

Evaluation title	Evaluation of the Breaking Barriers for Girls' Education Programme in Chad from 2019 to 2022	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized - Activity	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 74%	
<p>The report of the Evaluation of the Breaking Barriers for Girls' Education (BBGE) Programme in Chad from 2019 to 2022 is well written and evaluation users can rely on the credible findings provided for decision-making. The report's findings, conclusions, and lessons learned provide considerations for future programming. However, the report does not clearly present the evaluation purpose, objectives, and scope. While the evaluation questions are aligned with relevant OECD-DAC criteria, some of the questions would have benefited from refinements to facilitate a greater focus on assessment. The evaluation used a mixed methods approach, although much greater emphasis was placed on the collection of primary data with limited citations of secondary data and weak use of footnotes. The assessment of the results of the programme is somewhat uneven. Conclusions and lessons learned are generally well presented. Some of the recommendations clearly align with the challenges noted in the findings section, although they are primarily focused on operational as opposed to strategic considerations.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The Executive Summary covers most of the key information in the main report, including a clear overview of the purpose and scope of the evaluation. It includes some titles in bold to help navigate each section and to identify some of the main topics of relevance to the evaluation. However, it could have been shortened, particularly the conclusions and lessons learned..</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Partly Satisfactory
<p>The report includes key information on the Chadian context that is relevant to the programme. It describes the obstacles girls face in accessing education and includes a good description of government commitments to the SDGs and to some relevant international and national policies. It also presents a description of the theory of change which includes some useful information to understand the vision and anticipated results of the programme. However, it could have been stronger and more consistent in mainstreaming gender and social inclusion dimensions. The identification and consideration of challenges faced by specific vulnerable populations, such as the disabled, lack clarity and detail. The use of sub-titles to demarcate key information would have been helpful and would have assisted with identifying key information.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Unsatisfactory
<p>The report includes general details on the evaluation objectives in two separate sentences of the Executive Summary. There is no clear section that outlines the objectives of the evaluation in the main report. Furthermore, gender and women equality considerations (GEWE) are not noted directly in the objectives and there is no explicit reference to consideration being given to the issue of human rights. The purpose and the scope are not directly stated.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The methodological approach described in the Annex is quite clear, providing sufficient detail on the mixed quantitative and qualitative data collection, analysis methods and the sampling frame. The description of how a gender-responsive approach was adopted and of how ethical issues were considered in relation to gender is adequate. However, the approach to accommodating other vulnerable populations is not sufficiently described or comprehensive in covering all vulnerable populations, such as the disabled and IDPs, referenced in the context section. The limitations and mitigation actions are clearly outlined but more could have been said about the limitations on diversity data and how these were addressed. The list of stakeholders is limited and does not include all those referenced in the evaluation terms of reference.</p>		

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>All the evaluation questions are addressed but with varying degrees of comprehensiveness uneven reference to quantitative and qualitative data sources. In spite of this, the analysis of quantitative data and of the qualitative inputs from stakeholders through KIIs and FGDs are satisfactory. The results of the programme and WFP's contribution to them are covered to a certain extent and unintended effects are appropriately addressed. However, the findings section is weak in terms of citing secondary data sources including with inadequate footnoting. As such, triangulation of data is limited, found primarily among different sources of primary data. Gender issues are generally well covered but disaggregation is inconsistent, including in relation to the analysis of activities which focus on "students" and "youth" rather than disaggregating by gender and social inclusion.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The conclusions are balanced and well connected to key points noted in the findings section. There are no notable gaps or omissions nor is new information introduced. While the issue of disability is well covered, other vulnerabilities noted in the findings section such as the situation with refugees would are not addressed. The lessons learned are well articulated. Some of the conclusions are also quite specific while overlooking some of the broader issues such as related to the relevance criterion. It would have been helpful if the conclusions had been more directly and consistently connected to the BBGE programme.</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The recommendations are clear and concise but could have been identified as either strategic or operational. They align with some of the key points raised in the findings section. However, they do not respond to all the requested uses of the evaluation. Some of the recommendations are too specific and overlook some key issues connected to the specific objectives of the programme.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report is well written and structured. There are no notable grammar or spelling errors. Key points are signposted in some areas. The length of the main report is acceptable. However, not all findings are correctly sourced. The report would have benefited from a greater use of sub-titles in bold.</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: 7 points	
<p>The evaluation framework includes specific questions that consider GEWE issues. The methodology is strong in terms of documenting how a gender-responsive approach was adopted. This includes noting ethical considerations and approaches adopted related to discussing gender-based violence and other sensitive topics. The team has also put forward methodological approaches to address gender differences. The analysis disaggregates the findings related to gender. Unintended effects include reference to gender equality. A few recommendations address GEWE issues and priorities for action in this regard.</p>		

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.