

Evaluation title	Developmental Evaluation Catalyzing Good Food Through School Feeding Programmes in Benin, Burundi, Ghana, Honduras, India, and Rwanda (2022-2025)	
Evaluation category and type	Decentralized – Developmental	
Post Hoc Quality Assessment (PHQA) – overall rating	Satisfactory: 72%	
<p>The <i>Developmental Evaluation of Catalyzing Good Food Through School Feeding Programmes in Benin, Burundi, Ghana, Honduras, India, and Rwanda (2022 - 2025)</i> is a satisfactory report that effectively applies developmental evaluation principles to assess WFP's innovative food systems initiatives across six countries. The report presents a comprehensive contextual analysis of food system challenges, clearly articulates the evaluation rationale and objectives, and employs a well-structured Strategic Learning Framework aligned with developmental evaluation principles. It systematically addresses six strategic learning questions with balanced findings drawn from multiple sources and provides valuable insights on project adaptations throughout the implementation process. The developmental evaluation approach was appropriate given the innovative and adaptive nature of the initiatives. However, the report could have been strengthened by providing additional details on resource allocations across countries and programme components as important context for interpreting variations in implementation and results. Additionally, the analysis could have more consistently differentiated between the evaluators' interpretations and stakeholder perspectives, and conclusions could have been elevated to a higher level to distil sharper strategic insights rather than reiterating detailed findings. The report could also have offered more explicit guidance on sequencing or prioritization of forward-looking issues for consideration to support more actionable and coherent decision-making for future programming.</p>		
CRITERION 1: REPORT SUMMARY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The executive summary functions well as a standalone section that can be read as a standalone document to support decision making. It presents concise information on the evaluation's key features and context and effectively synthesizes the main findings, conclusions, and forward-looking considerations. However, the summary could have been further strengthened by incorporating visual aids to enhance readability and quick comprehension and by explicitly identifying the intended users of the evaluation.</p>		
CRITERION 2: CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW OF EVALUATION SUBJECT	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report offers a clear contextual analysis of food system challenges and school meals programmes at global and country levels, positioning the interventions within relevant systems and trends, while also offering comprehensive information on project components, innovations, and strategic learning priorities across the six target countries. However, it could have been strengthened by including additional information on resource allocation across countries and components, the project's evolution over time, integration between regional and global elements, and the key assumptions underpinning the innovative and adaptive nature of the evaluation subject.</p>		
CRITERION 3: EVALUATION RATIONALE, OBJECTIVES, AND SCOPE	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report provides a clear and comprehensive overview of the evaluation rationale, objectives, and scope, including an explanation of why a developmental evaluation approach was chosen. However, the report could have benefited from more clearly describing the envisioned value added of this final report within the broader developmental evaluation process, helping readers understand its specific contribution and position in the overall learning architecture. Given that developmental evaluations typically emphasize real-time learning and adaptive feedback, clarifying how the report contributes to that process would enhance the reader's understanding of its purpose and utility.</p>		
CRITERION 4: METHODOLOGY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The methodology aligns well with developmental evaluation principles, supported by a solid Strategic Learning Framework. Evaluation questions were designed to enable learning and adaptation, and appropriate developmental techniques—such as joint reflection workshops and the “what, so what, now what” framework—were applied with strong ethical safeguards. The report could have been strengthened by more clearly articulating what alternative or hybrid methodology was employed when developmental principles could not be fully applied and addressing the quality of available monitoring data and how data limitations shaped methodological choices. In addition, the evaluation could</p>		

<p>have more thoroughly analyzed the implications of limited engagement with vulnerable groups and reflected on how this gap could have been anticipated and mitigated earlier in the process.</p>		
CRITERION 5: FINDINGS	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The findings effectively address the six strategic learning questions with a good balance of analytical statements and descriptive evidence. The report draws on diverse sources —stakeholder perspectives, country examples, documentation, and workshop discussions— with transparent sourcing through footnotes and in-text attributions. The developmental orientation of the evaluation is clear, with clear examples of how the evaluation supported learning and adaptation. The report is generally balanced, presenting both strengths and challenges across thematic areas. However, the report could have more consistently distinguished between evaluator analysis and stakeholder perceptions, particularly regarding effectiveness. In addition, some findings adopt a definitive tone without adequate caveats. The report could have more clearly demonstrated how insights were derived through triangulation across different social groups.</p>		
CRITERION 6: CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS	Rating	Partly Satisfactory
<p>The conclusions flow logically from the findings and provide a balanced view of both positive and negative insights. However, they could have been further strengthened if they more consistently elevated the analysis beyond restating the findings, offered more analytical depth, and articulated overarching insights that go beyond stakeholder perceptions. While the lessons learned offer practical, broadly applicable guidance —including useful methodological reflections on the developmental evaluation approach—they could have been more clearly distinguished from findings and conclusions.</p>		
CRITERION 7: ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The 10 forward-looking strategic issues for consideration are generally feasible and clearly derived from the evaluation’s findings and conclusions. They focus on areas of strategic importance for WFP’s future work in food systems transformation. However, they could have more fully reflected additional significant findings— such as private sector investment beyond school meals and capacity gaps along the food value chain — and provided greater attention to the feasibility of proposed actions.</p>		
CRITERION 8: ACCESSIBILITY AND CLARITY	Rating	Satisfactory
<p>The report is logically structured, coherent, and written in clear, professional language. It uses footnotes and cross-references effectively. However, readability could have been improved by reducing the overall length—particularly by removing duplication and limiting descriptive detail—and by incorporating more visual aids to summarize complex information.</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	
UN-SWAP EPI – individual evaluation score	Meets requirements: 7 points
<p>The evaluation integrated GEWE considerations into its scope of analysis, but it could have more fully examined the quality of available gender-related data and how data gaps shaped methodological choices. Gender aspects were reflected in data collection and analysis, with some triangulation of women’s perspectives. However, the conclusions could have benefited from more strategic insights on gender equality. Strategic issues for consideration address gender equality and inclusion, noting the need to prioritize these dimensions earlier in future initiatives.</p>	
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
<p>While the evaluation identified persons with disabilities as part of the broader category of “vulnerable groups” within the terms of reference and evaluation questions, there is limited evidence that the stakeholder analysis or data collection methods explicitly included persons with disabilities or organizations representing them. As a result, disability-specific perspectives may not be fully reflected in the findings, conclusions, or issues for consideration.</p>	

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.