

<b>Evaluation title</b>	Evaluation of the School Feeding Programme in South Sudan, 2018 to 2023	
<b>Evaluation category and type</b>	Decentralized - Activity	
<b>Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) - overall rating</b>	Satisfactory: 76%	
<p>The Evaluation of the School Feeding Programme in South Sudan, 2018 to 2023 constitutes a satisfactory report that decision-makers can use with confidence. It clearly summarizes the evaluation purpose, rationale and methodology, and provides relevant information on the context and the evaluation subject. The report draws on secondary and primary sources and methods of data collection to present findings on all evaluation questions, addressing strengths and weaknesses without bias. Gender equality considerations were effectively mainstreamed. The report formulates conclusions and lessons that have potential to inform future organizational learning. It articulates ten prioritized and largely realistic recommendations. The findings section could have been strengthened by consistently linking value judgments to specific evidence and data sources. The conclusions could have benefited from better outlining their higher-level strategic implications. Some recommendations would have benefited from clearer linkages with the evidence of key programme gaps, and from being more specific and actionable. Finally, the report slightly exceeds WFP requirements for length and might have benefited from omitting some descriptive detail and duplication of information.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The executive summary clearly describes key evaluation features and subject, while providing relevant contextual information. It captures key findings for the main evaluation questions, mirrors the main evaluation conclusions, and summarizes a subset of the recommendations and lesson learned. The summary could have been strengthened by ensuring that the summarized findings capture some additional important insights; pitching the conclusions at a higher analytical level that includes strategic implications; ensuring that lessons learned are clearly formulated as lessons rather than recommendations and that they are supported by the presented evidence; and ensuring that all recommendations are summarized and that each of them clearly flows from the findings.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report provides an overview of key features of South Sudan and of the education and school feeding context in the country. It also describes the evaluation subject, providing information on its objectives, intended outcomes, beneficiaries, budget, and relevant gender and broader equity dimensions. The context could have benefited from providing additional sex-disaggregated data. The overview of the subject should have included planned/actual programme beneficiaries; additional information on WFP's analytical work and if/how this informed the evaluated programme; and information on planned and actual transfers by year and activity.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report clearly describes the evaluation objectives, rationale and purpose, and scope of the evaluation. Gender equality and equity considerations were mainstreamed into the evaluation's objectives of accountability, learning, and evidence for adaptive programming.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The mixed-methods design, the use of 'with/without' (school feeding) comparison and contribution analysis were appropriate for answering the evaluation questions despite baseline and monitoring data gaps. The evaluation drew on a range of quantitative and qualitative data sources and methods, consulting with diverse stakeholder groups in different locations. Ethical standards were consistently applied, and all stakeholders were treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality. The report could have benefited from elaborating on the baseline and monitoring data gaps, including in relation to gender and equity/equality dimensions, and providing additional information on how these were mitigated by the evaluation.</p>		

<b>CRITERION 5: FINDINGS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report presents transparent and impartial findings on all evaluation questions and sub-questions, drawing on a range of qualitative and quantitative evidence and triangulating the voices of different social role groups. WFP contributions to results are assessed clearly taking contextual factors into consideration, and the report reflects on both positive and negative unanticipated effects of the intervention. Findings also assess performance against International Humanitarian Principles. Some findings could have referred more clearly to specific underlying evidence or sources and could have been more analytical and less descriptive. The claim that the programme was aligned with International Humanitarian Principles should have been underpinned by a stronger evidence base.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Partly Satisfactory
<p>The conclusions present key strengths and weaknesses of the programme. They logically flow from the findings and incorporate gender equality-related reflections. The report also presents four lessons learned that have potential to inform wider organizational learning. The conclusions could have been strengthened by focusing on forward-looking implications of the findings rather than restating some of them. The lessons could have benefited from ensuring that all of them are fully supported by the presented evidence and findings.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Partly Satisfactory
<p>The report presents ten recommendations that align with the evaluation's purpose and objectives, though their connection to findings and conclusions varies. Most recommendations are realistic, context-aware, and include responsible actors, priorities, timeframes, and attention to GEWE and inclusion issues. They could have been improved by consistently ensuring clear links to findings and conclusions, providing more specific actionable steps within lead actors' influence, clarifying the rationale for priority levels, and maintaining consistency in timeframe categories. The recommendations section could also have benefited from better alignment between sub- and main recommendations and could have been condensed by moving rationale information to the conclusions section.</p>		
<b>CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY</b>	<b>Rating</b>	Satisfactory
<p>The report is, overall, accessible and clear. It follows the WFP template for decentralized evaluation reports, includes all required lists and annexes, and is written in professional language. It makes good use of bold font and textboxes to highlight key findings/messages and direct quotes and employs a variety of visual aids such as figures and tables. It could have been strengthened by: replacing some technical jargon with accessible language; providing sources for all quoted information and data, especially those underlying figures and tables; ensuring that all visual aids complement and are relevant to the narrative that they support; using bold font slightly more sparingly to focus on one key message per paragraph; and slightly reducing overall report length by omitting narrative detail and/or duplication of information.</p>		

<b>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>	
<b>UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score</b>	Meets requirements: 8 points
<p>The evaluation approach and mixed-methods methodology, which drew on a variety of data sources and processes, were gender-responsive and based on deliberate considerations on how to integrate GEWE dimensions in data collection and analysis. The evaluation matrix includes several sub-questions on GEWE issues. Ethical standards were consistently considered, and all stakeholder groups treated with respect for confidentiality and integrity. Evaluation findings, conclusions, and recommendations reflect a gender analysis. The report could have been further strengthened by explicitly commenting on the availability of monitoring data on GEWE-relevant indicators and of related gaps.</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.