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2. Approach
3. Results
Support for the Integrated School Feeding Program

Cote d’Ivoire
Evaluation Objectives

• Assess the progress made in reaching program targets of results
  o Document program implementation through 2018
  o Compare program results with the 2016 baseline levels

• Assess and identify key achievements and challenges, draw lessons, and identify best practices for learning
  o Provide evidence-based findings to guide operational and strategic decision-making
  o Incorporate lessons learned, improve partnership coordination, and inform sustainability
Evaluation Approach

• Evaluation questions related to program relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability

• Mixed-method evaluation in 7 regions

• Focus group discussions at 10 sites with students, parents, school management committee members, and women production groups

• Key informant interviews with program implementers, USDA, and national and local government stakeholders
Evaluation Approach

• Difference-in-Difference method to compare the changes in reading outcomes between population of beneficiaries and population that did not benefit from the program.

• Surveys and ASER reading assessments:
  - Students and households (N = 1,740)
  - Teachers (N = 329) and principals (N = 104)
  - School canteen managers (N = 67)

\[
2\text{-year impact} = (C-A) - (D-B)
\]
Very Literacy Poor Environment at Baseline

- 68% of students came from illiterate households
- 78% of students reported not having books at home
- 67% reported not reading with parents or siblings at home
- 7% of schools had a library
- Over 40 students per teacher in a classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading proficiency</th>
<th>Non-MGD</th>
<th>MGD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CP1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP2</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE1</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE2</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM2</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Promising Literacy Findings at Midline

• Enrolment increased schools for girls in CM grades where take-home rations are offered

• 67% of students enrolled in MGD schools had access to mobile libraries and many students also had access to other materials, including reading boards, illustrated boards, junior dictionaries, and sculpted plastic letters

• In non-MGD schools, only 10% of students had access to such learning materials

• Over 90% of teachers at every grade level said that they had participated in AVSI trainings

• If available, school records showed near-perfect levels of teacher attendance
Reading Assessment Scores by Grade at Midline
Positive Program Impacts on Literacy

- All Students: 1.2*** (N = 1,740)
- Older Students: 1.7*** (N = 446)
- Girls: 0.9* (N = 1,036)
- Boys: 1.8*** (N = 704)
Sustainability Findings

• Ensuring functioning and well provisioned canteens is essential to encourage regular student attendance in school

• Continuous efforts are needed to enhance school infrastructure and reduce teacher absenteeism

• Turnover is a threat to sustainability at all levels—at both the local level, and at the regional and national level

• Strengthening the capacities of local communities and government partners will increase the likelihood of the project achieving sustainable, long term impact
Beoog Biiga Program (Tomorrow’s Child)

Burkina Faso
Background

- Selected by CRS in 2015 for BB2 evaluation
- Performance evaluation
  - Baseline (May 2015)
  - Midline (May 2017)
  - Final (May 2018)
- Impact evaluation of girls’ mentorship
  - Baseline (May 2015)
  - Follow-up (May 2018)
Evaluation Objectives

▸ Assess whether the project has achieved the expected results as outlined in the project-level results framework

▸ Assess the relevance and sustainability of the outputs and their contribution to the long-term outcomes

▸ Generate lessons learned and recommendations for CRS, the Ministry of Education, partners, USDA, and sectoral peers for future food assistance and education programs

Source. CRS
Evaluation Questions

▸ Relevance

▸ Effectiveness

▸ Efficiency

▸ Impact

▸ Sustainability

Source: CRS
Quantitative Research Questions

- Relevance
- Effectiveness
- Efficiency
- **Impact**
- Sustainability

Impact

“What percentage of students have increased their reading comprehension compared to baseline?”
Quantitative Research Questions

- Relevance
- Effectiveness
- Efficiency
- Impact
- Sustainability

Sustainability

“Extent to which the project has planned for continuation of activities and developed sustainable partnerships?”
Evaluation Approach

Impact Evaluation

- A Randomized Controlled Trial method
  - Baseline (May 2015)
  - Follow-up (May 2018)

- Data Source
  - Student survey
  - Reading assessment
  - Key Informant Interviews and Focus Group Discussions
Evaluation Approach

Performance Evaluation

▸ Mixed-method approach

▸ Data Sources
  o Various quantitative surveys, reading assessment for Grade 2, and attendance data
  o Qualitative key informant interviews and focus group discussions
  o Classroom Observations

▸ Data Analysis
  o Assessing changes over time using descriptive analysis

RCT and Performance Evaluation Design

Random Assignment
44 selected schools

Base Package & Mentorship
22 Treatment Schools

Base Package
22 Control Schools

Grade 2 students at Baseline (2015):
7 boys and 7 girls

Grade 5 students tracked from baseline (2018)
7 boys and 7 girls

Performance Evaluation Sample
8 boys and 8 girls x 22 (Grades 2-8)
36 female caregivers
5x2 teachers (Grade 2-6)
1x22 PTA members
Findings – Reading Outcomes

- More students (18 percentage points) passed reading proficiency at grade level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Difference in Means (Baseline – Midline) (p-value)</th>
<th>Difference in Means (Baseline - Endline) (p-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2 students demonstrating reading ability at grade level or above</td>
<td>15% 188</td>
<td>33% 175</td>
<td>9 (0.2458)</td>
<td>18*** (0.0001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>13% 88</td>
<td>33% 86</td>
<td>4 (0.7253)</td>
<td>20*** (0.0014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>18% 100</td>
<td>33% 89</td>
<td>15 (0.1811)</td>
<td>15*** (0.0205)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings – Reading Outcomes

Distribution of Reading Skills for Second Grade Students

Source: Student Survey; Author’s calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Endline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level A</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level B</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level C</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level D</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level E</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level F</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level G</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level H</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level I</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level J</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level K</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings – Impact Outcomes

- Regression analysis
  - Disaggregated by sex

For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient (P-Value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment effect for girls (β₁)</td>
<td>-0.25** (.043)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment effect for boys (β₁ + β₂)</td>
<td>0.021 (.340)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control-group mean for girls</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control-group mean for boys</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: student survey, * p-value < 0.1, ** p-value < 0.05, *** p-value < 0.01

- Impact evaluation outcomes:
  - Reading proficiency
  - Success in school due to mentors (self-reported)

Indicates a significantly negative result for girls
Indicates an insignificant result for boys
Findings – Impact Outcomes

Impact of mentoring on...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading proficiency</td>
<td>↑</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact of Mentoring Program on Literacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient (P-Value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment effect for girls ($\beta_1$)</td>
<td>-0.03 (0.702)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment effect for boys ($\beta_1 + \beta_2$)</td>
<td>0.21*** (.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control-group mean for girls</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control-group mean for boys</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: student survey; * p-value < 0.1, ** p-value < 0.05, *** p-value < 0.01
Findings - Sustainability

- Those who have been impacted by the program (students, teachers, mentors, and parents) will continue to benefit
- There is support from the community for continuation of program activities
- Transition of some activities from CRS to MENA have occurred
- There is confusion among stakeholders and partners about which activities will be sustained and who will lead those efforts.
- Of particular concern is the continued training of teachers