

Evaluation title	Endline Evaluation of USDA McGovern-Dole Grant for WFP School Feeding in Laos from 2017-2022	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized - Activity	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 76%	
<p>The Endline Evaluation of USDA McGovern-Dole Grant for WFP School Feeding in Laos from 2017-2022 presents credible findings that can be used with confidence for decision-making. The report clearly presents the project context and overview of the project under review. The methodology section is sufficiently detailed, containing the logic of the mixed methods approach and the primary data quantitative and qualitative collection methods. The findings address most questions and are well sourced. The Gender and Social Inclusion dimension is also well covered in both the methodology and the findings. However, it would have been helpful to note the vulnerable populations and to be consistent about them throughout the report. Some of the conclusions are strong, whereas others could have benefited from revisions. The recommendations are too many and some are not clear and/or not sufficiently aligned with what WFP and other relevant stakeholders could take as actions. The recommendations are exclusively assigned to WFP whereas some would have warranted reference to partners as contributors. The Executive Summary is also problematic as it is too long, should have summarized key sections such as the recommendations and should have presented the correct timeframe for the project.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Partly Satisfactory
<p>The executive summary includes key information that is clearly presented. However, it is long, and it would have been useful for the topics to be clearly demarcated with titles in bold for ease of reading. Key findings related to sustainability are overemphasized relative to the rest, while lessons learned, conclusions and recommendations are not summarized. This would have helped ensure a more concise summary.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The context and overview of evaluation subject are well presented. They cover the key elements clearly and concisely. The narrative is effectively complemented by tables that summarize critical information. Reference to gender and social inclusion is also well covered. It would have been helpful to mention the SDG Voluntary Report. The table that lists factors of vulnerability should have been clearer and vulnerable populations related to the project more clearly and consistently stated. Inclusion of budget details in relation to the outcomes would have been useful.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The objectives, rationale and scope of the evaluation are well defined. The purpose statement effectively notes how the evaluation aligns with the timing of the project moving forward. It would have been helpful to include separate subtitles for each of the key areas, as was done in the evaluation terms of reference (TOR). The gender and human rights dimensions could have been integrated more directly into the objectives to reflect their importance as captured in the TOR.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The methodology section and details in the Annex include extensive detail to enable the reader to understand steps taken implement a mixed method approach and to facilitate triangulation of data. The use of tables to capture key approaches is helpful. The bibliography and detailed list of questions for the key informant interviews and focus group discussions demonstrate that in-depth data gathering, and analysis was conducted. Some of the evaluation questions inconsistent about noting relevant vulnerable populations. Some of the indicators identified for the questions could not necessarily enable measurement or assessment of change due to the interventions. Finally, it is not clear how the stakeholder mapping sought to solicit input from organizations that could provide a Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (GEWE), diversity or human rights perspective.</p>		

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The findings section adequately references primary and secondary sources of data, with uneven triangulation of data. The section offers a good balance of strengths and weaknesses. The narrative analysis is effectively complemented with tables and other figures. The GEWE issues are well addressed in the analysis. There are, however, a few questions that have been overlooked. Sourcing of data should have been consistent throughout. It would have been helpful to be more consistent in terms of integrating the social inclusion perspective and in noting which groups constitute vulnerable populations.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The conclusions are clear and concise. It is helpful that they are linked to specific findings. They are also linked to the relevant OECD criteria by referring to the terms in specific conclusions. Most of the lessons learned are useful. Nonetheless, conclusions could have been more directly linked to the main areas of focus. The reference to gender and social inclusion is covered in two paragraphs whereas it should have been mainstreamed throughout this section. Some lessons learned are too general including the one on girls' and women's empowerment which also overlooks the importance of considering boys and men given poor learning outcomes for boys.</p>		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Partly Satisfactory
<p>The recommendations are clearly presented. They include a priority ranking and proposed timelines for implementation. However, there are too many recommendations, and some are unclear or do not reflect key points raised in the findings. The gender and social inclusion recommendation also overlooks reference to vulnerable populations. The implementation is limited to WFP without properly identifying partners or contributors that should have been considered.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report is well written in clear language. It is free of grammar and spelling errors. It follows the relevant criteria/titles in the main section. The annexes are also correctly listed. However, the report and the annexes exceed the word limit requirements.</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	Approaches requirements: 6 points	
<p>The main section of the report effectively refers to gender differences. However, vulnerable groups are not consistently referenced, including in relation to what is covered in the context section. While the human rights frameworks including CRC is referenced, reference to rights holders and duty bearers is only presented on an ad-hoc basis. There is also no dedicated question to examine the effectiveness of the project in mainstreaming gender and social inclusion. The sampling frame does demonstrate that efforts were made to gather disaggregated perspectives by gender. However, insufficient detail is provided in relation to primary data collection methods. There is a good balance of methodologies to capture the gender perspective. The presentation of the approach to ethical considerations for GEWE and social inclusion is well presented. The findings section includes some good analysis of gender differences particularly the question on efficiency and effectiveness although the analysis on other vulnerable groups is less clear. There is a specific recommendation focused on gender and social inclusion.</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.	

POST HOC QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF WFP EVALUATIONS

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>