

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Evaluation of the National School Feeding Programme in Lesotho, in consultation with the Lesotho Ministry of Education and Training 2007-2017	<b>Evaluation report number</b>	DE/LSCO/2017/001
<b>Type</b>	Thematic evaluation	<b>Centralised/ decentralised</b>	Decentralised
<b>Global/region or country</b>	Lesotho	<b>PHQA date</b>	March 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>Meets requirements: 9 points</b>	
<p>The evaluation of the National School Feeding Programme (SFP) in Lesotho is of good quality. The context is thorough with reference to SDG data and education, nutrition, and food security trends. The methodology is credible and is supported by a well-designed evaluation matrix which enables systematic assessment of the evaluation questions. Gender and equity are clearly woven through the narrative as a cross-cutting issue even though transformative gender dimensions are not explicitly discussed. The findings are based on clear and triangulated evidence despite not referencing recommendations from previous evaluations. However, the conclusions largely re-state the findings without adding further strategic summary and the risks encountered over the course of the evaluation are not described in detail. Overall, the report is well-written and clear, but its readability and accessibility could have been further enhanced by adding summative statements and additional headings.</p>			

<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Category</b>	Exceeds
<p>The summary is succinct, clearly stating the scope of the evaluation and presenting main findings against the evaluation criteria as well as conclusions and recommendations. The main features of the methodology such as the approach to the analysis, the sample size, limitations and mitigation efforts, are also largely described. However, the section would have benefitted from a complete description of the purpose, objectives, and users of the evaluation, which are only partially listed.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Category</b>	Approaches
<p>The overview omits key elements of the evaluation such as the theory of change (ToC), which was specifically asked for and developed in the inception phase and does not reference the analytical basis of the subject. The three delivery models are not fully described nor are the role of the National Management Agent, which is central to the subject. On the positive side, the overview provides a good explanation of changes occurred to the evaluation subject and illustrates well recent policy developments and the key objectives of the School Feeding Programme.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Category</b>	Meets
<p>The context of the evaluation is clearly described, including a thorough discussion of government policies on primary education and their influence on the School Feeding programme over time. The section describes the history of WFP's work in Lesotho on School feeding and the gender dimensions surrounding food security and nutrition. The objectives are stated but are not explicitly linked to the purpose of the evaluation, which aims at informing the transition of the School Feeding Programme from WFP to the government. Information related to timing, scope and beneficiaries is missing.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Category</b>	Meets
<p>The evaluation criteria are coherent with the evaluation's purpose and scope and the questions and sub-questions are well defined and aligned with the selected criteria. Sampling methods, triangulation principles, and data availability are set out clearly in the methodology, which is supported by a robust evaluation matrix. The methodology could have been strengthened by making clear reference to previous evaluations, and discussing risks, unanticipated challenges, and safeguards.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS</b>	<b>Category</b>	Exceeds
<p>The evaluation findings are consistently supported by a solid body of evidence, and systematically address almost all evaluation questions, with a few exceptions for the impact questions. The section describes the positive and negative impacts of the School Feeding Programme on local communities' livelihoods and assesses WFP's use of resources and the cost-efficiency of the programme. Moreover, it explains the contribution of the programme to the expected results and describes the enabling or constraining factors that are out (or within) WFP's control. The section provides also a clear presentation of</p>		

gaps in the evidence base, along with their justification. Nevertheless, the section could have been strengthened by explicitly discussing how recommendations from previous evaluations have been addressed or not.

**CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS**

**Category**

**Approaches**

The conclusions frequently stray into the realm of recommendations or present bits of new evidence that has not been fleshed out in the findings section, which slightly detracts from the logical flow of the report. In some cases, they provide an overarching summary rather than adding any wider strategic statement. They are nevertheless comprehensive and provide a balanced assessment of the programme, articulating its contributions and shortcomings.

**CRITERION 7: GENDER AND EQUITY**

**Category**

**Exceeds**

Gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEEW) dimensions are integrated in the evaluation criteria and aspects of equity, participation, and inclusiveness are well covered in the evaluation framework. The evaluation makes strong efforts to include the perspectives of boys, girls, men and women, which is evident in its data triangulation and in the selection of the indicators. The analysis, findings, conclusions, and recommendations pay attention to equity. Nevertheless, transformative gender dimensions could have been more explicitly discussed.

**CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Category**

**Exceeds**

The recommendations are specific, measurable, actionable, and realistic. They appear relevant to the purpose of the evaluation, have a clear time-frame for implementation, are broken down into clear actions year by year, and are well targeted. They could have been improved by explicitly listing any structural or contextual challenges that might hinder their implementation.

**CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY**

**Category**

**Exceeds**

The report is well written and logically structured with clear introductions to each section. Data is appropriately cited and visual aids, in particular tables, are used effectively to convey key data. It would have benefited from the use of additional headings to draw out key messages and reduce the text heavy structure.

**Gender EPI**

1. Scope of Analysis, Evaluation Criteria and Questions	3
2. Methodology	3
3. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations	3
<b>Overall EPI score</b>	<b>9</b>

<b>Quality rating scale legend: Evaluation reports</b>	<b>Overall scoring of gender EPI scale legend: Evaluation reports</b>
Exceeds requirements: 75–100%	UNSWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator
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