

Evaluation title	Evaluation décentralisée de la modalité transfert monétaire utilisée dans le programme de cantines scolaires appuyé par le PAM au Sénégal	Evaluation report number	DE/SENEGAL/2017/010
Type	Transfer modality evaluation	Centralised/ decentralised	Decentralised
Global/region or country	Senegal	PHQA date	March 2019
Overall category – Quality rating		Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating	
Meets requirements: 60%		Approaches requirements: 5 points	

The evaluation of WFP's School Feeding Cash Based Transfers Programme in Senegal meets requirements. The report is balanced and logically presented; the evaluation criteria and methodology are relevant to the evaluation purpose and scope. Conclusions and recommendations are clearly presented and flow from the findings. However, the evaluation could have also been strengthened through the inclusion of additional details to support key analytical statements and findings, clear referencing of data sources, and evidence of triangulation. While there is a clear emphasis on gender and equity considerations throughout the report, a more specific description of the intended beneficiaries and of their specific vulnerabilities in the context of WFP's work would have also strengthened the report.

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Meets
The summary is succinct, and accurately reflects the main findings and recommendations. Key elements such as the evaluation purpose, objectives, questions and scope are clearly stated. However, further details on the evaluation subject, and the methodological limitations could have been provided. Moreover, some conclusions are not included, and others are presented at a more strategic level than in the main report.		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Partially
The overview of the evaluation subject does not outline the analytical basis for the interventions, nor does it present or assess the logical framework. Some of the key information on the evaluation subject, including outputs, specific activities, amounts of transfers, details of previous WFP interventions, are also not sufficiently discussed. Furthermore, the overview provides limited reference to data sources and lessons learned from previous evaluations. Nevertheless, the transfer modality for each intervention and how this has evolved over time is presented in detail.		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Approaches
The contextual information provided is high level and does not identify specific vulnerable groups in relation to the evaluation subject. Furthermore, while government policies and selected programmes are outlined, institutional capacity is not discussed. Target groups are also not covered in the evaluation scope. On the positive side other key elements such as the purpose, rational and time period being evaluated are stated.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Meets
The evaluation criteria are relevant to the type of evaluation and are largely consistent with its purpose and scope. They are also explained in relation to the context through the evaluation matrix. Every evaluation criteria except for coherence and coverage is broken down into well-defined evaluation questions and supported by sub-questions. However, while proposed methods are relevant and broadly feasible, they are not explained in detail, and may be over-ambitious in some cases given the poor data quality and availability. Furthermore, specific detail on how ethical safeguards were applied, including in relation to female and student interviewees, was not discussed.		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Approaches
Findings are often presented without key supporting data or explicit signposting to the evidence base; as such, there is a lack of transparency and clarity on how representative the findings are. There is also limited evidence of triangulation. In addition, the analysis does not consider effects beyond policy influencing. A number of important analytical statements are located in the footnotes and bringing them into the main narrative would have improved the flow and accessibility of this section. Nevertheless, the findings present several unintended effects, include both positive and negative findings, and identify and explain the considerable data gaps.		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Meets

<p>Conclusions are balanced and organised according to the evaluation criteria, making them flow logically from the findings. However, the conclusions largely summarise the findings, rather than answer the ‘so what’ question. Only over-arching strategic statements, e.g. in relation to funding and target levels, are presented. Lessons are specifically targeted at the country office and at the other stakeholders supporting the programme; their wider applicability is not explicitly discussed, however.</p>		
CRITERION 7: GENDER AND EQUITY	Category	Approaches
<p>The evaluation does not include an objective, specific to the assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations. Furthermore, it does not identify who the ‘vulnerable populations’ are and how they are specifically affected by food insecurity and education. Wider gender issues, related to education and food security, are not presented, either. Nevertheless, sub-questions relating to gender equality were integrated into the evaluation framework, and one evaluation question specifically sought to consider human rights.</p>		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Meets
<p>The recommendations can be linked clearly to the findings and conclusions and are specific, thanks to the inclusion of a number of sub-recommendations. They are also targeted at different actors, including groups within WFP and present a clear timeframe for action. However, while most critical areas have been addressed, greater weight could have been placed on key WFP or Government outcomes, in the design of each of the three recommendations. Moreover, given the lack of data, several of the recommendations may require substantial pieces of work before they can be put in place, including a review of the institutional capacity of government partners and WFP, analysis to enable re-design of more context-specific and locally owned systems, and a review of the M&E needs; as such the proposed timelines may be ambitious.</p>		
CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Meets
<p>The report is within the recommended length and appears appropriately balanced and objective. It is fairly accessible, although a number of important analytical statements are located in the footnotes, rather than in the main narrative, which affects flow and accessibility. However, while some references to data and quotes are evident, information is often presented without key supporting data or explicit signposting to the evidence base.</p>		

Gender EPI	
1. Scope of Analysis, Evaluation Criteria and Questions	3
2. Methodology	1
3. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations	1
Overall EPI score	5

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