

Evaluation title	WFP's USDA McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program's Support in Rwanda 2016-2020 Evaluation Report: Midterm Evaluation	Evaluation report number	DE/RWCO/2018/060
Type	Activity Evaluation	Centralized/ Decentralized	Decentralized
Global/region or country	Rwanda	PHQA date	February 2020
Overall category – Quality rating		Gender Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) – Overall report category and rating	
Meets requirements: 72%		Meets requirements: 8 points	
<p>“WFP's USDA McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program's Support in Rwanda 2016-2020 Midterm Evaluation” meets requirements. The purpose of this mid-term evaluation is clear, and the reader is given a suitable picture of the context surrounding the school feeding operation under evaluation. In terms of the methodology, a very informative discussion of the sampling approach and of the limitations affecting data collection provides confidence in the robustness of the evidence collected. Findings are presented comprehensively and are well substantiated. Conclusions are largely comprehensive, and recommendations are appropriate, focusing both on key strategic shifts and immediate changes needed to strengthen the school feeding programme under implementation. The report would have benefited from an in-depth discussion of gender dynamics and the implications of the intervention on gender and equity, as well as from the inclusion of recommendations on GEEW issues. Equity aspects are not considered in the findings, conclusions or recommendations.</p>			

CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Category	Meets
The summary is succinct and readable. It provides key information on the evaluation purpose, objectives and scope. It captures the methodology and intended users well and comprehensively summarises the recommendations. The summary is readable and accessible to intended readers. It is however rather short and could have contained more information on key aspects concerning the resourcing situation and transfers implemented; findings around efficiency and unintended results; and the conclusions.		
CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Category	Meets
The overview of the evaluation subject succinctly captures the key features of the intervention, including planned achievements, beneficiary numbers and modalities as well as resourcing, partners and related WFP activities. The analytical basis of the school feeding operation is discussed together with changes implemented to the design over the course of the intervention. The section is based on relevant and up-to-date sources. The section would have benefited from a more extensive examination of the logical framework, which is not discussed nor reconstructed. Annex 6 presents a result framework, which is however not accompanied by a narrative or a commentary.		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE AND SCOPE	Category	Exceeds
The context section provides relevant and up to date information on the poverty and food security issues in Rwanda, as well as on relevant humanitarian issues and government policies. The objectives and wider purpose of the evaluation are stated and the intended link between accountability and learning is explicitly stated. Equity and gender dimensions in the targeted districts are also discussed. More information on the wider issues affecting the operation (e.g. around malnutrition, other donor and government assistance) and WFP operations in the country would have been useful. The section does not provide information on the scope of the evaluation, which is however detailed in the overview of the evaluation subject.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Category	Exceeds
Evaluation criteria and questions are systematically presented, with the identified criteria being largely appropriate for this type of evaluation and to the evaluation purpose. The methodology is very strong in terms of the description of the data collection methods employed and the sampling approach. Findings from previous evaluations are used, limitations and data gaps are thoroughly presented along with a set of mitigation actions and UNEG ethical safeguards are duly followed. The methodology could have presented in greater detail both qualitative and quantitative data analysis tools and processes as well as how data triangulation was conducted.		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS	Category	Exceeds

Findings are comprehensively discussed and cover all the key evaluation questions. Results are very well presented with good use of evidence and sources. The findings are stated in a balanced and impartial manner. WFP's contribution to results is discussed and internal and external factors are examined. On the other hand, unintended effects are not explored and the analysis and narrative on efficiency could have examined in greater detail the use of resources and as well as providing a comparative analysis of the efficiency of the Rwanda operation vis-a-vis other school feeding programmes.		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS	Category	Meets
The conclusions bring together evidence presented in the findings section, are well organized according to the selected evaluation criteria and provide a useful strategic overview in terms of the progress towards an eventually sustainable school feeding and literacy model for Rwanda. They place the findings within the longer-term perspective of the national primary level literacy and school feeding goals. They are largely comprehensive and balanced and reflect both positive and negative findings. However, the conclusions on efficiency are not adequately supported by findings in this area and impact is referred to in a sub-heading but is not discussed in detail. Although useful to capture key messages, the summary boxes are too succinct and do not adequately capture the key conclusions.		
CRITERION 7: GENDER and EQUITY	Category	Approaches
The methodology adequately integrates gender, with two specific sub-questions on gender access and the performance of boys and girls at school included in the framework. There is a good mix of data sources that help build inclusivity and credibility of evidence. Ethical standards are adhered to. Nevertheless, the report misses the opportunity to assess gender dynamics and human rights in the intervention, such as how different social groups relate to the school feeding programme in terms of employment, food provision and community engagement. Little attention was given to the unintended effects on human rights or gender. There are also no recommendations on GEEW issues. Equity aspects are not considered in the findings, conclusions or recommendations.		
CRITERION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS	Category	Meets
The recommendations are appropriate and focus on key strategic shifts and immediate changes needed to strengthen the school feeding programme under implementation. They flow logically from findings and conclusions, present clear timeframes and are adequately prioritised. Although the main critical areas emerging in the report are generally well-addressed, some recommendations could have been broken down into more realistic actions and cover better issues emerging from the findings and conclusions around community involvement and partnerships.		
CRITERION 9: ACCESSIBILITY/CLARITY	Category	Exceeds
The report is clearly written with precise language, good balance and tone and with excellent referencing. It is appropriate for the intended audience, without undue complexity and very few grammatical errors. The structure of the report would have benefited from greater use of graphs and figures to convey the report's wide range of data.		

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