsistencies between document analysis and the feedback from key informants, and how external parties perceive the results of the measures undertaken within the PAR Strategy. Impartiality and lack of bias were safeguarded by the evaluation methodology which relies on a cross-section of information sources and uses a blended methodological approach (quantitative, qualitative and participatory) to ensure triangulation of information through a variety of means.

The evaluation involved all key stakeholders in the process of data collection, validation of findings and development of recommendations for the future programming of PAR in North Macedonia in line with the stakeholder mapping and consultation strategy conducted during the inception and document reviewphase.

2.1. Organization of the assignment

The structure of the phases of the evaluation closely followed the instructions of the Term of reference (ToR). The content of the three main phases is presented below.

Inception phase

The inception phase took stock of information and relevant documentation in the ToR. The draft Methodology for conducting the evaluation and obtaining confirmation/approval of this methodology from the MISA team took place in this phase. The Methodology was developed through a review of the background and context of the PAR Strategy through document review and research of available secondary sources; analyses of the intervention logic and adapts the list of evaluation questions proposed in the ToR. Within this phase, a thorough stakeholder mapping was conducted, an evaluation matrix was developed and elaborated and identification and formulation of evaluation questions (EQ) concerning the DAC Criteria concerning the Strategy priorities, as well. The evaluation matrix and EQs’ judgment criteria were presented and discussed at the meeting with the MISA team.

Also, in the Inception phase of the assignment a proposal of a draft outline of the Report, containing Headings and a description of the information that will be included in each chapter/subchapter was submitted to the MISA team. The outline contained an Action plan for the preparation of the new strategy (steps, deadlines, and institutional structure, comprehensive analysis of the problems and prioritization of the ones that should be solved etc.), as well as recommendations for capacity building and the strategic and technical operational framework for PAR.

Desk research

The desk review started with the review of available annual reports as well as other secondary sources on the status of implementation of the PAR Strategy and AP and particularly the outcomes of the interventions on institutional changes across the MK public administration. A list of relevant documents as a primary and secondary source of information for the PAR Strategy and AP priority areas was made with the support of the MISA team.

Analysis of data across document review provided homogenized findings across the PAR objectives showing

2 The OECD DAC Network on Development Evaluation (EvalNet) has defined six evaluation criteria – relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability – and two principles for their use. These criteria provide a normative framework used to determine the merit or worth of an intervention (policy, strategy, program, project or activity). They serve as the basis upon which evaluative judgments are made.
global trends rather than individual results. The document review provided an insight into the implementation and results of the PAR Strategy, and the evaluator derived a set of hypotheses that were cross-checked and confirmed during the field inquiry, which included:

Field research

**Individual semi-structured interviews** with 21 key informants (KIs). Document review provided insight into the extent to which different actors from government, donors and development partners, and civil society. The evaluator, in close consultation with MISA, elaborated the list of potential key informants to be interviewed within the scope of this evaluation. All identified key informants were interviewed within the field mission that took place in Skopje during May and June 2022 (*See List of KIs in Annex 2*). The interviews were semi-structured with a focus on the key evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, impact and sustainability. Also, a set of questions about Public administration reform (PAR) management (leadership, coordination, evaluation and monitoring, change management, communication of PAR and budgeting and financing) was a part of the interviews, as well as the development of the PAR Strategy and AP (delegation of responsibilities among institutions and within, setting PAR goals and measures and budgeting of the measure. In the end risks and obstacles and lessons learned were elaborated on with informants.

The field research process also included four Focus group meetings in all four priority areas. Representatives of all institutions involved in a particular priority area participated. **In total 58 participants from ______ institutions participated.**

In addition, Questioner for main stakeholders engaged in the implementation (and monitoring of) the PAR strategy was developed and distributed. The Questioner was designed to gather partners’ experiences with and views about the Strategy design, implementation, main results, hindering factors, their experience of collaboration with different government departments, drivers and opportunities ahead of continued reforms of public administration in North Macedonia. A total of 25 completed questionnaires were collected. The Questionnaire is enclosed in Annexe of this report.

Workshops

Two-day workshops were organized in Ohrid, North Macedonia on the Evaluation of the PAR Strategy and AP. The first workshop was organized on 8-9 June and the second one on 4-5 July. In both workshops, 60 participants in total participated – 30 participants each workshop.

The evaluation of public administration reform 2018-2022 and recommendations for a new strategy and action plan were the main topics of both workshops. Evaluators used the workshop to present preliminary and final results and recommendations and to check them with participants. Also, the workshops elaborated on the main problems in the implementation of the PAR Strategy and AP so far (using the "Problem Tree" method), for the participants to determine the main recommendations for the new PAR Strategy. In addition, participants worked on a Relevance Matrix, which identified the importance of individual activities that were planned but not implemented. Relevance was assessed from the point of view of available resources for the implementation of activities and the impact of activities on citizens and the economy. The workshops also proposed an action plan for the development of a new PAR Strategy and AP, with deadlines until the end of 2022.

Data analysis and report preparation

The examination of data and information collected under the desk and field research and at workshops were the part of this phase. All findings were combined to arrive at conclusions, lessons learned and a proposal of recommendations. Analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data was performed in this phase. Monitoring reports and all other relevant documents identified during the desk phase were the basis for quantitative data analysis and information extracted in workshops, questionnaires’ and interviews were used for qualitative data analysis.
The inputs for the report concerning PAR Strategy priority areas were prepared and merged with the main findings on the implementation of the PAR Strategy concerning the DAC criteria, and achievements of the indicators. Recommendations for the next PAR Strategy preparation were provided with a focus on improvement of the strategic framework, improvement in relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

The evaluation expert liaised directly with the MISA team and took into consideration the inputs/comments received. MISA offered a room, technical equipment and assistance for the evaluators' work in the field. The expert also took into consideration the inputs/comments received during the assignment from the ReSPA Program Manager in charge of the project.

**Evaluation limitations**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Limited availability of reliable, disaggregated data, particularly for outcome/impact-level results</strong></td>
<td>Annual and quarterly reports on the implementation of the PAR strategy provide a wealth of data with a certain level of analysis also at the outcome level. However, more in-depth outcome/impact (overall strategy goal) level data is missing. To the extent possible, the evaluator gathered outcome/impact-level data from a range of sources. One approach used to gather additional data was primary data collection through interviews and document review of secondary sources. Nevertheless, these limitations affected the Evaluator’s ability to provide a comprehensive assessment of outcomes and the impact of the Strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Consistency of data across various documentation</strong></td>
<td>Evaluator worked closely with the MISA team to obtain PAR Strategy documents and monitoring reports as well as other relevant sources (SIGMA, NGO reports, etc.) to ensure a sufficient amount of documentary inputs for the evaluation. Data quoted in this report are provided with references to the source.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 As it is described in the ToR.