

Evaluation title	Midterm Evaluation of McGovern-Dole Funded School Feeding Project in Guinea-Bissau (January 2016 - June 2018)	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized - Activity	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 71%	
<p>The Midterm Evaluation of McGovern-Dole Funded School Feeding Project in Guinea-Bissau (January 2016 - June 2018) is a good quality evaluation report overall. The methodology is well defined and clearly explained, with the report outlining the design and relevant features, including the mixed-methods approach and sampling framework used. Findings are clearly presented and for the most part respond adequately to evaluation questions and sub-questions, although some could have been further developed. The report also presents well-summarized key messages and conclusions in textboxes in the analysis for each evaluation question. However, while gender equality and women's empowerment (GEWE) is generally well integrated into the report, other equity and inclusion dimensions are largely absent. Conclusions are forward-looking, providing a higher level of analysis for each evaluation criterion as well as across the evaluation criteria. Recommendations are feasible, actionable, and identify implementing actors in each case. However, the report should have further specified which unit/department within WFP CO is targeted for implementation of each recommendation.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>A complete executive summary is presented that provides a thorough overview of the main features of the school feeding project and does not include any information that is not discussed in further detail in the main report. Findings, conclusions and recommendations are correctly summarized and faithfully reflect the most salient elements of each of these sections in the main report. However, the summary largely exceeds WFP's maximum word length requirement.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The school feeding project is well described and a complete overview is presented of the country context although key external events which may have led to changes in WFP's work in Guinea Bissau are not discussed nor is information provided on national policies related to Agenda 2030. The report includes information on the school feeding project's coverage, design, main objectives, logical framework and main partners. Even though amendments made to the intervention are listed, an explanation for such changes is missing.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report clearly and succinctly presents the objectives, main users and intended use of the evaluation. Similarly, human rights and gender equality are consistently integrated throughout the evaluation questions and GEWE appears as a priority line of inquiry for the evaluation. and The evaluation scope is for the most part well covered although it does not identify the target groups covered by the intervention.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation used a mixed-methods approach that matched the baseline design. Data sources as well as the sampling rationale are described in detail in the report. The methodology ensured that diverse stakeholder voices were captured and triangulated. Furthermore, evaluation limitations and mitigation strategies are clearly outlined and discussed. However, the evaluation matrix presented in the annexes is incomplete, requiring the reader to refer to the inception report in order to access the full evaluation matrix. Finally, ethical standards are not fully discussed and the UNEG ethical standards are not mentioned.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Partly Satisfactory
<p>Overall, the report presents findings which correctly identify both the project's strengths and weaknesses. Recommendations from previous evaluations are thoroughly referenced and unintended effects are duly noted and analyzed. However, findings related to some evaluation questions and sub-questions are limited and do not demonstrate a good deal of data sourcing or triangulation, and contributions by WFP activities and outputs towards</p>		

strategic outcomes are insufficiently addressed. The analysis related to the effectiveness of the intervention is too heavily focused on the achievement of output-level targets and not on the measurement of outcome-level results.

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>Conclusions are correctly formulated at a higher level of analysis, are forward-looking and accurately reflect the analysis in the findings section. Moreover, conclusions are presented per evaluation criterion, allowing the reader to clearly see how they are linked to specific findings, while overall conclusions link the findings across the evaluation criteria. However, the report does not present any lessons learned even though the inclusion of lessons was an explicit requirement of the evaluation terms of reference.</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report identifies recommendations that appear feasible, take into consideration WFP internal constraints and adhere to WFP requirements in number. Recommendations are clearly linked to findings and conclusions, indicate their priority level, and generally identify the specific actors that should be responsible for their implementation. They are also aligned with the evaluation purpose and objectives of learning and accountability. However, the lead entity, i.e., specific unit or division responsible for its implementation could have been identified more explicitly. The recommendations could also have further built upon the findings related to GEWE with a view to improving the intervention on specific gender issues. Moreover, the report should have specified whether the recommendations are strategic or operational in nature.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report is of high quality in terms of its form, clarity, language used, and use of visual aids. Maximum length requirements are well respected, data sources are consistently provided, cross-references within the report are clearly signposted, and all annexes are included and correctly listed.</p>		

Integration of Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (GEWE) considerations in the evaluation report based on the UN System-Wide Action Plan (UN-SWAP) Evaluation Performance Indicator (EPI) scorecard	
UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score	Meets requirements: 8 points
<p>While it is not mentioned as a specific evaluation objective, gender equality is mainstreamed in the evaluation criteria and questions, indicating that GEWE was duly considered in this evaluation. Data collection tools also included gender-specific questions and separate focus group discussions were conducted for girls and boys, with their distinct voices reflected in the evaluation findings. While the report does not outline how equity and wider inclusion considerations were integrated into the project and does not discuss whether the project monitoring system may have collected gender- or human rights-related data, the evaluation compared its results to some sex-disaggregated baseline data. Moreover, the findings and the conclusions of the evaluation are based on a sound and credible analysis that highlights relevant human rights and gender issues. Finally, while one of the recommendations addresses gender, the recommendations overall do not fully reflect the depth of the gender analysis presented in the evaluation findings.</p>	

Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels	
Highly Satisfactory	<p><i>Definition at overall report level:</i> Evaluation users can rely on the credible and useful evaluation findings provided and can use the evaluation with a high degree of confidence for decision-making. The report is considered an excellent example.</p> <p><i>Definition at criterion level:</i> The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.</p>
Satisfactory	<p><i>Definition at overall report level:</i> Evaluation users can rely on the quality and credible evaluation findings provided and can use it with confidence for decision-making.</p> <p><i>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are no significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</p>
Partly Satisfactory	<p><i>Definition at overall report level:</i> Evaluation users can rely on the evaluation findings provided and may use it for decision-making noting that there are some gaps/shortcomings in the information provided.</p>

POST HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF WFP EVALUATIONS

	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are some significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</i>
Unsatisfactory	<i>Definition at overall report level: Evaluation users can use some of the learning from the evaluation, noting that there are significant gaps/ shortcomings in the evaluation findings provided. The report may still contribute to decision making but should be used with caution.</i>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are critical gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. Most of the required parameters are not met.</i>