

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Establishing the Foundation for a Nationally Owned Sustainable School Feeding Programme in The Gambia, from 2012 to 2017	<b>Evaluation report number</b>	DE/GAMBIA/2017/011
<b>Type</b>	Operation	<b>Centralised/ decentralised</b>	Decentralised
<b>Global/region or country</b>	Gambia	<b>PHQA date</b>	January 2019
<b>Overall category - Quality rating</b>		<b>Gender Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI)– Overall report category and rating</b>	
<b>Meets requirements: 74%</b>		<b>Approaches requirements: 6 points</b>	

The final evaluation of the Gambia School Feeding Programme from 2012 to 2017 is an insightful and well-written report which generally complies with WFP quality standards. An extensive methodological annex is provided which sets out the evaluation criteria and questions. Findings are explicitly derived from evidence - the evaluation clearly lists all the evaluation questions and responds to each in turn. The report describes WFP's contribution and highlights successes and constrained performance. The report would have been enhanced by the provision of more information about preceding or concurrent WFP interventions and about the nutrition situation of children in the country. Although gender was identified as a cross-cutting issue in the TOR and in the methods applied, the analysis does not mainstream gender issues and as a result neither the findings, conclusions, or recommendations adequately capture the gender dynamics, or transformative gender aspects of the programme.

<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>
The executive summary provides a succinct and useful summary of the key features of the evaluation. The rationale, data collection and analytical methods are described clearly and the report indicates how these were applied in practice, clearly stating limitations encountered. A full description of evaluation users is provided in the summary. However, the summary omits key information such as the evaluation scope, or the timeframe of the programme. All recommendations are appropriately summarised. However, with the combination of findings and conclusions into one section, the opportunity to pull out the key conclusions is somewhat missed.		
<b>CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Meets</b>
The duration and geographic scope of the evaluation are clearly defined. The resourcing profile, and how this has changed over time, is described, even though a detailed breakdown of the resources allocated to each activity is missing. The overview refers to the findings from the Mid-Term Evaluation and is clear about the transfer modalities used for each activity. There is also explicit reference to how the lessons from this evaluation will feed into the Country Strategic Plan. However, the overview provides only partial information about adaptations to the design made during implementation and the validity of the logical framework is not assessed.		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Exceeds</b>
The purpose and objectives of the evaluation are clearly articulated in the evaluation report. The context section describes well relevant humanitarian issues, political events and the concurrent WFP PRRO. The rationale for the timing, the objectives, purpose and users are clearly stated. The equity dimensions are well captured with regard to regionally specific poverty and food insecurity. The information provided in the context section is relevant and up to date, even though it lacks key data regarding SDG 17 and government capacity to address food insecurity and nutrition is not described. Finally, the scope of the evaluation is not described fully: for instance, information details on target groups covered by the evaluations is missing.		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>Meets</b>
The report builds on a solid methodology, with complete information well detailed in its annexes. There is consistent and explicit reference to the evaluation questions and criteria, which are correctly applied. Ethical safeguards are duly discussed. The evaluation matrix provides only the minimum information to answer each evaluation question and does not provide the basis for a systematic assessment. Finally, risks are not discussed in adequate depth and an explanation of mitigating actions applied is missing.		

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Exceeds
<p>Findings are generated based upon a solid body of evidence, presenting both achievements and challenges as well as advantages and disadvantages linked with the chosen transfer modality. The evaluation describes funding shortfalls and assesses the cost efficiency of the programmes. Reasons for constrained performance are described clearly in the report along with WFP contributions to the School feeding programme. Findings have been triangulated and previous studies, including evaluations, have been used as important sources of evidence. The report would have benefitted from a more detailed discussion of unintended effects and even though there is a clear line of sight to the results, the analysis is somewhat focused at the output level.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Exceeds
<p>The conclusions are balanced, bring evidence together by evaluation criterion and respond coherently to the 'so what' question. The conclusions largely draw on findings presented, even though they also include a few new judgements that are not explicitly substantiated by evidence.</p>		
CRITERION 7: GENDER AND EQUITY	Category	Approaches
<p>Whilst Gender Equality and Women Empowerment dimensions are well integrated into all Evaluation questions, there is limited integration of gender in the indicators applied and findings, conclusions, and particularly recommendations do not reflect a gender analysis. Moreover, the evaluation does not state how the intervention responds to organisation specific or system-wide policies on gender. Nonetheless, the methodology provides interview guides and focus group discussions which are designed to hear the voices of women, men, boys, and girls for gender-responsive data collection and analysis. Equity is addressed partially in the evaluation, but it is not clear in the findings, conclusions, or recommendations, how the most vulnerable have been served as compared to other groups.</p>		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Approaches
<p>While the recommendations are generally relevant to the purpose- supporting learning and accountability- they do not reflect on the implications for the programme as WFP moves from a project approach to a country strategy. In addition, they are not prioritised and do not specify which organizational level within WFP is responsible for the follow up action. Nevertheless, they largely respond to the critical issues raised in the report and specify the action to be taken and their purpose.</p>		
CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Exceeds
<p>The report is clear, concise, and free of jargon. It is well balanced and describes challenges as well as successes encountered. However, it is important to note that GEEW stands for Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women rather than 'Emancipation' of women; the criteria are referred to as 'elements' which is an imprecise use of terminology. Visual aids, apart from tables, are used sparingly and the annexes do not have page numbers which diminishes the accuracy of the table of contents.</p>		

Gender EPI	
1. Scope of Analysis, Evaluation Criteria and Questions	2
2. Methodology	3
3. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations	1
<b>Overall EPI score</b>	<b>6</b>

Quality rating scale legend: Evaluation reports	Overall scoring of gender EPI scale legend: Evaluation reports UNSWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator
Exceeds requirements: 75–100%	
Meets requirements: 60–74%	
Approaches requirements: 50–59%	7–9 points = Meets requirements
Partially meets requirements: 25–49%	4–6 points = Approaches requirements
Does not meet requirements: 0–24%	0–3 points = Missing requirements