

| | | |
|---|---|---------------------|
| Evaluation title | Mid-Term Evaluation of the WFP McGovern-Dole Funded School Feeding Project in the Republic of Congo 2018-2022 | |
| Evaluation category and type | Decentralized - Activity | |
| Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating | Highly Satisfactory: 91% | |
| <p>The Mid-Term Evaluation of the WFP McGovern-Dole Funded School Feeding Project in the Republic of Congo 2018-2022 qualifies as an excellent report that users can rely on with a high degree of confidence. The report includes a good description of the country context, subject of the evaluation, evaluation objectives and scope. The evaluation findings are well balanced in terms of identifying where performance has been strong and highlighting challenges that need particular attention, with well-formulated and pragmatic recommendations on how to address those challenges. The report’s gender focus is well directed to issues that are highly relevant for the project’s context and activities. The evaluation conclusions could have provided more strategic value with an analysis of the higher-level implications of the findings across the evaluation criteria. The report’s use of visuals is especially strong. The design included a focus on school students considered most vulnerable in the country as the second population of interest. This may be because findings were not statistically different for the two populations. However, there may have been a missed opportunity to identify particular needs and/or targeted approaches for this highly vulnerable population.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY | Rating | Satisfactory |
| <p>The Executive Summary is well organized, well written, and contains no extraneous information. It pinpoints a gender-related issue in findings and lessons learned related to the issue of cooks’ non-payment and links it to the WFP Gender Policy 2015-2020, which stipulates that food assistance should do no harm to the safety, dignity and integrity of the women, men, girls and boys receiving it, and be provided in ways that respect their rights. The findings are presented by OECD-DAC criteria (except for Coherence) and gender, and are evidence based. The conclusions align with findings and contain sufficient detail to lead to useful recommendations. The report summary could have adhered to length requirements and harmonized recommendations with the recommendations presented in the main body of the report.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT | Rating | Satisfactory |
| <p>The overview is informative in terms of context and background for the evaluation. It explains the three linked activities (baseline, midterm and endline evaluation) that have been designed together as a package. It presents a comprehensive description of the project's coverage, implementation period, activities, and partners. The overview describes the project's results frameworks, strategic objectives, key outputs and outcomes, and details the increase in beneficiary numbers over time. As part of the evaluation context, the report could have acknowledged the long-running conflicts with rebel groups that occur in the country, which could have affected food security in some areas targeted by the school feeding project under review. The report also appears to have missed an opportunity to address intersectional vulnerabilities relevant to the evaluation subject.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE | Rating | Highly Satisfactory |
| <p>The report describes the evaluation rationale and objectives of learning and accountability clearly, and the evaluation scope in general terms. It presents the Mid-Term Evaluation as part of three interconnected exercises that include a baseline study, carried out in 2018, and a final evaluation planned for 2022. Gender equality is well integrated into the evaluation objectives. The report could have been explicit about the activities covered in the evaluation scope.</p> | | |

| | | |
|--|---------------|----------------------------|
| CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY | Rating | Highly Satisfactory |
| <p>The report's methodology section is well developed. Data collection methods are described as including desk review, collection of quantitative data in schools using the same data collection tools as the baseline, an assessment of reading capacity of school children (PASEC), observation in the field, and qualitative data collection through semi-structured interviews. Gender aspects of the project are well reflected in the evaluation design and tools, findings, conclusions and recommendations. The methodology focuses on vulnerable indigenous students as a key population of interest. Evaluation limitations and where mitigation strategies were possible are well described. Some findings and conclusions that relate to Coherence might have justified the inclusion of this OECD-DAC criterion in the evaluation matrix. There should also have been a brief explanation of the differences noted between evaluation questions in the report and those identified in the Terms of Reference (TOR).</p> | | |
| CRITERION 5: FINDINGS | Rating | Highly Satisfactory |
| <p>Findings are well written with a high level of detail, particularly with regard to effectiveness-related findings, flow logically from the evidence, and are well balanced in terms of successes and challenges in project performance. They point out important issues related to project definitions and indicators that make it difficult to measure certain important project components and outcomes. Per the TOR, the report includes a section on how well the six recommendations from the baseline report were integrated into the project. The findings highlight important gender issues that need to be addressed as the project evolves. Human rights are implied in the selection of most vulnerable indigenous students as project beneficiaries and part of the evaluation design. The report could have explicitly highlighted where there was inconclusive evidence to assess the evaluation questions.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS | Rating | Partly Satisfactory |
| <p>Conclusions flow logically from the findings and are succinct and balanced in terms of positive, negative and mixed project results. They align with, and serve to link, the findings and recommendations. The conclusions are presented by OECD-DAC criterion rather than connecting across the criteria which limits their strategic value. Conclusions might have been strengthened by highlighting any differences in findings between the two populations of interest, one of which is comprised of indigenous students, the population considered to be most vulnerable in the country. The two "lessons learned" are not clearly formulated as lessons that have the potential for wider application and use beyond the context of this evaluation.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS | Rating | Highly Satisfactory |
| <p>Recommendations and sub-recommendations provide sufficient detail to enable key evaluation report users to take action. They flow logically from the findings and conclusions and are targeted and prioritized with clear timeframes for action. Recommendations demonstrate consistency in their alignment and are presented in a useful order for implementation. Recommendation 6 addresses more emphasis on women's empowerment and gender sensitization and provides four concrete actions toward this end. The recommendations section slightly exceeds the maximum allowable word count.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY | Rating | Highly Satisfactory |
| <p>The report is well written and its visuals - figures, tables, one map - in both main report and annexes, are very well illustrated. Footnotes are well utilized. The report follows the requested lists and structure expected for evaluation reports, remaining within the word length requirement as well. While the Annexes are well developed, relevant and easy to read, they do not include all of the required annexes.</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

GEWE is mainstreamed in the evaluation objectives, criteria, and questions, with several questions separating out the needs of beneficiaries by age, gender, and/or other vulnerabilities (such as indigenous groups). The evaluation effectively assessed whether sufficient information was collected during the implementation period on specific result indicators to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results. The evaluation used a gender-responsive methodology, tools, data analysis techniques, and collected sex-disaggregated data, wherever possible, to ensure inclusion, accuracy and credibility. The evaluation methods and sampling frame addressed the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable such as indigenous populations, where appropriate. The evaluation findings and recommendations reflect a gender analysis, and the report identifies several areas of the project where gender considerations are important.

| Post Hoc Quality Assessment – Rating scale and definitions at overall report and criteria levels | |
|--|---|
| Highly Satisfactory | <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. |
| Satisfactory | <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. |
| Partly Satisfactory | <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. |
| Unsatisfactory | <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. |