

Evaluation title	Evaluation of National School Feeding Programme in Eswatini 2010-2018	Evaluation report number	DE/SZCO/0000/001
Type	Activity Evaluation	Centralized/decentralized	Decentralized
Global/region or country	Eswatini	PHQA date	February 2020
Overall category – Quality rating		Gender Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating	
Meets requirements: 66%		Meets requirements: 8 points	
<p>The Evaluation of National School Feeding Programme in Eswatini 2010-2018 meets requirements. Overall, the evaluation is well-written and accessible to its intended audience. The overview of the evaluation subject and the evaluation purpose and scope are well detailed and clearly laid out. The methodology is relevant to the context and nature of the evaluation subject. Findings are presented transparently and logically and in a balanced and impartial manner. Recommendations reflect the evaluation’s purpose and objectives and are realistic, prioritised and targeted. Issues or GEEW are largely considered throughout the report. Additional detail in a few areas would have further enhanced the report, including more detail in the methodology on how performance would be assessed, greater analysis of WFP's direct contributions and funding in support of the programme and the inclusion of lessons, good practices and pointers for learning.</p>			

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Meets
The summary is largely well presented with a logical structure; it is succinct and written in clear, simple language. Key information on the evaluation purpose and objectives, evaluation questions, type, period and scope are included. Recommendations convey all the main points from the report and most of the key elements related to the evaluation subject, methodology and findings are mentioned. However, the summary lacks some important information related to the methodology (e.g. limitations), the evaluation subject (e.g. budget) and some aspects of the findings (e.g. sustainability). The conclusions also do not reflect the breadth and richness of the analysis in the report.		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Exceeds
The overview of the subject presents the key information on the evaluation subject and includes a wide range of detailed information to explain the analytical basis. The information sources used are relevant and appropriate. Adaptations made to the design during implementation, based on some changes in the dietary regime in response to 2015/16 El Niño drought and in policy instruments, are clearly described. A reconstructed theory of change is presented and referenced in an annex; a critical assessment of the theory of change’s logic and assumptions would have further enhanced the overview of the evaluation subject.		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Exceeds
The discussion of the context, purpose, objectives and scope is presented to a high standard, setting the objectives firmly in the country context, with references made to climatic shocks and to other factors such as the impact of HIV/AIDS. The information provided is up to date and based on reliable sources. The intended balance between learning and accountability is clearly stated. The main weakness is the omission of an objective reflecting the requirement in the terms of reference to assess WFP's support to the national school feeding programme.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Meets
The methodology draws on a range of methods, including key informant interviews, focus group discussions and analysis of secondary data, which are relevant to the context and the nature of the evaluation subject. Evaluation criteria are used to structure the questions and indicators, and means of analysis are explained including the use of triangulation. Ethical safeguards are clearly stated and appropriate. The methodology would have been more robust with the inclusion of greater specificity on how performance would be assessed. In addition, the discussion of limitations and gaps in data does not include sufficient information on mitigation measures.		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Meets
Findings are presented transparently and logically. Gaps in evidence are explained and the discussions take a balanced and impartial approach, providing evidence for the results that are found. Unintended effects are explained and enablers and constraining factors for achievement and underachievement are identified. The presentation is introduced as being structured against the evaluation sub-questions but combines questions without any explanation to the reader. The report would have benefitted from an assessment and detailed discussion of WFP's direct contributions and funding in support of the programme.		

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS / LESSONS	Category	Approaches
The conclusions are succinct, balanced and follow directly and logically from the findings, helped by the structure of evaluation criteria. Four of the five criteria have concise assessments arising from the evidence in the evaluation. The conclusions on sustainability are excessively brief and do not reflect the range of findings in the analysis. The main weakness is the absence of lessons learned. While the evaluation's purpose included the intention to draw lessons, derive good practices and pointers for learning but these are not included.		
CRITERION 7: GENDER and EQUITY	Category	Meets
A strong awareness of GEEW is evident in the evaluation questions and indicators. Gender equality was specifically explored under one of the evaluation questions and gender considerations were mainstreamed into all criteria with the exception of efficiency. The evaluation specified how gender issues were addressed in the methodology and included a specific recommendation related to GEEW issues. Consideration of gender equality would have been further strengthened by greater disaggregation of data to compare and contrast diverse views. Finally, with the exception of gender and some general assessment of social protection, equity dimensions are not clearly defined and applied throughout the evaluation.		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Meets
The recommendations reflect the evaluation's purpose and objectives, follow logically from the conclusions and derive mostly from the analysis and findings. They are realistic, grouped logically, prioritised, assigned to specific actors, and have a timeframe for action. While most of the recommendations are well-crafted and feasible, a few are somewhat simplistic, such as proposing the supply of diverse products by smallholder farmers and developing school gardens, both without a strong analytical basis in the evaluation. Issues such as investigating the reason behind worsening dropout rates, or the true extent of benefits from nutrition, both of which are central to the school feeding concept, are overlooked.		
CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Exceeds
The report is well written, using language that is accessible and appropriate for the intended audience. Good use is made of summary boxes to recapitulate findings and the tone remains balanced and objective throughout. The glossary of technical terms is well cited and helpful. The report has a few minor weaknesses related to accessibility, namely: the table of contents for volume 2 is not listed in the main report; the list of acronyms is only in volume 2 of the annexes; page numbers in the index are incorrect. The text would also have been improved by better linkages between sections.		

Gender EPI	
1. Scope of Analysis, Evaluation Criteria and Questions	3
2. Methodology	2
3. Findings, Conclusions & Recommendations	3
Overall EPI score	8

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