

<b>Evaluation title</b>	School Feeding Contribution to the Sustainable Development Goals: A Strategic Evaluation	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Centralized - Strategic	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory: 94%	
<p>The Strategic Evaluation of "School Feeding Contribution to the Sustainable Development Goals" is a high quality report that provides credible findings which decision makers can use with a high degree of confidence. It clearly and concisely presents the evaluation purpose, rationale and methodology, as well as relevant information on internal and external contextual developments during the evaluation period. The report includes clearly formulated findings on all the evaluation questions and sub-questions that are supported by evidence deriving from a wide range of secondary and primary data sources. The evaluation effectively integrates and uses its guiding analytical frameworks, including two 'nested' theories of change and a framework for operational readiness of WFP, and systematically mainstreams gender equality. In doing so, the evaluation laudably goes beyond questions of numerical equality towards exploring the potential for more gender transformative approaches. The report formulates a set of conclusions that synthesize strategic implications of the evaluation findings, and presents a set of eight clear, prioritized, targeted and actionable recommendations. Visual highlights for key findings and messages, and textboxes to present good practice examples are used effectively. However, the report is very long, and its readability would have benefited from keeping within the word limit prescribed by WFP. Similarly, while providing a wealth of additional information, accessibility and usability of the annexes could have been improved by being more selective and concise.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The summary presents key information on the evaluation features, including the main evaluation questions and the Organizational Readiness Framework at the centre of the methodological design, as well as on key contextual issues and features of the evaluation subject. It effectively summarizes key evaluation findings by evaluation questions and sub-themes and provides a useful summary of evaluation conclusions as well as recommendations.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation report provides a good description of relevant WFP and global contexts, capturing both elements specific to the school feeding agenda and important elements related to the overall strategic direction and positioning of WFP. The subject of the evaluation is clearly described, including the evolution of thinking about and approach to school feeding in WFP, and the logic model underlying the current WFP School Feeding Strategy is clearly presented. While the context section includes some reflections on GEWE dimensions of school feeding, it would have benefited from moving some additional related information from the annexes into the main report.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation rationale, scope and dual objectives of learning and accountability are clearly stated, and the main users of the report are identified. Human rights and gender equality considerations are mainstreamed in the evaluation's objectives.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The theory-based evaluation approach and selected data collection methods were appropriate for the evaluation purpose and addressing the evaluation questions. The evaluation effectively used its guiding analytical frameworks, the overarching and the more detailed operational Theories of Change and the Operational Readiness Framework, to guide data collection and analysis. GEWE, as well as other cross-cutting dimensions, including climate change, were effectively mainstreamed throughout the evaluation process using dedicated indicators. Methodology development was informed by a detailed evaluability assessment conducted during inception, and flexibly adapted to the evolving</p>		

challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic. However, the report could have benefited from including more details on the main types of data limitations identified during the evaluability assessment, especially with regard to information on GEWE, equity and inclusion-related indicators.

<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
------------------------------	---------------	----------------------------

Evaluation findings are clearly articulated, and credibly supported by well-triangulated qualitative and quantitative sources. Strengths and weaknesses are reported in a balanced manner and supported by appropriate data, including through illustrative examples deriving from country case studies. Unexpected effects of, and implications for, WFP-supported school feeding programs in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic are identified. Gender is well integrated into the findings and the analysis goes beyond questions of numerical equality to explore the potential for gender transformative approaches and results.

<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
---	---------------	----------------------------

The conclusions are clearly and succinctly articulated, summarized, and cross-referenced with the findings. They identify key factors that emerged from the findings which have, positively or negatively, influenced WFP performance in the area of school feeding, and note strategic implications of the evaluation findings for WFP, including in relation to gender.

<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
-------------------------------------	---------------	----------------------------

Recommendations are well formulated, context specific and aligned with the evaluation purpose and objectives. They logically derive from the evaluation findings and conclusions and focus on the most important areas for improvement noted by the evaluation (i.e. updating the school feeding policy and strategy, strengthening guidance and standards for school feeding in humanitarian settings, strengthening implementation including through better resourcing and partnerships, improving monitoring and evaluation, and strengthening gender and other cross-cutting dimensions of school feeding). All recommendations are targeted, specific, and actionable, and the report clearly identifies a responsible lead actor as well as supporting actors for each recommendation. They are also prioritized and outline a clear timeframe for action.

<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>
---	---------------	---------------------

The report is written in clear and understandable language and well organized with jargon and acronyms avoided as much as possible. Data is cross-referenced and graphs and tables are used effectively. Key findings for each evaluation question are visually highlighted for easy access and the report makes effective and selective use of visual aids such as graphs. The only significant weaknesses are that both the main report and the annexes are too long, which reduces their readability.

### **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>UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score</b>	<b>Meets requirements: 9 points</b>
--	-------------------------------------

GEWE considerations are very well integrated into the report. The context section provides some reflections on the relevance of school feeding for gender equality considerations, and additional information, including on the availability and quality of data collected by WFP on GEWE related results indicators is provided in a dedicated annex. The evaluation matrix, while not including a stand-alone question or sub-question on gender, effectively mainstreams GEWE through dedicated indicators for most of the sub-questions. The methodology, sampling and data collection tools were adequate for generating appropriate data for the analysis. Findings consistently include reflections on GEWE dimensions, going beyond the question of numerical equality to explore the potential of school feeding to contribute to gender transformative results. One of the eight recommendations, including three sub-recommendations, focuses on gender and broader equity and inclusion issues, and gender is also reflected in one other sub-recommendation.

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.