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1. **Introduction**

**1.1. Introduction to the Midline Study.**

1. The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) – Mc Govern Dole (MGD) International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Programme has granted the World Food Programme (WFP) Kenya US$ 28 million to support its programme in Kenya that will run from 2016 -2020. The MGD program seeks to support education, child development and food security in low-income, food-deficit countries around the globe. Support covers provision of United States (US) produced agricultural commodities and financial assistance; as well as support to capacity development and to monitoring and reporting. Sustainability of interventions is a critical consideration for the resource provider. The grantee (WFP in this case) is expected to support the Kenya Government and engender community ownership. On its part, the USDA seeks to reduce hunger and improve literacy.
2. Since the inception of the School Meals Programme in Kenya in the 1980s, WFP works closely with National Government Ministries (Education, Agriculture, and Health), counties and other partners to provide school meals to vulnerable children in arid counties and the unplanned settlements of Nairobi. It also works to improve the management and implementation of the national school feeding programme and to strengthen the capacities of national, county and school level actors to ensure reliable and cost-efficient and-effective implementation of the intervention.
3. The current MGD programme is the last of three phases of support, and will see the school feeding programme being fully handed over to the Government of Kenya (GoK). Previous phases of USDA support included three single year awards in 2004, 2005, and 2006, and three multi-year phases awarded in 2007 (2007-2009), 2010 (2010-2012), and 2013 (2013-2016), respectively. These phases were followed by the current multi-year phase awarded in 2016 (2016-2020). The total funds awarded between 2004 and 2015 amount to approximately 93 million USD.
4. WFP school feeding has already been handed over to Government in a number of other areas of the country starting in 2009. In these areas, the GoK runs what is known as the Home Grown School Meals Programme (HGSMP). Under this modality schools receive funding from the GoK to procure food locally.
5. In the spirit of transition, the MGD 2016-2020 programme is divided into two phases. For the first period of three years (2016-2019), the program will provide daily school lunches to a total of 358,000 primary school children in targeted arid and food insecure counties of Kenya. At the end of the first three years the responsibility for the school feeding will have been handed over to the HGSMP and the government will be responsible for managing the programme and procuring food. Support from USDA will then continue for a further two years (2019-2020) in the form of WFP continuing to provide technical assistance to further strengthen institutional structures and to ensure that the capacity is in place for the management of the HGSMP in Kenya.
6. For a period of five years the programme will be implemented in eight counties namely: Baringo, Garissa, Mandera, Turkana, Wajir and West Pokot, Marsabit and Tana River. The latter two counties will not receive food but will benefit from the complimentary activities. The complementarity activities focus on: strengthening governance and multi-sectoral coordination and collaboration for the school meals programme; advocacy and dialogue to ensure adequate and regular budget allocations and to maintain political commitment to the programme; strengthening oversight and management functions; empowering communities to manage school feeding activities through training and capacity building of school managers, teachers, and parents in order to ensure a solid level of awareness about school feeding implementation principles.
7. At the school-level, the MGD School Meals Programme (SMP) includes WFP support to train education officials to monitor school feeding and train trainers among local education, health and agriculture officers, equipping them to facilitate school feeding management trainings at the sub-county level. WFP shares the responsibility for the commodity delivery with the Ministry of Education (MoE), with WFP managing the pipeline and ensuring delivery to central warehouses and the MoE transporting commodities at sub county level and to schools. The hot lunch with food from MGD funds will be served for 120 out of the 190 school days, comprising 150 grams of bulgur wheat, 40 grams of green split peas, 5 grams of vegetable oil (fortified with vitamin A and D), and 3 grams of iodized salt – to be procured separately by WFP.
8. In parallel to the SMP programme there are interventions in place that support improving critical gaps in nutrition and hygiene awareness as well as strengthening literacy and numeracy. The Tusome programme, funded by USAID, aims at increasing the pupils’ literacy rate. Within the Education sector, the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) is working with the GoK to update the current national curriculum, an essential step to improve the quality of teaching and pupils’ learning experience. WFP is supporting this process and providing inputs to the review of the national curriculum. UNICEF also aims to increase enrolment, through awareness campaigns sensitizing communities about the importance of education and increasing literacy under the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) programme. UNICEF is also active in the Water, Sanitation and Health (WaSH) sector, providing toilets and running water at school level. These activities complement the SMP.
9. The SMP seeks to contribute to improved enrollment, retention, attentiveness at school level and in this manner to contribute to improved literacy and numeracy in primary schools in the intervention areas – together with actions promoted by other partners like the USAID Funded ‘Tusome’ – Programme. The Tusome (“Let’s Read’’ in Kiswahili) Early Grade Reading Activity is a collaboration between the MOE, USAID and UKAID to improve learning outcomes in English and Kiswahili in Class 1 and 2. The TUSOME Programme was conceptualized and developed as a National Literacy Programme. It targets approximately 60,000 teachers, 22,600 schools for improvement in literacy instruction and outcomes. It is envisaged that 5.4 million class 1 and 2 pupils will be twice as likely to meet MOE benchmarks for literacy. The programme is being implemented in all public primary schools and 1000 alternative basic education institutions serving low cost urban settlements countywide.
10. A baseline – based on a quasi-experimental design - for the SMP was conducted in April/May 2017. Findings from the baseline were recorded in a comprehensive baseline report (Visser et al. 2017).
11. The benchmark values generated by the baseline provide WFP and her partners with information against project indicators at the start of the intervention and a set of values against which to verify the targets. It also provided information against a range of evaluation questions that sought to establish the situation at the start in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the SMP.
12. In terms of methodology key lessons from the baseline – which were reported to the evaluation reference group at the debriefing stage – include ensuring that:

* The same schools visited during the baseline are visited during the midline and end line.
* The changes in school meals programmes in the schools are documented and considered at both the midline and end line.
* The same sampling strategy is maintained at midline and end line.
* Other cofounding factors that might influence the outlined hypothesis are documented and reported at both midline and end line.
  1. **Objectives of the Midline Survey.**

1. The aim of this piece of work - for which the Terms of Reference (ToR) can be found in Annex 1 - is to update the baseline findings with a midline measurement which takes place one year after the baseline.
2. It is noted that the midline survey takes place at a critical juncture of the SMP programme because it coincides with the end of the provision of food inputs by MGD, and marks the formal transition to the government taking on full responsibility for this. The remaining two years of the SMP will focus on strengthening capacity and systems.
3. The midline will:

* Provide an update in terms of output and performance indicators based on the midline values for the lower level results in the logical framework.
* Assess whether the project is on track to meet the results and targets and outcomes at endline
* Identify any necessary mid-course corrections.

1. The midline will form the foundation for the planned final evaluation which will measure performance indicators for McGovern Dole’s strategic objectives as well as the indicators of highest level results that feed into the strategic objectives.
2. The mid-term evaluation will also focus on the implementation of the program with the evaluation findings targeted at adjustments or program management decisions aimed at helping improve implementation. As such, the evaluation will look at interim or anticipated results, partnerships, implementation arrangements and systems, and any factors affecting the results achieved at the mid‐point.
3. The present report provides – in the next chapters - an overview of the methodology for the midline. The midline builds on the work done for the baseline which included:an update of the desk work with relevant key documents if existing; interviews with stakeholders to capture developments in the policy and institutional context; a detailed review of available secondary data sources (e.g. Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (VAM) data, Education Management Information System (EMIS) data[[1]](#footnote-1), etc.); as well as quantitative and qualitative data collection in the field in April and May 2018. The methodology closely mirrors what was proposed for the baseline phase but with some adjustments to improve the design based on lesson learning from the baseline.
4. **Study Methodology**
   1. **Evaluation Matrix as the basis for data collection**
5. This section of the report provides an overview of the evaluation methodology. The methodology includes a quasi-experimental design which is further explained below, as well as qualitative data collection. These tools will assist the evaluation in collecting data that responds to the evaluation questions. The manner in which each of the questions will be responded is summarized in an evaluation matrix which is presented in Annex 2.
   1. **A quasi-experimental design**
6. Mirroring the baseline, a quasi-experimental design (for which the rationale was explained in the IR for the baseline) will be employed in this study to demonstrate the theory of change attributable to the intervention. In the approach, the ‘double difference’ will be measured as a more accurate measure of effect size as opposed to the single difference. This approach will measure both the difference before and after the intervention at midline in the treatment and control groups, and also the difference-in-differences between control and treatment groups.
7. The quasi experimental design as proposed in this survey is feasible in situations where it is practically impossible to randomize units to a particular group and therefore impractical to employ a pure experimental design. In a situation like the WFP/USDA-MGD midline in question - where one or more intervention groups are pre-selected (in this case WFP SMP and HGSMP) - it is feasible to identify a comparable control that is theoretically known to account for any extraneous factors. The control helps in removing the effect due to factors other than the intervention.
8. **The Research question & testable hypotheses that will underpin the quasi –experimental design will be:** Are baseline vs. mid-term, and end term primary education outcomes (literacy and numeracy levels) in the Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASAL) areas of Kenya the same in schools included in WFP/USDA-MGD School meals programme (2016 -2020) as those not included (controls and those transitioning to HGSMP)?
9. Differences between baseline, and mid-term and end term measures will be analysed for the following indicators:

* Enrolment
* Attendance rate
* Primary school completion rate
* Literacy and numeracy

1. Hence, four different hypotheses are formulated and proposed for testing at Mid-term and End term evaluation for each indicator:

**Indicator 1:**

* **H0**: Enrolment in schools included in WFP/USDA-MGD SMP ≠ Enrolment in schools not included in WFP/USDA-MGD SMP
* **H1:** Enrolment in schools included in WFP/USDA-MGD SMP= Enrolment in schools not included in WFP/USDA-MGD SMP

**Indicator 2:**

* **H0:** Attendance rate in schools included in WFP/USDA-MGD SMP≠ Attendance rate in schools not included in WFP/USDA-MGD SMP
* **H1:** Attendance rate in schools included in WFP/USDA-MGD SMP = Attendance rate in schools not included in WFP/USDA-MGD SMP

**Indicator 3:**

* **H0:** Primary school completion rate in schools included in WFP/USDA-MGD SMP ≠ Primary school completion rate in schools not included in WFP/USDA-MGD SMP
* **H1:** Primary school completion rate in schools included in WFP/USDA-MGD SMP = Primary school completion rate in schools not included in WFP/USDA-MGD SMP

**Indicator 4:**

* **H0:** Literacy/numeracy rate in schools included in WFP/USDA-MGD SMP ≠ Literacy/numeracy rate in schools not included in WFP/USDA-MGD SMP
* **H1:** Literacy/numeracy rate in schools included in WFP/USDA-MGD SMP = Literacy/numeracy rate in schools not included in WFP/USDA-MGD SMP

1. The Midline evaluation will compare baseline with midline values. The comparison will involve an intervention, control, and a HGSMP group.
   1. **Design of the study**
2. The study will adopt a quasi-experimental design, with three comparison groups namely;

* WFPSMP: Selected schools located in counties where WFPSMP under the USDA – MGD funding is currently being implemented.
* HGSMP: Selected schools located in counties where WFPSMP was being implemented but now transitioned to HGSMP.
* Control: Selected schools located in counties where neither WFPSMP nor HGSMP is to be implemented.

1. The three-arm approach involving schools targeted by WFP school feeding programmes, the HGSMP, and the controls where there is no form of school feeding programmes will allow for the measurement of the impact of the WFP school feeding programmes in targeted schools against a control. It will also allow for the measurement of sustainability of numeracy and literacy indicator estimates after the transition of the WFP run SMP to the HGSMP.
2. Since the WFPSMP was running in all schools located within the six selected ASAL counties (Baringo, Garissa, Turkana, Mandera, West Pokot, and Wajir)[[2]](#footnote-2), the control schools were selected from the neighboring counties with comparable socio-economic activities - livelihood zones - so as to ensure similarity in terms of vulnerability and food insecurity. Similarly, the HGSMP schools were selected from the neighboring counties with comparable socio-economic activities. Selected control and HGSMP schools were matched against WFPSMP schools. This process was done at baseline before intervention was commenced.
3. *Group comparison based on schools:* The process took place before data collection where propensity score matching (PSM) was used to compare and match schools using selected school characteristics derived from the EMIS tool. Selection of matching characteristics was based on theoretical background knowledge of confounders of the measurement indicator(s). Theoretical background knowledge refers to knowledge about factors that are plausible or known to confound the relationship between the outcome(s) and the intervention. They are potential or are confirmed to be independently related to the outcome(s).The matching characteristics are unrelated (unaffected) by the proposed intervention (WFPSMP or HGSMP). The propensity scores was constructed using the ‘participation equation’, derived from a logit regression[[3]](#footnote-3) with programme participation as the dependent variable coded as follows:

* WFPSMP school = 1, versus Control school = 0, and
* HGSMP school = 1, versus WFPSMP school = 0.

1. Each school belonging to a specific group was matched to one school of the comparison group by matching each to their ‘nearest neighbor’ using propensity score.
2. Control and HGSMP schools were matched against WFPSMP schools using PSM. Selected school characteristics derived from the MOE Education Management Information System (EMIS) tool assisted in facilitating matching of schools using PSM. Characteristics (covariates) that were used in matching included: boy to girl ratio; average pupils/class; pupils to teacher ratio; and residence type (rural/urban). These characteristics are generally known to influence academic performance in schools and thus were identified and/or computed to carry out the PSM.
3. Schools in the first group with a propensity score lower than the lowest observed value in the second group were discarded. Similarly, schools in the second group with a propensity score higher than the highest observed value in the first group were also discarded. The same approach was used for the control group. The remaining schools were in the ‘region of common support’ from which participating schools were selected. This process resulted in the identification of three groups of schools that were as similar as possible in terms of characteristics that influence academic performance.
4. Figure 1 and 2 demonstrate comparison of schools before and after matching.
5. Figure 1 - Selection of Control and WFPSMP schools using PSM

Distribution of schools by PSM After Matching

Distribution of schools by PSM Before Matching

1. Figure 2 - Selection of WFPSMP and HGSMP schools using PSM

Distribution of schools by PSM After Matching

Distribution of schools by PSM Before Matching

1. *Group comparison based on children*: This process will take place after midline data collection where different variables will be compared between the groups to identify those which are significantly different. A propensity score will be constructed using those variables. This score will be used to leverage and ensure comparability of pupils (between the groups), therefore eliminating selection bias (the possibility that those enrolled in a particular group are systematically different from those enrolled in another group). The variables to be used for computing the propensity score are unaffected by the intervention (WFPSMP or HGSMP). Like in school comparison, the propensity scores for children comparison will be computed using the ‘participation equation’, derived from a logit regression with programme participation as the dependent variable coded as follows;

* WFPSMP = 1, versus Control = 0.
* HGSMP = 1, versus WFPSMP = 0.

The same technique will apply at final evaluation. The computed propensity score will be used as a an adjustment factor that will leverage the comparison during analysis.

## 2.3. Survey sample size

1. The envisages realization of two results as follows:
2. Results framework #1: *MGD Strategic Objective (SO)1 Improved Literacy of School-Age Children*.
3. Results framework #2: *MGD SO2 Increased Use of Health and Dietary Practices.*
4. Since *MGD SO2* is a function of *MGD SO1,* the sample size is calculated based on *MGD SO1* that seeks to address the overall programme outcome. The midline estimate aligned to *MGD SO1* is *the proportion of* *children ages 7-13 that have attained literacy and numeracy of a Standard 2 level*. Other quantitative indicators to be estimated using children sample size include:

* Number of individuals benefiting indirectly from USDA-funded interventions – *Source parents*
* Percent of students in target schools who regularly consume a meal before the school day – *Source children*
* Percent of students in target schools who regularly consume a meal during the school day – *Source children*
* Percent of parents in target communities who can name at least three benefits of primary education (disaggregated by male and female) – *Source parents*
* Number of school-aged children receiving daily school meals (breakfast, snack, lunch) as a result of USDA assistance – *Source WFP, MOE and school records*
* Number of radio spots held – WFP
* Number of community members benefiting from radio spots– *Source parents*
* Number of posters, fliers, leaflets distributed– *Source WFP*

1. The midline evaluation is anchored on the baseline sample design. Calculation of baseline sample size was informed by UWEZO[[4]](#footnote-4) Kenya Sixths Learning Assessment Report December 2016, which outlines the learning outcome by selected counties on Class 3 who can do Class 2/Standard 2 level work. The estimated proportions in the proposed intervention areas range as follows; Wajir – 9.9%, Mandera – 10.1%, Turkana – 11.4%, Garissa – 12.9%, West Pokot – 15.4%, and Baringo – 16.6%.
2. Due to variation in estimates across selected counties and with potential variation in other measurement indicators, we proposed to use a 50% conservative estimate as the proportion of *children ages 7-13 that have attained literacy and numeracy of a Standard 2 level*- Standard 2 competencies in literacy and numeracy. The UWEZO tests are set according to the Standard 2 level curriculum, which is the level attained after two years of primary education. Thus, assuming education quality standards are maintained, one should expect pupils at Standard 3 or above to correctly answer all test questions. This is termed as a “pass” in the presentation of the results. The 50% proportion optimizes the sample size to allow for estimation of all indicators devoid of the risk of low sample size calculation. The study presumes a 20% effect size on the primary indicator.
3. The minimum sample size was calculated using *Fleiss, et al* (15)formula as follows:

n = 

1. Where;

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Performance indicators presented as percentages (P1, P2) |  |
| P1 (estimated value of indicators at baseline) | 50% |
| P2 (estimated value of indicators at final evaluation) | 70% |
| P2-P1 (estimated change over time) | 20% |
| α (Type 1 error) | 0.05 |
| β (Type 2 error) | 0.10 |
| Zα (Z score at desired statistical significance) 0.975 | 1.96 |
| Zβ (Z score at desired statistical power) 0.90 | 1.28 |
| D (design effect = 1 + *δ* (*m* – 1); where *m* is the average enrolment per school (200) and *δ* is the estimated intra-class correlation coefficient, referenced from literature (0.02)) | 5.0 |
| The sample size (n) of measurement unit - number of sampled *children ages 7-13 in Standard 3 to 8* | 620 |
| Allowing for 10% non-response, the sample size is adjusted upwards (n/ (1-L) where L is the provision of 10% non-response).  Adjusted sample size = 620/ (1-0.1) = 688.88889, rounded upwards to 689 children. |  |
| Therefore; number of sampled children per study arm (without replacement) | 689 |
| Overall sample size in both intervention and control arms | 2,067 |

1. In order to address gender mainstreaming and women’s empowerment as per WFP’s evaluation principle of gender equality, the evaluation will be conducted with a view to elucidating the effect of the intervention (WFPSMP or HGSMP) among boys and girls. To the greatest extent possible, the consultants will ensure both men and women are targeted as respondents. Therefore, the overall sample size in both interventions (WFPSMP and HGSMP) and control arms will triple to 4,134 (2067 boys (689 HGSMP, 689 WFPSMP, 689 Controls); 2,067 girls (689 HGSMP, 689 WFPSMP, and 689 Control). As each pupil questionnaire also includes questions for a corresponding parent (see Annex 3), there will be an equal number of parental responses. Care will be taken to have at least 40 percent female parents participating in the study.

## 2.4. Survey sample design

1. A two-stage sampling procedure will be employed at the WFPSMP sites as follows:

* *First stage:* will involve selection of 46 primary sampling units (PSUs) which are schools, across the five selected counties (Garissa, Turkana, Mandera, West Pokot, and Wajir).[[5]](#footnote-5) Using probability proportionate to size (PPS) method, the 46 PSUs will be distributed across the -five counties. Selection of schools within counties will be done using simple random sampling, with application of a random number generator.
* *Second stage:* will involve selection of secondary sampling units (SSUs) which are *children* *ages 7-13 years in class 3 to 8,* across the forty-six selected schools. Total number of males and females will be determined per school. Distribution of school specific sample size allocation will be done across gender and school grade using PPS, where gender specific samples across school grade will be drawn. Selection of childrenwithin gender and across school grade will be done using simple random sampling, with application of a random number generator.

1. The selection of a matching HGSMP and control for the WFPSMP schools (PSUs) will be picked from the neighbouring counties with comparable socio-economic activities – same livelihood zones. A total of twenty-three (23) schools across 9 counties (Elgeyo Marakwet, Embu, Kajiado, Kitui, Laikipia, Machakos, Makueni, Nyeri and Taita Taveta) will be selected to represent HGSMP and twenty-three schools (23) across another 8 counties (Elgeyo Marakwet, Kajiado, Kitui, Laikipia, Machakos, Makueni, Nyeri and Taita Taveta) will be selected to represent the control arm of the study. The Selection of PSUs (schools) and SSUs (*children* *ages 7-13 years in class 3 to 8*) will be done as described in the first and second stage sampling.
2. Annex 4a and 4b illustrate the sample design structure to be applied in both interventions (WFPSMP and HGSMP) and control sites.

## 2.5. Statistical analysis plan

1. Data analysis will be done using IBM SPSS version 24.0 and any other relevant data analysis software. MS-Excel will be used to generate graphical presentation of specific findings.
2. ***Univariate analysis:*** Descriptive statistics such as measures of central tendency (mean, standard deviations, median, and range) will be used for analysis of continuous variables, while frequencies and percentages for categorical variables.
3. ***Bivariate analysis:*** Pearson’s Chi-square or Fisher Exact test (depending on the mean expected count) will be used to compare the distribution of indicator variables and other observable characteristics between interventions and control groups. T-test will be used to compare mean difference between intervention and control groups. Where normality assumptions are violated, appropriate non-parametric methods will be used.
4. ***Multiple regression analysis:*** Binary logistic regression will be used to estimate the difference in *the proportion of* *children ages 7-13 that have attained literacy and numeracy for a Standard 2 level* adjusting for midline characteristics, identified to be significantly different between intervention and control groups at bivariate analysis.Threshold for statistical significance will be set at p<0.05.
5. **Estimation of programme effects:** Difference-in-differences (DID), also known as the ‘double difference’ method, will be used to compare the changes in outcome (effect size) *over time* between specific intervention (HGSMP and WFPSMP) and control group. Applying the DID method will remove the difference in the outcome between both interventions (HGSMP and WFPSMP) and control group at baseline.
6. Effect of WFPSMP: In order to identify the effects of WFPSMP at midterm and final evaluation, the difference in the measurement indicator between WFPSMP and control groups will first be calculated at baseline, midterm and final evaluation. The calculated baseline difference will then be differenced from the midterm and final evaluation differences to ascertain the accurate difference attributable to the WFPSMP at midterm and final evaluation.
7. Evaluating sustainability of SMP: In order to determine whether transitioning schools from WFPSMP to HGSMP sustains school performance, the comparison of HGSMP and WFPSMP will be done. The indicators were measured at baseline, this will be measured and compared again at midterm and final evaluation. Owing to its rigorous programme implementation, the bench mark will be WFPSMP. Propensity score matching will be used as an adjustment factor at every step of analysis.
8. An overview of the sampled locations and the needs in terms of supervisors and enumerators is provided in the table.

**Table 1 - Overview of counties, sampled locations by interventions and needs in terms of supervisors, enumerators**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **County** | **Sub county (ies)** | **Number of schools** |
| **WFP School meals Programme** | | |
| Garissa | Lagdera, Garissa and Ijara | 6 |
| Wajir | Wajir East, Wajir West, Habaswein, Wajir South | 10 |
| Turkana | Loima, Turkana East, Turkana West, Turkana Central, Turkana South, Turkana North | 11 |
| Mandera | Mandera West | 8 |
| West Pokot | Pokot North | 11 |
| **Home Grown School Meals Programme** | | |
| Elgeyo Marakwet | Marakwet East | 4 |
| Embu | Embu East | 3 |
| Kajiado | Kajiado West | 4 |
| Kitui | Tseikuru | 3 |
| Laikipia | Laikipia East | 2 |
| Machakos | Matungulu | 2 |
| Makueni | Mbooni East | 1 |
| Nyeri | Kieni East/West | 3 |
| Taita Taveta | Taveta | 1 |
| **None WFP SMP/HGSMP** | | |
| Kajiado | Kajiado West | 3 |
| Elgeyo Marakwet | Keiyo South/North | 4 |
| Kitui | Tseikuru | 3 |
| Laikipia | Laikipia East | 1 |
| Machakos | Matungulu | 4 |
| Makueni | Mbooni East | 6 |
| Nyeri | Kieni East | 1 |
| Taita Taveta | Taveta | 1 |

**Table 2 – logistics requirements**

| **Team** | **No of schools** | **Supervisor(s)** | **Enumerators** | **Vehicles** | **# of tablet required** | **Note** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Turkana | 11 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 8 |  |
| Wajir | 10 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 7 |  |
| Mandera | 8 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 5 |  |
| West Pokot | 11 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 8 |  |
| Garissa | 6 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 5 |  |
| Elgeyo Marakwet | 8 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 7 |  |
| Embu/Nyeri/Laikipia | 10 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 8 |  |
| Machakos/Kitui | 12 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 8 |  |
| Kajiado/Taita Taveta | 9 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 6 |  |
| Makueni | 7 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 5 |  |
| Qualitative Date team (Muriel and Warue) | Various | 0 | 3 | 2 |  | One vehicle to Warue and another to Muriel (for week of 11th June) |
| Study team (Moses and Ernest) | Various | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | Supervision schedule will be provided for availability of vehicles |
| **Totals** |  | **10** | **60** |  | **67** |  |

**2.6.** **Study implementation process.**

1. The figure below outlines the key stages in implementing the study. The detailed description of many of the stages are captured in the descriptions above and those that follow below.

***Figure 1 - Study Implementation stages.***

* 1. **Data collection**

1. The data collection process will be structured as shown in the figure:

***Figure 2 - Data Sources and Their use in Supporting the Evaluation Inquiry***

**Desk Research:** Reports, and use of existing data sets

Expected Products

Secondary data including data sets aligned to performance indicators

Expected Products

Primary data both quantitative and qualitative from beneficiaries at the school level

**School Level Data Collection:** Targeting parents, pupils, head teachers, teachers, in schools

Expected Products

Qualitative data on perspectives regarding the intervention, roles and responsibilities of other actors to complement the documentation review

**National and County Level Interviews**: with a small selection of implementing partners, donors, administrators, education officials and other stakeholders

* 1. **Review of secondary data**

1. The desk phase will use secondary data sets establish the midline for selected key indicators in the monitoring framework for which primary data will not be collected. In cases where WFP is already collected output data on indicators, the study team will rely on WFP for such data sets. Data in the following indicators will be sought from WFP;
   1. Number of individuals benefiting directly from USDA-funded interventions
   2. Number of individuals benefiting indirectly from USDA-funded interventions
   3. Number of daily school meals (breakfast, snack, lunch) provided to school-age children as a result of USDA assistance
   4. Number of school-aged children receiving daily school meals (breakfast, snack, lunch) as a result of USDA assistance
   5. Number of social assistance beneficiaries participating in productive safety nets as a result of USDA assistance
   6. Total quantity of commodities provided to students as a result of USDA assistance.
   7. Number of students enrolled in schools receiving USDA assistance (by gender)
   8. Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of USDA assistance
   9. Number of Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs) or similar “school” governance structures supported as a result of USDA assistance
   10. Number of target schools with increased access to improved food prep and storage equipment (kitchens, storerooms, stoves, kitchen utensils)
   11. Number of parents trained or certified as a result of USDA assistance
   12. Number of school administrators and officials in target schools trained or certified as a result of USDA assistance
   13. Number of county-level officials trained or certified as a result of USDA assistance
   14. Number of school administrators and officials in target schools who demonstrate use of new techniques or tools as a result of USDA assistance
   15. Number of county-level officials in target schools who demonstrate use of new techniques or tools as a result of USDA assistance
   16. Number of radio spots held
   17. Number of community members benefiting from radio spots
   18. Number of posters, fliers, leaflets distributed
   19. Number of educational facilities (i.e. school buildings, classrooms, and latrines) rehabilitated/constructed as a result of USDA assistance
   20. Number of energy saving jikos installed in schools as a result of USDA assistance
   21. Number schools benefitting from nutrition education and hygiene
   22. Number of children benefitting from nutrition education and hygiene
   23. Number of counties where beneficiary feedback has been has been incorporated into community training and awareness activities
   24. Number of officials trained on food quality in HGSMP supply chain
   25. Number of farmer organizations trained on food quality
   26. Number of traders trained on food quality
   27. Number of testing kits (Blue Boxes) distributed to public health officials
   28. **Qualitative Method in the Evaluation**
2. Qualitative methods will be part of the approach used to collect data for the evaluation of the programme. The qualitative approach will contribute to responding to the Key Mid-Term Evaluation Questions stipulated in the ToRs. It will be used to complement the quantitative approach, by delivering deeper insights into the information collected through the survey and getting more meaning of the observed frequencies. It will provide insights into the connection between policy and implementation, possible policy gaps, as well as the challenges that need attention, especially on important issues at mid-term; including in particular learning (especially from the schools that have already transitioned) and prospects for sustainability. This means also bringing in a better understanding of the context and environment in which the project is implemented, and constraints at various levels that need to be addressed during the next phase of the project. In other words, the qualitative methods will provide the possibility of understanding the dynamics of the project through delving into the ‘why’ and ‘how’ of the implementation.
3. It is also through the qualitative methods that the evaluation will be able to document the lessons learned, which are critically important to inform both WFP and the government, as it takes over. Lessons learned will also be a good source of information for decision making as well as planning processes that will contribute to ensuring sustainability. It is also important to note that the qualitative work will provide an additional means of triangulation, as it will be contributing to answers to Questions 1 to 5 in the Evaluation Matrix (See Annex 2)
4. The qualitative methods used will include; Document Review, Key Informant Interview (KII) and Focus Group Discussion (FGD). At the national and county levels, the KII will capture experience so far, views and perceptions, policy directions and thinking. At sub-county and school level, the KII will focus on issues of implementation. FGDs will be used to collect data mainly at school level, with parents, students, teachers.
5. Qualitative data collection will take place in all the 4 SMP counties (Garissa and Wajir, Turkana and West Pokot) and 2 HGSMP counties (Elgeyo Marakwet and Nyeri). The total number of schools will be 12; 2 schools will be selected per county, Inclusion of schools from the counties under the HGSMP programme will give a perspective of capacity and preparedness at the government, communities and school levels to manage transition and ensure sustainability. The two schools will be selected using criteria including location, e.g. a school close to an urban area or close to road system and another from geographically remote location, and also (derived from the baseline survey), quality of the school in terms of how well the SMP has been implemented.

**Table 3 - Proposed number of schools and locations for qualitative field work**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **County** | **Sub county (ies)** | **Number of schools** |
| **WFP School meals Programme** | | |
| Garissa | Lagdera, Garissa and Ijara | 2 |
| Wajir | Wajir East, Wajir West, Habaswein, Wajir South | 2 |
| Turkana | Loima, Turkana East, Turkana West, Turkana Central, Turkana South, Turkana North | 2 |
| West Pokot | Pokot North | 2 |
| Elgeyo Marakwet | Marakwet East | 2 |
| Nyeri | Kyeni West | 2 |
| Total |  | * + 1. chools |

1. There will be two teams, each comprising 2 data collectors, including the DTL. Each team will have a maximum of 6 schools for the duration of data collection. Taking into consideration the distances in the sample counties, the need to cover various groups of informants, and to allow for a maximum time in each school for in-depth data collection, it may be prudent to collect data in one school per day. One team will work in the North West, i.e. Turkana, West Pokot and Elgeyo Marakwet, while the other team works in Wajir, Garissa and Nyeri. The same teams will collect data at the county and sub-county level for the offices that correspond to the schools visited, with the Key Informants at these levels. The qualitative data collection tools can be found in Annex 5.
2. **Key Informant Interviews** – these will be carried out with:
   * **WFP Staff, Partners and other stakeholders:** KII will be carried out with including key staff of WFP, Ministry of Education and relevant line ministries, USDAand other stakeholders. When the identification of this group of respondents is completed after the desk review, appointments will be set up for these interviews. The high level national interviews will be undertaken by the TL and the DTL while those at the county and sub-county levels if will be conducted by a team of 3 qualitative data collectors, and the DTL. A total of between 15 and 20 key informant interviews will be targeted.
   * **County and Sub-County levels:** KII will be done with key officials at county and sub-county level. These will include:

County

* County Executive for Education
* Officer in-charge of Finance
* Officer in charge of SMP at county level
* One MCA– (not all counties - 6 counties)

Sub-County

* Officer in-charge of SMP
* Inspector/Education Officer

School level

* Head teacher
* PTA chair or BOM chair

1. **Focus Group Discussions:** FGDs will be mainly carried out at school/community level and will involve three groups of participants; ensuring gender balance in terms of numbers and participation in the discussions. It will also be important to have both lower and upper primary represented in the different groups. Each group should have a maximum of 10 participants, but ideally 8 people. The following will be the main participants in the FGDs:

* Teachers (male and female)
* Students (boys and girls)
* Parents (male and female)
  1. **Tools development and testing**

1. The tools that will be developed and used will be in the English Language. However, the enumerators will be selected from the regions and should have the capacity to translate each item into Kiswahili and the local language without losing the original meaning.
2. As was the case for the baseline, the team will use digital data collection developed by a statistician who is good in Open Data Kit approaches (ODK). This will mitigate errors of omission and commission as data will be submitted immediately upon collection. Real time data entry will enable the study management team to undertake quality control on the work by each enumerator and will ensure minimal time is spent on data processing. The English versions of the data collection tools will be converted into an electronic version after they have been checked and approved as instruments that will generate requisite data. To live up to the real time nature of data collection and quality assurance, the team will ensure that a Global Positioning System (GPS) picking capability is integrated into the mobile/electronic version of the data collection script. This will enable the tracking of interviewers in order to ensure that data collection is indeed carried out at the sampled sites.
3. The tools will be pre-tested with the support of the WFP field officers. Field offices are being used in the interest of time – given the short time-line for this study – but will have been adequately briefed on the importance of impartiality in this first round of testing. This first round of pre-testing will focus on developing as many closed responses as feasible for each of the responses and ensuring that the tool takes into account specificities that are particular to each region.
4. Training of the enumerators will include a trial administration of the revised survey in nearby schools. This will ensure that enumerators who are not familiar with the survey have the opportunity to test the administration of the questionnaire and will provide valuable information on the time it takes to administer the revised questionnaire.
   1. **Selection of Enumerators**
5. Enumerators will be will be drawn from the WFP established pool of enumerators. The consultant team will do the selection and WFP will support with the contracting. Care will be taken to ensure that recruitment conforms to the criteria that have been drawn up and training focused on ensuring objectivity and independence of data collection. Where possible the team will work with enumerators that participated in the baseline although it is anticipated that there will be some new recruits. For the new recruits key criteria for selection will be identical to those at baseline, namely:
   * Post-secondary education qualifications in education or social sciences will be preferable.
   * Good interpersonal skills – in particular ability to create rapport with learners and other stakeholders at the school level.
   * A track record of participation in at least 2 similar surveys with one targeting ASALS in particular.
   * Language skills in alignment with the areas where data is being collected.
   * Availability during data collection.
6. Teams of enumerators will need to be gender balanced to ensure that interviews with girl pupils can be done by female enumerators to the extent possible.
7. Each team of enumerators will be headed by a supervisor. In addition to overseeing the data collection process and quality assurance the supervisors will also provide technical guidance to the teams and do any trouble shooting on digital data gathering technology.
8. Given the critical importance of the supervisors for the overall quality of the study the evaluation team will identify and propose candidates for these positions. The following criteria will be used for the selection of the supervisors (these too are identical to the baseline phase):
   1. Completed or currently in a University (but not in an active academic session).
   2. Having had at least 3 data collection experiences both qualitative and quantitative (both Household Surveys and Focused Group Discussions)
   3. Comfortable and conversant with use of mobile devises running Android application
   4. Have had an experience with mobile data collection using Kobo collect or ODK (Must have knowledge of ODK configuration and troubleshooting)
   5. Have had an experience in facilitating focused group discussions with elderly and senior members of the society.
   6. Have had experience in team leadership and planning on behalf of the team.
   7. Keen on details and have excellent communication abilities
   8. Ability to work under pressure and maintain professional relationship with both peers, supervisors and other group members.
9. Selection of supervisors will be gender balanced.
10. The key informant interviews with WFP, partners and other stakeholders at national level will be undertaken by the Team leader and Deputy Team Leader. The qualitative interview at the county and school level will be undertaken by the Deputy Team Leader.
    1. **Training Enumerators and piloting of tools**
11. The study team proposes to work with a total of 60 enumerators and 10 supervisors (see Table 1). Enumerators and supervisors will be trained by the evaluation team over a period of 5 days, in two groups of approximately 35 participants.
12. The training for all supervisors and enumerators will take place in one central location so as to facilitate logistics. The programme will start with a joint session of the two groups (note a sufficiently large space will need to be available to accommodate the whole group) and will be organized in modular manner of which the order will vary so that groups can be trained in parallel. The different modules will focus on:
    1. Survey objectives and methodology, sample size, techniques for selecting sample learners and households, ways of administering questionnaires with learners and households
    2. Role of enumerators, team leadership and coordination.
    3. Administration of the UWEZO numeracy and literacy questions
    4. Qualitative data collection for enumerators/data collectors who work on the qualitative side of the assignment.
    5. Technology training and familiarization with the mobile platforms
13. A number of simulation sessions will be done to familiarize enumerators with the questions. Time will be spent pre-testing questionnaires and guidelines. Each enumerator will be required to complete 2 learner and 2 household questionnaires, and based on their experiences, a feedback session on technique and methods will be facilitated the following day. The questionnaires and guidelines will then be modified based on enumerators’ feedback. The final day will also be utilized in exposing the enumerators to all the other tools that are shorter, more specific than and not as complex as the ones that have to be pre-tested (parent and pupil tool).
14. The team leader, the deputy team leader and the lead statistician or his designate among others will facilitate the training. A point person from UWEZO Kenya will be requested to facilitate the handling of numeracy and literacy assessment. The study team proposes that it would be good for WFP and representation from implementing partners to attend the trainings. This will not affect that impartiality of the exercise as the evaluation team will be fully in charge of design, facilitation and leading the training.
15. **Field Protocol, Data Collection and Quality Control -** Field protocol demands that the team of enumerators observe the highest level of courtesy on making entry into the counties and particularly so the schools. Prior appointments and courtesy calls on county and sub–county education officials at their offices to brief them on the study will be in order. At the school level, requisite logistics will be organized by the supervisor prior to the day of the study including calling the head teacher and booking an appointment. The field team will liaise with the WFP field team based in the counties on any other relevant procedures to observe in dealing with the schools.
16. On the day of the school surveys, the teams will assemble in the schools first thing in the morning to go through the due diligence before the start of the actual study. The due process will include introducing each team member and their role; processing consent with the head teacher and understanding the school programme for that day so the study team can fit their activities in the school schedule in an effective manner; conducting a briefing meeting with all teachers (organized by the head teacher) to create rapport through informing them about the activity, the processes and requesting their collaboration. This will be followed by sampling/selecting the respondents and the actual data collection.
17. Selection of respondents at the school level: This will be done after the school level due diligence. The following will be the key respondents:

* The head teacher is an automatic selection
* A school committee member will also be selected automatically preferably the chairperson and a PTA representative available in the school. Study coordinators must ensure that at least half of the total number of school committee members are women
* Pupils will be selected from each class (from classes 1-8). The number of –girls and boys will be pegged on attendance on that day.
* A sample of parents per school – Equal numbers of male and female parents must be selected for each school. There will be one parent for each child.
* A cook and a store keeper will be selected automatically in the schools where they are available. Both male and female cooks must be covered.

1. On completing the survey at each school, the team will assemble and led by the supervisor thank the head teacher and the teachers. Then they will be set to move to the next school. It is anticipated that the survey will be carried out in one school in a day (10 schools in two weeks; how many schools in total will be determined by the sampling process outlined earlier).
2. **The ethics of conducting surveys in the schools:** The field teams will need to ensure that the following are adhered to:

* Seeking consent from the head teacher before the survey among the learners.
* Introducing enumerators to the class in order to create rapport through explaining the exercise to the learners and ensuring they are comfortable.
* Letting the learners participate voluntarily by replacing those unwilling to be part in the study.
* Conducting warm up sessions to create rapport and an atmosphere that ensures participation.
* Being friendly and respectful to the learners.
* Maintaining confidentiality of the information provided by the learners by not sharing information with other respondents (including with the teaching and management staff of the school).
* Interviewing male and female respondents separately as appropriate, and using male and female enumerators to match with the gender of the respondents (in particular for the learner interviews).
  1. **Data Analysis and reporting**

1. The analysis will be done on the basis of each of the indicators stipulated in the Performance Monitoring Framework (PMF). The agreed upon analysis tools and approaches will be shared with WFP prior to being utilized.
2. A report format/outline is presented in Annex 6. Any other relevant details will be annexed in the main report.
   1. **The Study Team Personnel and Organization.**

**Table 4 - Overview of team**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 5 - Team composition, specific roles, and tasks**   | Name of Individual | Role in the Study | Specific Tasks | | --- | --- | --- | | Muriel Visser | Team lead and Evaluation Specialist | 1,2, 3,6, 7, 8, 9 | | Warue Kariuki | Deputy Team Leader – qualitative research specialist | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 | | Moses Mwangi | Lead Statistician – Technical lead on Quasi Experimental Design | 1 2,3, 5, 6,8 | | Ernest Midega | ODK specialist – Senior Researcher | 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8 | | Team of Enumerators (60) | Field Survey Team | 6 | | Supervisors of enumerator teams (10) | Support data collection and supervise enumerator teams, troubleshooting in the field | 6 | | **Key** | **Role** | **Deliverables** | | 1 | Develop study design | design Draft Inception Report | | 2 | Review of Study Design | Finalized Inception Report | | 3 | Development of data collection tools and procedures | Data collection tools field usable version | | 4 | Selection and recruitment of survey team | Competent field team identified. | | 5 | Training of Survey team | Training report and field survey mission plan | | 6 | Data Collection & Quality control | Clean data | | 7 | Data Analysis | Analysis report and Structure of presentation | | 8 | Report Writing | Drafts and final report. | | 9 | Dissemination | PPT Face to Face presentation | |

* 1. **Next steps**

1. Next steps in the midline process will include:

* Finalization of the IR based on the inputs from the reference group
* Piloting of the data collection tools for the school based surveys
* Translation of selected tools (as necessary) and conversion of the data collection tools onto an electronic platform for data collection
* Training of data enumerators
* Data collection in the field
* Data analysis
* Drafting of the midline report which reflects the data analysis (qualitative and quantitative) and sharing it for review and feedback from the midline reference group
* Incorporating comments/feedback and finalizing the midline report
  1. **Work Schedule**

|  | **April** | **May** | | | | | **June** | | | | **July** | | | | **August** | | | | | **Sept** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 23- 28 | 30th - 5th | 7th - 11th | 14th - 18th | 21st - 25th | 28th - 1st | 4th-8th | 11th-15th | 18th -22nd | 25th - 30th | 2nd-6th | 9th-13th | 16th-20th | 23rd - 27th | 31st -4th | 6th - 10th | 13th - 17th | 20th - 24th | 27th - 31st | 3rd - 8th |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |
| **Inception phase** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Drafting of Inception Report (IR) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Draft IR (11th May) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Feedback Reference Groups |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Revision of IR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sharing Inception Report (25th May) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Preparatory phase** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Desk Research |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Identification of the Sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Design of data collection tools |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Converting tools to electronic version |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Selection of data enumerators |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Training of enumerators |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Piloting of data collection tools |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Main survey phase** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Data collection (quantitative) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data collection (qualitative) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (schools) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data cleaning (qualitative and quantitative) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Debriefing- initial findings |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Data Analysis and reporting** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Data and information analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Draft report (20th July) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Feedback DEQS and IC (27th July) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Feedback Reference Group (3rd August) and revised report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Final midline report (10th August) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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**Annex 1 – Agreed terms of reference**

****

**Annex 2 – Evaluation matrix**

| Sub - Questions | Indicators | Main data source (s) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| KQ 1 – Relevance: How relevant is the programme? | | |
| 1. To what extent is the programme approach and activities relevant to the Government? | * Degree of alignment of programme choices and approaches with strategies and approaches of Government | Interviews of education staff at national and county and sub-county levels  WFP staff  Documentation review |
| 1. To what extent is the activity aligned with WFP, partner UN agency and donor policies and priorities? | * Degree of alignment with strategies and normative guidance of WFP, UN agencies and donors | Interviews national level with WFP, other UN agencies, USDA  Documentation review including UNDAF planning and reporting |
| 1. Is the package of interventions coherent? | * Extent the programme has been situated within an analysis of longer-term and interconnected problems of the context * Quality of the design in light of the context, policies and priorities | Interviews national level  Documentation review |
| 1. Is the investment in the right, relevant areas? | * Degree of satisfaction of different stakeholders with the priority areas of funding and intervention of the programme | Interviews at national, county, sub-county and school levels (KII’s) |
| KQ 2 - Appropriateness: How Appropriate is the programme? | | |
| 1. Is the intervention approach chosen the best way to meet the food security/nutrition needs of beneficiaries and the capacity gaps of key institutions | * Choice of transfer modalities against analysis of the context and needs of beneficiaries * Logic of complementarity between transfer modalities and other activities | Survey  School management, sub county officials (education and maybe nutrition and agriculture)  Beneficiaries (FGD’s)  Beneficiary and household interviews |
| 1. Are protection needs met? | * Analysis of programme design against WFP and UN policies on protection and accountability of affected populations * Existence of a complaints mechanism for beneficiaries * Evidence that beneficiaries are not harmed by the intervention | *Programme documents*  *WFP and UN corporate documents*  *Survey for existence of complaints mechanism*  *School Management*  *Beneficiary interviews* |
| 1. To what extent is the intervention based on a sound gender analysis? To what extent is the design and implementation of the intervention gender-sensitive? | * Analysis of programme priorities for attention to gender and equity * Quality of gender and equity strategies compared to accepted standards (national, international and WFP) * Interviews with KI at county, sub-county and school level * *Survey population sample and participation reflects gender equality* | *Documentation review (programme documents, WFP and UN corporate documents)*  *School management*  *Survey (for the role of girls and boys and men and women in the implementation of the SMP)* |
| KQ 3 – Effectiveness: What are the results of the programme? | | |
| 1. To what extent are the outcomes or objectives of the intervention likely to be achieved? | * Comparison of outcome data (achievements) at midline with baseline values | Survey |
| 1. What are the major factors influencing progress in achievement or non-achievement of the outputs outcomes/objectives of the intervention? | Analysis of:   * Internal factors (within control of programme) e.g. processes, systems, tools, capacity etc. * External factors: the external environment, funding climate, etc. | Interviews at national, county, sub-county levels and school management (including PTA) |
| 1. To what extent does the intervention deliver results various groups of beneficiaries | Analysis of beneficiary views on the results of the programme | Survey  Interviews and FGDs |
| KQ 4: Efficiency – How efficiently was the programme implemented? | | |
| 1. Is the programme implemented in a timely way? | Analysis of:   * Timely availability of programme resources * Timeliness of delivery * Pipeline breaks | Project reporting  Survey (pipeline breaks)  School management |
| 1. Are the activities cost-efficient? Is the programme implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives? Were the project strategies efficient in terms of financial and human resource inputs as compared to outputs? | Analysis of:   * Extent to which programme management practices and tools were adequate to implement the programme * Cost-efficiency (relevant unit costs comparisons) * Value for Money | Unit cost data  Value for Money (VfM analysis) |
| 1. Does the monitoring system efficiently meet the needs and requirements of the project? | * Review quality of WFP, MGD monitoring and reporting against key objectives of the programme and standards of good practice * Assess to what extent M&E was used to adapt/modify approaches or implementation | Documentation review  (M&E system and reporting)  Interviews |
| 1. What are the management strengths, including technical and financial, of this project? | * Extent to which programme and financial management was part of design * Evidence of good technical and financial management practices | Documentation review  Interviews with MoE (national and county level) and WFP, school management interviews  Survey |
| KQ 5 – Impact: What are the impact level results of the programme so far? | | |
| 1. What are the medium-term effects? | * Comparison of outcome data (effects) with baseline | *KII and FGDs at national, county/sub county and even school levels.* |
| KQ 6 – Sustainability: To what extent are the project results sustainable? | | |
| 1. To what extent is the government taking ownership of the programme? | * Qualitative analysis of views expressed by government staff at national, county and sub-county levels | *Interviews at national, county and sub-county levels*  *WFP views* |
| 1. What is the demonstrated capacity at central and sub-national levels to manage the programme? | * Qualitative analysis of views expressed by government staff at national, county and sub-county levels | *Interviews at national, county and sub-county levels*  *WFP views*  *and FGDs at school level* |
| 1. How are local communities involved in and contributing to the implementation of the programme? | * Extent of food and non-food contribution (e.g. firewood, money) * Integration of the programme into other community strutures and programmes | *Survey*  *Sub-county and school management interviews*  *Secondary Data: Document review*  *HGSM reports and evaluation reports*  *Control group comparison* |
| 1. Is the HGSMP adequately funded? | * Evolution of funding by Government and donors * Timeliness of disbursement of cash to schools * Number of school feeding days and evolution over last years | *Government data on funding levels and flows*  *Schools management*  *Sub- county officials* |
| KQ 7 – General: What factors affected the results and what lessons can be learned from the implementation so far? | | |
| 1. What are the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the program? | * Qualitative analysis of views expressed by informants | *Interviews and focus groups at national, county, sub-county, and school levels* |
| 1. What are lessons learned from the project up to this point? | * Analysis of evidence at mid-point and of views expressed by informants | Interviews and survey  WFP  County, sub-county, school level management |
| 1. Are there any recommendations for mid-course corrections to improve the project’s relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability? | * Analysis of evidence at mid-point and of views expressed by informants, and comparison with lessons from other SF programmes | *Interviews and survey*  *County and sub-county interviews* |

**Annex 3: Data Collection Tools - Quantitative**

**Tool 1 – Individual interview: classroom teacher**

**Suggested introduction:** Hello my name is \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. I am seeking information that will facilitate the implementation of the forthcoming school meals project. The purpose of this interview is to determine what the conditions are like prior to the start of the project. This will allow the Ministry of Education, WFP and the donor to measure what changes take place during the project. I would like to ask you some questions that will help in understanding what the situation is like in the school today. Your answers will be kept confidential in that we will not be reporting who said what in any of our reports. The interview will take about XX minutes. You may refuse to participate in the interview, or you may choose at any time not to answer one or more of the questions.

***Important prior instruction to interviewee****: if the teacher teaches more than one class then ask him/her to identify one class (e.g. Std 5 Science) and then to reply to all the questions as if they were referring only to this particular group of pupils.*

*Please make sure to interview teachers separately and to obtain responses for each of the questions.*

**Basic information about the interview:**

Name/code of interviewer:

Date of interview:

Name of school:

Name of sub-county:

Name of country:

**Information about the interviewee:**

1. Gender of the teacher:

* Male
* Female

1. Grade/class taught:
2. Educational level of the teacher:

Completed primary school

Did not complete secondary school/undertaking secondary education

Completed secondary school

Did not complete certificate course/undertaking certificate course

Completed certificate course

Did not complete diploma course/undertaking diploma course

Completed diploma course

Did not complete degree course/undertaking degree course

Completed degree course

Did not complete post graduate course/undertaking post graduate course

Completed post graduate course

Others

1. Number of years of teaching experience:

**Questions**

From your assessment as a class teacher, do you feel attentiveness/inattentiveness is an issue in your class?

Yes

Somehow

No

1. What is the % (proportion) of children in class you would confidently consider to be paying attention in class in your last lesson you have just taught?

\_\_\_\_\_\_

In your observation between boys and girls, which is commonly inattentive in class?

Boys

Girls

Both

1. In your observation, on averare what percentage of students in your classes would you confidently say were inattentive in class last term (term 1 2018)?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. What are some of the factor you think could be contribution to inattentiveness in among children in your class?
   * The class work is too difficult
   * The class work is too easy
   * Pupils don’t find the material/topic interesting
   * Pupils are hungry
   * Pupils are worried about some other family issues
   * External activities that take their attention away from class
   * When the pupil is sickness
   * Pupils are tired from work or domestic chores
   * They can’t hear/see what the teacher is explaining/children with disability
   * Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
2. In your teaching experience, during which time of day is pupil attentiveness in class lowest?

* Early Morning
* Mid-Morning
* Early after noon
* Mid after noon
* Early evening
* Late evening
* There is no difference

1. What in your view are some of the factors that promote attentiveness in class?

* The children not hungry or not worried about what they will eat
* The children coming to school after having enough rest at home.
* Interesting topics for the children
* Good educational content delivery methods
* Appropriate support from the teachers
* Quiet and conducive school environment
* The children are not required to work at home/in the field
* The class size is not too big
* Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. During the last term (1st term of 2018), are you aware of students who dropped out of this school, left or joined this school from other schools

* Yes
* I am not sure
* No

The largest proportion of leaving or drop puts were boys or girls?

* Boys
* Girls
* No difference between boys and girls

1. If yes, what are the reasons why students left this school for another school or dropped out of school?

* They had problems at home
* Hunger/ No food to eat
* School fees/lack of money
* Sickness of the child
* Insecurity in the village or the area
* Distance of the school was too long
* The school performed poorly in exams
* The child was withdrawn from school by the parent
* Not applicable
* Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

1. If some students joined this school from other schools, what we were some of the reasons why they joined this school?

* This school serves school meals
* This school offers better safety
* The school performed well in the last examination more than other schools in the area
* The school is closer to the students
* The parents decided that the children to join this school
* The teachers are friendly and knows how to teach.
* This school has better facilities (buildings, etc.)
* The school offers higher grades than other schools in the vicinity
* For personal reasons (family moving etc.)
* Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

1. What proportion of pupils in your class would you confidently say attends school regularly?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Between boys and girls, which groups are more consistent with attendance of school??

* Girls
* Boys
* There is no difference
* I am not able to assess

1. Have you received any training on health and hygiene promotion??

* Yes
* No

How long ago did you receive the training?

* This year
* Within the past one year
* 1 -3 three years ago
* More than three years ago

1. Do you hold discussions with pupils on issues related to health and hygiene?

* Yes
* No

1. If yes, what did you talk about?

* Deworming
* Hand washing
* General bodily hygiene/cleanliness
* How to use the latrine properly
* How to keep the environment clean
* Importance and water treatment methods
* Causes of diarrhoea
* Other (please specify)

1. How often do you discuss hygiene with your pupils?

* Frequently – Every week
* Occasionally (less than every week but more than once a month)
* Rarely (once a month or less)
* Never

1. Do you hold discussion with your pupils on nutrition?

* Yes
* No
* sometimes

1. If yes, what did you talk about?

* Food types
* Food sources
* Nutrients and their functions
* Common signs of poor nutrition
* Common consequences of poor nutrition
* Balanced diet
* Anemia
* Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_\_

1. How often do you discuss nutrition with your pupils?

* Frequently – Every week
* Occasionally (less than every week but more than once a month)
* Rarely (once a month or less)
* Never

What in your view are the main barriers to learning/ seeking education in this community?

* Ignorance in general
* Ignorance of the importance of girl’s education
* Hunger
* Poverty
* Insecurity
* Distance to the school
* Cultural barriers
* Other (please specify)

In your view what are the promoters to seeking education in this community

* Better future for the children
* Need for certificate to get a job
* It’s a government policy
* There is nothing children are doing at home so they go to school
* It is the trend of nowadays

**Thank you for your collaboration/assistance in this interview.**

**Tool 2 – Head teacher school audit tool**

**Tool 2 – Individual interview - head teacher**

**Suggested introduction:** Hello my name is \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. I am seeking information that will facilitate the implementation of the forthcoming school meals project. The purpose of this interview is to determine what the conditions are like prior to the start of the project. This will allow the Ministry of Education, WFP and the donor to measure what changes take place during the project. I would like to ask you some questions that will help in understanding what the situation is like in the school today. Your answers will be kept confidential in that we will not be reporting who said what in any of our reports. The interview will take about XX minutes. You may refuse to participate in the interview, or you may choose at any time not to answer one or more of the questions.

***Important prior instruction to interviewee****: to be inserted as necessary ….*

**Basic information about the interview:**

Name/code of interviewer:

Date of interview:

Name of school:

Name of sub-county:

Name of country:

**Information about the interviewee:**

1. Gender of the respondent:

* Male
* Female

How many years have you been employed as a teacher?

How many years have you been a head teacher?

1. Have you been trained or learnt on the management of school meals program?

* Yes
* No

1. How long ago was the training?

* Within this year 2018
* Within the past 1 year
* Between 2 – 3 years ago
* More than 3 years ago

Who offered the training?

* The central government
* The county government
* World Food programme (WFP)
* Non-governmental organization
* Other organizations
* I taught myself
* Others

1. Are you aware of any policies and guidelines relating to school feeding programme?

* Yes
* No

If yes, which guidelines or policies are you aware of?

* SFP financial management
* Procurement of commodities guidelines
* Food rations and preparation guidelines
* Others

Has your school had school feeding programme for primary pupils in the past?

* Yes
* I am not sure /I am new in this school
* No

How long ago was the school feeding program active?

* The programme is currently active
* Last term
* Third term 2017
* Second term 2017
* First term 2017
* In 2016
* Others (2015 and beyond)

If yes, what was or is the current source of the support for the school meals programme?

* The central government
* County government
* World food program (even if implemented by partners)
* Non-Governmental organization
* Well wishers
* Parents
* Religious organizations
* Others

If the school meals programme is currently active, what is the modality of main support?

* Cash
* Commodities
* Both cash and commodities

Do you feel the current modality of SMP support is the best model for your school?

* Yes
* I am not sure
* No

Do the parents make any contribution to the school meals programme?

* Yes regurlaly
* Yes but not regularly
* No

Of the total budget requirement of the school meals program, what proportion if contributed to by the parents (whether in cash/in kind/or by work force)

What contribution do the parents make?

* Money
* Labor
* Commodities (Maize, beans, etc)
* Firewood and water
* Utensils
* Others

Does your school benefit from the books funds provided by the government?

* Yes
* No

Are the books currently available in school sufficient for the pupils?

* 100% sufficient
* 75% sufficient
* 50% sufficient
* 25% sufficient
* Not sufficient

Are there any activities carried out by any organization or entity in your school that complements primary school feeding programme?

* Yes
* No

What are the activities are implemented?

* Water support
* School garden
* Health and hygiene promotion
* Nutritional promotion
* Others

During the start of the year (2018) are there pupils who were supposed to be in school but dropped out?

* Yes
* No

Approximately what proportion of pupil’s population dropped out of this school?

Were the pupils who dropped out predominantly boys or girls?

* Boys
* Girls
* Both

If yes, what are the reasons why students left this school for another school or dropped out of school?

* They had problems at home
* Hunger/ No food to eat
* School fees/lack of money
* Sickness of the child
* The pupil was pregnant
* Insecurity in the village or the area
* Distance of the school was too long
* The school performed poorly in exams
* The child was withdrawn from school by the parent
* Not applicable
* Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

At the beginning of this school year, did you receive new students to your school?

* Yes
* No

Approximately what proportion of the student’s population are new admissions for this school year?

If some students joined this school from other schools, what we were some of the reasons why they joined this school?

* This school serves school meals
* There were attending nursery in this school
* This school offers better safety
* The school performed well in the last examination more than other schools in the area
* The school is closer to the students
* The parents decided that the children to join this school
* The teachers are friendly and knows how to teach.
* This school has better facilities (buildings, etc.)
* The school offers higher grades than other schools in the vicinity
* For personal reasons (family moving etc.)
* Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

Is this school’s PTA involved in any way in the school meals programme (if the school meals is currently active)?

* Yes
* Somehow
* No

How would you rate their level of involvement in the school meals programme (very high being 5 and very low being 1)?

* Very high
* High
* Medium
* Low
* Very low

What activities are the PTA members mainly involved in?

* Mobilizing contributions from parents
* Preparation so schedules of school feeding programme (including cooking)
* Receiving /procuring of commodities
* Management of SFP funds
* Others

Is this school’s board of management involved in the management of the school meals programme?

* Yes
* Somehow
* No

How would you rate their level of involvement in the school meals programme (very high being 5 and very low being 1)?

* Very high
* High
* Medium
* Low
* Very low

What are the major activities the schools board of management are involved in?

* Receiving of cash or commodities from the supporting organization
* Mobilization of resources including from the government
* Procurement of commodities
* Financial management of the school meals programme
* Audit of the school meals programme
* Structural improvement for the school meals programme
* Others

Complaints management

Does this school have in place a mechanism in which any parent or child not happy with how the school meals programme is handled can raise their concerns or complaints?

* Yes
* No

If yes, what is the channel?

* Suggestion box
* School complaints committees
* Telephone line
* Walk in to the office/dedicated school staff
* Dedicated PTA/BOM member
* Children’s parliament
* Sub county education office
* Others

School population

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Males | | Females | | Totals | Number of streams | |  |
| Class 1 |  | |  | |  |  | |  |
| Class 2 |  | |  | |  |  | |  |
| Class 3 |  | |  | |  |  | |  |
| Class 4 |  | |  | |  |  | |  |
| Class 5 |  | |  | |  |  | |  |
| Class 6 |  | |  | |  |  | |  |
| Class 7 |  | |  | |  |  | |  |
| Class 8 |  | |  | |  |  | |  |
| Number of teachers | | | | | | | |  |
|  | | PTA teacher | | Tsc teacher | | | volunteers |  |
| Males | |  | |  | | |  |  |
| Female | |  | |  | | |  |  |
| Average termly Teacher attendance rates | | | | | | | |  |
| Average termly Pupil attendance rates | | | | | | | |  |
| Approximate proportion of pupils starting school who complete the last grade of primary school? | | | | | | | |  |
| How new pupils were enrolled in this school at the start of this year? | | | | | | | |  |
| **Storage facility** | | | | | | | |  |
| Does the school have a dedicated storage facility for the school meals programme?   1. Yes 2. No | | | | | | | |  |
| Is this a separate room/store, or is one of the classrooms being used for storage for all items?   1. Separate room 2. Classroom converted to storage 3. Another building converted to a store | | | | | | | |  |
| If yes, what is the condition of the storage facility?   1. In a good condition 2. Needs slight repair 3. Needs major repairs 4. There is need for a new as it cannot be repaired | | | | | | | |  |
| What is the roof made of?   * Grass * Iron sheets * Asbestos * Tiles * Others | | | | | | | |  |
| What are the walls of the store made of   * Mud * Bricks * Stones * Blocks * Iron sheet * Wood/timber * Others | | | | | | | |  |
| What is the floor of the store made of   * Cement * Stones * Mud * Timber * Tiles * Others | | | | | | | |  |
| Is the storage room lockable?   1. Yes 2. No | | | | | | | |  |
| How is the ventilation of the store?   * Well ventilated * Averagely ventilated * Poorly ventilated * Not ventilated at all | | | | | | | |  |
| Is the storage room free of humidity/water?   1. Yes 2. No | | | | | | | |  |
| Does the storage room have pallets for stacking the stored items?   1. Yes –enough for commodities in store 2. Yes but not enough for commodities in store 3. No | | | | | | | |  |
| Does the storage facility have a weighing scale?   1. Yes 2. No | | | | | | | |  |
| 1. **Kitchen** | | | | | | | |  |
| Does the school have a kitchen for pupil’s school meals program?   * Yes –Dedicated to pupil’s meals only * Yes – Used for all cooking’s in the school * No | | | | | | | |  |
| If yes, what is the condition of the kitchen?   * In a good condition * Needs slight repair * Needs Major repairs * There is need for a new as it cannot be repaired | | | | | | | |  |
| Does the kitchen have fuel efficient stoves?   * Yes – enough quantity * Yes – but the quantity is not enough * No | | | | | | | |  |
| Which fuel does the school use to cook the pupils school meals?   * Wood * Charcoal * Cow dung * electricity * Others (please specify) | | | | | | | |  |
| What is the main source of water used for cooking in the school?   * Water tank/tap in the school * Children carry water from home * A water source around the school (well, spring, dam) * Water tracking to the school * Public tap within the community * Others | | | | | | | |  |
| Does the kitchen have sufficient utensils and pans to prepare meals for the pupils in the school?   * Yes – sufficient * Yes but not sufficient * No – The utensils and pans are brought by parents/pupils | | | | | | | |  |
| **Latrines** | | | | | | | |  |
| Does the school have latrines/toilets for pupils?   * Yes enough * Yes but not enough * No | | | | | | | |  |
| Do girls have separate toilets from boys?   * Yes * No | | | | | | | |  |
| How many latrines/toilets are available for use by:   1. Female pupils \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Male pupils \_\_\_\_\_ | | | | | | | |  |
| Is there a dedicated hand washing station for children to wash their hands after using the latrines?   * Yes –functional * Yes – But not functional * No | | | | | | | |  |
| **School garden** | | | | | | | |  |
| Does the school have a school garden?   * Yes * No | | | | | | | |  |
| How many acres is the school garden area? | | | | | | | |  |
| * What are the food items that were harvested from the school garden last harvest season? * Maize * Beans * Sorghum * Fruits * Potatoes * Onions and tomatoes * Others | | | | | | | |  |
| What is the main use of the food produced in the school garden?   * The food is sold * The food is used for school feeding * The food is used for teachers * Other use (please specify) | | | | | | | |  |
| **Other observations** | | | | | | | |  |
| **Instructions for interviewee: please interview one cook per kitchen. If there is a female cook then please make sure you interview the female cook.** | | | | | | | |  |
| Sex of respondent:   1. Male 2. Female | | | | | | | |  |
| For how long have you been a cook? | | | | | | | |  |
| Have you been trained in safe food preparation?   1. Yes 2. No | | | | | | | |  |
| If yes how long ago year?   1. Less than 1 month ago 2. Less than 3 months ago 3. Less than 6 months ago 4. Less than one year ago 5. More than one year ago | | | | | | | |  |
| Have you been trained in food storage and handling?   1. Yes 2. No | | | | | | | |  |
| If so in what year?   1. Less than 1 month ago 2. Less than 3 months ago 3. Less than 6 months ago 4. Less than one year ago 5. More than one year ago | | | | | | | |  |
| Do you have a valid health certificate?   1. Yes 2. No | | | | | | | |  |
| If not what is the reason?   1. Cannot afford the fee 2. Did not have time to go to the health sector 3. Do not know how to get one 4. Do not think I need one 5. No-one told me to get one 6. Other (specify) | | | | | | | |  |
| To your knowledge, do children always wash their hands before the meals?   1. Yes all 2. Yes most 3. Yes a few 4. No | | | | | | | |  |
| Do you have a uniform or apron to use in the kitchen?   1. Yes 2. No | | | | | | | |  |
| At what times do you clean the kitchen? (multiple options possible)   1. Every morning before food preparation 2. After food preparation 3. At the end of the week 4. Whenever there is water 5. Other (please specify) | | | | | | | |  |
| Do you wash your hands in the process of food preparations?  Yes  No  Sometimes | | | | | | | |  |
| At what points in the food preparation process do you wash your hands?   1. Before handling food 2. During food preparation whenever necessary 3. After using the latrine 4. After finishing food preparation 5. Before serving food 6. After serving food 7. Whenever I have water 8. Never 9. Other (please specify) | | | | | | | |  |
| Do you ensure that the food commodities are clean before cooking?  Yes  No  Sometimes | | | | | | | |  |
| How do you ensure the food is clean before cooking?   1. If the food looks clean I will cook it 2. Rinse in water and cook 3. Remove foreign matters and cook 4. Use clean containers to collect food from store, remove foreign matters and then wash with clean water thoroughly before cooking 5. Others | | | | | | | |  |
| Do you verify that the food is of quality before or in good condition before cooking?  Yes  No  Sometimes | | | | | | | |  |
| How do you verify that food is in good condition/quality for cooking?   1. Look at expiry date 2. Smell the food 3. Color of food 4. Check if there are signs of infestation by pests 5. Other (please specify) | | | | | | | |  |
| Do you keep food for some period before serving to the pupils?  Yes  No  Sometimes | | | | | | | |  |
| How do you store food prior to serving it?   1. Store cooked food in covered cooking pots in a clean, safe place before serving the pupils 2. Store cooked food in open containers 3. Store cooked food outside the kitchen without covers 4. Other (please specify) | | | | | | | |  |

**Tool 1 - Parent/child questionnaire**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Suggested introduction:** Hello my name is \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. I am seeking information that will facilitate the implementation of the forthcoming school meals project. The purpose of this interview is to determine what the conditions are like prior to the start of the school meals project. I would like to ask you some questions that will help in understanding what the situation is like in the school today and what challenges families face in supporting their children’s education. Your answers will be kept confidential; we will not be reporting who said what in any of our reports. The interview will take about XX minutes. If you don’t want to you participate you may refuse or you may choose at any time not to answer one or more of the questions. | |
| **Basic information about the interview:** | |
| Name/code of interviewer: |  |
| Study arm   1. Intervention 2. HGSMP 3. Control |  |
| Name of county: |  |
| Name of sub-county: |  |
| Name of school: |  |
| Date of interview: |  |
| **Information about the interviewee:** |  |
| What is the gender of the respondent?   1. Male 2. Female |  |
| What is your relationship to the child?  Parent  Guardian  Brother/sister  Aunt/Uncle  Grand parent  Neighbor  Others |  |
| How old are you? |  |
| What is your main occupation?   1. Too old to work 2. Student 3. Farmer 4. Pastoralist 5. Salaried Employee 6. Casual Laborer 7. Business person 8. Currently not doing any work 9. Fisherman 10. Other |  |
| What is the highest educational level you have achieved?   1. Never attended formal school school/attended Madrassa 2. Did not complete primary school 3. Completed primary school 4. Did not complete secondary school 5. Completed secondary school 6. Did not complete technical college/undertaking certificate/diploma 7. Completed technical college (certificate/diploma) 8. Did not complete or undertaking university degree 9. Completed university (degree) 10. Did not complete or undertaking graduate course (Master/PhD) 11. Completed graduate school (master/PhD) |  |
| How many male and female children (18 years and below) currently live in your household?   1. Males 2. Females |  |
| Of the children 18 years and below who currently live in your household, how many are currently in school?   1. Males 2. Females |  |
| If some of your children who are school going age are not going to school, what is the reason why?   1. Parents/family don’t think they should go to school 2. There is no money to send them to school 3. They are working 4. They are taking care of sick family members 5. They are sick 6. They failed school last year and did not return 7. They are helping with household tasks 8. Others |  |
| **Questions** |  |
| In the past 5 school days how many days did your child (the one who is present at the interview) eat BEFORE going to school? (enter number of days) |  |
| In the past 5 days, how many days did you child (the one who is present at the interview) take lunch during the school day? |  |
| Did your child have a meal/take breakfast today before going to school?   1. Yes 2. No |  |
| Did your child have lunch/or is going to have lunch to day?  Yes  Not sure  No |  |
| Food consumptions score:  In the past 7 days, Could you please tell me how many days your household has eat any of the following foods: | # of days |
| *Main staples (Maize , maize porridge, rice, sorghum, millet pasta, bread and other cereals, Cassava, potatoes and sweet potatoes, other tubers, plantains)* |  |
| *Pulses (Beans. Peas, groundnuts and cashew nut)* |  |
| *Vegetables (Vegetables, leaves)* |  |
| *Fruits (any fruit)* |  |
| *Meat (Beef, goat, poultry, pork,)* |  |
| *Fish (any type)* |  |
| *Eggs* |  |
| *Milk (Milk yogurt and other diary)* |  |
| *Sugar (Sugar and sugar products, honey)* |  |
| *Oil (Oils, fats and butter)* |  |
| *Condiments (spices, tea, coffee, salt, fish power, small amounts of milk for tea)* |  |
| Has your child been receiving school meals at school in the current school year (2018)?   * Yes - regularly * Yes - not regularly * I am not sure * No |  |
| Is the school currently (this week) serving food?   * Yes * No * I am not sure |  |
| Do you feel the method through which support is given for school meals programme (either homegrown/government support or WFP school meals programme) is the best way the school meals program could be given?   * Yes * I am not sure * No |  |
| If yes, why,   * The food does not come late * There is no a lot of requirements from the parents * The food is purchased from the local community and thus is beneficial to us * There is minimal cost involved in transporting the food * The food commodities received/purchased are of high quality * The parents are actively engaged in the SMP and they own it * Other reasons |  |
| In not why?   * There is delays in delivery of food or cash * It is very involving for the parents * There commodities supplies is not enough * There are a lot of other costs involved * There is no ownership for the parents * There is a lot of responsibilities to the parents * Other reasons |  |
| If you are not happy or you have a suggestion about the school meals program, is there any means/channel through which you can raise your concerns on air your opinions?   * Yes * I am not sure * No |  |
| What are the channels?   * Through the teachers * Through suggestion box * Through a representative in the PTA * Through the sub county education office * Through calling * Though politician * Through WFP staff * Others |  |
| Do you make any contribution in any form to the school meals programme?   * Yes - regularly * Yes - sometime * No |  |
| What do you contribute   * Utensils * Labor (cooking/offloading food items) * Money * Firewood/cooking fuel * Water * Food commodities * Others |  |
| If you contribute money to the school meals programme, how much do you pay per child per month? (Kshs) |  |
| *Reduced Coping strategies*  Behaviors:  In the past 7 days, if there have been times when you did not have enough food or money to buy food, how many days has your household had to: | # of days: |
| *a. Rely on less preferred and less expensive foods?* |  |
| *b. Borrow food, or rely on help from a friend or relative?* |  |
| *h. Limit portion size at mealtimes?* |  |
| *i. Restrict consumption by adults in order for small children to eat?* |  |
| *k. Reduce number of meals eaten in a day?* |  |
| In the last term of this year (term 1 of 2018) apart from the known public holidays, Did this child (one present for interview) miss a complete day of school?   * Yes * I am not sure * No |  |
| If Yes, approximately how many days was the child absent from school? |  |
| Why did the child miss school?   * Insecurity * Environmental challenges including flooding * No food/the child was hungry * The child had to support in other household chores * Because the school was not serving food * The child was sick * The parent traveled so the child had to stay home to look after the animals and other children * The child attended other social/family functions * I just decided he/she don’t go to school * Other reasons | |
| Do you think education is beneficial to your children including the one in the interview?   * Yes * Sometimes * No | |
| Between boys and girls, which group do you think education is most important to?   * Boys * Girls * Both | |
| What in your view are the most important benefits of education? (multiple select)   * Improves literacy * Develops social skills * Increases ability to learn new skills (adoption of technology) * Girls remain more in school and early marriages are delayed * Improves cohesion in the community * The children are able to get jobs * It helps children to be better people in the community * Helps break the cycle of poverty * Increases the chances of the pupils' future economic self-reliance * Through girls' education, improves the general wellbeing of households (nutrition, health etc) * Other (please specify |  |
| Where did you get this information on the benefits of education?   * I am learned so I know * From spouse and other family members * From the schools * From the radio * From Television * From the local leaders * From friends and other community members * From politicians * From the government and other government agencies * From UN agencies * From other NGO’s * From the church * From print media including fliers, posters, billboards * From online platforms * From other channels |  |
| Have you received any information on health, good hygiene and nutritional practices?   * Yes * No |  |
| If yes, how long ago did you receive such information?   * Less than a month ago * Between 1-3 months ago * Between 3- 6 months ago * Between 6-9 months ago * Between 9 months and 1 year ago * More than 1 year ago |  |
| If yes, from what source did you receive the message?   * I am learned so I know * From spouse and other family members * From the schools * From the radio * From Television * From the local leaders * From friends and other community members * From politicians * From the government and other government agencies * From UN agencies * From other NGO’s * From the church * From print media including fliers, posters, billboards * From online platforms * From other channels * Others |  |
| **Thank you for your collaboration/assistance in this interview.** | |
| **Student section** | |
| **Suggested introduction:** Hello my name is \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. I am seeking information that will facilitate the implementation of the forthcoming school meals project. The purpose of this interview is to determine what the conditions are like prior to the start of the project. I would like to ask you some questions that will help in understanding what the situation is like in the school today and what your family life is like. Your answers will be kept confidential in that we will not be reporting who said what in any of our reports. The interview will take about XX minutes. If you don’t want to you participate you may refuse or you may choose at any time not to answer one or more of the questions. | |
| ***Important prior instruction to interviewee****: Please conduct each interview separately and try to ensure that the interview is done in a quiet place where the pupil can feel comfortable and where you are not interrupted or observed by other students.*  *NOTE: Girls be interviewed by lady enumerators/ boys by male enumerators.* | |
| **Basic information about interviewee:** |  |
| What is the gender of the child?   1. Male 2. Female |  |
| What is your age: |  |
| What grade/class are you in this year: |  |
| Have you repeated any classes during your learning years?   * Yes * No |  |
| If years how many years have you repeated? |  |
| Most school days, by what means do you go to school?   * On foot * By bicycle * By car * By bus/school bus * By motorbike * Other (please specify) |  |
| How many minutes does it take you to go to school? |  |
| Did you have a meal/breakfast today BEFORE coming to school?   1. Yes 2. No |  |
| Have you eaten lunch or will you be eating lunch today?  Yes  Not sure  No |  |
| How many times do you normally eat per day?   * 1 time * 2 times * 3 times * More than three times |  |
| Do you have brothers and sisters who need to be in school but are currently out of school?   * Yes * I am not aware * No |  |
| If you have brothers and sisters at home, why are they not going to school? (multiple response)   * Parents/family don’t think they should go to school * There is no money to send them to school * They are working * They are taking care of sick family members * They are sick * They failed school last year and did not return * They are helping with household tasks * Other (please specify)\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |  |
| In the past month or past school term, did any of your teachers talk to you and your class mates about hygiene?   * Yes * I cannot remember/not sure * No |  |
| In the past month or the past school term, did your teacher talk to you and your class mates about nutrition?   * Yes * I cannot remember/not sure * No |  |
| Do you know any important hygiene and sanitation habits?   * Yes * No |  |
| What are some of the important hygiene and sanitation habits that you know? (multiple response)   * Regular deworming and its importance * Hand washing, importance of handwashing and how to wash hands * Importance of general bodily hygiene/cleanliness * Importance of using toilets and how to use toiles. * Importance of environmental cleanliness * Ways of treating water and importance of drinking clean water * Causes of diarrhea * Other (please specify) |  |
| Do you know any good nutrition habits or practices?  Yes  No |  |
| What are some of the nutrition habits or practices that you know about? (multiple response)   1. Different food types and their importance to the body 2. Sources of different nutrient for the body 3. Common signs of poor nutrition 4. Common consequences of poor nutrition 5. Dietary needs of individuals 6. Balanced diet and the importance of the same 7. Signs of anemia and how it can be treated 8. Other (please specify) |  |
| Do you think it is important to go to school?   1. Yes 2. I am not sure 3. No |  |
| Between girl’s boys, who do you think going to school is important to?  Girls  Boys  Both |  |
| Why do you think it is important to go to school? (multiple response)   1. Improves literacy 2. Develops social skills 3. Increases ability to learn new skills (adoption of technology) 4. Girls remain more in school and early marriages are delayed 5. Improves cohesion in the community 6. Helps break the cycle of poverty 7. Increases the chances of the pupils' future economic self-reliance 8. Through girls' education, improves the general wellbeing of households (nutrition, health etc.) 9. Other (please specify) |  |
| If no, why do you feel it is not important to go to school?   * It waste time * It gives teachers an opportunity to harm the children * Those who have gone to school have no difference in their life * Those who have not gone to school are doing better in life than those who have gone to school * It is not enjoyable * Children do not get food in school * Because parents say it is not important * Because if fail in school * others |  |
| During last term of this year (term 1 of 2018), did you miss full day of school?   1. Yes 2. No |  |
| How many days in the last term did you miss school? |  |
| Why did you miss school?   1. I was sick 2. Someone else in the house was sick 3. I had to work 4. My parents did not want me to go 5. The teacher was not there 6. It was dangerous to come to school/security issues 7. I did not have any transportation 8. Other (please specify) |  |
| Do you find it easy to concentrate in class?  Yes - always  Yes - sometime  No |  |
| Whenever you don’t concentrate in class, what is it that is bothering you? (Multiples select)   1. The work is too difficult 2. The work is too easy 3. I don’t find the material/topic interesting 4. I am worried about some other things like how to get money 5. I am hungry 6. When I am feeling sick 7. I am tired from work or domestic chores 8. I can’t hear/see what the teacher is explaining 9. When some other children are making noise 10. When the environment around the school is not peaceful 11. When there is insecurity in my village 12. Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |  |
| *Learners assessment (to be carried out using the UWEZO learner’s assessment booklet and administered to pupils between 6 – 16 years)* |  |
| What is the English literacy level if the child? (Please choose the highest level)   1. Nothing 2. Letter 3. Word 4. Paragraph 5. Story |  |
| What is the comprehension level of child in English Q1 (administer only if the child can read story)?   1. Can do 2. Cannot do |  |
| What is the comprehension level of child in English Q2 (administer only if the child can read story)?   1. Can do 2. Cannot do |  |
| What is the Kiswahili literacy level if the child? (Please choose the highest level)   1. Nothing 2. Letter 3. Word 4. Paragraph 5. Story |  |
| What is the comprehension level of child in Kiswahili Q1 (administer only if the child can read story)?   1. Can do 2. Cannot do |  |
| What is the comprehension level of child in Kiswahili Q2 (administer only if the child can read story)?   1. Can do 2. Cannot do |  |
| Please record the child numeracy level (tick the highest level)   1. Nothing 2. Counting and matching 3. Numerical rec. between 10-99 4. Which one is greater 5. Addition 6. Subtraction 7. Multiplication 8. Division |  |
| Can the child do the bonus question 1   1. Yes 2. No |  |
| Can the child do the bonus question 1   1. Yes 2. No |  |
| Can the child do the bonus question 1   1. Yes 2. No |  |
| **Thank you for your collaboration/assistance in this interview** |  |

**Annex 4a: Sample Design Structure (WFPSMP sites)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total number of school (N=??)** | | | | | | Target Population |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Baringo (N=??) | Garissa (N=??) | Turkana (N=??) | Mandera (N=??) | West Pokot (N=??) | Wajir (N=??) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total number of sampled schools (n=30)** | | | | | | PSUs |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Baringo (n=??) | Garissa (n=??) | Turkana (n=??) | Mandera (n=??) | West Pokot (n=??) | Wajir (n=??) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total number of sampled children per school (n=??: M=??; F=??)** | | | | | | SSUs |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Baringo (n=??: M=??; F=??) | Garissa (n=??: M=??; F=??) | Turkana (n=??: M=??; F=??) | Mandera (n=??: M=??; F=??) | West Pokot (n=??: M=??; F=??) | Wajir (n=??: M=??; F=??) |
| School1 (n=??: M=??; F=??) | School1 (n=??: M=??; F=??) | School1 (n=??: M=??; F=??) | School1 (n=??: M=??; F=??) | School1 (n=??: M=??; F=??) | School1 (n=??: M=??; F=??) |
| School2 (n=??: M=??; F=??) | School2 (n=??: M=??; F=??) | School2 (n=??: M=??; F=??) | School2 (n=??: M=??; F=??) | School2 (n=??: M=??; F=??) | School2 (n=??: M=??; F=??) |
| ……. | ……. | ……. | ……. | ……. | ……. |

**Annex 4b: Detailed Sample Design Structure for SSUs (WFPSMP sites)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **County** | **School** | **Gender** | **Class** | **County** | **School** | **Gender** | **Class** |
| Baringo (n=??) | School1 (n=??) | Male (n=??) | Class3 (n=??) | Mandera (n=??) | School1 (n=??) | Male (n=??) | Class3 (n=??) |
| Class4 (n=??) | Class4 (n=??) |
| Class5 (n=??) | Class5 (n=??) |
| Class6 (n=??) | Class6 (n=??) |
| Class7 (n=??) | Class7 (n=??) |
| Class8 (n=??) | Class8 (n=??) |
| Female (n=??) | Class3 (n=??) | Female (n=??) | Class3 (n=??) |
| Class4 (n=??) | Class4 (n=??) |
| Class5 (n=??) | Class5 (n=??) |
| Class6 (n=??) | Class6 (n=??) |
| Class7 (n=??) | Class7 (n=??) |
| Class8 (n=??) | Class8 (n=??) |
| School2 (n=??) | Male (n=??) | Class3 (n=??) | School2 (n=??) | Male (n=??) | Class3 (n=??) |
| Class4 (n=??) | Class4 (n=??) |
| Class5 (n=??) | Class5 (n=??) |
| Class6 (n=??) | Class6 (n=??) |
| Class7 (n=??) | Class7 (n=??) |
| Class8 (n=??) | Class8 (n=??) |
| Female (n=??) | Class3 (n=??) | Female (n=??) | Class3 (n=??) |
| Class4 (n=??) | Class4 (n=??) |
| Class5 (n=??) | Class5 (n=??) |
| Class6 (n=??) | Class6 (n=??) |
| Class7 (n=??) | Class7 (n=??) |
| Class8 (n=??) | Class8 (n=??) |
| ……….. | ……….. | ……….. | ……….. | ……….. | ……….. |
| Garissa (n=??) | School1 (n=??) | Male (n=??) | Class3 (n=??) | West Pokot (n=??) | School1 (n=??) | Male | Class3 (n=??) |
| Class4 (n=??) | Class4 (n=??) |
| Class5 (n=??) | Class5 (n=??) |
| Class6 (n=??) | Class6 (n=??) |
| Class7 (n=??) | Class7 (n=??) |
| Class8 (n=??) | Class8 (n=??) |
| Female (n=??) | Class3 (n=??) | Female | Class3 (n=??) |
| Class4 (n=??) | Class4 (n=??) |
| Class5 (n=??) | Class5 (n=??) |
| Class6 (n=??) | Class6 (n=??) |
| Class7 (n=??) | Class7 (n=??) |
| Class8 (n=??) | Class8 (n=??) |
| School2 (n=??) | Male (n=??) | Class3 (n=??) | School2 (n=??) | Male | Class3 (n=??) |
| Class4 (n=??) | Class4 (n=??) |
| Class5 (n=??) | Class5 (n=??) |
| Class6 (n=??) | Class6 (n=??) |
| Class7 (n=??) | Class7 (n=??) |
| Class8 (n=??) | Class8 (n=??) |
| Female (n=??) | Class3 (n=??) | Female | Class3 (n=??) |
| Class4 (n=??) | Class4 (n=??) |
| Class5 (n=??) | Class5 (n=??) |
| Class6 (n=??) | Class6 (n=??) |
| Class7 (n=??) | Class7 (n=??) |
| Class8 (n=??) | Class8 (n=??) |
| ……….. | ……….. | ……….. | ……….. | ……….. | ……….. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **County** | **School** | **Gender** | **Class** | **County** | **School** | **Gender** | **Class** |
| Turkana (n=??) | School1 (n=??) | Male (n=??) | Class3 (n=??) | Wajir (n=??) | School1 (n=??) | Male (n=??) | Class3 (n=??) |
| Class4 (n=??) | Class4 (n=??) |
| Class5 (n=??) | Class5 (n=??) |
| Class6 (n=??) | Class6 (n=??) |
| Class7 (n=??) | Class7 (n=??) |
| Class8 (n=??) | Class8 (n=??) |
| Female (n=??) | Class3 (n=??) | Female (n=??) | Class3 (n=??) |
| Class4 (n=??) | Class4 (n=??) |
| Class5 (n=??) | Class5 (n=??) |
| Class6 (n=??) | Class6 (n=??) |
| Class7 (n=??) | Class7 (n=??) |
| Class8 (n=??) | Class8 (n=??) |
| School2 (n=??) | Male (n=??) | Class3 (n=??) | School2 (n=??) | Male (n=??) | Class3 (n=??) |
| Class4 (n=??) | Class4 (n=??) |
| Class5 (n=??) | Class5 (n=??) |
| Class6 (n=??) | Class6 (n=??) |
| Class7 (n=??) | Class7 (n=??) |
| Class8 (n=??) | Class8 (n=??) |
| Female (n=??) | Class3 (n=??) | Female (n=??) | Class3 (n=??) |
| Class4 (n=??) | Class4 (n=??) |
| Class5 (n=??) | Class5 (n=??) |
| Class6 (n=??) | Class6 (n=??) |
| Class7 (n=??) | Class7 (n=??) |
| Class8 (n=??) | Class8 (n=??) |
| ……….. | ……….. | ……….. | ……….. | ……….. | ……….. |
| Total (n=??) |  | Male (n=??) | Class3 (n=??) |  | | | | |
| Class4 (n=??) |
| Class5 (n=??) |
| Class6 (n=??) |
| Class7 (n=??) |
| Class8 (n=??) |
| Total (n=??) |
| Female (n=??) | Class3 (n=??) |
| Class4 (n=??) |
| Class5 (n=??) |
| Class6 (n=??) |
| Class7 (n=??) |
| Class8 (n=??) |
| Total (n=??) |

**Annex 5: Data Collection Tools – Qualitative**

**Interview Guide WFP Personnel**

**Introduction**

* Introduction of team member(s) present
* Explain purpose of evaluation

Appropriateness

1. To what extent has the design of MGD SMP been coherent with national policy, with the interventions of government, with the work of other development partners, and with the needs of the population?

2. To what extent has the programme design reflected a strong focus on gender and equity? How was this done?

Results and factors affecting results

3. How successful has the programme been in achieving its planned outputs?

4. To what extent have planned outcomes been attained?

5. How adequately has the operation addressed gender and equity issues? How was this done?

6. To what extent has the program built capacity of the GoK, at national and county/sub-county levels in managing national SM efforts?

Factors affecting results

7. What accounts for the areas of success of the intervention? What internal and external factors have positively affected the achievement of results?

8. What areas do you think didn’t do so well or did not happen and why? What internal and external factors have negatively affected the achievement of results?

(Note: follow-up questions can query internal WFP process, system and logistical factors; monitoring and reporting; internal institutional and governance arrangements; partnership and co-ordination; as well as external factors such as national political and policy environment; domestic and external funding; etc.)

9. Were there unintended positive or negative results or outcomes? Please explain.

10. How likely is the GoK to continue to implement an effective SM programme following WFP withdrawal? What would be the key factors that will contribute to successful transition? What would be the key constraints?

**General**

11. Do you have recommendations about the design, implementation and continued sustainability of the operation? With the benefit of hindsight what do you think could be done differently?

**Interview guide for Government of Kenya personnel (national level)**

**Introduction**

* Introduction of team member(s) present
* Explain purpose of evaluation
* Explain confidentiality and next steps

Appropriateness

1. To what extent was the MGD SMP and Child Nutrition programme coherent with national policy, with the interventions of government, with the work of other development partners, and with the needs of the population?

2. To what extent has the programme design reflected a strong focus on gender and equity? How was this done?

Results and factors affecting results

3. How successful has the programme been in achieving its planned outputs?

4. To what extent have planned outcomes been attained?

5. How adequately has the programme addressed gender and equity issues? How was this done?

6. To what extent has the programme built capacity of the MoEST in managing national SM efforts?

Factors affecting results

7. What accounts for the areas of success of the intervention? What internal and external factors have positively affected the achievement of results?

8. What areas do you think didn’t do so well or did not happen and why? What internal and external factors have negatively affected the achievement of results?

(Note: follow-up questions can query internal WFP process, system and logistical factors; monitoring and reporting; internal institutional and governance arrangements; partnership and co-ordination; as well as external factors such as national political and policy environment; domestic and external funding; etc.)

9. Were there unintended positive or negative results or outcomes? Please explain.

10. How likely is the GoK to continue to implement an effective SM programme following WFP withdrawal? What would be the key factors that will contribute to successful transition? What would be the key constraints?

11. What learning took place from the MGD intervention that informed the Government’s Emergency School Feeding Programme? What have been the strong and weak points of the SMP and what are the lessons learnt for future SM in Kenya?

General

12. How do you perceive WFP as a partner? Please explain.

13. Do you have recommendations about the design, implementation and continued sustainability of the operation? With the benefit of hindsight what would you do differently?

**Discussion guide for Government of Kenya personnel (county level)**

**Introduction**

* Introduction of team member(s) present
* Explain purpose of evaluation
* Explain confidentiality and next steps

Background

1. Please explain briefly when and how the school feeding programme started in this area and what partners have been involved?

Appropriateness and understanding of the intervention

2. How relevant was the SM programme to it beneficiaries when it started? Has it continued to remain relevant?

3. What is CSB and what does it contain? Oil: What does it contain? What are the benefits of adding these?

Results

4. To what extent has the programme produced results?

5. What difference has the programme made to the lives of beneficiaries, and to the community? What specific changes have happened as a result of the programme?

6. Has the programme made a difference to enrolment, attendance and participation of girls in school? And to that of boys? In what way?

7. How effective have WFP’s capacity development activities been? Please explain.

8. Were there unintended positive or negative results or outcomes? Please explain.

Factors affecting results

9. What accounts for the areas of success of the intervention? (probe for WFP factors, and for external factors, including for other social protection activities that may affect the outcomes e.g. access to grants, etc.)

10. What activities were not implemented and why? (probe for internal and external factors that may have negatively affected the achievement of results)

11. How do you perceive WFP as a partner? Please explain.

Sustainability

12. Are the changes that you mentioned took place as a result of the programme, going to continue after the programme is completed? Why or why not?

13. Do you have recommendations about enhancing the sustainability of the operation?

**Interview Guide for USDA**

**Introduction**

* Introduction of team member(s) present
* Explain purpose of evaluation
* Explain confidentiality and next steps

Appropriateness

1. To what extent was the MGD FFE and Children Nutrition programme coherent with national policy, with the interventions of government, with the work of other development partners, and with the needs of the population?

2. To what extent has the programme design reflected a strong focus on gender and equity? How was this done?

Results and factors affecting results

3. How successful has the programme been in achieving its planned outputs?

4. To what extent have planned outcomes been attained?

5. How adequately has the operation addressed gender and equity issues? How was this done?

6. To what extent has the programme built capacity of the GoK in managing national SF efforts?

Factors affecting results

7. What accounts for the areas of success of the intervention? What internal and external factors have positively affected the achievement of results?

8. What did not happen and why? What internal and external factors have negatively affected the achievement of results?

(Note: follow-up questions can query internal WFP process, system and logistical factors; monitoring and reporting; internal institutional and governance arrangements; partnership and co-ordination; as well as external factors such as national political and policy environment; domestic and external funding; etc.)

9. Were there unintended positive or negative results or outcomes? Please explain. 10. How likely is the GoK to continue to implement an effective SM programme following WFP withdrawal? What are the identified strengths? What are the key constraints?

General

11. Do you have recommendations about the design, implementation and continued sustainability of the operation? With the benefit of hindsight what would you do differently?

**Focus Group Discussion Guide for School Staff**

**Introduction**

* Introduction of team member(s) present
* Explain purpose of evaluation
* Explain confidentiality and next steps

Background

1. Please explain briefly when and how the school feeding programme came to this area and what partners have been involved.

Appropriateness and understanding of the intervention

2. How relevant was the SF programme to it beneficiaries when it started? Has it continued to remain relevant?

3. What is CSB and what does it contain? Oil: What does it contain? What are the benefits of adding these?

Results

4. To what extent has the programme produced results?

5. What difference has the programme made to the lives of beneficiaries, and to the community? What has changed as a result of the programme?

6. Has the programme made a difference to the schooling of girls? And to that of boys? In what way?

7. How effective have WFP’s capacity development activities been? Please explain.

8. Were there unintended positive or negative results or outcomes? Please explain.

Factors affecting results

9. What accounts for the areas of success of the intervention? (probe for WFP factors, and for external factors, including for other social protection activities that may affect the outcomes e.g. access to grants, etc.)

10. What activities were not implemented and why? (probe for internal and external factors that may have negatively affected the achievement of results)

Sustainability

11. Are the changes that you mentioned took place as a result of the programme likely to continue after the programme is completed? Why or why not?

General

12. What should have been done differently in terms of programme design, and implementation?

13. How do you perceive WFP as a partner? Please explain.

**Focus Group Discussion guide for school children**

**Approach**

The ET will seek to interview small groups (between four and six) school children aged ten or above. Girls and boys will be interviewed separately.

Introduction Schools will have been asked to inform parents about the interviews and to seek their consent. Children will be told they do not have to participate and that they may opt out of the interview at any time. Questions will be posed in simple personal terms (Do you like the food? Do you always eat it? Do you eat before you come to school? What did you eat today before coming to school? What did you eat yesterday after the school?

**Introduction**

* Introduction of team member(s) present
* Explain purpose of evaluation
* Explain confidentiality and next steps

Appropriateness

1. Do you think that the school feeding programme is needed at your school? Why?

2. Do you think the programme is providing the right kind of food?

3. Do you know children of school age who do not get school feeding? If so, why not?

Results

4. Do you like the food? Why or why not?

5. What is CSB and what does it contain?

6. Oil: What does it contain?

7. What do you think are the benefits of adding these elements to what you eat?

8. Are there any problems with the school feeding programme? If so, what are they?

9. What difference does the school feeding programme make to you?

10. Does the school feeding have a different effect for girls and boys?

11. Is the oil that girls get if they come to school important? In what way?

12. How could the school feeding programme be improved? How would you change the school feeding programme if you could decide?

**For the girls only**:

13. Do you know of any girls who are no longer coming to school? What is the reason for this?

14. Have you regularly received the take home ration of oil?

15. How is the ration used by your family?

16. How does it make you feel to receive this ration?

17. If you no longer receive the ration will this have an impact on whether you will be able to come to school? Please explain.

**For boys only:**

18. Do you know boys who are no longer coming to school? What it the reason for this?

19. Are there days that you are not able to come to school? What are the reasons for this?

**Focus Group Discussion Guide for PTA and Community Groups**

**Introduction**

* Introduction of team member(s) present
* Explain purpose of evaluation
* Explain confidentiality and next steps

Background

1. Please explain briefly when and how the school feeding programme came to this local school, and what the roles and contributions of the various stakeholders were and are.

Appropriateness and understanding of the intervention

2. How relevant was the SF programme to it beneficiaries when it started? Has it continued to remain relevant?

3. What is CSB and what does it contain? Oil: What does it contain? What are the benefits of adding these?

Results

4. What have been the results of the SM programme for the school? What have been the results for the community?

5. What difference has the programme made to the beneficiaries, and to the community? What has changed as a result of the programme?

6. Has the programme made a difference to the schooling of girls? And to that of boys? In what way?

7. How effective have WFP’s capacity development activities been? Please explain.

8. Were there unintended positive or negative results or outcomes? Please explain.

Factors affecting results

9. What accounts for the areas of success of the intervention? (probe for WFP factors, and for external factors, including for other social protection activities that may affect the outcomes e.g. access to grants, etc.)

10. What activities were not implemented and why? (probe for internal and external factors that may have negatively affected the achievement of results)

Sustainability

11. Are the changes that you mentioned took place as a result of the programme likely to continue after the programme is completed? Why or why not?

General

12. What should have been done differently in terms of programme design, and implementation? How would you change the school feeding programme if you could decide?

**Annex 6: Report Format/Outline.**

Executive Summary

* Methodology
* Key findings
* Overall conclusions
* Recommendations

Summary table of baseline indicator values against targets

1. Introduction
2. Study approach, methodology and limitations
3. Introduction to baseline findings
4. Situation analysis
5. Results by indicator
   1. Education indicators
   2. Nutrition indicators
   3. Community and parental involvement
   4. Other indicators as relevant
6. Conclusions and recommendations

Annexes as relevant

**Acronyms**

ASALs-Arid and Semi-Arid Lands

BOM – Board of Management

DID – Difference- in - Difference

DTL – Deputy Team Leader

EMIS – Education Management Information Systems

FGD – Focus Group Discussion

GoK – Government of Kenya

GPE – Global Partnership for Education

HGSMP – Home Grown School Meals Programme

HGSMP- Home Grown School Meals Programme

KI – Key Informants

MGD – Mc Govern Dole

MOE – Ministry of Education

MS- Excel – Microsoft Excel

NGO- Non Governmental Organization

ODK- Open Data Kit

PMF- Performance Measurement Framework

PPS – Probability Proportionate to size

PSM- Propensity Score Matching

PSU- Primary Sampling Unit

PTA-Parents/Teachers Association

SO -Strategic Objective

SSU-Secondary Sampling Unit

SMC- School Management Committee

SMP- School Meals Programme

TL- Team Leader

TOR- Terms of Reference

UNICEF – United Nations Children’s Education Fund

USDA – United States Department of Agriculture

US – United States

UWEZO – Kiswahili for ‘Capability’

VAM-Vulnerability Assessment Matrix

WASH – Water Sanitation and Health

WFP- World Food Programme

WFPSMP-World Food Programme School Meals Programme
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1. The EMIS tool collects standard data from all schools in Kenya and includes information on school infrastructure, pupils, teachers, textbook and other resources. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Isiolo, Nairobi, Samburu, and Tana River which were targeted under the previous phases of the USDA support will not be included. These counties were excluded from the HGSMP group for the following reasons. Nairobi was excluded because of urban context issues. The majority of the counties of focus are in the Arid, rural areas, consequently, there were hardly any common contextual similarities that will match Nairobi with them. The other three have been beneficiaries of the Cash Transfers to schools Model developed and implemented by WFP before being handed over to HGSMP – consequently their evolution modality and short history of the same does not approximate to a pure HGSMP modality of government that has been going on in some of the counties selected since 2009. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. A **Logistic regression** is a statistical method for analyzing a dataset in which there are one or more independent variables that determine an outcome. The outcome is measured with a dichotomous variable (in which there are only two possible responses). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Uwezo is a five year initiative that aims to improve competencies in literacy and numeracy among children aged 6-16 years old in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda, by using an innovative approach to social change that is citizen driven and accountable to the public. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Isiolo, Nairobi, Samburu, and Tana River counties were excluded from the HGSMP group for the following reasons. Nairobi was excluded because of urban context issues. The majority of the counties of focus are in the arid, rural areas, consequently, there were hardly any common contextual similarities that will match Nairobi with them. The other three have been beneficiaries of the Cash Transfers to schools Model developed and implemented by WFP before being handed over to HGSMP – consequently their evolution modality and short history of the same does not approximate to a pure HGSMP modality of government that has been going on in some of the counties selected since 2009. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)