

| | | |
|--|--|---------------------|
| Evaluation title | Midterm Activity Evaluation of USDA McGovern-Dole Grant (FFE-442-2019-013-00) for WFP School Feeding in Cambodia | |
| Evaluation category and type | Decentralized - Activity | |
| Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating | Satisfactory: 89% | |
| <p>The Midterm Activity Evaluation of USDA McGovern-Dole Grant for WFP School Feeding in Cambodia is a satisfactory report that evaluation users can rely on the quality and credible evaluation findings provided and can use it for decision-making with a degree of confidence. A particular strength of the report is its consideration for mainstreaming gender issues, including how gender was considered and mainstreamed within the evaluation's processes of data collection and data analysis. Overall, the report effectively summarizes the evaluation purpose and methodology, as well as relevant information on internal and external contextual developments during the grant's implementation period. The findings are presented very clearly, answering the evaluation questions and sub-questions, with evidence drawn from a range of secondary and primary data sources. The conclusions and recommendations synthesize the findings and suggest strategic implications for the future of the programme. The report is also very well written and is easy for the reader to understand and navigate. The only significant weaknesses of the report are its summary, which is too long and is missing important information on gender-related findings; the evaluation scope description, which lacks clarity; and the report's limited consideration of broader equity and inclusion dimensions (e.g., poverty, disability, etc.).</p> | | |
| CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY | Rating | Satisfactory |
| <p>The report summary presents concise information on most evaluation features and key findings, lessons learned, and recommendations from the main report. However, the summary is lengthy and gender-related findings discussed in the main report are not included.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT | Rating | Satisfactory |
| <p>The report provides a clear description of the evaluation context in Cambodia and of the subject of the evaluation. It strikes a good balance between detail and synthesis, and reflects the gender equality dimension as well. There is good discussion of important contextual changes during the programme and of previous evaluations, which informed the programme, and the continuing emphasis on seeing the programme be taken up within national budget priorities. The programme's internal logic is outlined where activities, modalities, and beneficiaries of the school feeding programme are described. While overall this section is strong, some contextual information is missing, such as that related to the health and agriculture sectors, and a programme budget updated by outcomes is not included.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE | Rating | Satisfactory |
| <p>The objectives, rationale, and purpose of the evaluation are outlined in good detail. The main users and stakeholders are identified, as are the uses of the evaluation. However, the scope of the evaluation, in terms of geographic areas, target groups, and specific activities covered, could have been more clearly summarized for the reader.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY | Rating | Highly Satisfactory |
| <p>The mixed methods approach is clearly described, including data sources and methods of data collection and analysis. The report drew on a variety of qualitative and quantitative data sources and used complementary methods of data collection to support data triangulation. The sampling frame, rationale and analysis methods were relevant and appropriate for answering the evaluation questions in an unbiased way and allowed for effective data collection in the context of the programme in Cambodia despite the limitations posed by the COVID-19 pandemic. Notably, it is very clear how gender was thought of in the methodology, such as through gender-sensitive approaches to data collection. The evaluability assessment offers clear discussion of the methodological mitigation</p> | | |

measures used for each limitation faced in the evaluation. The only minor weakness is that there is no assessment of monitoring data in reference to broader equity and inclusion dimensions of the programme (e.g., poverty).

| | | |
|--|---------------|---------------------|
| CRITERION 5: FINDINGS | Rating | Satisfactory |
| <p>The evaluation addresses and provides information on all the evaluation questions and sub-questions and the findings are presented such that WFP's contributions to results are discussed in a fair and nuanced way, reflecting both positive and negative findings in many instances, including considering contextual factors such as the COVID-19 pandemic. The findings do particularly well to include the views of stakeholder groups from inside and outside of WFP (e.g., government, partners, beneficiaries). When evidence is inconclusive or contradictory, there is good effort to explain this in a balanced manner. There are no major weaknesses in the report's findings, although references to sources could have been more consistent and broader equity and wider inclusion dimensions are not explicitly triangulated in the findings (e.g., poverty), nor are unanticipated effects addressed.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS | Rating | Satisfactory |
| <p>The report offers strong conclusions and lessons learned that synthesize evaluation findings, noting both strengths and weaknesses of the programme and its implementation. While they present this information from a strategic perspective, the conclusions would have been further improved if structured across evaluation criteria to offer a more analytic perspective and if the lessons learned had included the conditions under which they are valid.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS | Rating | Satisfactory |
| <p>The evaluation makes seven recommendations, which follow logically from the evaluation findings and conclusions. These identify relevant entities for their implementation and timing for action. However, the recommendations would have been further strengthened, specifically more could have been done to consider WFP constraints in implementation, to clearly prioritize the recommendations, and to reflect upon equity and inclusion dimensions.</p> | | |
| CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY | Rating | Highly Satisfactory |
| <p>The report is well written, with effective use of tables and graphs as visual aids. It is free from jargon. There is good use of cross-references, both within the main report and between the report and the annexes. The report is within the length requirements, as are the annexes which are in the order listed in the report. While overall clear and accessible, there are some punctuation errors and more precise language could have been used to identify data sources.</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 |
| <p>The context provides relevant information on intersectional vulnerabilities in Cambodia. GEWE is clearly mainstreamed in the evaluation scope of analysis, across the evaluation criteria, and within the evaluation matrix. The methodology was gender-responsive, reflected in the mixed-methods design, and with the use of a variety of data sources and processes. The report does particularly well to note how a gender-sensitive data collection methods were applied at the beneficiary level, including how gender-disaggregated focus groups were organized to be sensitive to timing and location for different groups. Ethical standards were consistently considered, and all stakeholder groups treated with respect for confidentiality and integrity. The evaluation effectively addresses GEWE considerations in its analysis. The findings draw upon the triangulated voices of different stakeholder groups and there is excellent use of disaggregated data throughout. However, while some unanticipated effects are mentioned regarding vulnerability, none that may be related to gender are highlighted. The report includes two recommendations that specifically address GEWE issues.</p> | |

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