

Evaluation title	USDA McGovern Dole Food for Education Program in Nepal	Evaluation report number	DE/NPCO/2017/001
Type	Thematic evaluation	Centralised/ decentralised	Decentralised
Global/region or country	Nepal	PHQA date	November 2019
Overall category – Quality rating		Gender Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating	
Approaches requirements: 53%		Meets requirements: 7 points	
<p>The Evaluation of the USDA McGovern Dole Food for Education Program in Nepal approaches requirements. The report is uneven in the quality of its different sections. The overview, description of context and methodology are well presented, gender and equity are integrated in the evaluation questions and methodology, and good use is made of tables and graphs. The main weakness of the report concerns the recommendations which are not strategic or actionable. In addition, qualitative interviews could had been used more effectively to reflect on and explore findings from the statistical analysis. Moreover, while conclusions related to relevance, efficiency, gender and sustainability represent a strategic overview, those on effectiveness and impact miss the opportunity to do so.</p>			

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Approaches
Overall the summary report is readable and accessible and summarizes the lengthy evaluation findings concisely. However, it lacks important information on the evaluation type, scope and commissioning unit, as well details on the nature of the project and its activities. The summary of the conclusions and recommendations also omits some important details from the main narrative report.		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Meets
The overview of the evaluation subject highlights most of key expected information on beneficiaries, activities, resources and gender aspects, as well as changes in design during implementation. It also draws on relevant information from previous studies. However, there is no assessment of the coherence and logic of the intervention, its activities and its objectives, nor a critical examination of the origin and justification of the five thematic areas covered.		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Exceeds
The evaluation context, purpose, objectives and scope section concisely set out key aspects of the context that are relevant to the intervention, including how broader issues (e.g. poverty post 2015 earthquake, restructuring of the education division) may have influenced results found by the evaluation. The section also clearly details the objectives and their link to the evaluation purpose. The discussion of scope would have benefited from further explanation on how it informs the intended balance of learning and accountability.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Meets
The methodology selects and applies relevant evaluation criteria which are explicitly aligned to well-defined and relevant evaluation questions. The evaluation uses mixed methods which are appropriate for the evaluation questions and triangulates data. However, the evaluation framework lacks sufficient information on data collection methods and does not establish clear measures of performance or success criteria.		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Approaches
Findings are presented in a simple, factual manner and draw information together from different sources, including surveys, Early Grade Reading Assessments, observations from respondents and quotes from interviews. While they are presented systematically by evaluation criteria and questions, the analysis is limited, with little attempt to explain why results have or have not changed between baseline and endline, or to explore reasons for the survey findings. Some results also underemphasise where progress has been made and there is no discussion of unintended effects.		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Partially Meets
The main weakness of this section is that no lessons learned are presented, despite being part of the evaluation objectives. Moreover, while the conclusions take a broad strategic overview with respect to relevance, efficiency, gender and sustainability, conclusions on effectiveness and impact miss the opportunity to reflect on overall performance and the implications of performance challenges across the different strands of activities. Nonetheless, this section comprehensively		

summarizes the key evidence, flows logically from the findings, and is balanced in its reflection of both positive and negative findings.		
CRITERION 7: GENDER and EQUITY	Category	Meets
The methodology and design integrate both gender and equity, mainstreaming these dimensions into the evaluation criteria and questions, and using gender sensitive participatory tools, mixed methods and triangulation to ensure inclusion. Much of the quantitative data is sex-disaggregated and includes gender sensitive indicators. However, the analysis makes only limited use of qualitative data to interpret trends found in the quantitative results, and there is insufficient analysis of the views and perceptions from different social groups. In addition, there is no mention of unintended effects of the intervention on Human Rights or Gender Equality.		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Does not meet
While the recommendations follow from issues identified in the findings and conclusions, they are general and vague in nature, and do not respond to the objectives of the evaluation. They do not include clear proposals for action, or consideration of feasibility. Some recommendations call for more resources; others advocate changes in emphasis such as WASH awareness, food intake awareness, community ownership without any indication of how these might be achieved. They also convey no prioritisation or identification of specific stakeholders or timeframe for action.		
CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Meets
Overall, the report is readable with a logical structure, accessible text, good use of tables and graphs and a fair, balanced tone. The main weakness is the absence of summaries in the text to draw together findings and help the reader consolidate the wide-ranging and interesting evidence. There are some instances of phrases where words are missing, or the meaning is not clear and acronyms are sometimes used without explanation in the summary, which reduce the effectiveness of the report.		

Gender EPI	
1. Scope of Analysis, Evaluation Criteria and Questions	3
2. Methodology	3
3. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations	1
Overall EPI score	7

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