

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Endline Evaluation of United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) McGovern-Dole Grant Food for Education (FFE) Programme for WFP Cambodia 2013-2016 Evaluation Report	<b>Evaluation Report #</b>	
<b>Type</b>	Thematic Area	<b>Centralised/ Decentralised</b>	Decentralised
<b>Global / Region or Country</b>	Cambodia	<b>PHQA date</b>	26-07-2018

<b>Quality Rating - overall category</b>	<b>EPI – Overall Report Category</b>	
Meets requirements: 60% - 74%	4-7 points = Approaches requirements	
To maintain the logical structure of the report conclusions should not be mixed with key findings in the findings section. In the summary section, one of the key conclusions about the unsustainable nature of the FFE program is omitted and this omission is significant. Also, the recommendations do ignore the unsustainable nature of the program model.		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Meets</b>
Most conclusions are correctly summarized. Requirements on lengths are met, the users of the evaluation are identified, the description of the evaluation subject is clear, the findings and recommendations are correctly summarized, and the summary is succinct and fully accessible for its intended readers. One of the key conclusions about the unsustainable nature of the FFE program is omitted and this omission is significant. Sufficient evidence is provided in the summary to inform decision-making with the exception of the key issue of the unsustainable program model. This would have been of significant importance to inform decision-makers.		
<b>CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Meets</b>
The overview explains well the analytical basis of the subject. While no adaptations of the FFE are mentioned in the report, changes to the design of the next phase of FFE are explained. The overview is solidly based on secondary data, for example from the World Bank, Asian Development Bank, UNDP and national ministries. The overview of the evaluation subject shows very few weaknesses. The resourcing profile over time is not provided and the programme logic is not further described or analysed in the overview section. Otherwise this section is of good quality.		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>
This is a very strong section with the context focusing on relevant thematic sectors and the relevant time period. Sources are reliable and up-to date and the report highlights how the context may have influenced the FFE programme. Further, the objectives of the evaluation are well linked to the evaluation purpose and the main evaluation questions were formulated accordingly. The balance between accountability and learning is well explained. For criterion 3 the only weakness to note is the geographic and school coverage sampling is only presented in the methodology section rather than in the evaluation purpose, objectives and scope. Otherwise quality criteria are met.		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Meets</b>

Specific evaluation methods are relevant and able to answer evaluation questions. Areas of strength include the selected evaluation criteria are consistent with the scope; criteria are applied consistently throughout the report; the evaluation matrix contains all minimum components and includes an assessment of the expected evidence quality; and, the use of previous evaluation findings as data sources for the methodology is given. It is important to note that the team selected relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability to evaluate the FFE programme. However, in the evaluation matrix contained in the inception report, impact does not figure as a criterion while the criterion of coherence is added. This inconsistency is significant.

<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Meets</b>
---	-----------------	--------------

Findings are transparently generated. References to primary data and secondary data are systematically made. The comparison of baseline, midline and end line data for FFE deliverables is impressive and provides a very solid evidence-base. This constitutes an example of good practice. The only weakness of this section is that the ToR asks for an analysis of the intended and unintended impacts of the FFE programme. As a full impact analysis could not be accomplished, due to problems with the control group, the evaluation also skipped reporting on unintended impact.

<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Meets</b>
---------------------------------	-----------------	--------------

The comprehensiveness of conclusions is high. No gaps or omissions emerge. Conclusions are balanced. Conclusions are presented by evaluation criteria and build on key findings which are also grouped by evaluation criteria. Evidence is brought together very well. However, the key findings and conclusions are mixed in boxes in the findings section which is confusing. This also affects the logical flow from findings to conclusions which as a result is suboptimal. Based on the rich evidence-base of this evaluation, the omission to identify lessons learned seems a lost opportunity.

<b>CRITERION 7: GENDER</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Partially meets</b>
----------------------------	-----------------	------------------------

Overall, this evaluation is rather weak concerning the use of a gender and equity lens, despite stating otherwise in the methodology section. The results analysis reflects some gender analysis such as including primary school drop out by gender and under the evaluation criteria of relevance and effectiveness the conclusions section refers to gender. However, 19 out of 23 quality criteria were either omitted or showed major gaps or limitations.

<b>CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Approaches</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------------	-------------------

The recommendations are relevant to the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. Recommendations are specific and at times slightly prescriptive. Prioritisation and targeting of the time-bound recommendations is indicated. However, breaks in the logic from findings/conclusions to recommendations emerge. Despite concluding that the programme delivery modality is unsustainable, a continuation of the implementation of the USDA McGovern-Dole Program as per the current agreement is recommended. As such, the recommendations do not address critical areas identified in findings and conclusions. This is a serious shortcoming.

<b>CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Meets</b>
---	-----------------	--------------

The accessibility and clarity of the report is high. Technical jargon is avoided where possible and the report can be easily understood. The language is precise and appropriate for an official document. Tables, graphics and maps are used in the report supporting the strong evidence base. Data sources are consistently provided. However, the logical structure of the report breaks when conclusions are introduced in the findings section. Clear linkages between the findings, conclusions and recommendations section are blurred as a result. In the summary, the report omits the main limitation of the FFE programme concerning sustainability as a conclusion. This is an important shortcoming which is also not addressed in the recommendation section.

<b>Criteria Scoring Scale Legend</b>
--------------------------------------

<b>- Gender Integration EPI</b>
3 points = Fully integrated
2 points = Satisfactorily integrated
1 point = Partially integrated
0 point = Not at all integrated

1. Scope & Indicators	1
2. Criteria & Questions	1
3. Methodology	1
4. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations	1
<b>Overall EPI SCORE</b>	<b>4</b>

Quality Rating Scale Legend Evaluation Reports		Overall Scoring of Gender EPI Scale Legend Evaluation Reports	
		UN SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator	
Exceeds requirements:	75% - 100%	11-12 points = Exceeds Requirements	
Meets requirements:	60% - 74%	8-10 points = Meets requirements	
Approaches requirements:	50% - 59%	4-7 points = Approaches requirements	
Partially meets requirements:	25% - 49%		