

Quality rating scale legend: Evaluation reports		Overall scoring of gender EPI scale legend: Evaluation reports	
Exceeds requirements: 75–100%		UNSWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator	
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	Mid-Term Evaluation of McGovern-Dole-supported School Feeding Programme in Lao PDR	Evaluation report number	Not given
Type	Thematic / activity	Centralised/ decentralised	Decentralised
Global/region or country	Lao People’s Democratic Republic	PHQA date	August 2017
Quality rating – overall category		EPI – overall report category	
Meets requirements: 60–74%		Approaches requirements: 4–7 points	
This report is a good example of an evaluation that builds up strong supporting material in an extensive set of annexes and draws on these in the report. There are several ways in which this could be strengthened further. Firstly, to develop the implications from the analysis of assumptions in the theory of change and draw wider conclusions and lessons about WFP's approach to school feeding. Secondly, to expand discussion of gender mainstreaming within the main analysis rather than mainly in dedicated sections. Thirdly, to map the linkages from findings to conclusions and recommendations so the reader can follow the logic more easily. Overall, the evaluation would be strengthened if performance of the project was summarised by satisfactory/unsatisfactory ratings against the selected evaluation criteria.			

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Exceeds
<p>The summary is comprehensive and covers all the main criteria effectively. It summarises the findings against the four evaluation questions very neatly without excessive detail and reproduces all the main conclusions and recommendations. However, more information about the evaluation questions would help the reader understand the focus of the evaluation better. Less use of acronyms is preferable in a summary so that readers unfamiliar with the material can follow more easily. The recommendations lack any information about prioritisation of timing.</p>		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Meets
<p>The overview presents detailed background information and statistics using up to date sources of information. A gendered approach is evident throughout the text. Much work was devoted to understanding the results framework and the evaluators developed a theory of change with comprehensive material initially in the inception report and some reproduced in the evaluation report. But the text fails to describe the features of the theory of change and does not make an assessment of strengths and weaknesses.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Exceeds
<p>There is a strong presentation covering virtually all the criteria expected in the section. Good linkage of statistics about context to the target group of the intervention. There are no obvious weaknesses in this section. The one exception is the missing link between changes in context and results from the intervention. There may be little to say here as the evaluation was for a very short period of one year's implementation.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Meets
<p>A largely well-presented description of methodology supported by detailed material in the annexes and appropriate references back to the inception report. There is a good discussion of limitations in the data and an assessment of strength of evidence for the evaluation questions. Nonetheless, in selecting one additional humanitarian evaluation criterion there was no discussion about why coherence was selected and not, for example, coverage. The description of analysis in the evaluation matrix only deals with</p>		

triangulation, with no mention of other analytical techniques. There is little reference to benchmarks or targets for evaluating performance.		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Exceeds
The presentation of evidence, especially as supported by the annexes, is of a very high standard. The systematic review of previous evaluations, summary of evidence against each question and analysis of assumptions all exceed requirements. There are no substantial weaknesses against these criteria. The only area of more limited achievement is the discussion on the use of resources.		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Meets
Conclusions are fairly brief and succinct at drawing out the substance from the very detailed findings. Their effectiveness is enhanced by the detailed supporting material for the findings in the annexes to the Mid-Term Evaluation. It was a good decision to include a conclusion about gender alongside evaluation criteria. There are few substantive weaknesses. The conclusions would be enhanced if there was a clear assessment of performance against the criteria (satisfactory; partially satisfactory etc.), which would enable comparisons across projects, countries and over time. They would be strengthened by incorporating some of the text under rationale in the recommendations which provides more detailed information.		
CRITERION 7: GENDER	Category	Approaches
The evaluation approach and methodology was clearly structured to mainstream analysis of Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (GEEW). Gender was well incorporated in the evaluation matrix and there are frequent considerations of gender issues in the report. Although much detailed work was given to gender in the approach and findings, translating that into specific issues such as interview guides, or considering how mainstreaming strategy such as gender budgeting, gender audit, and gender empowerment might affect the overall implementation performance were not made.		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Meets
There is a reasonable and practical number of recommendations which can be traced back to the findings in the evaluation. Responsibility and timing are indicated. There are no major weaknesses, however, it might have been helpful to make some recommendations about the final evaluation to ensure there is sufficient time and budget to try and overcome the data limitations at mid-term.		
CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Exceeds
It is a nicely written and well presented report with good signposts, helpful use of summarising boxes and strong supporting material in annexes that are well referenced. There are few substantive weaknesses. One minor point is that whilst there is an introduction overall to the material in Chapter 2, it would help the reader to have short introductions under each of the major sections (which reflect evaluation questions) and use that to remind readers about how the evaluation criteria are linked to these four questions.		

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