



# Decentralized Evaluation

## Final Evaluation of McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program in Guinea-Bissau

**2016-2019**

March 2021

WFP Guinea-Bissau Country Office

Evaluation Managers: Elber Nosolini/Jose Cabral

Prepared by

Bert Fret, Team Leader

Fernanda M Leite Villamarin, International  
consultant

Raoul Mendes Fernandes, National consultant

## **Acknowledgements**

The Evaluation Team (ET) wishes to thank the World Food Programme Country Office (WFP CO) in Bissau for all assistance received during the evaluation mission. We are also grateful to all Ministry of Education (MoE) staff, both in Bissau and in the regional capital, and in the various schools that were visited, who took the time and were available to help us along with all the information we needed. We thank the volunteer cooks in the school kitchens, and the leaders of the School Management Committees (SMCs) and Parents' Associations (PAs), and the local NGOs with whom we could discuss, for helping us to understand their perspective. And finally, our thanks go also to the pupils, boys and girls, whom we could interview, for volunteering, and for readily answering our questions.

## **Disclaimer**

The opinions expressed in this report are those of the Evaluation Team, and do not necessarily reflect those of the World Food Programme (WFP). Responsibility for the opinions expressed in this report rest solely with the authors. Publication of this document does not imply endorsement by WFP of the opinions expressed.

The designation employed and the presentation of material in maps do no imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the WFP concerning the legal or constitutional status of any country, territory or sea area, or concerning the delimitation of frontiers.

## Table of contents

<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>Disclaimer</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Context .....	1
Methodology .....	1
Key Findings:.....	2
1. Relevance.....	2
2. Effectiveness.....	2
3. Efficiency .....	3
4. Impact .....	3
5. Sustainability .....	3
Conclusions and Recommendations.....	4
<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	<b>8</b>
1.1. Overview of the Evaluation Subject .....	8
1.2. Context .....	9
1.3. Evaluation Methodology and Limitations: .....	11
1.4. Limitations:.....	13
1.5. Ethics:.....	13
<b>2. Evaluation Findings</b> .....	<b>13</b>
2.1. Evaluation Question 1.1: Is the project’s strategy relevant to the beneficiaries’ needs?.....	14
2.2. Evaluation Question 1.2: Is the project aligned with the national government’s education and school feeding policies and strategies? .....	17
2.3. Evaluation Question 1.3: Does the project complement other donor-funded and government initiatives? .....	17
2.4. Evaluation Question 2.1. The extent of project implementation – Did the project carry out all activities as planned? (Effectiveness) .....	18
2.5. Evaluation Question 2.2: To what degree have the interventions resulted, or not, in the expected results and outcomes? In particular, to what extent did providing THRs result in increased attendance and enrolment of girl pupils? (Effectiveness) .....	23
2.6. Evaluation Question 2.3. Is short term hunger reduced? (Effectiveness).....	23
2.7. Evaluation Question 2.4. Did assistance reach the right beneficiaries in the right quantity and quality at the right time? (Effectiveness).....	24
2.8. Evaluation Question 3.1. Has the programme been implemented in an efficient way? Was there efficient use of resources and efficient methods of work? (Efficiency).....	25
2.9. Evaluation Question 4.1. To what degree has the project achieved the results that were foreseen in the project level framework? (Impact) .....	27

2.10. Evaluation Question 4.2. Have there been any unintended outcomes, either positive or negative? (Impact).....	33
2.11. Evaluation Question 4.3. What internal and external factors affected the project's achievement of intended results? (Impact) .....	35
2.12. Evaluation Question 5.1: Is the school meal programme sustainable, including a strategy for: sustainability; sound policy; stable funding; quality programme design; institutional arrangements; local production and sourcing; partnership and coordination; and community participation and ownership? (Sustainability).....	35
2.13. Evaluation Question 5.2 What substantive progress has the Government made toward developing a nationally owned school feeding programme? (Sustainability) .....	37
2.14. Evaluation Question 5.3. How are local communities involved in and contributing to school feeding? (Sustainability) .....	38
2.15. Evaluation Question 5.4. What needs remain in order to achieve a full handover and nationally owned school feeding programme? (Sustainability).....	39
<b>3. Conclusions and Recommendations .....</b>	<b>41</b>
Overall assessment .....	41
<b>Lessons learned .....</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>Annexes.....</b>	<b>45</b>
Annex 1 - McGovern-Dole FFE Framework.....	45
Annex 2 - Revised version of the reconstructed Logical framework of the WFP/McGovern Dole FFE Programme in Guinea Bissau (2016-19).....	47
Annex 3 – Evaluation Matrix.....	49
Annex 4 - Interviewed Stakeholders .....	64
Annex 5 - Number of schools assisted by the McGovern-Dole FFE programme and visited during the baseline, Mid-Term and Final evaluations.....	65
Annex 7 - Project Performance Indicators .....	66
Annex 8 – Total amount of food distributed to schools, meals prepared and served.....	73
Annex 9 – Approximate estimates of financial reporting.....	75
Annex 10 - Nutritional content of one school meal .....	76
Annex 11 – Results of the SABER exercise.....	77
Annex 12 - To what extent have the recommendations of the baseline survey and of the mid-term evaluation been implemented by WFP.....	79
Annex 13 - Terms of Reference.....	81
Annex 14 - Documents Reviewed .....	100
Annex 15 – Documents gathered .....	108
Annex 16 - Data Collection Tools.....	116
Annex 17 - Bibliography.....	127

## List of Tables

Table 1.1 - Overview of the McGovern-Dole FFE-WFP project in Guinea-Bissau (2016-2019)...	8
Table 2.1 - Application of international criteria and the corresponding evaluation questions .....	13
Table 2.2 - Take-home rations for boys and girls by region and income quintile (2019).....	16
Table 2.3 - Number of girls from 4 <sup>th</sup> to 6 <sup>th</sup> grade receiving THRs by year.....	19
Table 2.4 - Perceptions of students (boys and girls) at WFP-supported schools who reported on quantity and quality of the meals provided (2019).....	24
Table 2.5 - Main programme outcome values per year, against the baseline and the target values .....	27
Table 2.6 - Median enrolment for all applicable school levels, according to school years (2015-16, 2017-18 and 2018-19) and gender. ....	29
Table 2.7- Profile of WFP assisted households according to the Food Consumption Score by year (2016, 2018, 2019).....	30
Table 2.8- Profile of non-WFP assisted households included according to wealth quintiles by year (2016, 2018, 2019).....	30
Table 2.9- Percentage of schools with improved source of water and toilet facilities, handwashing practices and separate toilets (2016, 2018, 2019) .....	31
Table 2.10- Percentage of SMC members who received training from WFP (2016, 2018, 2019) .....	31
Table 2.11- Analysis of Results of SF End-line Survey (2019): Mean values in percentage and significant differences between WFP assisted and non-WFP assisted schools .....	32
Table 2.12- Median number of students in WFP and Non-WFP schools (2019) .....	34
Table 2.13- Local communities' participation (2016, 2018, 2019) .....	38

## List of figures

Figure 2.1 - Attendance rates of grade 4 students in WFP and non-WFP Schools (baseline, mid-term and final evaluation) .....	28
Figure 2.2. - Percentage of students who ate a meal before and after school (2016, 2018, 2019) .....	29

## List of Acronyms

ABC	Brazilian Cooperation Agency
CIMCE	Inter-ministerial School-Feeding Committee
CO	Country Office
CRS	Catholic Relief Service
DEQAS	Decentralized Evaluation Quality Assurance System
DGASCE	General Directorate for School Meals and Social Affairs
DGPASE	Evaluation and Planning Department of the Ministry of Education
ESP	Education Sector Plan
ET	Evaluation Team
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FSNMS	Food Security and Nutrition Monitoring System
GB	Guinea-Bissau
GEEW	Gender Equality and Emancipation of Women
GoGB	Government of Guinea-Bissau
HGSF	Home Grown School Feeding
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
ICSP	Interim Country Strategic Plan
INE	National Statistics Institute
IPDH	International Programme for Human Development
LIC	Low-income country
MADR	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural development
MAM	Moderate Acute Malnutrition
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MNECJD	Ministry of National Education, Culture, Youth and Sports (former name)
MENES	Ministry of National Education and Higher Education (current name)
MGD	McGovern-Dole
MGD FFE	McGovern-Dole Food for Education and Child Nutrition Programme
MoE	Ministry of Education
NAEC	Nutritional assessment, education and counselling
NDSF	National Directorate of School Feeding
OEV	Office of Evaluations
PA	Parents' Association
SABER	Systems Approach for Better Education Results
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SFP	School Feeding Programme(s)
SISSAN	Food and Nutrition Security Monitoring System
SMC	School Management Committees
THR	Take-home ration(s)
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
US	United States
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
VAM	Vulnerability Analysis & Mapping
WFP	World Food Programme
RB	Regional Bureau
WHO	World Health Organization

## Executive Summary

1. The final evaluation of the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program (McGovern-Dole FFE) project (FFE-657-2015/019-00), implemented by the World Food Programme (WFP) in Guinea-Bissau (GB), from March 2016 to July 2019 (extended to April 2020), had two main objectives: (1) Accountability: To account for the activities carried out by WFP as well as the outputs and outcomes reached; (2) Learning: To draw lessons for the main actors. Baseline (2016) and mid-term (2018-2019) evaluations preceded this end-line evaluation. The baseline study conducted before the start of the project provided a situational analysis and allowed WFP to establish indicator baseline information. It also verified the targets established in the Project Agreement. The mid-term evaluation covered the period from August 2017 (preparation phase) to July 2019 (final evaluation report). This evaluation aimed at allowing the WFP to monitor the progress of the established indicators.
2. The present end-line evaluation comprises the entirety of activities covered by the McGovern-Dole funded WFP school feeding project in GB (2016-2018). The final evaluation, in line with the completed mid-term evaluation includes: (1) a review of the project's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability; (2) the collection of performance indicator data; more specifically it (3) assesses whether or not the project achieved its expected results; (4) identifies lessons learned; (5) assesses project replicability; and (6) investigates whether or not the mid-term evaluation recommendations were implemented.
3. Main users of the evaluation are the WFP Country Office (CO), the WFP Regional Bureau (WFP RB), the Office of Evaluation (OEV), the Ministry of National Education and Higher Education (Ministério da Educação Nacional e Ensino Superior, MENES)<sup>1</sup> along with its General Directorate for School Meals and Social Affairs (DGASCE), USDA, and Japan.
4. The study covered 100 schools, 50 of which were WFP schools and 50 of which were non-WFP schools, as a control group. WFP schools covered a total of 19,323 students.

### Context

5. GB is a low-income country (LIC), with 70% of the population living below the poverty line of USD 1.9 per day. Women are most affected by poverty due to inadequate healthcare, low levels of education, poor literacy rates, and low-income rates. Roughly half of the population 15 years of age or older are illiterate, and malnutrition among children under 5 years old is staggering: in 2016, up to 4.2% and 6.1% of children under five had severe and moderate acute malnutrition, respectively.
6. The main activities of the McGovern-Dole FFE project, which cost USD 20 million, were the provision of school meals to pupils in 758 primary schools, and of take-home rations (THRs) of rice to girls in grades 4, 5, and 6 with sufficient attendance (80%). It also included activities related to capacity building and equipment provision. WFP's main partner was MENES and its DGASCE.

### Methodology

7. A mixed-methods approach was implemented for data collection. Primary data was collected from stakeholders using inquiry techniques such as questionnaires, interviews, and on-site observation. The quantitative survey used a non-experimental method. Data were collected by applying the same questionnaire as the base-line and mid-term surveys in 100 schools, distributed in eight regions of GB. The final sample consisted of 50 WFP-schools and 50 non-WFP schools. Interviews were conducted with school directors (n=100, one in each school visited), male (n=500) and female (n=500) students (five per sex per school) and male (n=500) and female (n=500) students' parents and guardians (n=1,000). Existing WFP reports were used for triangulation along with other sources of data<sup>2</sup>. Both gender equality and human rights were mainstreamed throughout the evaluation process.

<sup>1</sup> Previously named Ministry of National Education, Culture and Youth and Sports (MNEJCD)

<sup>2</sup> Sources: I) UNICEF Annual Reports; II) Guinea-Bissau Interim Country Strategic Plan 2018-2019; III) Rethinking School Feeding: Social Safety Nets, Child Development, and the Education Sector. World Bank (2009). Available at: <https://elibrary.worldbank.org/doi/abs/10.1596/978-0-8213-7974-5>, access in 8/12/2019; IV) World Food Programme/Partnership for Child Development /World Bank: Workshop for Assessing National Capacities in School Feeding in Guinea-Bissau - SABER Action Plan; V) Terms of Reference, Mid-term and Final Evaluations of McGovern-Dole funded School Feeding project in Guinea-Bissau (2016-2018).

8. The qualitative survey was based on semi-structured individual and group interviews during the fieldwork phase of the evaluation. These interviews were held in 30 WFP-schools located in six regions of GB: Oio, Bafata, Cacheu, Biombo, Quinara and Gabu. In Bissau, interviews were carried out with the WFP staff involved in SF project management, as well as stakeholders from the Ministry of Education (MoE), the Ministry of Agriculture, and other government institution; national non-governmental organizations (NGOs); and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). Additionally, the ET gathered secondary data from databases, reports, surveys, web resources, and other documented sources for triangulation. Results from the mid-term school feeding survey were also considered for data comparison.
9. Some limitations were encountered during fieldwork, such as unreliable road or sea access and diverse language use. Nevertheless, measures were taken to mitigate these barriers as much as possible, i.e., by using local interpreters; by inviting a key actor from the Bolama-Bijagós region (which was not visited) for an interview in Bissau.

## Key Findings:

### 1. Relevance

10. The school feeding program (SFP) is very relevant to the needs of pupils, their families and local communities, and is aligned with educational policies and strategies of the Government of Guinea Bissau (GoGB). It alleviates short-term hunger and supplements household food income. The THRs given to girls from 4<sup>th</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> grade have motivated parents to send their daughters to schools. The strategy to evolve towards a programme based on locally purchased foods, or Home Grown School Feeding (HGSF), further increases the relevance of the programme to local communities. This shift should provide a local selling opportunity for farmers - increasing their income - and could thus have a positive effect on the local economy, thereby reducing poverty. Currently, two pilot initiatives are testing different modalities of local food purchases. One is funded by the GoGB, and the other is funded by Japan.

### 2. Effectiveness

11. All activities linked to the handling of school meals at schools were generally well performed and short-term hunger has been reduced. Overall, the targeted numbers of pupils (boys and girls from grades 1 to 6) have been served the agreed upon number of quality school meals. Meals were 7.67 % in excess of the predicted number. Girls from 4<sup>th</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> grade with an attendance of 80% or more have received a monthly THR of rice for their families in higher numbers than foreseen (1.4% more<sup>3</sup>). Delays were negligible. The planned number of kitchens, storerooms and firewood saving stoves have all been renovated or constructed.
12. There is still space for improvements for some of the accompanying activities that have been performed to a lesser degree, e.g., the training of various locals and MENES personnel (30,36% of target, see activity 8, table A.7.1, Annexe 7 p. 69), and the number of timely school feeding reports produced (50,45% of target, see activity 9, same table, p. 70). The high turnover of the MoE's staff and recurrent

预览已结束，完整报告链接和二维码如下：

[https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/report?reportId=5\\_6463](https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/report?reportId=5_6463)

