

QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM¹

Title of the evaluation

EVALUATION OF THE SCHOOL MILK SCHEME

DG/Unit DG AGRI, Unit L4

Officials managing the evaluation: Andreas KOLODZIEJAK

Evaluator/contractor AFC-COCONCEPT

Assessment carried out by:

Steering group with participants from units C-2, D-3, D-4, I-1, J-2, K-1, L-1, L-4 and SG, DG SANCO.

Date of the Quality Assessment November 2013

¹ Refer to the [‘Guide on Scoring the Criteria’ for how to assess each criterion.](#)
Quality Assessment Form for the evaluation of the School Milk Scheme

(1) RELEVANCE

Does the evaluation respond to information needs, in particular as expressed in the terms of references?

SCORING Poor Satisfactory Good Very Good Excellent
X

Arguments for scoring:

The evaluation study covers in a very precise way all the numerous requirements expressed in the terms of reference.

(2) APPROPRIATE DESIGN

Is the design of the evaluation adequate for obtaining the results needed to answer the evaluation questions?

SCORING Poor Satisfactory Good Very Good Excellent
X

Arguments for scoring:

The design of the evaluation is based on a mix of quantitative and qualitative tools which are properly described. The analyses are built upon a large number of evaluation criteria and indicators. The design regarding the surveys and interviews proved to be very adequate.

(3) RELIABLE DATA

Are data collected adequate for their intended use and have their reliability been ascertained?

SCORING Poor Satisfactory Good Very Good Excellent
X

Arguments for scoring:

The analyses were based on very precise collection of data from the reports of the Member States [based on article 15 and 17 of the Regulation], a standardised questionnaire, developed for the evaluation, about the Scheme in all 26 participating Member States [Greece is not participating] and structured qualitative personal expert interviews with Control Authorities, Single Contact Points, school headmasters and parents of participating children in selected member States.

In addition a large amount of desk research was done to obtain useful data on market information, relevant legislation, relevant bibliography such as scientific papers and project reports on the School Milk Scheme, as well as statistical and administrative data gathered in the Commission services and on milk and milk products consumption from EUROSTAT and EFSA.

The limitations encountered in terms of data availability are properly and precisely explained. These were taken into account in the formulation of findings and conclusions. Survey statements and reports of Member States regarding numbers of participating children were handled with due care. In particular the great efforts made in the evaluation study to bring together all the data on the development of the SMS's implementation in all the participating 26 countries (2004-2007) were appreciated.

(4) SOUND ANALYSIS

Are data systematically analysed to answer evaluation questions and cover other information needs in a valid manner?

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
			X		

Arguments for scoring:

The theoretical and empirical analyses are carried out in a systematic way, based on a comprehensive intervention logic and a mix of qualitative and quantitative tools including correlation analysis.

The quantitative tools included indicators such as an efficiency indicator derived from the share of participating children of all children in a country and from the spending per child and year. To the extent possible, the findings formulated based on quantitative tools were crosschecked with findings developed using qualitative tools. In some cases the statistical analysis could have been more sophisticated in order to check for causality. The inclusion of ample analysis on the role of socio-economic factors is appreciated.

The constraints encountered and the limitations of the methods and tools used are pointed out in the presentation of the analysis results and taken into account in the formulation of the conclusions.

(5) CREDIBLE FINDINGS

Do findings follow logically from and are justified by, the data/information analysis and interpretations based on pre-established criteria and rational?

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
			X		

Arguments for scoring:

The findings are well explained and justified by the results of the analyses carried out.

Important findings are mostly based on more than one method, source or approach which makes these findings more robust and reliable.

(6) VALID CONCLUSIONS

Are conclusions non-biased and fully based on findings?

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
			X		

Arguments for scoring:

The conclusions are clearly formulated and reflect in a systematic way the judgement regarding each evaluation question. If conclusions are missing because valid conclusions could not be supplied it is very well explained why e.g. in the case of the sustainable increase of consumption of milk and milk products. The conclusions reflect very well the relationship of the SMS with the School Fruit Scheme and the multidisciplinary framework of the SMS CAP measures e.g. the framework of the European Strategy on Nutrition, Overweight and Obesity related Health issues and the EU 2020 objectives.

(7) HELPFUL RECOMMENDATIONS

Are areas needing improvements identified in coherence with the conclusions? Are the suggested options realistic and impartial?

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
			X		

Arguments for scoring:

The recommendations are logically derived from the evaluation results and conclusions. The recommendations are useful for preparing the impact assessment report on the School Schemes and for reflecting on possible adaptations of the SMS after 2013, in particular on the finding of the evaluation on added value of a more strategic and targeted design with more reporting and evaluation obligations for the Member States. The recommendations could also be used in the implementation of the European Strategy on Nutrition, Overweight, Obesity related Health issues.

(8) CLARITY

Is the report well structured, balanced and written in an understandable manner?

SCORING	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
			X		

Arguments for scoring:

The report has a very clear structure. Both the clear description of the national schemes and their implementation of the measures are much appreciated. The boxes after every evaluation question provide very clear summaries of the answers to the evaluation questions. The text contains some repetitions that are to a large extent necessary to cover adequately the answers to the evaluation questions; Some formulations in English are too complicated or literally translated from German, but the overall clarity of the text is good, and the report can be well understood by the reader due to the clear structure and adequate descriptions and explanations.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT **OF THE FINAL EVALUATION REPORT**

Is the overall quality of the report adequate, in particular:

- Does the evaluation fulfil contractual conditions?

Clearly and fully.

- Are the findings and conclusions of the report reliable, and are there any specific limitations to their validity and completeness?

The findings and conclusions of the report are reliable; limitations have been clearly indicated and are mainly linked to the difficulty encountered in measuring sustainable impacts and in isolating the effects of the policy measures from other factors of influence and attributing causal relationships.

- Is the information in the report potentially useful for designing intervention, setting priorities, allocating resources or improving interventions?

The findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation can be used in the debate on the future CAP after 2013 and in particular in the impact assessment of the School Schemes. The conclusions can also be used in the implementation of the European Strategy on Nutrition, Overweight, Obesity related Health issues. Therefore, they are very useful and relevant.