USDA/FAS Grant: FFE-656-2015/009-00
Planet Aid Inc. Mozambique McGovern Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program (MGD-FFE)

Request for Proposal (RFP)

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY: All information within this RFP, regardless of the communication form, is given in confidence and may not be disclosed without written permission from Planet Aid Inc.

I. Introduction
Planet Aid Inc. (PAI) is seeking a consultant to perform the Scope of Work (SOW) outlined in Attachment to complete a Final Evaluation of their MDG-FFE in Mozambique to be submitted to Planet Aid, Inc. and further to the donor. Data provided for evaluation, project intermediate results, and project frameworks are provided for context in Annexes A, B, and C.

II. Proposed Timeframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Release of RFP document</td>
<td>March 20, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions due to PAI (Response within 3 days)</td>
<td>April 1, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals in English due to PAI</td>
<td>April 20, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAI Proposal Review Period</td>
<td>April 20 – May 1, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Selection Notification by PAI</td>
<td>May 1, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts Finalized</td>
<td>May 15, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of Performance</td>
<td>June – October 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Instructions for RFP Questions/Responses
a. The PAI point of contact regarding questions on this RFP process is Kelly Vaena, Senior Grants Manager at Planet Aid, Inc. Contact via email at kvaena@planetaid.org.

b. Any questions associated with the requirements of this RFP process should be sent via email to Kelly Vaena, Senior Grants Manager at kvaena@planetaid.org. Questions will be answered within three (3) business days via email to all applicants.

c. Applicants are encouraged to contact PAI as instructed above for a copy of the Midterm Evaluation. The same materials will be provided to all applicants requesting supplemental information.

d. Proposals may be submitted via email (one soft copy in PDF format) to kvaena@planetaid.org.

IV. Conditions for RFP Responses
a. Proposal responses and supporting documentation shall become the property of PAI and will not be returned.

b. PAI ultimately reserves the right throughout this process to select any servicing option that best meets its business requirements, regardless of this process.

c. Respondent agrees to the following conditions in participating in this process:

- Neither issuance of this RFP nor receipt of proposals represents a commitment on the part of PAI.

- PAI will not be responsible for any costs incurred by respondents in the preparation of any materials or presentation relating to this process.

d. This document is provided for the exclusive use of your organization and copies shall not be made available to any other party without written consent from Kelly Vaena at Planet Aid, Inc.
e. Neither party shall use the name of the other in publicity releases, referrals, advertising, or similar activity without the prior written consent of the other.

V. RFP Response

Please provide a cover letter and written proposal. The cover letter should explain the organization’s reasons for application, including a brief statement of qualifications, and interest in conducting the Final Evaluation. The proposal should address each of the areas in the tables below, be submitted in English, and be no more than 15 pages, including all annexes and appendices. In addition, please include a cover letter explaining reasons for application and interest in conducting the Final Evaluation.

### 5.1 Organizational Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1.1</td>
<td>Provide your (or your organization’s) full name, corporate address, and telephone number and preferred point of contact (including name, position, email, and phone number).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.2</td>
<td>If applicable, provide a list of any subcontractors that you (or the organization) will use to provide the services requested in Attachment. Include a description the work that each proposed subcontractor will perform and how it will be consolidated into a Final Evaluation document and product.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.3</td>
<td>Describe any conflicts of interest that you or your organization or subcontractors may have in performing the work described in Attachment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.4</td>
<td>Provide a capacity statement for your organization and each subcontractor that supports the ability to adequately and completely undertake this project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.2 Relevant Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1</td>
<td>List each person (aka key personnel) who will be performing work described in Attachment under this contract. Please include title, email address, and phone number for each individual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2</td>
<td>Please provide a Resume/Curriculum Vitae and biographical data sheet for each person that will perform work in Attachment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.3</td>
<td>Please describe similar work experience of each person that will perform work described in Attachment. Include examples of past projects of similar scope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.4</td>
<td>Please provide three references for work performed by the key personnel that is similar to the work described in Attachment. Include company, contact name, email address, phone number, and the role the key personnel member performed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.5</td>
<td>Please state the estimated percentage of a full-time equivalent (FTE) each is person expected to spend on this project?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.3 Technical Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.3.1</td>
<td>Describe the proposed approach including the process, methodology, and timeline to address the requirements in the Scope of Work included as Attachment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.2 Specifically outline the approach to the literacy assessment, including the administration of the Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA), training of enumerators and methodology, equipment and software for data collection.

5.3.3 Include a description of sampling, data collection, and data analysis methods to be used and address management considerations for producing the required deliverables on schedule.

5.3.4 Include a schedule of specific deliverables demonstrating progress towards completion of the evaluation. Deliverables must include a work plan (which will be approved by PAI), a draft evaluation report, a final evaluation report and a Summary of Key Findings document. Other deliverables should be proposed to demonstrate progress, including trip reports, data sets, and/or presentation of preliminary results. All deliverables should allow time for PAI review and response and any revisions; the final report additionally requires donor review. Include a communications plan for tracking progress and problem solving during the project.

5.3.5 Include a description of any pertinent activities or expectations involving PAI program personnel, including meetings, review of existing records, field activities, and other activities.

5.4 Pricing and Pricing Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1</td>
<td>Include a detailed budget for the work described proposed. Include a breakout of the level of effort (LOE), daily rate(s), travel and other direct costs and all applicable indirect cost rates. Daily rates and indirect cost rates not included in your proposal cannot be accepted after the fact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2</td>
<td>Please include a proposed payment schedule by deliverable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI.   Evaluation

PAI will evaluate proposals according to the criteria below and select a consultant at its discretion. PAI reserves the right to modify its evaluation criteria at their sole discretion prior to evaluating responses. PAI will evaluate all proposals received that demonstrate alignment with PAI goals and requirements as described in this RFP and Attachment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Experience and technical proficiency in monitoring and evaluation processes, and evaluating large USDA, USG, or similar programs</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Technical proposal, work methodology, and proposed work plan in line with consultancy objectives</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Writing and presentation skills (communication)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Proposed consultancy cost</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. Profile of Evaluator

Applicants may apply as individuals or as a consortium of partners. In either case, applicants must present clear roles of all individuals and/or consortium members and one individual must be named as the lead evaluator with overall responsibility for the management and coordination of the evaluation.

The profile of the lead evaluator should meet the below requirements:
• Masters degree or equivalent in areas of international development, economics or social science or other relevant field and more than 7 years of managerial experience in a relevant field.
• Over 10 years of experience in research, strategy/organizational development/project management and program evaluations
• Extensive experience working with international organizations globally and specifically in complex environments in the fields of education, literacy, nutrition and/or institutional development.
• Excellent attention to detail and evidence of quality outputs from previous assignments
• Fluent, professional-level oral and written English and Portuguese
• Excellent reporting and presentation skills
• Punctuality and availability to complete the work on time

Issuance of this RFP, the preparation and submission of proposals by respondents, and the subsequent receipt and evaluation of proposals by PAI shall not commit PAI to award a contract to any respondent. Furthermore, in no event shall choosing a consultant for presentation, negotiations, or otherwise be construed to create any legal obligations on the part of PAI.
I. Background

The 2015-2020 Planet Aid Food for Education project (phase 2 of the 2012-2016 project of the same name) is a comprehensive school-feeding project with child health, nutrition education, teacher training, water and sanitation components, complemented by a literacy component. It is funded by the Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS) of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA); the total value of the project is US$31.8 million. The project is implemented in Mozambique by Planet Aid (PAI) and Ajuda de Desenvolvimento de Povo para o Povo (ADPP), Planet Aid’s local partner in Mozambique, in partnership with the World Initiative for Soy in Human Health program (WISHH) of the American Soybean Association (ASA) and Cambridge Education (CE).

The project’s overarching goals are to improve literacy of school-age children in Mozambique and to increase the use of health and dietary practices. To this end, the project takes a holistic, multi-faceted approach to promote the health, wellbeing and education of school-aged children, combining a straightforward school feeding program with health, water, sanitation, literacy and nutrition education components. The government of Mozambique has made considerable progress in improving access to education, but major challenges remain in improving the quality of education and the ability to commit transitioning responsibility for the school feeding program. The rapid expansion has placed intense pressure on school management, teaching personnel and the ability to deliver effective classroom instruction, resulting in a large number of overcrowded multi-shift schools, growing student:teacher ratios, resulting in plummeting reading and mathematics test scores.

According to the project’s theory of change, improving the quality of literacy instruction by providing intensive, targeted literacy instruction to teachers in project schools, thereby increasing the skills and knowledge of primary school teachers and giving learners improved access to school supplies and materials, is expected to contribute to improving child literacy. Improving students’ attendance, through a combination of improved school infrastructure and increased enrolment, brought about by increased access to food as a result of the school feeding program and other interventions to increase enrolment, is expected to further contribute to improving child literacy and learning capacity. The project aims to increase the use of health and dietary practices through a combination of increased knowledge of nutrition, increased access to clean water and sanitation services, and increased access to preventative health interventions, such as deworming. The approach recognizes the importance of both increased engagement of local organizations and community groups and increased capacity of government institutions to the achievement of the project goals. The project depends on building community support for school feeding and related activities through School Feeding Committees based at each targeted school. Finally, the project is intended to serve as a model for the national school feeding program being developed by the Government of Mozambique (GOM) with collaboration and assistance from the World Food Program (WFP).
The project consists of three major components:

1. **School feeding, water supply development, school gardens, infrastructure and related activities**
   The project aims to improve the health and nutrition of 74,000 students in 271 target schools in 4 districts of Maputo Province, Mozambique (Moamba, Magude, Manhiça, and Matutuine), through a daily meal, the development of school gardens, the provision of a safe and adequate school water supply, building and maintenance of school infrastructure, and the implementation of a deworming campaign.

2. **Early grade reading and writing intervention**
   Children in the beneficiary districts speak one of several local Mozambican languages when they enter school, but they have traditionally been taught to read in Portuguese, the official national language. This creates an obstacle in their acquisition of reading and writing skills as well as in their wider education. In 133 out of the 271 beneficiary schools the program has provided materials to reinforce reading and writing skills for 1st-3rd grade children; 111 of these schools received materials in local languages (either Rhonga or Changana) and 22 received materials in Portuguese. The teachers receive training in how to use the new methods and reading coaches provide follow up support to the trained teachers in the form of school-based coaching and professional development. After-school clubs and kits of educational and recreational materials are provided in the 271 schools benefiting from school feeding, in order to promote an improved learning environment, enrolment and attendance, with a focus on ensuring gender parity in these areas.

3. **Nutrition education program**
   The project also produces nutrition and health education materials and information and, in partnership with Planet Aid’s implementing partner, WISHH, implemented a comprehensive nutrition campaign in the four beneficiary districts of Maputo province for the first four of the five project years. Within this component, primary school teachers currently teaching in primary schools are trained as nutrition educators/trainers (Coaches) and, in turn, they each train other primary school teachers as nutrition educators in the respective schools in which they work. By the end of the project, 10,300 teachers, government officials, and other personnel will be trained as educators. In addition, curriculum developed to introduce and maintain nutrition education for primary schools will benefit all primary school students enrolled in targeted schools.

II. **Previous Evaluations**

During the first phase of the Food for Education project (2012-2016), a baseline study was conducted by project staff with support from an external evaluator. The first phase was then evaluated by an external evaluator at mid-term and end point. The baseline, mid-term and final reports of the first phase of the project are available on request. Prior to the commencement of the second phase of the project (2015-2020), a baseline study was designed and supervised by an external evaluator and the project Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) coordinator. Baseline data were collected by project staff. The baseline study included a quasi-experimental cohort study of a sample of 6,318 pupils from intervention schools and control schools, based on a stratified sample drawn by experts in statistical analysis. The results of this study are available in the phase two baseline study report.

In 2019, a mid-term evaluation was completed by an external evaluation team to measure progress against the baseline outcomes and formulate recommendations for the remainder of the project. The midterm evaluation utilized the indicators and methods used in the baseline study and evaluated the progress of the cohorts of intervention and counterfactual pupils studied at baseline. The Final Evaluation will consider the previous evaluations to determine the improvements made based on evaluation results and recommendations.

III. **Management of the Final Evaluation**

The Final Evaluation will be carried out during the final year of implementation and after the third year of literacy intervention at the beneficiary schools. Planet Aid will take overall responsibility for organization
and administration of the Final Evaluation. In order to ensure the objectivity and validity, the Final Evaluation will be carried out by an external evaluator, who is independent of the implementing organizations and has no role in the implementation of the project. The external evaluator will be recruited using a public, competitive bidding process; all qualified applicants will be considered. Organizational and logistical aspects of the evaluation will be coordinated by the project M&E Coordinator, who will also ensure existing project monitoring data and other project information and records are made available to the external evaluator. The project M&E Coordinator will work with the project staff to include appropriate input into the evaluation processes, such as ensuring project records are complete and readily consultable, supporting the logistical planning of field work and collecting staff comments on the draft report. However, neither the project’s M&E Coordinator, nor any other member of the project staff will be involved in the gathering or analysis of data beyond assisting to make arrangements for the external evaluator activities. The independent evaluator holds ultimate responsibility for all information gathering and analysis and for the findings of the evaluation, including preparing the evaluation report. The USDA’s Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS) will be invited to participate in the evaluation.

IV. Purpose and Scope of the Final Evaluation

The purpose of the final evaluation is to assess the extent to which the project has achieved the expected results as outlined in the results framework. The final evaluation should assess areas of project design, implementation, management, lessons learned and replicability. It should seek to provide lessons learned and recommendations for USDA, program participants and other key stakeholders for future food assistance and capacity building programs. The evaluation will likely use mixed methods approaches as outlined in the agreed upon evaluation plan.

Based on the project results framework and overall theory of change, included in ANNEX C, the evaluation will attempt to test causal linkages within these and respond to the following key questions:

- Does increased access to food lead to reductions in short-term hunger and improved attentiveness among target learners?
- Do reductions in short-term hunger and improved attentiveness lead to increased literacy outcomes amongst school-aged children?
- To what extent do the provision of literacy materials and teacher training lead to increased quality of literacy instruction and increased literacy outcomes among school-aged children?

The Final Evaluation will assess the project’s relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and potential for sustainability as defined in the USDA FAS Monitoring and Evaluation Policy. The evaluation will assess what has changed in the lives of the project beneficiaries, in addition to whether the project objectives have been

---

1 Relevance-The extent to which the project interventions met the needs of the project beneficiaries and is aligned with the country’s agriculture and/or development investment strategy and with USDA and US Government’s development goals, objectives, and strategies. Relevance should also address the extent to which the project was designed taking into account the economic, cultural and political context and existing relevant program activities.

Effectiveness-The extent to which the project has achieved its objectives. Effectiveness should also assess the extent to which the interventions contributed to the expected results or objectives.

Efficiency-The extent to which the project resources (inputs) have led to the achieved results. An assessment of efficiency should also consider whether the same results could have been achieved with fewer resources or whether alternative approaches could have been adopted to achieve the same results.

Impact-Assessment of the medium and long-term effects, both intended and unintended, of a project intervention. Effects can be both direct or indirect and positive or negative. To the extent possible, the evaluation should assess the extent to which the effects are due to the project intervention and not other factors.

Sustainability-Assessment of the likelihood that the benefits of the project will endure over time after the completion of the project. Sustainability should also assess the extent to which the project has planned for the continuation of project activities, developed local ownership for the project, and developed sustainable partnerships (USDA FAS Monitoring and Evaluation Policy).
achieved. In doing this, it will assess the project in three areas: 1) internal validity (Is the project doing what it set out to do?), 2) initial impact (Is it making a difference?), and 3) strategic relevance regarding effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and potential for sustainability (Were these the right things to do? What can be learned from what was done?)

Literacy Assessment
The final evaluation will also assess the status of literacy levels of the learners in intervention and control schools, in both the bilingual and Portuguese language cohorts to establish the impact of program interventions. The evaluation will include classroom observations and the administration of the Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) to a sample of students from all 4 districts that have completed grades 2 and 3 (current grade 3 and 4 learners). The assessment of students that have completed year 2 (current grade 3 learners) will inform the evaluation of MGD SO1, specifically, while the assessment of students that have completed grade 3 (current grade 4 learners) will permit the comparison of longitudinal data for the same cohort from baseline through midline and to endline.

The evaluator will generate the student sample based on those used in previous evaluations in order to allow comparison and to determine improvements. The evaluation plan should include how the EGRA will be administered, including who will administer the testing and how enumerators will be trained to administer the testing as needed. The evaluation team will collect literacy data with equipment and software as defined in their evaluation plan and agreed upon with the project team.

The sampling frame utilized to date includes five categories of schools:
- FFE+literacy (local language
- FFE+literacy (Portuguese)
- FFE+literacy (local language and Portuguese)
- FFE only
- Comparison

Evaluation Questions
The Final Evaluation will seek to respond to the following evaluation questions and compare results to previous evaluations on phase one and two of the project to include evaluation of responses to lessons learned and recommendations made in previous independent evaluations:

Activities and processes
- Did each activity achieve its target?
- To what extent were activities carried out effectively, according to principles of good practice and to the satisfaction of different stakeholders?
- What could have been improved regarding these activities/processes?
- What were the main problems and constraints?
- Were improvements made based on recommendations from previous evaluations and lessons learned?

Results
- Did the project achieve its intended results?
- What was the initial impact on the direct beneficiaries?
- What was the initial impact on their families (and other indirect beneficiaries)?
- To what extent, if any, did the activities carried out begin to improve direct and indirect beneficiaries’ wellbeing?
- Were there any unintended effects on people, including undesirable effects?
- Did any factors external to the project change the situation of the project and/or its beneficiaries?
- Were any changes observed due to the project interventions?
- Were any changes observed due to factors external to the project?

**Project staff and partners**
- Were different project roles performed effectively?
- Did project staff feel motivated, committed to project objectives and able to carry out their functions effectively?
  - If not, what could have been improved?
- Were implementing partners contributing to the project as planned?
  - If not, what could have been improved?
- Did the capacity of the project staff increase since the beginning of the project?
  - If so, what factors led to improved staff capacity?
- Did the capacity of the project partners increase since the beginning of the project?
  - If so, what factors led to improved partner capacity?

**Sustainability**
- Were the project plans designed to produce sustainable change after the conclusion of the project?
- What are the perspectives of the interventions being continued by government and/or other partners after the conclusion of the project?
- What was the level of ownership of and commitment to the project by implementing actors and beneficiaries at national, provincial, district and local level?
- To what extent has the project built sufficient capacity to ensure sustainability after the duration of the project?
- What elements or components are most likely sustainable beyond the life of the project? What elements or components are unlikely to be sustained and why?

**Collaboration and coordination**
- What was the level/quality of collaboration between the project and its implementing partners?
- What was the level/quality of collaboration and coordination between the project and national, provincial and district government?
- What was the level/quality of collaboration and coordination between the project and local and community leaders, including traditional leaders?
- What was the level/quality of collaboration and coordination between the project and other organizations implementing school feeding programs in Mozambique?
- How is the project working with the Government of Mozambique, World Food Program and other school feeding implementers to share lessons learned and good practices to help inform a national school feeding policy and program environment?
- How has collaboration with the MINEDH and INDE supported sustained implementation of literacy interventions in Mozambique?
- How relevant is the project to the local and national school feeding policy and program environment?
- How relevant is the project to the cultural and social environment?
- To what extent has the project fit within existing policy and program contexts, both those planned and/or implemented by the Government and those implemented by projects supported by other donors?
**Budget and cost**

- Was the project within its budget?
- Were there unforeseen expenses?
- Were resources used as effectively as possible?
- Could project activities have been more cost-effective?

In addition to the general questions above, specific evaluation questions will be formulated for each activity through consultation between PAI, ADPP, and the external evaluator. In doing this, the evaluation should address the impact of key project components, including but not limited to school feeding, literacy and nutrition interventions. The evaluation of school feeding activities will range from questions regarding food storage, handling, distribution, safeguarding and preparation to the effectiveness of school feeding committees. Nutrition and literacy should assess the long-term impact of specific interventions. Specific to literacy, for example, the evaluation should assess the impact of offering literacy programming in both Portuguese and bilingual (Portuguese and local language) modalities and comparative learning outcomes achieved between the monolingual and bilingual interventions.

**V. Methodology of Information Collection**

A mixed method approach combining quantitative and qualitative information is needed in order to answer the general and specific evaluation questions. The overall approach for data collection should take into account the methodology and software used in previous evaluations in order to allow comparability and consistency. The external evaluator is responsible for overseeing data collection and will collect data with equipment and software as defined in their evaluation plan and agreed upon with the project team. Organizational and logistical aspects of the data collection processes will be supported by the project M&E coordinator and staff following principles agreed with the external evaluator. A preliminary list of data to be collected by the evaluator is included in **ANNEX A**. Data collection methods will include some or all of the following:

- Review and collation of information from project documentation, inventory records, project monitoring documents, records and reports, literacy test scores, attendance records, reports and observations of ADPP field staffs, district health center data, literacy training materials, nutrition training materials, nutrition test scores, tests of government officials;
- Internal self-review by the project implementation team, facilitated by the external evaluator;
- Literacy testing of the cohort of target learners (intervention group) and non-target learners (control/counterfactual group) tested at baseline and midterm. This includes separate intervention and control groups for monolingual and bilingual literacy interventions;
- Interviews with the cohort of target learners (intervention group) and non-target learners (control/counterfactual group) tested at baseline and midterm;
- Weighing and measuring of the cohort of target learners (intervention group) and non-target learners (control/counterfactual group) tested at baseline and midterm;
- Surveys of project beneficiaries and other stakeholders (learners, teachers, parents, food preparers, school-feeding committee members, government officials, etc.);
- Focus groups with project beneficiaries and other stakeholder groups (learners, teachers, parents, food preparers, school-feeding committee members, government officials, etc.);
- Semi-structured interviews with a small number of key stakeholders, including MINEDH, INDE and other relevant ministries;
- Field visits and observations using a standardized observation framework and photographic recording of infrastructure;
Case studies that showcase examples of positive change and/or lessons learned;
Review workshop to validate findings;
Statistical modelling to account for measured background differences between target learners and the comparison group such that changes associated with the project will be measured.

Prior to the evaluation, ADPP will ensure that the accuracy and completeness of the samples provided, and will provide individual record level data in unanalyzed, non-tabulated form to the external evaluator for analysis. Information from project records and documents and government sources will be made available. A list of data to be provided by ADPP is included in **ANNEX A**.

VI. **Data Quality Assurance**
The external evaluator will hold ultimate responsibility for the overall quality and validity of the information gathered and its analysis. This includes ensuring the quality of the evaluation methodology and instruments, quantitative and qualitative data collected for the purposes of the evaluation and for the training and supervision of data gatherers. Suitable quality assurance processes must be in place during fieldwork: these may include but are not limited to: spot checks during the data gathering processes, quality assurance of at least 10% of all data collected, systematic double checking of all data entry and ongoing inter enumerator checks to ensure consistency and validity of the data gathered. All interviews and focus groups shall be conducted by researchers with the requisite research skills, thus minimizing risks such as bias in questioning. The evaluation will include different types and sources of data to allow triangulation of the information provided.

VII. **Specific Indicators, Data Types and Collection Methods**
The indicators against which the project Outputs (Intermediate Results) are to be measured form part of the project’s evaluation plan: many of the indicators used are standard McGovern-Dole indicators used in other Food for Education projects supported by the FAS of the USDA. Information regarding each project indicator was collected and analyzed in the baseline study and midterm evaluation. In order for the Final Evaluation to allow accurate measurement of progress against each project Intermediate Result, the same indicators will be used and the information will be collected in an appropriate and comparable manner to allow a meaningful measurement of progress against the Baseline and Midterm.

**ANNEX B** includes each of the project Intermediate results with their respective associated indicators, the characteristics of the data needed for the Final Evaluation, and the suggested responsibility for data collection and analysis.

VIII. **Evaluation Products and Deliverables**
Evaluation products and deliverables are listed below. Each deliverable will be reviewed and approved by PAI. The Final Evaluation Report will be reviewed and approved by both PAI and the donor.
- **A final evaluation work plan** will be agreed between the external evaluator and PAI to ensure continuity and comparability with the baseline and midterm evaluations, as well as with the evaluations conducted during the previous FY 2012-16 project. The work plan should include the timeline, schedule of deliverables, methodology/approach, budget, and place(s) of performance. The work plan will be submitted, reviewed and approved by PAI.
- **Status deliverables**, as outlined in the work plan, will include trip reports, provision of data sets, and summaries of preliminary findings.
- **A draft evaluation report** written in English according to the requirements outlined will be submitted for PAI and selected project personnel for review;
• The final data set will include one electronic file of the cleaned and final qualitative and quantitative data collected.

• A Summary of Key Findings document should concisely summarize key outcomes by component and the key findings of the evaluation.

• A Final Evaluation Report should address the issues and questions of this SOW and correspond to the evaluation objectives outlined. The final evaluation report should contain (but is not limited to) the following:
  - Executive Summary presenting the major findings and recommendations
  - Evaluation aims, objectives, and scope
  - Assessment of the project’s underlying impact logic
  - Description of the methodology used
  - Limitations of the evaluation or methodology
  - Description of the assessment context and process, including constraints and challenges
  - Detailed findings (related to the objectives and structure, considering evaluation criteria and questions)
  - Analysis of the findings (following the key questions in this SOW and as established with PAI)
  - Conclusions
  - Lessons learned and recommendations for the project approach
  - Recommendations for sustainability of program outcomes, including transfer of ownership to the GOM.

Note that the working language of the evaluation is Portuguese, while the reporting language is English.
ANNEX A: DATA TO BE COLLECTED

I. Data to be provided by ADPP

ADPP will collect the following information and provide it to the external evaluator in individual record, non-analyzed form. ADPP will ensure the accuracy and completeness of samples and data provided.

a. Project records
   i. Number of individuals benefiting directly from USDA-funded interventions
   ii. Number of individuals benefiting indirectly from USDA-funded interventions
   iii. Number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants in target schools who demonstrate use of new and quality teaching techniques or tools as a result of USDA assistance
   iv. Number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants trained or certified as a result of USDA assistance
   v. Number of after-school learning clubs active in project schools
   vi. Number of school children participating in clubs
   vii. Number of awards given to students
   viii. Number of schools receiving school supplies and materials as a result of USDA assistance.
   ix. Number of textbooks and other teaching and learning materials provided as a result of USDA assistance
   x. Number of 1-3 Grade children receiving literacy books
   xi. Number of supplementary literacy materials produced and distributed to project schools
   xii. Number of teachers trained
   xiii. Number of teachers anticipated to graduate as a result of USDA assistance
   xiv. Number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants trained or certified as a result of USDA assistance
   xv. Number of awards given to teachers
   xvi. Number of school administrators and officials trained or certified as a result of USDA assistance
   xvii. Number of school administrators and officials in target schools who demonstrate use of new techniques or tools as a result of USDA assistance
   xviii. Number of daily school meals (breakfast, snack, lunch) provided to school-age children as a result of USDA assistance
   xix. Number of school-aged children receiving daily school meals (breakfast, snack, lunch) as a result of USDA assistance
   xx. Number of social assistance beneficiaries participating in productive safety nets as a result of USDA assistance
   xxi. Number of students enrolled in schools receiving USDA assistance
   xxii. Number of kitchens, storerooms and firewood saving stoves maintained as a result of USDA assistance
   xxiii. Number of local leaders and school council members attending school feeding project management trainings
   xxiv. Number of Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs) or similar “school” governance structures supported as a result of USDA assistance
   xxv. Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of USDA assistance
   xxvi. Value of public and private sector investments leveraged as a result of USDA assistance
   xxvii. Number of food preparers at target schools trained in hand washing, safe food preparation and storage practices
xxviii. People trained in good hygiene practices
xxix. Number of cooks tested for TB
xxx. Number of volunteer cooks receiving health and hygiene training
xxxi. Number of Home-Grown School Feeding Gardens established
xxi. Number of school children benefiting from Home-Grown School Feeding Gardens
xxxii. Number of school gardens further developed and maintained
xxxiv. Number of school children benefiting from school gardens
xxxv. Number of people trained in child health and nutrition as a result of USDA assistance
xxxvi. Number of latrines & hand washing facilities constructed
xxxvii. Number of educational facilities (i.e. school buildings, classrooms, and latrines) rehabilitated/constructed as a result of USDA assistance (latrines)
xxxviii. Number of hand washing facilities rehabilitated
xxxix. Number of school children benefiting from latrines and hand washing facilities
xl. Number of schools with improved sanitary facilities
xli. Number of water tanks secured
xliv. Number of students receiving deworming medication
l. Number of community volunteers receiving laundry soap
lxv. Number of participants in school feeding conferences (district, province and national)
lxvi. Number of late and hand washing facilities rehabilitated
lxvii. Number of government officials trained in nutrition

b. Trainee teacher test scores, collected by 5 EPFIs, using a tool developed by the external evaluator in collaboration with EPF trainers

c. DPEDH enrolment data for 2016 - 2019 for basic education in the 4 intervention districts (Magude, Manhiça, Matatuine, Moamba) and the 4 control districts (Boane, Marracuene, Matola and Namaacha);
d. DPEDH attendance data for 2016 - 2019 for basic education in the 4 intervention districts (Magude, Manhiça, Matatuine, Moamba) and the 4 control districts (Boane, Marracuene, Matola and Namaacha);
e. DPEDH drop-out data for 2016 and 2017 for basic education in the 4 intervention districts (Magude, Manhiça, Matatuine, Moamba) and the 4 control districts (Boane, Marracuene, Matola and Namaacha);
f. WISHH project/monitoring information for all WISHH nutrition education interventions.
g. Project scope of work, results framework, list of indicators and previous evaluations.

II. Data to be collected by the external evaluator using tools developed by the external evaluator

a. Individual interviews with a sample of learners in Grades 3 and 4 (having completed grades 2 and 3, respectively) including a measurement of their weight and height (intervention and control groups).
b. Survey of teachers who were studied at the midline evaluation.
c. Visits and observations at sample schools using standardized observation sheet
d. A literacy assessment of a sample of students who have completed Grade 2 in all 4 districts, using the Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA).
e. Classroom observation of literacy interventions (bilingual and Portuguese)
f. Observation of nutrition training sessions
g. Focus groups with parents, food preparers, teachers, learners, parents, EPF teachers, Food For Education Field Officers
h. Focus group/interviews with school council heads/members
i. Interviews with head teachers
j. Interviews with district education officers
k. Interviews with district health officers
l. Interviews with EPF directors
m. Interviews with Planet Aid representatives
n. Interviews with Food for Education project managers or team representatives:
o. Interviews with WISHH representatives/employees
p. Interviews with USDA/FAS representatives:
q. Interviews with Government of Mozambique representatives:
r. Interviews with other key stakeholders:
s. Results of internal self-review by the project implementation team
t. Case studies which showcase examples of change and lessons learned
u. Results of review workshop to validate findings
### ANNEX B – Project Intermediate Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Indicator #</th>
<th>Result #</th>
<th>Title in MGD Framework</th>
<th>Indicator type</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Data characteristics/collection method</th>
<th>Who performs collection/analysis</th>
<th>Feed the Future?</th>
<th>Unit of Measure</th>
<th>Frequency of Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MGD 1.3</td>
<td>Improved Student attendance</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Number of students regularly (80%) attending USDA supported classrooms/schools</td>
<td>Project records based on school registers</td>
<td>Supplied by ADPP; Analyzed by external evaluator</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Biannual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MGD 1.1.2</td>
<td>Better Access to School Supplies and Materials</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Number of textbooks and other teaching and learning materials provided as a result of USDA assistance</td>
<td>Project records with evidence of materials distributed</td>
<td>Supplied by ADPP; Analyzed by external evaluator</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Biannual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MGD 1.1.5</td>
<td>Increased Skills and Knowledge of School Administrators</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>1. Number of school administrators and officials in target schools who demonstrate use of new techniques or tools as a result of USDA assistance</td>
<td>Survey and/or interviews with school administrators</td>
<td>Collected and analyzed by external evaluator</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Biannual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MGD 1.1.5</td>
<td>Increased Skills and Knowledge of School Administrators</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>2. Number of school administrators and officials trained or certified as a result of USDA assistance</td>
<td>Project records- Participants’ list of individuals who attended such trainings</td>
<td>Supplied by ADPP; Analyzed by external evaluator</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Biannual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MGD 1.1.4</td>
<td>Increased Skills and Knowledge of Teachers</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>1. Number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants in target schools who demonstrate</td>
<td>1. Project records</td>
<td>Supplied by ADPP;</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Indicator #</td>
<td>Result #</td>
<td>Title in MGD Results Framework</td>
<td>Indicator type</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Data characteristics/collection method</td>
<td>Who performs collection/analysis</td>
<td>Feed Future?</td>
<td>Unit of Measure</td>
<td>Frequency of Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MGD 1.1.4</td>
<td>Increased Skills and Knowledge of Teachers</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>2. Number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants trained or certified as a result of USDA assistance</td>
<td>TTC records</td>
<td>Supplied by ADPP; Analyzed by external evaluator</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Biannual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MGD 1.3.3</td>
<td>Improved School Infrastructure</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Number of kitchens, storerooms and firewood saving stoves maintained as a result of USDA assistance</td>
<td>1. Visits and observation at sample schools 2. Project records</td>
<td>Supplied by ADPP; Analyzed by external evaluator</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Biannual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>MGD 1.3.4</td>
<td>Increased Student Enrolment</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Number of students enrolled in school receiving USDA assistance</td>
<td>Project records</td>
<td>Supplied by ADPP; Analyzed by external evaluator</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MGD 1.4.4</td>
<td>Increased Engagement of Local</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Number of Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs) or similar “school” governance</td>
<td>1. Project Records 2. Focus group/interviews</td>
<td>Supplied by ADPP</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Biannual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Indicator #</td>
<td>Result #</td>
<td>Title in MGD Results Framework</td>
<td>Indicator type</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Data characteristics/collection method</td>
<td>Who performs collection/analysis</td>
<td>Feed the Future?</td>
<td>Unit of Measure</td>
<td>Frequency of Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>MGD 1.4.4</td>
<td>Increased Engagement of Local Organizations and Community Groups</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of USDA assistance</td>
<td>Project Records</td>
<td>Supplied by ADPP; Analyzed by external evaluator</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Biannual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>MGD 1.4.3/1.4.4</td>
<td>Increased Government Support/ Increased Engagement of Local Organizations and Community Groups</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Value of new public and private sector investments leveraged as a result of USDA assistance</td>
<td>Project Records</td>
<td>Supplied by ADPP; Analyzed by external evaluator</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>US Dollar</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>MGD 1.2.1.1</td>
<td>Increased Access to Food (school feeding)</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Number of daily school meals (breakfast, snack, lunch) provided to school-age children as a result of USDA assistance</td>
<td>Project Records</td>
<td>Supplied by ADPP; Analyzed by external evaluator</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Biannual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>MGD 1.2.1.1</td>
<td>Increased Access to Food (school feeding)</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Number of school-age children receiving daily school meals (breakfast, lunch, snack)</td>
<td>Project Records</td>
<td>Supplied by ADPP; Analyzed by external evaluator</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Biannual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Indicator #</td>
<td>Result #</td>
<td>Title in MGD Results Framework</td>
<td>Indicator type</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Data characteristics/collection method</td>
<td>Who performs collection/analysis</td>
<td>Feed the Future?</td>
<td>Unit of Measure</td>
<td>Frequency of Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>MGD 1.2.1.1/2.5</td>
<td>Increased Access to Food (school feeding)/Increased Access to Preventative Health Interventions</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Number of social assistance beneficiaries participating in productive safety nets as a result of USDA assistance</td>
<td>Project Records</td>
<td>Supplied by ADPP; Analyzed by external evaluator</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>MGD SO 2</td>
<td>Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Number of individuals trained in child health and nutrition as a result of USDA assistance</td>
<td>Project records-Participants’ list of individuals who attended such trainings</td>
<td>Supplied by ADPP; Analyzed by external evaluator</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>MGD 2.2</td>
<td>Increased Knowledge of Safe Food Prep and Storage Practices</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Number of food preparers at target schools trained in hand washing, safe food preparation and storage practices</td>
<td>Project records</td>
<td>Supplied by ADPP; Analyzed by external evaluator</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Biannual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>MGD 2.4</td>
<td>Increased Access to Clean Water and Sanitation Services</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Number of schools using an improved water source</td>
<td>1. Visits and observation at sample schools 2. Project records</td>
<td>Collected and analyzed by external evaluator</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Biannual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Indicator #</td>
<td>Result #</td>
<td>Title in MGD Results Framework</td>
<td>Indicator type</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Data characteristics/collection method</td>
<td>Who performs collection/analysis</td>
<td>Feed the Future?</td>
<td>Unit of Measure</td>
<td>Frequency of Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>MGD 2.4</td>
<td>Increased Access to Clean Water and Sanitation Services</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Number of schools with improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>1. Visits and observation at sample schools 2. Project records</td>
<td>Collected and analyzed by external evaluator</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Biannual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>MGD 2.5</td>
<td>Increased access to preventative health interventions</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Number of students receiving deworming medication(s)</td>
<td>1. Focus groups and interviews with teachers and learners 2. Project records</td>
<td>Collected and analyzed by external evaluator</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Biannual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>MGD SO1</td>
<td>Improved literacy of school-age children</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Percent of students who, by the end of two grades of primary schooling, demonstrate that they can read and understand the meaning of grade level text</td>
<td>Results from EGRA - the same or of comparable level to that used at baseline and midline</td>
<td>Collected and analyzed by external evaluator</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Baseline, Midterm and End Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>MGD SO1</td>
<td>Improved literacy of school-age children</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Number of individuals benefiting directly from USDA-funded interventions</td>
<td>Project records</td>
<td>Supplied by ADPP; Analyzed by external evaluator</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Indicator #</td>
<td>Result #</td>
<td>Title in MGD Results Framework</td>
<td>Indicator type</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Data characteristics/collection method</td>
<td>Who performs collection/analysis</td>
<td>Feed the Future?</td>
<td>Unit of Measure</td>
<td>Frequency of Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>MGD S01</td>
<td>Improved literacy of school-age children</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Number of individuals benefiting indirectly from USDA-funded interventions</td>
<td>Project records</td>
<td>Supplied by ADPP; Analyzed by external evaluator</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGD 1.2</td>
<td>Improved attentiveness</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>1. Percentage of teachers who report increased attentiveness of students in the classroom</td>
<td>Survey of teachers</td>
<td>Collected and analyzed by external evaluator</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Baseline, Midterm and End Line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGD 1.2</td>
<td>Improved attentiveness</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>2. Percentage of students in project schools who report increased attentiveness in the classroom</td>
<td>Interviews with learners</td>
<td>Collected and analyzed by external evaluator</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Baseline, Midterm and End Line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGD 1.2.1</td>
<td>Reduced Short-term hunger</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>1. Percentage of teachers who report reduced short-term hunger of learners in the classroom</td>
<td>Survey of teachers</td>
<td>Collected and analyzed by external evaluator</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Baseline, Midterm and End Line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGD 1.2.1</td>
<td>Reduced Short-term hunger</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>2. Percentage of students who report reduced short-term hunger in the classroom</td>
<td>Interviews with learners</td>
<td>Collected and analyzed by external evaluator</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Baseline, Midterm and End Line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGD 2.1</td>
<td>Improved Knowledge of Health and Hygiene Practice</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Percentage of students that demonstrate acceptable knowledge of health and hygiene practices</td>
<td>Interviews with learners</td>
<td>Collected and analyzed by external evaluator</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Baseline, Midterm and End Line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Indicator #</td>
<td>Result #</td>
<td>Title in MGD Results Framework</td>
<td>Indicator type</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Data characteristics/collection method</td>
<td>Who performs collection/analysis</td>
<td>Feed the Future?</td>
<td>Unit of Measure</td>
<td>Frequency of Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MDG 2.6              |          | Increased access to requisite food preparation and storage tools and equipment | Output         | Number of schools receiving dish washing soap | 1. Visits and observation at sample schools  
2. Project records | Collected and analyzed by external evaluator  
Supplied by ADPP; Analyzed by external evaluator | N               | Number                                      | Biannual                            |
| MGD 2.7.1            |          | Increased capacity of government institutions | Output         | Number of government officials trained in nutrition | 1. Focus groups and interviews with government officials  
2. Project records | Collected and analyzed by external evaluator  
Supplied by ADPP; Analyzed by external evaluator | N               | Number                                      | Biannual                            |
Planet Aid Inc. Mozambique FY15 McGovern-Dole Results Framework #2

MGD SO2
Increased Use of Health and Dietary Practices

MGD 2.1
Improved Knowledge of Health and Hygiene Practices
- Training: Health and hygiene practices

MGD 2.2
Increased Knowledge of Safe Food Prep and Storage Practices
- Training: Food preparation and storage practices

MGD 2.3
Increased Knowledge of Nutrition
- Establish School Gardens
- Establish Home-Grown School Feeding Gardens
- Training: Good health and nutrition practices

MGD 2.4
Increased Access to Clean Water & Sanitation Services
- Rehabilitation/maintaining: Clean Water Solutions

MGD 2.5
Increased Access to Preventative Health Interventions
- Distribution: deworming medications

MGD 2.6
Increased Access to Requisite Food Prep and Storage Tools and Equipment
- Distribution: dish and laundry soap

MGD 2.7.1
Increased Capacity of Government Institutions
- Training: government officials

MGD 2.7.4
Increased Engagement of Local Organizations & Community Groups
- Capacity building: Local leaders, School Councils and School Feeding Committees

Foundational Results