

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 Nepal	Evaluation report number	Not given
Type	Thematic / activity	Centralised/ decentralised	Decentralised
Global/region or country	Nepal	PHQA date	August 2017
Quality rating – overall category		EPI – overall report category	
Meets requirements: 60–74%		Approaches requirements: 4–7 points	
<p>This well presented and thorough report presents detailed supporting material in the annexes then draws on those in the main text. In common with the concurrent school feeding mid-term evaluation in Lao PDR and Bangladesh, the authors have included analysis of theory of change. More use could have been made of that analysis to present a critique of the overall design, or an in-depth examination of the assumptions, which are fundamental to achieving planned outcomes and impact. This might have generated lessons that challenge and refine WFP's approach to school feeding. The evaluation matrix would have benefitted from much more detail about sources of information, specific indicators and data analysis. Other improvements would include a table that tracks linkages from recommendations to conclusions to findings, and a formal assessment of performance against the evaluation criteria that would enable comparisons across projects and over time.</p>			

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Exceeds
<p>The summary is concise and easy to read. It conveys the essential elements of the report with full detail of the recommendations. A few key elements are missing, such as detail about the evaluation reference period, the nature of the evaluation questions (EQ) and limitations in the methodology. The conclusions merit a fuller treatment in order to justify the recommendations.</p>		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Meets
<p>The evaluation subject has been treated comprehensively, with detailed information in an annex and extensive reference to past evaluations and their findings and recommendations. There is clear presentation of performance statistics. However, the presentation is highly descriptive and fails to explore implications of the design in the context of findings and recommendations from past studies. There is a discussion of the underlying theory of change but only under the methodology section and in an annex and there is no critical assessment of the design.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Exceeds
<p>This section has straightforward and comprehensive text that covers all important issues with detailed and well referenced material that explains the context with reference to the project intervention. There are few substantive weaknesses. The scope of the evaluation is set out in appropriate detail for the reader. Some more performance data about WFP's past programmes in Nepal might help understanding of the design and potential for success.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Meets
<p>The methodology is pragmatic and appropriate given the very limited time-scale and resources for the mid-term evaluation. Examination of the results framework and theory of change are interesting and questions developed help test the assumptions in the design. However, the methodology is largely 'off the shelf' and lacks substantive detail such as information about statistical analysis, sources of information (office-holders</p>		

and specific documents) or benchmarks and standards for comparison. Much information is given without any critical assessment or explanation about how it is used in the analysis.		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Meets
Overall the evidence is presented clearly and factually with good use of data sources and many examples where interviews have confirmed findings or revealed differences of opinion about the programme. It is balanced and fair. However, some of the data tables and the accompanying text are rather busy with numbers and facts, making them hard to follow in places. Links to the evaluation question are relatively few, even though findings are well mapped in an annex. The effort put into developing the theory of change and then evaluating the assumptions is rather wasted with very little discussion about the implications for the programme design.		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Meets
There is comprehensive text on conclusions, appropriate length with a shorter summary against the evaluation criteria and more on the four evaluation questions. Gender is particularly well incorporated throughout the text. There are no major weaknesses. The strength of the conclusions would be enhanced by rating the evaluation criteria, which would allow for more comparability. In view of learning being one of the dual objectives, lessons would have benefited from clearer statements and the implications arising from them.		
CRITERION 7: GENDER	Category	Meets
This evaluation report has a good approach to Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (GEEW) issues, with aspects being reflected widely throughout the text and a detailed analysis in a separate annex. There is a nod towards equity issues as well, though not fully developed. The main weakness is that the presentation in the evaluation matrix does not give details about indicators and sources of data, so that intentions in the text cannot be traced through to data collection. Most other aspects are minor deficiencies such as not interpreting evaluation criteria through a GEEW lens.		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Meets
The recommendations are relatively few in number, they follow logically from the findings and conclusions and are prioritised and time referenced. They focus directly on improving the operation, which was a requirement of the terms of reference. Two recommendations (1 & 2) are dependent on WFP having strong influence over a funding partner; five (3, 4, 6, 10 and 11) call for WFP to influence and advocate policies which may be beyond capacity of the CO; one (5) seeks a rationalisation of the indicators but fails to refer to any substantive guidance on how that might be done, nor which indicators could be dropped. The recommendations give direction but little practical help.		
CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Exceeds
The report reads well. The text is supported by appropriate maps and tables though there is little use of boxes and figures. There is good cross-referencing to the annexes and other sources of information to support findings. The text uses abbreviated phrases from the EQ to structure the presentation. More consistent references to the EQ would help the reader follow that approach. Also use of summarising leading sentences to paragraphs would help the reader grasp the nature of each finding and would build logically to the summary boxes. A few 'case study' boxes would have helped bring the material to life in understanding the circumstances of the targeted schools. Avoiding acronyms and abbreviations in summary text and conclusions would help those readers who only want to read the main messages in the report.		

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