Evaluation title	Final Evaluation of McGovern-Dole-supported School Feeding Programme in Bangladesh (FFE-388-2014/048-00) March 2015 to December 2017	Evaluation report number	DE/BANGLADESH/2017/001
Type	Thematic evaluation	Centralised/ decentralised	Decentralised
Global/region or country	Bangladesh	PHQA date	March 2019

Overall category – Quality rating	Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating
Meets requirements: 62%	Approaches requirements: 6 points

The evaluation of the McGovern-Dole-supported School Feeding Programme in Bangladesh from March 2015 to December 2017 meets requirements. It presents a very strong executive summary and context section and is supported by a sound methodology. It is accessible and follows a logical structure. Evidence presented in the findings section is consistently triangulated and informs the conclusions. However, the report would have benefited from a greater level of detail and analysis of information, specifically regarding the integration of gender and equity. Moreover, the utility of the recommendations could have been strengthened if they built more closely on findings and conclusions and put forward specific and actionable ideas on how to improve subsequent operations.

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Exceeds

The report summary provides a very clear and systematic presentation of all the key aspects of the evaluation, including the evaluation subject, a simple and effective description of the methodology, and a detailed list of the main users and stakeholders. Findings, conclusions and recommendations are all summarised, without omission. However, a slightly longer summary would have enabled some statements to be further supported with examples of the evidence and allowed some discussion of lessons.

CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Partially

While the programme factsheet includes a comprehensive range of information, the information in the overview is presented without any critical analysis or consideration of the implications for the programme or the evaluation. There is no discussion of the analytical basis of the subject, any adaptations during implementation, or discussion or analysis of the Theory of Change and results framework. Nevertheless, the section is well referenced, drawing on recent and reputable resources.

CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Exceeds

Key elements such as the purpose, rationale for timing, and objectives are stated. Relevant contextual information is complete and up to date, and is based on reliable sources, including very recent statistics. The section includes information on equity and gender dimensions, even though it is brief and highly summarised. The section could have benefited from further analysis of the specific context and discussion of implications for the evaluation, particularly regarding the Rohingya crisis, climate change and the effects of floods on food delivery.

CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Meets

The report provides an effective and succinct overview of the methodology, although more detail on the sampling approach and criteria used for interviews and focus groups would have been helpful. There is good cross-referencing and the interview topics and questions are fully presented in the annex. However, methodological limitations and their implications and efforts to mitigate data gaps are not discussed and there is no explanation as to why time constraints feature so prominently in the text.

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Meets

The text draws together findings from other studies, results from administrative records and responses to interviews and surveys in an effective manner, consistently triangulating data. Detailed tables and results are reported in annexes and cross referenced in the main report. However, in a number of places, particularly for relevance, findings are stated without reference to the data and without clarity as to whether the reported findings are the judgment of the evaluators or the views of respondents.

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Meets

The conclusions flow logically from the findings and are sufficiently balanced. The use of shaded text boxes is effective, as they highlight the broad conclusions and ensure the overarching questions and evaluation criteria are covered in the text. There are

no major gaps or omissions except for the lack of reference to whether the midterm recommendations were successful in strengthening the programme, as required in the TOR. The discussion would have benefited from a more strategic assessment; supportive text tended to repeat findings rather than develop the implications of the conclusions for the overall design and success of the programme. Closer reference back to the overall objective of the evaluation would have improved their presentation.

CRITERION 7: GENDER AND EQUITY	Category	Partially

The discussion of methodology does not address several critical gender dimensions, including the specific methods used to gather views from men and women in ways that avoided gender bias, how respondents were selected, or how well GEEW or human rights data were collected during implementation. Equity dimensions are also not clearly defined and consistently applied throughout the evaluation. A general awareness of GEEW dimensions is nevertheless evident in the evaluation indicators, analysis, findings, conclusions and recommendations.

CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Partially

While the summary recommendation statements are realistic, they are not sufficiently specific or actionable in many instances. Moreover, many critical areas identified by the analysis / findings could have been better reflected in the recommendations, including the importance of NGO partnerships; how, if at all to mitigate external factors; and how to tackle some of the sustainability problems. A limited number of recommendations are presented in a well-constructed table with details to support the overall statements.

CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Meets

The report is of an accessible length and follows a logical structure with good use of tables and figures and summary boxes of key findings and conclusions at the end of the main topics. However, some of the text used does not seem to reflect the correct use of terminology and greater linkages between sections and introductory text would have helped guide the reader.

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

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