

Evaluation title	Midterm Evaluation of USDA McGovern-Dole Grant for WFP Home-Grown School Feeding Project in Rwanda (2020 to 2025)	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized - Activity	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) - overall rating	Satisfactory: 88%	
<p>The report for the "Midterm Evaluation of USDA McGovern-Dole Grant for WFP Home-Grown School Feeding Project in Rwanda (2020 to 2025)" is a satisfactory report that evaluation users can rely on with confidence. The report's summary effectively includes the evaluation purpose, objectives, context, methodology, findings, lessons, and conclusions. The evaluation used a range of data sources, including surveys and interviews with beneficiaries, and this supports robust data triangulation throughout the findings. The report answers all the evaluation questions and sub-questions including important gender and inclusion issues for the programme. The report's conclusions contribute to strategic decision making at the programme's midterm. Eight recommendations are made, and these are relevant and targeted, framed flexibly such that they are both specific and open to adjustments if needed. Overall, the report is easy for the reader to understand and navigate. In terms of weaknesses, the executive summary is long and does not effectively summarize the recommendations. In the main report, the scope of the evaluation could have been presented more clearly. Considerations for the availability and appropriateness of monitoring data are not directly addressed, especially data related to human rights and gender. This limits the overall quality of the methodology presented in the report.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report summary presents concise information on most evaluation features, such as key findings, conclusions, and lessons learned, including those related to GEWE. However, the summary does not include information on the scope of the evaluation and the recommendations do not include targeting aspects, priorities and timeframe.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a clear description of the context in Rwanda. There is also a discussion of important contextual changes as well as an overview of USDA McGovern-Dole School Feeding programme, including relevant analytical work that informed programme design. However, there are relevant aspects not explicitly addressed in the discussion of the context, such as important health indicators, and the National Voluntary Review on progress made in SDGs 2 and 17.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation report clearly outlines the evaluation objectives and purpose. It identifies intended users, stakeholders, and uses of the evaluation but the scope of the evaluation is not clearly summarized. Finally, human rights and gender equality are brought in through GEWE-related sub-questions in the evaluation matrix.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation's mixed methods approach, and its chosen data sources and methods of data analysis, are well described in the report and its annexes. This methodology allowed for effective data collection from a variety of stakeholders. Notably, it is clear how GEWE was thought of in the methodology with gender-sensitive approaches to data collection. Limitations of the methodology are identified, and mitigation measures are presented. However, a significant limitation is the lack of discussion on the quality and availability of monitoring data to measure progress in human rights and gender, and how this affected the choice of methodology.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation addresses all evaluation questions and sub-questions, and supporting evidence is presented transparently using a neutral tone. WFP contributions to results are discussed in a fair and nuanced way, accounting for contextual factors that affected results achieved at the programme midterm point. The voices of different stakeholder groups inside and outside of WFP are reflected and this supports effective data triangulation. The way in which recommendations from</p>		

past evaluations informed the current programme is clearly brought forward. However, relevant unanticipated effects related to gender are not specifically described, while the sources of the data presented in tables are not clearly cited.		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Satisfactory
The conclusions flow logically from the findings and are presented without gaps. There is specific attention given to GEWE-related conclusions. Conclusions are relevant to the future of the programme and the lessons learned are relevant for organizational learning. However, the conclusions are structured by criteria instead of across criteria, which limits a more general strategic contribution. The lessons should also have been more specific with respect to the conditions under which they are valid.		
CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory
There are eight recommendations that include a timeframe for action and identify responsible actors. These are logically structured with a balance between specificity and generality to allow evaluation users to fine tune their implementation. The recommendations would have been further strengthened by being more concise and by more effectively considering constraints in implementation. Their length exceeds the maximum word limit requirement.		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
The report is written in clear and professional language and makes effective use of tables to depict data. There are cross-references which makes the report easy to navigate and it also includes the necessary annexes. However, the report and annexes exceed the word limit, and minor formatting problems were found.		

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
The report effectively addresses GEWE considerations in its analysis. The context includes discussion of gender-specific vulnerabilities such as stunting rates in Rwanda. Policies related to human rights and gender in the country are noted, including the National Gender Policy. Although there is no specific objective on human rights and gender, this midterm evaluation considers gender equality and women’s empowerment in its methodology, including through evaluation questions and sub-questions. The sampling frame included interviews and FGDs which ensured participation of diverse stakeholders, including the most vulnerable, while relevant ethical standards were observed. The findings triangulate the voices of different social role groups and there is excellent use of sex-disaggregated data throughout. There is one recommendation that focuses specifically on gender mainstreaming with an improved M&E system. However, unanticipated effects related to gender are not specifically addressed in the findings and the availability of monitoring on GEWE-relevant indicators was not considered for the methodology.	

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.