

<b>Evaluation title</b>	The Nutrition-sensitive Aspect of the "Development of Sustainable School Feeding" Project in Armenia 2018-2019	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Impact Evaluation	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	Satisfactory: 79%	
<p>The impact evaluation of the Nutrition-sensitive Aspect of the "Development of Sustainable School Feeding" Project in Armenia 2018-2019 uses a rigorous approach (RCT with primary data collection) on an important topic: School feeding. The evaluation purpose and scope are clearly linked with the main criterion covered by the evaluation (i.e. impact) and the context is described well. The evaluation methodology is well crafted and well executed, yet description of methodology and analysis could have been expanded to include more information and simplified to increase its accessibility. Findings shows interesting evidence on how the impact of the intervention on learning may vary depending on family background characteristics and gender of the child. In fact, although the main estimates of the report are statistically insignificant, there is evidence for statistically significant effects for disadvantaged groups. The report includes quality recommendations which are relevant and feasible. Overall, the impact evaluation was very well crafted, but conclusions remain limited because of the relatively small sample size (in terms of schools).</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The Executive Summary can be used as a stand-alone product. It provides adequate details about the evaluation subject and a good summary of findings and recommendations, , although information about intended users are not included. However, the summary is quite lengthy and contains some technical information that could have been rephrased in simpler terms or simply included in the evaluation report.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Partly Satisfactory
<p>The overview of the evaluation subject contains exhaustive information about the programme setting. Information sources referenced are relevant and appropriate. However, this section would have benefitted from a complete description of the Theory of Change, which should have been linked to the evaluation questions. Intended results should have been better connected to results and lessons learned from the literature and other evaluations.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION CONTEXT, PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>Overall the presentation of the context is relevant and comprehensive. It provides adequate information and data on government plans and policies, WFP sustainable school feeding strategy and equity dimensions in the country. The objectives are clearly stated, and the scope is discussed in detail. This section of the report would have been improved by shortening some general information and adding details about targeted population and gender related aspects.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY AND ANALYSIS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The methodology section describes in detail the Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT) approach used to address the impact criterion. It describes the specific evaluation questions / research hypothesis and clarifies that statistical analysis was used to assess the five evaluation criteria. Sub-questions allow to examine differential effects by gender/vulnerability/family status and the evaluation collected sex-disaggregated data on beneficiaries (i.e. children and parents). Mitigation strategies for the lack of baseline data are correctly identified and applied. However, the description of the methodology would have benefited from more explanations and easier language to make it better accessible to the reader. Also, for the sake of transparency this section could have referred to power calculations, include more details on limitations of methodology such as potential biases and evidence on attrition, which should have been discussed in more detail in an annex, and an elaborated discussion on how quality of data and analysis was ensured and applied in the evaluation.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS AND RESULTS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>Findings are appropriately described and triangulated as per what was indicated in the evaluation matrix. In particular, the analysis shows interesting evidence on how the impact of the intervention on learning may vary depending on family background characteristics and gender of the child. The description of results is done in an impartial manner and both positive and negative aspects are considered. The interpretation of results would have benefited from a comparison with findings from other evaluations and the scientific literature. Unintended effects are described with respect to food-security.</p>		

<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS/LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>Conclusions nicely summarize the main findings from the analysis and prepare the grounds for drawing recommendations. Equity dimensions are well reflected throughout the section. Moreover, lessons are highlighted with respect to adjustments for the continuation of the programme. The presentation of the conclusions could have been improved in various dimensions, for example by organizing them around evaluation criteria or questions, or by presenting in greater detail the magnitude and statistical precision of the findings, i.e. effect size and statistical significance.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The recommendations are concise and are coherently drawn from the findings. They relate to the evaluation purpose and objectives, are comprehensive and actionable and refer to the relevant stakeholders. They mainly comprise suggestions for improvement which appear to be realistic and within the capability of the organization.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report adequately covers the scope of the evaluation and presents insightful results. The tone is impartial and considers both positive and negative aspects.. Although wording and language are highly professional, the report contains several spelling mistakes. A better referencing of the annexes in the main report would have been useful.</p>		

<b>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</b>	
<b>UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score</b>	<b>Approaches requirements: 6 points</b>
<p>The report approaches UN-SWAP EPI requirements . GEWE considerations are well integrated in the scope of the analysis and in the evaluation tools. The report, however, did not fully integrate gender throughout, but rather considered other equality dimensions, in particular, with respect to household socioeconomic status and poverty and income status of the parents. The authors in fact chose to focus on other distributional dimensions, in particular poverty, since gender differences in schooling in Armenia are largely inexistent.</p>	

<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels</b>	
<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	<i>Definition at overall report level: 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.</i>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.</i>
<b>Satisfactory</b>	<i>Definition at overall report level: Evaluation users can rely on the quality and credible evaluation findings provided and can use it with confidence for decision-making.</i>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are no significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</i>
<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>	<i>Definition at overall report level: 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.</i>
	<i>Definition at criterion level: There are some significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.</i>
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<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>