

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Mid-Term Evaluation of "Support for the Integrated School Feeding Programme" in Côte d'Ivoire <sup>1</sup>	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	DE – Activity	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	Partly Satisfactory: 57%	
<p>The Mid-Term Evaluation of "Support for the Integrated School Feeding Program" in Côte d'Ivoire can be used for decision-making by evaluation users, although there are some notable shortcomings in the information provided. In terms of strengths, the report provides a good overview of the WFP-supported school feeding program in Côte d'Ivoire and relevant background information on both the country context and the evolution of school feeding initiatives supported by the government and international development partners. The evaluation's mixed methods approach ensured equitable participation of women and men, girls and boys. The findings are presented in a balanced manner, illustrating the strengths and weaknesses of the different components of the program, making explicit use of evidence from primary sources including government informants, members of women's production groups, and mothers of students. There are, however, key weaknesses in the report. For example, context related to the agricultural sector, local production and productivity of foodstuffs should have been described to shed light on the findings related to the program's support to local women's production groups. Moreover, the overview of the program's logic of intervention, results framework and key assumptions does not fully reflect some key aspects of the programme. The findings related to relevance and effectiveness could have been developed further and the conclusions are not pitched at a strategic level. Recommendations in the report include new information not brought forward in the findings. Finally, the executive summary is missing information on some findings, conclusions, and lessons learned found in the main report, and therefore cannot be used as a stand-alone document.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>
<p>The report summary outlines the evaluation objectives and methodology, as well as the context and overview of the school feeding program in Côte d'Ivoire. However, the summary lacks information on a number of key elements, notably the evaluation rationale, stakeholders/users of the program, and some of the key findings for evaluation questions related to relevance and effectiveness. Conclusions are also not included in the summary. Recommendations, included in their entirety from the evaluation report, contribute to the excessive length of the report summary.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>
<p>The report presents some relevant information on the country context related to poverty and education, including gender disparities. Results from previous school feeding programs are noted and there is an overview of the main objectives and components of the WFP program in Côte d'Ivoire. However, the data/information included is very limited. More information could have been included on the agricultural sector, production, and productivity of foodstuffs in the country. Moreover, the programme's logic of intervention is not clearly presented, and planned and actual transfers for the school feeding program are not described. There is also no intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the school feeding program and there is limited information on the relevant work of other development actors while no reference is made to priorities of Agenda 2030, or SDGs 2 and 17.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
<p>The report clearly states the evaluation objectives, rationale and main users, as well as some elements of the evaluation scope, such as period and geographic coverage. However, the scope-related information is scattered throughout different sections of the report, with programmatic coverage not clearly outlined.</p>		

<sup>1</sup> 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)

<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The methodological design, data collection methods, sources, sampling frame, and data analysis methods are well described, particularly in the annexes where additional detail is provided. Gender equality considerations are mainstreamed in most of the evaluation questions and significant attention was paid to ensuring the equitable participation of women, men, girls, and boys in the evaluation through qualitative interviews, focus group discussions and quantitative surveys of teachers and students. Methodological limitations, mitigation measures and ethical dimensions are well covered. There is some assessment of the availability of monitoring data for the feeding program limited primarily to issues with the baseline data, but there is no evaluability assessment per se. The evaluation matrix does not have sub-questions and there is insufficient information on data analysis methods for each evaluation question. While gender considerations are well-integrated in the methodology, other equity-related dimensions of vulnerable segments of the population in the seven targeted regions of the program were not addressed through the methodology.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Partly Satisfactory
<p>For the most part, the findings are well-balanced, covering both the strengths and the weaknesses of the program in Cote d'Ivoire based on triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data. A number of findings effectively zero in on key issues for each evaluation question and follow up on findings from a previous evaluation. However, the findings under some criteria do not sufficiently and systematically address all the related evaluation questions, notably with respect to relevance and effectiveness. For example, under relevance a question concerning the complementarity of the project design with other actors is answered with only one brief sentence that refers to WFP partnering with other actors for infrastructure improvements, although this work had not yet begun at the time of writing. Moreover, there appears to have been a missed opportunity for greater gender-disaggregation of data derived from surveys, focus groups and interviews. The report could have gone further to highlight any inconsistencies in findings as well as to highlight any unexpected findings that may have emerged.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Partly Satisfactory
<p>The conclusions are very brief and do not connect findings across the different evaluation criteria to discuss their implications from a strategic perspective. They also focus largely on positive aspects of the programme, overlooking some key findings related to bottlenecks. Other findings related to the increased use of health and dietary practices, support to local production and environmental protection are also not covered. Moreover, while some of the conclusions reflect GEWE related aspects, wider equity and inclusion dimensions are not considered. In addition, while the majority of lessons contribute to wider organizational learning, others introduce new information not found in the report.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Partly Satisfactory
<p>Recommendations are aligned with the evaluation objectives and most appear to be realistic, specific, and actionable. However, they are not targeted to a lead entity within WFP and their level of priority and timeframe for action are not specified. Moreover, beneficiary "suggestions" are also included in this section but do not serve as formal evaluation recommendations and these suggestions introduce new information not reflected in the findings reported (e.g., related to electrification of school buildings and participation in after-school study groups). While some of the recommendations address GEWE issues, broader equity and inclusion dimensions are not addressed.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report is well written and professional in tone. The findings are well-referenced overall and clearly highlighted in the textboxes at the end of the findings for each evaluation criteria. Visual aids and highlighted headings are clear and add value to the report. However, some key annexes are missing such as the evaluation timeline, fieldwork agenda, and data collection tools.</p>		

Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels	
<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>	<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.
	<i>Definition at criterion level:</i> The criterion is addressed without any gaps or limitations.
<b>Satisfactory</b>	<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.
	<i>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are no significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.
<b>Partly Satisfactory</b>	<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.
	<i>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are some significant gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion.
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	<i>Definition at overall report level:</i> 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>Definition at criterion level:</i> There are critical gaps or limitations in addressing the criterion. Most of the required parameters are not met.