

<b>Evaluation title</b>	WFP's USDA McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program's Support in Rwanda 2016-2021	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Decentralized - Activity	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) - overall rating</b>	Satisfactory: 82%	
<p>The evaluation report is professionally written and generally follows the WFP requirements. The report provides sound information on key aspects of the Rwandan context that are relevant to understanding the McGovern-Dole Programme as well as a good description of the programme itself. The evaluation used a mixed methods approach, combining various data collection and analysis methods. Evaluation findings provide a balanced performance assessment of the program, are presented in a transparent and unbiased manner, while also indicating how the observed performance was influenced by the implementation of mid-term evaluation recommendations. Conclusions provide a good summary of the findings and reflect GEWE-related aspects. The report presents correctly formulated lessons learned and recommendations that are realistic, consistent internally, and well targeted. However, the report could have been improved by re-constructing the programme's theory of change, presenting unintended results, and providing sufficient analysis on how the McGovern-Dole programme in Rwanda performed on the dimensions of equity and inclusion. Finally, the conclusions could have been improved by systematically outlining potential implications of the findings for future decision making.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The executive summary includes relevant and concise information on the Rwandan context and the McGovern-Dole Programme as well as on key evaluation features: scope, objectives, intended users and uses, and methodology. The evaluation key findings are well summarized and organized around the evaluation criteria and the four key evaluation questions. However, the conclusions could have been more comprehensive while the recommendations could have been improved by including information on prioritization, targeting, and timeframe. Moreover, since they are presented in the main report, the lessons learned could have been briefly presented in the executive summary.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a good overview of key aspects of the Rwandan context as well as relevant information on poverty, food security issues in the country, key sectors such as education, health, and agriculture, and key government policies and strategies related to nutrition. The McGovern-Dole Programme in Rwanda is well described, with relevant information on its results framework, stakeholders including direct beneficiaries. However, the report could have included a re-constructed theory of change for the programme, clearly describing the linkages between the different levels of the results chain, and all key assumptions. Information on the programme budget could also have been broken down by activity areas and by sources of funding.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The dual objective of the evaluation (accountability and learning) is clearly outlined, as are the evaluation's rationale/purpose and the time period, geographic scope, and activities covered. While GEWE was mainstreamed in the evaluation, the human rights dimension could have been more meaningfully considered.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report clearly identifies the OECD-DAC criteria and questions that guided the methodology used to conduct this evaluation. An evaluation matrix is presented, including sub-questions related to GEWE and gender-specific indicators. The report outlines various data collection and analysis methods and the sampling strategy used by the evaluation team. It also clearly describes the ethical standards followed throughout all phases of the evaluation process. Nevertheless, the methodology could have been strengthened by elaborating on how the evaluation engaged with the most vulnerable groups such as female-headed households and students living with disability.</p>		

<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>Evaluation findings are presented in a transparent and unbiased manner, providing a balanced performance assessment of the McGovern-Dole Programme in Rwanda on all key evaluation questions, and describing in quantitative and qualitative terms how expected results were achieved. The report indicates that a key internal factor that contributed to the strong results achieved by the McGovern-Dole Programme in Rwanda was the country office's willingness and ability to act on the recommendations from the mid-term evaluation of the programme. However, the findings do not present unintended results, including on human rights and gender equality, despite there being a specific question in the evaluation matrix on this aspect. Finally, the evaluation does not provide sufficient analysis on how the McGovern-Dole Programme in Rwanda performed on other dimensions of equity and inclusion.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>Conclusions provide a good summary of the findings and are derived from the evidence presented across the evaluation criteria and questions. They also reflect GEWE-related aspects. Lessons learned are correctly formulated and relevant. However, the logical links between conclusions and findings could have been better demonstrated by mapping the two and the conclusions could have systematically outlined the potential implications of the findings for future decision making. Moreover, wider equity and inclusion dimensions are not meaningfully reflected in the conclusions.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation recommendations are realistic, consistent internally, well targeted and provide sufficient details allowing the responsible entity to act upon them. In addition to being categorized as strategic and operational, they are indicated as of medium or high priority, and include a clear timeline for action. A recommendation is included addressing GEWE-related issues. However, the recommendations exceed WFP's maximum length requirement and they could have been strengthened by mapping them against the findings and conclusions that informed them, thus clearly allowing the reader to see the links between these three key sections of the report.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report is professionally written, follows the WFP template for decentralized evaluations, and has all requested lists. Primary and secondary data sources are consistently provided, and information presented in different sections is cross-referenced and adequately signposted throughout the report. For the findings section, key messages on each evaluation criterion are captured in boxes at the end of each section. However, accessibility of the report content could have been improved by highlighting all key messages and/or findings statements in bold.</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>	Meets requirements: 7 points	
<p>GEWE is mainstreamed in the evaluation framework, notably under the evaluation criteria of relevance and effectiveness. The methodology was designed to collect and analyse GEWE-related data, with an evaluation matrix that includes sub-questions related to GEWE and gender specific indicators. Questions aiming at collecting GEWE-related data were included in survey questionnaires, interview and focus group protocols. The sampling strategy deployed allowed the evaluation team to engage with a wide range of stakeholders in the McGovern-Dole Programme in Rwanda, including women and men. Findings present the views of different groups of stakeholders throughout the report, including women, and discuss the programme's contribution to gender equality, with gender-disaggregated data in several instances. Finally, the report includes one operational recommendation to implement appropriate gender analysis and approaches for Phase II of the programme. However, the report could have been strengthened by including an assessment to determine whether there were data gaps to measure results indicators, including progress on human rights and gender equality results as well as broader equity and inclusion dimensions.</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.