

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Mid-Term Evaluation of WFP's USDA McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Programme's Support in Afar and Oromia Regions in Ethiopia (2019 to 2025)	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Decentralized - Activity	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory: 91%	
<p>The Mid-term Evaluation of the USDA McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Programme's Support in Afar and Oromia Regions in Ethiopia (2019 to 2025) is a highly satisfactory and well-written report that decision makers can use with confidence. The report clearly presents the purpose, rationale and scope. The evaluation uses a rigorous mixed methods and theory-based design that incorporates and triangulates quantitative and qualitative data from a range of stakeholders, beneficiaries and secondary sources. Findings are evidence-based and respond to the evaluation questions and sub-questions. They include sex-disaggregated data, and provide explanations where this was not possible. Overall, conclusions effectively connect findings across criteria, include a good balance of key findings, and adequately reflect gender equality and inclusion dimensions. The recommendations are focused and logically derived from the evaluation findings and conclusions. The report could have been strengthened by reducing its length, presenting a more concise context and removing duplications across findings. The methodological description could have included examples of how data collection methods and tools were tailored to be gender-responsive and how the voices of different social groups were triangulated. Finally, the recommendations could have been more effectively prioritized.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The executive summary presents a clear description of the evaluation purpose, subject and context along with a concise and well-balanced synthesis of the key evaluation findings and recommendations. It could have benefited from including more information on key dimensions of the evaluation methodology along with a distinct summary of the evaluation conclusions and findings, and a more complete review of the evaluation recommendations.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a comprehensive overview of the main dimensions of the evaluation context and subject. Key strengths include the clear description of the project's theory of change and underlying assumptions along with the description of the project's evolution, including how and why changes were made to activities, budget and timelines in response to external events. While this section is highly satisfactory, it could have benefited from a more concise synthesis of the key information presented - the context and overview sections are lengthy and some details could have been moved to the related appendices.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a clear and concise overview of the main evaluation features, including objectives, rationale and scope. Explicit reference to considering the gender, equity and wider inclusion objectives of the project is included.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report includes a clear and concise description of the evaluation's mixed methods and theory-based methodology design. The section includes a discussion of the data collection methods and processes used along with a comprehensive evaluation matrix. Key strengths include the assessment of the baseline study and how the mid-term evaluation will build on this data, as well as an assessment of the availability and reliability of the project's performance data. However, this section could have benefited from examples of how data collection methods and tools were tailored to gather gender-responsive information, along with an explanation or justification of the gender imbalances of male and female stakeholders and beneficiaries participating in key informant interviews and focus group discussions.</p>		

<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>Overall, the evaluation findings are evidence-based and respond well to the evaluation questions and sub-questions. Data is well-referenced and triangulated, and there are clear assessments of data reliability and gaps with their implications on evaluation findings. The also report presents a strong alignment between the analysis and the evaluation's theory-based approach, and identifies potential negative unanticipated effects. However, the section could have benefited from the removal of duplications across findings, more consistent triangulation of the voices of different social groups and the inclusion of an assessment of whether previous recommendations were considered in the current intervention's design and implementation.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>Overall, the conclusions effectively connect findings across evaluation criteria, provide a balance of positive and negative findings, and adequately reflect gender equality and inclusion dimensions. This section could have been further strengthened by moving the detailed analysis in conclusion 8 to the findings section and providing a corresponding and concise synthesis in the conclusions.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The evaluation recommendations are focused on three areas and they logically derive from the findings and conclusions. Responsible actors and timeframes are included for each recommendation. Each of them incorporates a specific sub-recommendation addressing relevant GEWE issues and priorities. The feasibility of recommendation 2, focused on design lessons for future projects, is unclear given the purpose and nature of a mid-term evaluation. Moreover, the evaluation recommendations may have benefited from greater differentiation in the prioritization of their sub-areas.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report is well written with clear and easy to understand text. It follows the WFP template for evaluation reports and includes all the required annexes. It makes good use of visual aids and provides clear sources for all data and quotes. The report could have benefited from a more concise summary and synthesis of key information (particularly in sections 1.2 and 1.3) to reduce the length of the report.</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**

<b>UN-SWAP EPI - individual evaluation score</b>	Meets requirements: 8 points
<p>GEWE was effectively integrated in the evaluation objectives, criteria and questions. As assessment of performance data and indicators to measure progress on gender equality is included, and deficiencies noted. The evaluation's mixed methods and theory-based approach was appropriate to evaluating GEWE. It includes an intersectional analysis of gender vulnerabilities with disability issues and pastoral groups. The methodology included GEWE considerations. Findings identify potential unanticipated negative effects arising from project implementation, some of which have potential negative effects for gender equality. Sub-recommendations addressing GEWE issues are included in all three of the evaluation recommendations. However, the report could have been strengthened by providing more information and justification for the gender imbalances in male and female stakeholders participating in key informant interviews and focus group discussions.</p>	

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