

Evaluation title	Endline Evaluation USDA McGovern Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Project in Bangladesh FY 2020-2024	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized - Activity	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 73%	
<p>The <i>Endline Evaluation of the USDA McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Project in Bangladesh (FY 2020–2024)</i> is a satisfactory report that provides a credible and comprehensive assessment of the project performance. The evaluation clearly outlines its purpose, objectives, and scope, and offers a well-structured overview of the project context. It applies a robust mixed-methods design, drawing on quantitative and qualitative data to address the evaluation questions. Findings are systematically presented, with consistent sex-disaggregated analysis that supports meaningful gender insights. The report effectively triangulates diverse data sources and provides a balanced view of achievements and challenges in literacy outcomes, school attendance, and dietary diversity. The report could have been further strengthened by: establishing clearer causal linkages to substantiate attribution claims; expanding the analysis of inclusion beyond gender, particularly regarding disability; providing more forward-looking, analytical conclusions rather than descriptive summaries; framing recommendations in more specific, actionable terms; and enhancing readability through reduced length, shorter paragraphs, and additional visual aids to highlight key insights.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The executive summary functions well as a standalone section, providing a clear and comprehensive overview of the evaluation. It concisely presents key information on the evaluation's features, context, and subject, and offers a well-structured synthesis of findings organized by evaluation criteria, balancing achievements and challenges. The executive summary could have been further strengthened by incorporating visual aids to convey key results and by establishing clearer linkages between certain recommendations and the findings highlighted in the summary.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a clear and detailed overview of the relevant contextual factors and evaluation subject. It appropriately identifies key disadvantaged groups within the project context, with particular attention to gender dynamics. The description of the evaluation subject, however, could have been more concise to improve clarity. The report could have also benefitted from a broader discussion of other dimensions of marginalization—such as disability or ethnicity—and an exploration of how these factors interact to cause compounded disadvantages.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Highly Satisfactory
<p>The report clearly outlines the evaluation purpose, its dual accountability and learning objectives, its scope, and the primary users and stakeholders. Gender equality considerations are appropriately integrated into the evaluation's objectives and scope.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The mixed-methods design and sampling frame are appropriate for addressing the questions and ensure representation of women and marginalized groups. The evaluation matrix clearly links questions, indicators, data sources, and analysis methods. Methodological limitations are acknowledged with mitigation measures, and ethical standards are reportedly upheld throughout data collection. The report could have been strengthened by providing concrete examples of methodological adaptations based on the evaluability assessment; considering contextual factors beyond COVID-19 that affected evaluability; simplifying compound evaluation questions; using more specific indicators in the evaluation matrix; and explaining how the difference-in-differences approach was applied given data constraints.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The findings section systematically addresses all evaluation questions and provides a comprehensive assessment of project performance. It triangulates quantitative and qualitative evidence effectively, especially on literacy and attendance, and consistently presents sex-disaggregated data that supports meaningful gender analysis. The tone</p>		

remains balanced, acknowledging both achievements and challenges. The report could have been strengthened by more clearly substantiating attribution claims and by ensuring each finding directly aligns with its corresponding evaluation question. Some findings rely too heavily on single evidence types or offer descriptive rather than analytical insights. Evidence gaps—particularly missing socioeconomic or disability disaggregation—are not consistently explained. The discussion of unintended effects, especially potential negative effects, could also have been more robust.

CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Satisfactory
---	---------------	--------------

The conclusion section effectively synthesizes findings across the evaluation criteria, offering a balanced assessment of the project’s contributions to school attendance, literacy outcomes, and dietary diversity, while acknowledging challenges related to sustainability, institutional capacity, and systems integration. The section could have been strengthened by providing more forward-looking analytical insights rather than descriptive summaries, more fully addressing inclusion dimensions beyond gender, and more clearly distinguishing conclusions from recommendations to enhance their strategic value for decision-makers.

CRITERION 7: RECOMMENDATIONS	Rating	Satisfactory
-------------------------------------	---------------	--------------

The report presents six forward-looking recommendations that clearly specify lead responsibility, contributing entities, priority levels, and implementation timeframes, supporting both accountability and learning. One recommendation explicitly addresses gender equality and inclusion. The recommendations could have been strengthened by replacing generic terms such as “enhance” and “strengthen” with more concrete actions and clearer descriptions of the intended change. The report could have more consistently demonstrated how recommendations derive from the findings and conclusions.

CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
---	---------------	--------------

The report is logically structured, with clear sections and annexes. Footnotes are used well, and visual aids effectively present key data. The language is generally clear and professional. The report could have been improved by streamlining lengthy sections, increasing internal cross-references, reducing some jargon, and adding more visual summaries (e.g., tables).

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
--	--------------------

Gender equality and women’s empowerment (GEWE) are well mainstreamed across the evaluation’s scope, questions, methodology, and analysis. The mixed-methods design, triangulation, inclusive sampling, and strong ethical practices support robust GEWE integration. The report identifies key disadvantaged groups and gender-specific barriers but could deepen intersectional analysis across disability, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status. Findings consistently use sex-disaggregated data and triangulate stakeholder perspectives, highlighting gender-differentiated outcomes. Positive unintended effects include shifts in social norms supporting girls’ education. One recommendation addresses GEWE and inclusion, though broader integration across recommendations would have strengthened coherence.

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

UN-DIS individual evaluation score	Misses requirements
---	---------------------

While some elements were present, disability inclusion was not fully integrated into the evaluation’s analytical framework or reporting. The terms of reference considers disability inclusion and the evaluation report notes purposive sampling of persons with disabilities. However, disability was not explicitly reflected in the evaluation questions, and the findings provide limited substantive analysis on disability inclusion. As a result, conclusions and recommendations do not address disability inclusion.

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.