

Evaluation title	KOICA Supported Home-Grown School Feeding Programme in Cambodia in Kampong Thom, Kampong Chhnang and Pursat Provinces—2020 to 2024 Period Covered	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized - Activity	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 87%	
The evaluation of the KOICA Supported Home-Grown School Feeding Programme in Cambodia (2020 to 2024) constitutes a satisfactory report that decision makers can use with confidence. The report is well written, flows logically and is easy to understand. It presents a clear and relevant overview of the evaluation and programme context. The questions fully align with OECD DAC criteria and include targeted sub-questions on gender equality and disability inclusion. The evaluation's mixed methods approach is guided by a well-defined matrix and was appropriate to answering all questions. A clear description of the quantitative and qualitative sampling frames is provided, along with a discussion of data limitations and mitigation strategies. The evaluation findings are evidence-based, provide higher-level analysis, and respond well to the evaluation questions and sub-questions. The conclusions present a balanced picture of the programme's strengths and weaknesses, while recommendations are logically derived from them. The report could have been further strengthened by reducing its length to improve readability and more effectively connecting findings across conclusions. It could have also provided more information on how the gender-sensitive approach was mainstreamed throughout the evaluation, included sex-disaggregated data where possible and provided contextual information, data and findings related to disability inclusion.		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
Overall, the executive summary provides a comprehensive and useful overview of key information and can serve as a standalone document to aid decision-making. Key findings are clearly summarized for all evaluation criteria with a good balance of strengths and weaknesses and appropriate integration of gender related issues. The evaluation conclusions, recommendations and lessons flow logically from the key findings presented. However, the executive summary could have presented the conclusions in a more concise manner and included more details on the prioritization and timeframes for recommendations.		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
The report provides a clear and relevant overview of the Home-Grown School Feeding Programme and its context. This section, however, could have been further strengthened by including more details on the programme expenditures and on how the programme addresses the inclusion of marginalized groups, particularly with respect to disability issues. Additionally, the section could have been more consistent to include references and sources for the data presented, including sex-disaggregated data where possible.		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
The report provides a clear and concise overview of the evaluation rationale, objectives, and scope. This section could have been further strengthened by providing information on how the gender-sensitive approach was mainstreamed throughout the evaluation.		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
The methodological design was informed by a rigorous assessment of the programme's intervention logic and data quality. It includes a concise overview of the evaluation's mixed methods approach and a well-defined matrix to guide the evaluation. The methods were appropriate to answering all evaluation questions and allowed for effective triangulation of data collected through different methods, sources, and types of stakeholders. A clear description of the quantitative and qualitative sampling frames is provided, along with a discussion of limitations and mitigation strategies. Gaps in gender and social inclusion monitoring data, and the difficulties this presented in measuring gender-related effectiveness, are identified. The evaluation could have benefited from a careful review of the evaluation questions to		

reduce the number of sub-questions and from the inclusion of a summary of the ethical standards and how they were upheld.

CRITERION 5: FINDINGS**Rating**

Satisfactory

Overall, the evaluation findings are evidence-based, highly analytical, respond well to the evaluation questions and sub-questions, and provide a well-balanced assessment of strengths and weaknesses. There is a high level of data reliability and sources are clearly identified. The effective integration of quantitative and qualitative data collected from a range of project stakeholders and beneficiaries ensures different voices are reflected in the report. The findings could have been further strengthened by providing a more consistent sex-disaggregation of quantitative data, along with reporting data and formulating findings related to disability inclusion.

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS**Rating**

Satisfactory

Overall, the conclusions present a balanced picture of the programme's strengths and weaknesses, logically flow from the evaluation findings, and are useful for accountability and strategic decision-making. A gender-focused conclusion is provided. This section could have been further strengthened by connecting findings across criteria/questions more effectively, and by including reflections on wider equity and inclusion dimensions.

CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS**Rating**

Highly Satisfactory

The evaluation recommendations are clearly and logically derived from the findings and conclusions. The type, priority, and timeframes are included for each recommendation, along with the specific role to be taken by WFP (responsible actor). Overall, recommendations are forward looking and address gender and women empowerment issues. The recommendations section could have benefited from the identification of more specific and targeted actions.

CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY**Rating**

Satisfactory

Overall, the evaluation report is well written with a logical flow and internal consistency. It includes all required sections and incorporates the effective use of visual aids.

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

GEWE considerations are effectively mainstreamed across evaluation criteria. The report includes an assessment of limitations of the programme's results framework and indicators relating to gender and social inclusion. The evaluation's methodological design was appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations and a stratified sampling approach was used to ensure gender and social inclusion factors. The evaluation provides a description of Cambodia's policies and regulations to advance gender equality, effectively triangulates the voices of different social groups and actors and includes an analysis of positive unintended effects; and includes a GEWE-targeted recommendation. However, the report could have been strengthened by noting how ethical standards were upheld specifically for women participants including women.

Integration of disability considerations in the evaluation report based on the UN Disability Inclusion Strategy (UN-DIS) scorecard
UN-DIS - Individual evaluation score

Meets requirements: 4 points

The evaluation integrates disability considerations by including disability inclusion in two evaluation sub-questions; ensuring the evaluation team possessed knowledge and experience in disability inclusion; and including students with disabilities in the quantitative survey.

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.