

# GUIDELINES FOR TARGETING OF FOOD FOR EDUCATION PROGRAMMES



**World Food  
Programme**

**WFP School Feeding Service  
2007**

For more detailed information on WFP School Feeding activities contact:

**WFP School Feeding Service**

Via Cesare Giulio Viola, 68/70 – 00148 Rome, Italy

Tel. +39.06.6513-1

Fax +39.06.6513. 2854

E-mail to: [schoolfeeding@wfp.org](mailto:schoolfeeding@wfp.org)

# **GUIDELINES FOR TARGETING OF FOOD FOR EDUCATION PROGRAMMES**



**WFP School Feeding Service  
2007**

Aknowledgements:

*WFP colleagues in ODAV, WFP Country Offices and Regional Bureaux have provided insightful comments and input for the development and finalization of these guidelines. The School Feeding Service gratefully aknowledge their contribution and support.*

## Acronyms

CCA	Common Country Assessment
CFSVA	Comprehensive Food Security and Vulnerability Analysis
CO	Country Office (WFP)
CP	Country Programme (WFP)
DHS	Demographic Health Surveys
EFA	Education For All
EFSA	Emergency Food Security Assessment
EMOP	Emergency Operation
ENA	Emergency Needs Assessment
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FFE	Food For Education
FSMS	Food Security Monitoring System
FEWNET	Famine Early Warning Network System
FRESH	Focussing Resources on Effective School Health
GAR	Gross Attendance Rate
GIS	Geographic Information System
GNP	Gross National Product
HFSP	Household Food Security Profile
IDD	Iodine Deficiencies Disorder
ILO	International Labour Organization
LSMS	Living Standards Measurement Survey
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MICS	Multiple Indicators Clusters Surveys
MoA	Ministry of Agriculture
MoE	Ministry of Education
NAR	Net Attendance Rate
NRVA	National Risk and Vulnerability Assessment
OVC	Orphans and Vulnerable Children
PRRO	Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation
PTA	Parents / Teacher Association
RB	Regional Bureau (WFP)
SMC	School Management Committee
SSFS	Standardised School Feeding Survey
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNICEF	United Nations International Children's Fund
VAD	Vitamin A Deficiency
VAM	Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping
WHO	World Health Organization

## Table of contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Section 1 – Mainstreaming FFE targeting into the general geographic targeting</b> .....	<b>3</b>
1.1. WFP geographic targeting of food-insecure areas.....	3
1.2. Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (VAM).....	3
1.3. VAM household questionnaire.....	4
1.3.1. How children-related data are currently collected.....	4
1.3.2. How additional children-related data could be collected through an individual-level approach..	5
1.3.3. How additional children-related data could be collected through a household-level approach	10
1.4. VAM community questionnaire.....	13
1.4.1. How children-related data are currently collected.....	13
1.4.2. How additional children-related data could be collected.....	13
<b>Section 2 – Detailed geographic targeting of FFE programmes</b> .....	<b>16</b>
2.1. The objectives of Food For Education programmes: An overview.....	16
2.2. Additional outcomes of Food For Education programmes.....	16
2.3. Detailed geographic targeting of Food For Education programmes.....	17
2.3.1. Analysing indicators related to specific programme objectives.....	18
2.3.2. Including other important factors for programme implementation and outcomes.....	19
2.3.3. Adopting a participatory approach.....	20
<b>Section 3 – School-level targeting</b> .....	<b>22</b>
3.1. School-level targeting.....	22
3.2. Possible sources of data and tools for data collection.....	23
3.3. A selection of experiences from WFP Country Offices.....	25
<b>Section 4 – Standardized surveys providing data for FFE targeting</b> .....	<b>27</b>
4.1. Sources of information.....	27
4.2. Educational indicators provided by MICS and DHS.....	28
<b>Summary</b> .....	<b>31</b>

## Introduction

Targeting of WFP interventions is a complex exercise which takes place at different levels and at different stages of the programme design process, including sometimes the programme implementation. With regard to Food For Education (FFE) programmes, we can identify the following steps:

**Step 1:**  
**General  
geographic targeting**

Considering that food aid can work as an enabler for development mainly where there is food insecurity, the identification of food insecure areas is the first step that is undertaken in order to target areas that will receive WFP assistance. Within WFP the general geographic targeting is done through the Vulnerability Analysis & Mapping (VAM) studies and the Emergency Needs Assessments (ENAs).<sup>1</sup> While ENAs are conducted for targeting of Emergency Operations (EMOPs), VAM analyses are usually done for targeting Protracted Relief and Recovery Operations (PRROs), Country Programmes (CPs) or a Development Programmes. In line with WFP general approach, FFE programmes assist schools located in food insecure areas. Therefore, *the general geographic targeting based on food insecurity can be considered as the starting point for targeting a FFE programme.*

**Step 2:**  
**Detailed  
geographic targeting**

It is often not possible nor appropriate to implement an FFE programme in all areas identified through the general geographic targeting. This can be due to limited resources or because of factors specific to the FFE programme, such as the availability of certain partners or accessibility of schools. It is therefore important to identify the food-insecure areas (or sub-areas) where FFE assistance is most needed. For this reason, once food insecure and vulnerable areas are identified, *a further assessment is usually undertaken to carry out a more detailed geographic targeting and identify specific areas that will receive FFE assistance. Since this is part of the design process of an FFE programme, this often happens at a different time than the VAM analysis.*

The detailed geographic targeting is primarily conducted on the basis of specific objectives that have been identified for the FFE programme (e.g., increase enrolment, reduce drop out, etc.).<sup>2</sup> Nonetheless, also other elements – such as availability of partners, security, accessibility, implementation of other WFP programmes – are usually taken into consideration.

**Step 3:**  
**School-level targeting**


As a third step, *a school level targeting is usually done to make sure that food aid is used in the most effective and efficient way.* In order to decide whether or not individual schools will benefit from FFE assistance minimum standards should be set (in consultation with Government counterparts, and with inputs from appropriate United Nations and bilateral agencies) regarding hygiene, physical infrastructure and security/accessibility of the schools.

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper concentrates on the geographic targeting carried out by VAM.

<sup>2</sup> Specific objectives of an FFE programme and the justification for implementing such a programme are identified during the problem analysis. This stage of programme design is not the topic of these guidelines. Details on the problem analysis and the identification of programme objectives are reported in the WFP Food For Education/School Feeding Handbook.

Fig. 1 – The process of targeting an FFE programme



Not only do the three steps have different objectives, they are conducted at different points in time. As mentioned above, while the identification of food insecure areas is done through VAM or ENAs, the detailed geographic targeting and the school-level targeting are conducted during the design of an FFE programme. The purpose of this paper is to provide technical guidance on the process of targeting FFE programmes for each of the three steps. In particular:

Step 1: Considering that the general geographic targeting of food-insecure areas is the first step that is undertaken for targeting WFP assistance, we will propose questions/modules that are relevant to FFE targeting and can be included in WFP VAM studies (section 1).

Step 2: We will point out: *i)* which indicators relate to which objective of FFE programmes; *ii)* which other elements should also be taken into consideration to finalize the detailed geographic targeting of FFE assistance and *iii)* which strategies can be adopted to ensure that the targeting results are widely accepted by the local communities and institutions (section 2).

Step 3: We will propose specific criteria, indicators and questions which can be used to analyze the condition of schools located in the targeted areas and carry out a school-level targeting (section 3).


Finally, we will provide an overview of relevant sources of data sets / reports which can be used to conduct a literature review on children’s education at sub-national level (section 4). These data can be used during the general geographic targeting of food-insecure areas (step 1) as well as during the more detailed geographic targeting (step 2).



## Section 1 – Mainstreaming FFE targeting into the general geographic targeting

This section will describe the VAM approach to food security and vulnerability and see how educational aspects are usually covered during a VAM study. New questions / modules will be presented and explained with the ultimate purpose of incorporating indicators relevant to FFE targeting into WFP general geographic targeting (see fig. 2).

Fig. 2 – Mainstreaming FFE targeting into the general geographic targeting



### 1.1. WFP geographic targeting of food-insecure areas

Within WFP, geographic targeting of food insecure areas is conducted through Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (VAM), Early Warning Systems and Emergency Needs Assessments (ENAs). The VAM analytical framework consists of Comprehensive Food Security and Vulnerability Analyses (CFSVA), Food Security Monitoring Systems (FSMS) and Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and Mapping. CFSVA provide an in depth analysis of households' ability to meet food needs and risk management strategies and include the analysis of national policies / priorities regarding food security and household vulnerability. They are often used to provide "pre-crisis information" for an Emergency Food Security Assessment (EFSA) and to target WFP's areas of intervention, especially in non emergency settings. FSMS monitors trends in critical food-security variables, identifies potential threats to food security and produces data to inform decisions to initiate a needs' assessment or adjust food-security interventions. GIS and mapping enhance geographic targeting by integrating various satellite datasets into VAM analysis.<sup>3</sup>

Early Warning Systems complement VAM analysis and FSMS by monitoring food security and potential crises (e.g., weather patterns, pests, crop yields, political tensions). With the onset of an emergency, an ENA determines the impact of the crisis on peoples' food security, establishes if food aid is needed, when, how much, for how long and for how many people it is needed.<sup>4</sup>

### 1.2. Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (VAM)<sup>5</sup>

Food security and vulnerability are the key issues addressed by VAM. In particular, VAM approach to food security and vulnerability incorporates five guiding questions: 1) *Who are the food insecure?* 2) *How many are they?* 3) *Where do they live?* 4) *Why are they food insecure?* 5) *Does food aid have a role to play?*

VAM describes household food security and vulnerability by identifying groups that share similar characteristics / outcomes related to food security and developing household food security profiles (HFSPs) for each group. A combination of methods and data is used to identify HFSPs. A literature review and an analysis of secondary data are usually an important starting point to provide a good understanding of the national / sub-national situation of the country.<sup>6</sup> However, the HFSPs are developed by using primary data collected through quantitative and qualitative studies. As a general rule, the geographic distribution of HFSPs, as well as the distribution of specific relevant indicators, are represented on maps.

**Quantitative studies:** Quantitative data are usually collected at the household level (through the household questionnaire) and at the community level (through the community questionnaire). Data collected at the household level provide information on migration; housing / facilities; household assets; productive assets / access to credit; agriculture; income; expenditure; food sources / consumption; shocks / food security; maternal health / nutrition; child health / nutrition. The community questionnaire complements data collected at the households by providing information on the community. Major topics covered by this questionnaire

<sup>3</sup> WFP/EB.1/2006/5-A

<sup>4</sup> WFP/EB.1/2006/5-A

<sup>5</sup> Household Food Security Profiles, VAM Thematic Guideline

<sup>6</sup> VAM identified five main sources of secondary data that can be analysed to bring insight to the five questions of a VAM study: *i*) the National Population and Housing Census, *ii*) the Demographic and Health Survey (DHS), *iii*) the Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS), *iv*) the Living Standards Measurement Survey (LSMS), *v*) survey data previously collected by WFP partner agencies.

are: economy and infrastructures; food aid and external assistance; presence of educational and health infrastructures / services; land use / food production; prices.

**Qualitative studies:** Qualitative information complements the HFSPs identified by the quantitative data. Qualitative modules are primarily used to assess people’s livelihoods and risk management. This implies a clear understanding of 1) sources of risk and vulnerability, 2) household livelihood strategies and livelihood assets among different socio-economic groups, 3) ability of existing livelihood strategies to minimize welfare losses, 4) entry points where external support can help reducing household vulnerability. These topics are covered through community-wide discussions, focus group discussions and key informant interviews. Specific appraisal methods are often employed, such as *Historical “Event / Risk” Line, Livelihood Ranking and Scoring Matrix, Seasonal Calendar, Pie Chart for Income and Expenditure, Risk Description, Risk Matrix*, etc.

### 1.3. VAM household questionnaire

In this chapter we will provide an overview of how information on children’s education, household educational status, and quality of life of children are usually collected through VAM household questionnaires and we will propose new questions which can be included in this kind of questionnaire. In particular, we will outline two different approaches for collecting children-related data: the individual-level approach and the household-level approach.

#### 1.3.1. How children-related data are currently collected

**Educational level and status of children:** Most of the time, information on the educational level and status of children is collected at the household level, thus making impossible to extract individual profiles. However, some questionnaires collect data for each household member separately. In such a case, the analysis can be more flexible and the results more informative for FFE targeting. The wording and the specificity of the questions vary a lot from one questionnaire to another. However, children’s educational level, school enrolment, absenteeism and reasons for absenteeism are usually covered.

**Other relevant indicators:** VAM household questionnaires often include questions on household educational attainment, quality of life of children and FFE assistance. These data are always collected at the household level (see table 1).

Table 1 – An overview of other relevant indicators included in the VAM household questionnaire

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Question(s)</b>
Educational level of the head of the household	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Household head total years of education</li> <li>What is the level of education of the household head?</li> </ul>
Educational level of the spouse of the head of the household	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Spouse total year of education</li> <li>What is the level of education of the spouse?</li> </ul>
Literacy skills of the head of the household	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can you read / write a simple message in any language?</li> </ul>
Literacy skills of the spouse of head of the household	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can you read / write a simple message in any language?</li> </ul>
Household where children (alone / with mother / with father) participate in the main / second / third / fourth income activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Who participates in the main income activity?</li> <li>Who participates in the second income activity?</li> <li>Who participates in the third income activity?</li> <li>Who participates in the fourth income activity?</li> </ul>
Expenditure on education / school fees	<p>[in the past month]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Total expenditure on education / school fees</li> <li>Total expenditure of the household</li> </ul>
Children’s food consumption	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How many children were eating the day before?</li> <li>No. of children within the household</li> </ul>
Children’s food consumption (frequency)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yesterday, how many meals did the children eat?</li> </ul>
Households that compensate / resolve the decrease / loss of income and / or assets by sending their children to work for money or food	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What did the household do to compensate or resolve this decrease or loss of income and / or assets?</li> </ul>
Households that compensate or resolve the decrease or loss of income and / or assets by reducing expenditure on health and education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What did the household do to compensate or resolve this decrease or loss of income and / or assets?</li> </ul>
Households that compensate or resolve the decrease or loss of income and / or assets by marrying off their daughters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What did the household do to compensate / resolve this decrease / loss of income and / or assets?</li> </ul>
Households that compensate or resolve the decrease or loss of income and / or assets by removing children from school	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What did the household do to compensate or resolve this decrease or loss of income and / or assets?</li> </ul>

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Question(s)</i>
Households receiving assistance for education from the Government (and frequency of the assistance)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Do you receive assistance for education from the Government?</i></li> <li>• <i>How often do you receive this assistance?</i></li> </ul>
Households that received FFE assistance (and effectiveness of the assistance)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Has any member of your household received food aid in the last 12 months?</i></li> <li>• <i>Did FFE assistance increase attendance?</i></li> </ul>

### **1.3.2. How additional children-related data could be collected through an individual-level approach**

Ideally data should be collected at the individual level.<sup>7</sup> This approach is more flexible and effective for secondary data analysis, identifies intra-household variations with regard to children's education and individual-level correlations. The modules below include useful questions for FFE targeting, assuming that data are collected at the individual level.

<sup>7</sup> Individual level modules can be time-consuming because they increase the length of data collection, data entry and data processing. For this reason we have also developed household level modules (see 1.3.3).

Table 2 – Module to capture the demographical profile of the household (HH) members and identify orphans (pre-primary, primary and secondary school-age children) living in the HH

For each HH member, please report the following:					For each pre-primary, primary and secondary school-age child living in the HH, please ask the following:			
Demographical profile of the HH members					Orphans			
Q1 HH MEMBER ID	Q2 HH MEMBER NAME  Name of the person who usually lives in the household (Start with the head of the HH)	Q3 <sup>(1)</sup> RELATIONSHIP TO THE HEAD OF THE HH	Q4 SEX  Male = 1 Female = 2	Q5 AGE  (in years)	Q6 IS HIS/HER NATURAL MOTHER ALIVE?  No = 0 (→ go to Q8) Yes = 1	Q7 (if mother alive) DOES HIS/HER NATURAL MOTHER LIVE IN THIS HOUSEHOLD?  No = 0 Yes = 1	Q8 IS HIS/HER NATURAL FATHER ALIVE?  No = 0 (→ skip Q9) Yes = 1	Q9 (if father alive) DOES HIS/HER NATURAL FATHER LIVE IN THIS HOUSEHOLD?  No = 0 Yes = 1
01								
02								
...								
N								

**(1) CODES FOR Q3: RELATIONSHIP TO THE HEAD OF THE HOUSEHOLD**

Relationship	code
Head	01
Wife / Husband	02
Son / Daughter	03
Son / Daughter in law	04
Grandchild	05
Parent / Parent in law	06
Brother / Sister	07
Other relative	08
Adopted / foster / stepchild	09
Not related	10
Not known (NK)	99

Table 3 – Module to capture the educational status and level of children (pre-primary, primary and secondary school-age children) living in the HH

*For each pre-primary, primary and secondary school-age child, please report the following:*

Q1	Q2	Enrolment and repetition		Drop out		Reasons for non enrolment	Absenteeism (if enrolled)	Reasons for absenteeism (if enrolled)	Short-Term Hunger (if enrolled)		
		Q3 <sup>(1)</sup>	Q4 <sup>(1)</sup>	Q5	Q6 <sup>(2)</sup>	Q7 <sup>(3)</sup>	Q8 <sup>(4)</sup>	Q9 <sup>(5)</sup>	Q10 <sup>(6)</sup>	Q11	
HH MEMBER ID	HH MEMBER NAME	IN WHICH SCHOOL LEVEL AND GRADE WAS S/HE ENROLLED <u>LAST</u> YEAR?	IN WHICH SCHOOL LEVEL AND GRADE IS S/HE ENROLLED <u>THIS</u> YEAR?  (If non enrolled, answer only to Q5 and Q6)	(if not enrolled this year) DID S/HE DROP OUT FROM SCHOOL? (this year or the previous years)  No, never been enrolled=0 Yes = 1	(if not enrolled this year) WHY IS S/HE NOT ENROLLED?	HOW MANY SCHOOL DAYS HAS S/HE MISSED DURING THE LAST MONTH?	WHAT WAS THE MAIN REASON OF ABSENTEEISM?	DOES S/HE EAT BEFORE GOING TO SCHOOL? (e.g., breakfast if school is in the morning, lunch if it is in the afternoon)  IF NO, WHY?	(if s/he goes to school walking) HOW LONG DOES S/HE WALK TO REACH THE SCHOOL? (in minutes)	DOES S/HE RECEIVE FOOD AT SCHOOL?  No = 0 Yes = 1	
		LEVEL	GRADE	LEVEL	GRADE						
01			_____		_____						
02			_____		_____						
...			_____		_____						
...			_____		_____						
N			_____		_____						

## CODES FOR THE QUESTIONS

(1) CODES FOR Q3 AND Q4:

Level of education	code
Not enrolled	00
Pre-primary	01
Primary	02
Secondary	03
Higher	04
Other (specify: _____)	05
NK	99

(2) CODES FOR Q6:

Reasons for non enrolment	Code
Primary / secondary school completed	01
Work (paid work) out of the household	02
Work within the household / assist relatives	03
Children not interested in education	04
Education not useful for children's future	05
Unable to pay the school fees	06
Unable to pay other school expenses (Uniforms, books, etc.)	07
Illness	08
Marriage / pregnancy	09
School is far	10
School is located in an insecure area	11
Lack of teachers	12
Lack of classrooms	13
Lack of safe water	14
Lack of sanitation facilities	15
Other (specify: _____)	16
NK	99

(3) CODES FOR Q7:

No. school days child missed during the last month	code
None / Very few	01
Approximately half of the school days	02
Most of the school days / all of them	03
NK	99

(4) CODES FOR Q8:

Reasons for absenteeism	code
Work (paid work) out of the household	01
Work within the household / assist relatives	02
Children not interested in education	03
Education not useful for children's future	04
Illness	05
Marriage / pregnancy	06
School is far	07
School is located in an insecure area	08
Lack of teachers	09
Lack of classrooms	10
Lack of safe water	11
Lack of sanitation facilities	12
Other (specify: _____)	13
NA (always attending)	14
NK	99

(5) CODES FOR Q9:

Meals before going to school	code
YES	01
NO, food in the household is not enough	02
NO, because s/he eats at school	03
NO, no time for preparing food	04
Other (specify: _____)	05
NK	99

Table 4 – Module to capture involvement of children (primary and secondary school-age children) in formal and informal labour

For each primary and secondary school-age child living in the HH, please copy the HH member ID and ask the following					
Child Labour					
Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6 <sup>(1)</sup>
HH MEMBER ID	HH MEMBER NAME	DURING THE PAST MONTH, DID S/HE WORK (PAID/ UNPAID) FOR SOMEONE WHO IS NOT A MEMBER OF THIS HOUSEHOLD?  every day=4 often (3-6 per week)=3 once in a while (1-2 per week)=2 hardly at all (<1 per week)=1 never=0	DURING THE PAST MONTH, DID S/HE HELP WITH HOUSEKEEPING CHORES (cooking, shopping, cleaning, looking after siblings / sick relatives, etc.)  every day=4 often (3-6 per week)=3 once in a while (1-2 per week)=2 hardly at all (<1 per week)=1 never=0	DURING THE PAST MONTH, DID S/HE DO ANY OTHER FAMILY WORK (ON THE FARM OR IN A BUSINESS)?  every day=4 often (3-6 per week)=3 once in a while (1-2 per week)=2 hardly at all (<1 per week)=1 never=0	(if s/he did at least one job during the past month) WHEN DID S/HE USUALLY WORK?
01					
02					
...					
...					
N					

**(1) CODES FOR Q6: WHEN DOES S/HE USUALLY WORK?**

When at work	code
Only in the morning	01
Only in the afternoon	02
Only in the evening	03
Both in the morning and afternoon	04
Not Known (NK)	99

Table 5 – Module to capture the household educational status

For each household (HH), please ask the following:		
Household Educational Status		
Q1. Can the Household head / spouse read and write a simple message (e.g., letter)?	<b>Household Head</b>	<b>Spouse (if any)</b>
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Q2. How many years of education have been completed by the household head / spouse?	<b>Household Head</b>	<b>Spouse (if any)</b>
	_	_

- Demographical profile:** when data are collected at the individual level, the first step to take is to register the demographical profile of each household member (HH member ID, name of the household member, relationship to the head of the household, sex and age). The HH member ID plays a crucial role for creating individual records / profiles. It is therefore necessary to make sure that each ID is linked to a specific HH member and remains the same for every single module.
- Educational level and status of children:** questions included in this module depict the educational profile of each child living in the household. Primarily, they identify whether a child is enrolled or not.
  - If a child is out of school, reasons for non-enrolment are identified in order to understand whether FFE assistance can make a difference in his/her enrolment. Question on the enrolment in the previous year aims at discovering whether the child dropped out from school this year and, in such a case, at which grade. Question on drop out aims at discovering whether the child dropped out from school at any time during his/her school career.
  - If a child is enrolled, questions explore whether s/he is moving forward, how often s/he is attending class and what are the reason(s) for missing school. Finally, questions on food consumption and school distance, help identifying children at risk of short-term hunger (and causes).

Regarding the age category, ideally pre-primary, primary and secondary school-age children should be covered through this module. However, since primary education is the main objective of WFP FFE programmes, it is suggested to prioritize primary school-age children.

All these questions are crucial to identify the educational problems and understand whether a FFE programme can make a difference. In particular, for each sub-national area, they help us to understand if the problem is:

- A low percentage of children enrolled (and why)
- A high percentage of children dropping out (at which grade and why)
- A high percentage of students who frequently miss school (and why)
- A high percentage of students not being promoted at school
- A high percentage of students at risk of short-term hunger (and why)

3. **Presence of orphans:** in order to have a comprehensive picture of the family-network who can support child education, it is important to know whether the child still has the natural mother and/or father or if s/he lives without them. It is suggested to collect this information for all the pre-primary, primary and secondary school-age children living in the HH (however primary school-age children remain a priority).
4. **Child labour:** the questions included in this module take into consideration three kinds of jobs and in which part of the day children usually work. This last question aims at understanding to what extent labour is an obstacle to enrolment/attendance. Regarding the age category, we suggest covering the official primary and secondary school-age children (however primary school-age children are a priority).
5. **Household educational attainment:** these questions regard the educational level of the head of the household (and his/her spouse) as well as their literacy skills. They are useful to search out the educational environment that surrounds a child.<sup>8</sup>

As explained above, child labour, orphan status and low household educational level are important elements for the analysis because they may prevent children from receiving an education. Through these questions we are able to better explore the correlation between child labour, orphan status, household educational level and educational gaps. In addition, they allow us to identify vulnerable children that may have educational gaps in the forthcoming years.

### 1.3.3. How additional children-related data could be collected through a household-level approach

Since data collection at the individual level is time-consuming and cumbersome, some countries prefer collecting data at the household level. For this reason we have developed a module for collecting indicators at this level of analysis. The household-level module comprises the same indicators as those included in the individual-level modules. However, the information is different: here parents review the educational status / level of the children living in the household and give a summary, they do not report for each child separately. As a result, we obtain an outline of the household, not individual profiles of the children living in the household. The module assumes that the official primary and secondary school-age categories are 6-11 and 12-17 respectively. Age categories should be adapted to the official primary and secondary school-age of the country where the survey is conducted.

Table 6 – Module to capture household-level data. The module assumes that the official primary school-age is 6-11 and that the official secondary school-age is 12-17. Age categories should reflect the official age categories of the country where the survey is conducted.

<i>For each household (HH), please complete the module below:</i>						
<b>Demographic data, enrolment, drop out</b>						
- <i>For each age group, report the number of male and female members living in the HH.</i>						
- <i>For the age categories 6-11 and 12-17, report also the number of male and female currently enrolled in primary school and who dropped out from primary school.</i>						
- <i>Regarding drop out, do not limit your counting to children who dropped out the year before. Please count BOTH the children who dropped out last year AND the children who dropped out years before.</i>						
	<b>Q1</b> no. males in HH	<b>Q2</b> no. of females in HH	<b>Q3</b> no. of males currently enrolled in primary school	<b>Q4</b> no. of females currently enrolled in primary school	<b>Q5</b> no. of males who <u>dropped out</u> from primary school	<b>Q6</b> no. of females who <u>dropped out</u> from primary school
0-5 years	__	__				
6-11 years (1)	__	__	__	__	__	__
12-17 years (2)	__	__	__	__	__	__
18-49 years	__	__				
50-64 years	__	__				
65+ years	__	__				

<sup>8</sup> The educational level and the literacy skills are usually collected through the VAM household level questionnaires.



<b>Reasons for non enrolment</b>		
<b>Q7.</b> If in the household there are children of 6-11 years old who are not enrolled in primary school, what are the reasons? (1)  <i>(tick all that apply)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Primary school completed	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Marriage	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Work out of the household	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Work in the household	
	<input type="checkbox"/> School fees	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other school costs (uniforms, books, etc.)	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Lack of water at the school	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Lack of sanitation at the school	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Lack of teachers	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Lack of classrooms	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Children not interested	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Education not useful for children's future	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Illness	
	<input type="checkbox"/> School is far	
<input type="checkbox"/> School is located in an insecure area		
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify: _____)		
<input type="checkbox"/> NA (all children enrolled)		
<b>Repetition, absenteeism and reasons for absenteeism</b>		
<i>Please, consider ALL the children currently enrolled in primary school and report the following:</i>		
<b>Q8.</b> How many children currently enrolled in primary school are repeating the same grade of the previous school year?	Males  _	Females  _
<b>Q9.</b> How many children enrolled in primary school missed at least one week of school during the last month?	Males  _	Females  _
<b>Q10.</b> What are the main reasons for missing school?  <i>(tick all that apply)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Work out of the household	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Work in the household	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Illness	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Children not interested	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Education not useful for children's future	
	<input type="checkbox"/> School is far	
	<input type="checkbox"/> School is located in an insecure area	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Lack of teachers	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Lack of classrooms	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Lack of safe water	
<input type="checkbox"/> Lack of sanitation		
<input type="checkbox"/> NA (always attending)		
<b>Short-Term Hunger</b>		
<b>Q11.</b> Do children eat before going to school? If no, why? <i>(e.g., breakfast if school is in the morning, lunch if it is in the afternoon)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> yes	
	<input type="checkbox"/> no, food is not enough in the HH	
	<input type="checkbox"/> no, they eat at school	
	<input type="checkbox"/> no, no time for preparing food	
	<input type="checkbox"/> other (specify: _____)	
	<input type="checkbox"/> NK	
<b>Q12.</b> If children walk to school, how long do they walk to reach the school? <i>(in minutes)</i>	Minutes: _____	
	<input type="checkbox"/> NA (they have a transport to reach the school)	
	<input type="checkbox"/> NK	
<b>Q13.</b> Do they get a meal at school?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	
	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
	<input type="checkbox"/> NK	

<b>Child Labour</b>		
<i>Please consider all the children aged between 6 and 17 years old living in the HH and report the following (3):</i>		
	Males	Females
<b>Q14.</b> During the past month, how many 6-17 years old children worked for someone who is not a member of this household?	_	_
<b>Q15.</b> During the past month, how many 6-17 years old children helped with housekeeping chores (cooking, shopping, cleaning, looking after siblings, sick relatives, etc.)?	_	_
<b>Q16.</b> During the past month, how many 6-17 years old children did any other family work (on the farm or in a business)?	_	_
<b>Q17.</b> During the past month, how many 6-17 years old children worked both in the morning and in the afternoon?	_	_
<b>Orphans</b>		
<i>Please consider all the 6-17 years old children living in the HH and report the following:</i>		
	Males	Females
<b>Q18.</b> How many of them have lost the natural father <u>OR</u> natural mother?	_	_
<b>Q19.</b> How many of them have lost the natural father <u>AND</u> natural mother?	_	_
<b>Q20.</b> How many of them live without the natural father <u>OR</u> natural mother?	_	_
<b>Q21.</b> How many of them live without the natural father <u>AND</u> natural mother?	_	_
<b>Household Educational Status</b>		
<b>Q22.</b> Can the Household Head / Spouse read and write a simple message?	Household Head	Spouse (if any)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Q23.</b> How many years of education have been completed by the household head / spouse?	Household Head	Spouse (if any)
	_	_

(1) The module assumes that the official primary school-age is 6-11. **This age category should be adapted in order to track the official primary school-age category of the country where the survey is conducted.**

(2) The module assumes that the official secondary school-age is 12-17. **This age category should be adapted in order to track the official secondary school-age category of the country where the survey is conducted.**

(3) The purpose of these questions is to address the primary and secondary school-age children living in household. The module assumes that the official primary school-age is 6-11 and that the official secondary school-age is 12-17. **These categories should be adapted in order to track the official primary and secondary school-age category of the country where the survey is conducted.**

- Demographic data, enrolment, drop out:** When data are collected at the household level, it is important to report the number of male and female household members for each of the age categories listed in the module. From the FFE targeting perspective, it is crucial to develop a list of age categories that allows tracking the number of official primary and secondary-school age children living in the household. By doing so, we will be able to collect also the enrolment and drop out of the children.
- Reasons for not enrolment:** if there are primary or secondary school-age children who are not enrolled to primary school, it is important to identify the reasons. This is a multi-response question because children living in the household may have different reasons for not being enrolled.
- Repetition, absenteeism, reasons for absenteeism:** for all the children currently enrolled in primary school, the parents are asked to report how many are repeating the same grade as of the previous year, how many missed at least one week of school during the last month and the reasons for the absenteeism. Absenteeism is enquired through a multi-response question because children living in the household may have different reasons for missing class.
- Short-term hunger:** as we can see the questions are exactly the same as of the individual level module, but here parents do not have the chance to provide a specific answer for each child. Fortunately, children from the same household are likely to live under the same circumstances: i.e., if one child does not eat before school because his/her family does not have enough food, we can assume all the children of the household have the same problem.
- Child labour:** the number of working children, combined with the number of children living in the household, can be used to identify households where there is a high prevalence of children involved in work (inside or outside the household) or in housekeeping chores for most part of the day.
- Presence of orphans:** the number of orphans, combined with the number of children living in the household, can be used to identify households where there is a high prevalence of orphans.

7. **Household educational attainment:** these questions regard the educational level of the head of the household (and his/her spouse) as well as their literacy skills. They are useful to search out the educational environment that surrounds a child and are usually included in the VAM questionnaires.<sup>9</sup>

These questions allow computing statistics at the household-level. Of course, the information is slightly different from the information provided by the individual-level questions. In particular, these questions help us to understand if the problem is:

- A low percentage of households with many children enrolled (and why)
- A high percentage of households with many children dropping out (and why)
- A high percentage of households with many children frequently missing school (and why)
- A high percentage of households with many students not being promoted at school
- A high percentage of households with many students at risk of short-term hunger (and why)
- A high percentage of households with many working children (information disaggregated by kind of job and length of the assignment)
- A high percentage of households with many orphans
- A low percentage of households with low educational attainment

#### 1.4. VAM community questionnaire

In this chapter we will see how information on schools, children's education and quality of life of the children is usually collected through the community questionnaires and we will propose new questions that can be included in this kind of questionnaire.

##### 1.4.1. How children-related data are currently collected

VAM community questionnaires usually take into consideration education and / or quality of life of children. In particular they consider:

- a. **Presence (and quality) of schools:** presence of a functioning primary school in the village; distance of the nearest primary school; how children usually reach school; who runs the school; no. of grades / classes; no. of teachers; presence of a kitchen; presence (and quality) of latrines; physical condition of the school; tuition fees; costs of uniform/books
- b. **Attendance of children living in the village:** proportion of boys and girls attending primary school and main reasons for not attending school
- c. **Daily activities of children:** A wide range of daily activities is usually considered (e.g., going to school, collecting water, collecting firewood, cooking, serving meals, looking after small children, cleaning the house, washing clothes, looking after livestock / animals, working in family kitchen garden / farm, sewing, making handicrafts for home use and / or sale, labour). For each of these activities, the community is asked to report whether children perform these activities on a daily basis; which children do this (boys / girls), during what part of the day they perform these activities, and how many hours they spend on these activities each day.
- d. **Major health problems of children:** The community is asked to report and rank the major health problems for children living in the community.
- e. **Shocks and their consequences on education:** One of the objectives of the community questionnaire is to identify the major shocks that affected the community and their consequences. The community can report whether expenditure on health and education has been reduced in order to cope with the shocks.
- f. **External assistance received by the community:** The community is asked to report whether assistance in education is being received; sometimes FFE assistance is explicitly mentioned.

##### 1.4.2. How children-related additional data could be collected

From the FFE targeting perspective, it would be important to refine the sections regarding the presence and quality of schools (a) and the attendance of children living in the village (b). Questions regarding daily activities of children, their health problems, shocks and their consequences on education and external assistance received by the community do not require any further development.

---

<sup>9</sup> The educational level and the literacy skills of the head of the household (and his/her spouse) are usually collected through the VAM household level questionnaires.

Table 7 – Module to capture data relevant to FFE targeting through the VAM community questionnaire

Please, take into consideration the school where most of the children living in the village are currently enrolled and report the following:		
<b>Hygiene at school</b>	<b>Q1.</b> Does the school have safe water within / nearby the school compound?  <i>Safe water sources are pipe connection, public standpipe, borehole, protected dug well, protected spring, rainwater collection.</i> <i>Unsafe water sources are unprotected well, unprotected spring, rivers or ponds, vendor-provided water, bottled water (because of the limitations in the potential quantity), tanker truck water.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not Known (NK)
	<b>Q2.</b> What is the condition of the school latrines? (tick all that apply)  <i>Latrines are <u>improved</u> if they have connection to a public sewer, connection to a septic system, flush latrine, simple pit latrine, ventilated improved pit latrine.</i> <i>Open pit latrine, bucket latrine are not improved.</i> <i>Latrines are <u>well maintained</u> if they are clean and functional</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> improved <input type="checkbox"/> well maintained <input type="checkbox"/> separate for boys and girls <input type="checkbox"/> no latrines at the school <input type="checkbox"/> NK
	<b>Q3.</b> If food is distributed at the school, what is the condition of the storeroom?  <i>In a <u>well maintained storeroom</u> food can be stored safely and in a hygienic environment</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> NO storeroom at the school <input type="checkbox"/> NOT well maintained <input type="checkbox"/> well maintained <input type="checkbox"/> NK <input type="checkbox"/> NA (food not distributed)
<b>School environment conducive to learning</b>	<b>Q4.</b> On average, how many students are in each classroom?	_____
	<b>Q5.</b> On average, how many students are there for each teacher?	_____
<b>Cost of schooling</b>	<b>Q6.</b> Amount of school fees (per child per year)	_____
	<b>Q7.</b> Costs of uniforms, books, etc. (per child per year)	_____
<b>Community involvement at school</b>	<b>Q8.</b> Is there a parent / teacher association (PTA) at the school? (or any informal committee with parents involved)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> NK
<b>Major problems of the school</b>	<b>Q9.</b> From the point of view of the community, what are the major problems / needs of the school?  <i>List 3 main problems in order of importance. Please, let the respondents discuss on the issue before reading the options below</i>	1 <sup>st</sup> problem:    __  2 <sup>nd</sup> problem:    __  3 <sup>rd</sup> problem:    __
	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;">           1. no safe water            2. no/poor latrines            3. no/ poor hand washing facilities            4. no safe storerooms            5. no/poor eating place            6. poor teaching materials            7. few classrooms            8. few teachers            9. school inaccessible or located in an insecure area            10. Poor community involvement in the school management            11. Other(specify: _____)            12. Other(specify: _____)            13. Other(specify: _____)         </div>	
<b>Enrolment (1)</b>	<b>Q10.</b> What percentage of girls living in the village is <u>enrolled</u> in primary school? (give an estimate)	__ %
	<b>Q11.</b> What percentage of boys living in the village is <u>enrolled</u> in primary school? (give an estimate)	__ %
<b>Reasons for non enrolment</b>	<b>Q12.</b> What are the main reasons why children living in the community do not enrol in primary school? <i>List 3 main reasons in order of importance. Please, let the respondents discuss on the issue before reading the options below:</i>	1 <sup>st</sup> reason:    __  2 <sup>nd</sup> reason:    __  3 <sup>rd</sup> reason:    __
	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px;">           1. Marriage            2. Work out of the household            3. Work in the household            4. School fees            5. Other school cost            6. Lack of water at the school            7. Lack of sanitation at the school            8. lack of teachers            9. lack of classrooms            10. children not interested in education            11. parents believe education is not useful            12. school is far            13. school is located in an insecure area            14. Other (specify: _____)            15. Other (specify: _____)            16. Other (specify: _____)         </div>	

<b>School location / accessibility</b>	<b>Q13.</b> Is the school located in the village?	<input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no
	<b>Q14.</b> If it not in the village, how do most of the children reach the school? (if they walk, specify for how long they do)	<input type="checkbox"/> public/private transport <input type="checkbox"/> walk (minutes: _____) <input type="checkbox"/> other (specify: _____)
	<b>Q15.</b> Is the school accessible and located in a secure area?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

(1) This question is very similar to the question on attendance which is often included in the VAM community questionnaires. In order to draw the attention to the percentage of children which are officially registered on the school registers, we encourage systematically including these questions and using the term “enrolment” instead of “attendance”.

### Summary:

In this section we have seen how educational aspects are usually covered during a VAM study. New questions / modules have been presented and explained with the ultimate purpose of incorporating indicators that are relevant to FFE targeting into WFP vulnerability assessments.

#### Proposals for the VAM household questionnaire

We have outlined two different methods for collecting relevant data for FFE targeting: the individual-level and the household-level method. The household-level approach encompasses the same issues as those included in the individual-level approach (non-enrolment, absenteeism, drop-out, repetition, short-term hunger, child labour, orphan status and household educational attainment). However, the information is different: through the household-level approach, parents review the education of the children living in the household and give a summary; they do not to report for each child separately. As a result, we obtain an outline of the household, not individual profiles of the children.

#### Proposals for the VAM community questionnaire


From the FFE targeting perspective, it would be relevant to refine the sections regarding the presence of schools and the attendance of children living in the village. Questions regarding daily activities of children, their health problems, shocks and their consequences on education and external assistance received by the community do not require any further development. In this section we have proposed modules on the presence / status of primary schools and school attendance which can be used to improve the educational modules of the VAM community questionnaires.

## Section 2 – Detailed geographic targeting of FFE programmes

Fig. 3 – Detailed geographic targeting of FFE programmes

During the programme design it is necessary to conduct a more detailed geographic targeting of the FFE programme in order to identify the food-insecure areas (or sub-areas) where FFE assistance is most needed and will have the greatest effects. The detailed geographic targeting is based on the specific objectives that have been identified for the FFE programme through a problem analysis.<sup>10</sup>

In this section we will point out i) which indicators relate to which objective of FFE programmes; ii) which other elements should be also taken into consideration during the detailed geographic targeting and iii) which strategies should be adopted to ensure that the results of the detailed geographic targeting are accepted by the local communities and main stakeholders.



### 2.1. The objectives of Food For Education programmes: An overview

WFP is committed to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), of which FFE programmes particularly address the 2<sup>nd</sup> (achieve universal primary education) and 3<sup>rd</sup> (promote gender equality and empower women).<sup>11</sup> The primary objective of WFP FFE programmes is to improve education, namely to increase access to primary school of the most disadvantaged children as well as their attendance, completion rate, ability to concentrate in class and learning outcomes. Food assistance compensates parents for the cost of the schooling of their children. It therefore helps poorest households tackling the direct and indirect costs that prevent children, especially girls, from receiving an education. From this point of view FFE programmes act as a safety net.<sup>12</sup>

### 2.2. Additional outcomes of Food For Education programmes

FFE programmes can produce effects that go beyond education, namely they can improve nutritional status of students; stimulate the demand of locally produced food and increase community organization and empowerment. **Such effects should not be seen as reason in themselves for implementing a FFE programme nor as its primary objectives. Nonetheless, they facilitate the achievement of the educational objectives and can be additional outcomes whose presence is particularly important for sustainability, phasing out and development.**

FFE programmes can improve the nutritional status of students to the extent that complementary activities are integrated into the programme as specific components of the Essential Package.<sup>13</sup> In particular:<sup>14</sup>

- PREVALENCE AND INTENSITY OF WORMS INFECTIONS can be reduced through a systematic deworming.
- MICRONUTRIENT STATUS can be improved through micronutrient supplementation.
- ACCESS TO SAFE DRINKING WATER and ADEQUATE SANITATION can be improved by providing potable water and sanitary latrines to schools.
- AWARENESS-RAISING AND BEHAVIOUR ON HEALTH, NUTRITION AND HYGIENE can be improved through health, nutrition and hygiene education.
- EXPOSURE TO HIV/AIDS can be decreased by providing HIV and AIDS education which develops correct knowledge, attitudes, values and life skills.
- EXPOSURE TO MALARIA can be reduced through malaria prevention.
- AGRICULTURAL KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS (specifically on how to grow micronutrient-rich vegetables and fruits), AWARENESS ON NUTRITION AND ENVIRONMENT, CONSUMPTION OF FRESH FOODS can be facilitated by the presence of school gardens.
- SAFE AND FUEL-SAVING COOKING can be expanded by putting in place improved stoves.

<sup>10</sup> Details on the problem analysis are reported in the WFP Food For Education / School Feeding Handbook.

<sup>11</sup> WFP Food For Education / School Feeding Handbook

<sup>12</sup> WFP Food For Education / School Feeding Handbook

<sup>13</sup> In April 2000, recognizing the importance and potential healthy school setting, WHO, UNESCO, UNICEF and the World Bank agreed upon a shared framework (FRESH) to strengthen school health, hygiene and nutrition programmes. The Essential Package contributes to the implementation of the FRESH Framework and to fulfil children's rights to education. In 40 countries UNICEF and WFP Country Offices have committed themselves to work closely for the implementation of Essential Package interventions. (WFP – UNICEF, The Essential Package, Twelve Interventions to Improve Nutrition of School-age Children)

<sup>14</sup> WFP Food For Education School Feeding Handbook

FFE programmes can stimulate the demand of locally produced food when local food is used in the programme. So far, providing a market for small, developing-country farmers has not been one of the goals of FFE programmes. Although WFP buys food from local farmers where possible, the bulk of the food served to schoolchildren comes from agricultural surplus of developed countries (e.g., Australia, Canada and USA). Given that most poor people in developing countries live in rural areas and earn livelihoods in the agricultural sector, FFE programmes are now seen as a mechanism for stimulating the demand for locally produced food, particularly if they are concentrated on marginal rural areas where market mechanisms do not exist yet. Providing free school meals by using locally produced food is one of the entry points recommended by the 2005 UN Summit as a “quick win” to achieve MDG1 and MDG2, especially for rural areas facing the dual challenge of high chronic malnutrition and low agricultural productivity.<sup>15</sup>

FFE programmes can increase community organization and empowerment, especially if parents are responsible for the programme implementation. As a matter of fact, the implementation of FFE programmes requires community participation. In order to ensure a good utilization of the food, schools are encouraged to put in place canteen or food management committees comprised of representatives of parents, teachers and students. As a general rule, the essential services required for operating a FFE programme should be covered by the community either by providing such services or by contributing with cash. Besides the essential services, broader community participation should be promoted for construction / maintenance of school kitchens or storerooms, assistance in delivery/storage of commodities, contribution of fresh food for the school canteens, co-management of canteens with school personnel; management of funds, etc. Participation of the community to a FFE programme is often seen as a key element for the success of the success of the programme itself and as a way to strengthen community empowerment, ownership and social development.<sup>16</sup>

### 2.3. Detailed geographic targeting of Food For Education programmes

So far we have outlined the primary objectives of FFE programmes (promotion of education) as well as the additional outcomes. In this chapter we will focus on the detailed geographic targeting of FFE programmes and explain why it is needed, when it is done, how it should be conducted.

**Why:** Due to economical constraints and practical aspects, Food For Education programmes are usually not implemented in all the food-insecure areas identified during the vulnerability assessments. For this reason, it is crucial to identify the food-insecure areas (or sub-areas) where FFE assistance is most needed and will have the greatest effects.

**When:** There is a wide range of specific problems which can affect the primary education system in a country (low enrolment, low school attendance, significant disparities, high repetition rates, high drop out, poor learning outcomes, etc.). The incidence of these gaps in the country is usually studied during the problem analysis in order to define the specific objectives of FFE assistance. The detailed geographic targeting takes place once that the problem analysis has defined the objectives, and it is conducted on the basis of the defined objectives.

**How:** The detailed geographic targeting is primarily conducted on the basis of the objectives defined through the problem analysis. For instance, if the problem analysis suggests that drop out is the major educational problem in the country and that a reduction in drop out will be an objective of the FFE programme, the sub-national level analysis will focus mainly on indicators of drop out. Details on the relevant educational indicators and on possible sources of data are provided in 2.3.1.

Apart from indicators related to the defined objectives, the detailed geographic targeting should include other important factors, such as the presence of partners providing complementary services, security and accessibility of schools, the implementation of other WFP activities and the administrative organization of the country (further details in 2.3.2).

Targeting of food assistance is a sensitive topic. It is therefore crucial to involve the main stakeholders in the whole process and to share the results with the national /local institutions and representatives of the local communities. Details on such a participatory approach will be given in 2.3.3.

<sup>15</sup> World Food Programme (WFP), Support to NEPAD, Period of Report: August 2004 to April 2005 and EB 1<sup>st</sup> Regular Session, Information Note on WFP's Support to NEPAD, 27, January 2004.

<sup>16</sup> WFP Food For Education School Feeding Handbook

### 2.3.1. Analysing indicators related to specific programme objectives

There is a wide range of problems which can affect the primary education system in a country (low enrolment, low school attendance, gender or social disparities in education, high repetition rates, high drop out, poor learning outcomes, etc.).

The table below (see table 8) reports the specific objectives which are usually addressed through a FFE programme and relates each objective to one (or more) indicator(s). As mentioned above, the sub-national level analysis should focus on the indicators related to the specific objectives identified for each FFE programme. For instance, if drop out has been identified as one of the major problems in the country and the decline in drop out is one of the main objectives of the FFE programme, the sub-national level analysis should see how drop out rates vary among the areas (e.g., regions, provinces, districts) of the country. To the extent possible, the analysis should make use of data disaggregated by grade and gender. From the geographical perspective, the more detailed the analysis, the more accurate will be the targeting.

The list of indicators is not exhaustive and the selection of the indicators mostly depends upon the availability of data in the country. Nonetheless, it can be considered as a useful tool to highlight which indicators relate to which objectives.

Table 8 – Objectives of FFE programmes and related indicators

OBJECTIVES OF FFE PROGRAMMES	INDICATORS
Increase access to primary education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NET ENROLMENT RATIO IN PRIMARY SCHOOL (number of primary school-age children enrolled in primary school out of the primary-school age children living in the area)</li> <li>• (if net enrolment ratio is not available) GROSS ENROLMENT RATIO IN PRIMARY SCHOOL (number of children enrolled in primary school out of the official primary school-age children living in the area)</li> </ul>
Increase attendance to primary school	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ATTENDANCE RATE OF THE PRIMARY SCHOOL STUDENTS (number of school-days attended by students out of the total number of school-days)</li> </ul>
Increase completion of the primary cycle (in order to increase learning outcomes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DROP OUT RATE IN PRIMARY EDUCATION: % of children in a given grade in the previous school year who are not attending school this year (*)               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Drop out rate in grade 1: percentage (%) of students enrolled in grade 1 during the previous year who are not enrolled this year</li> <li>- Drop out rate in grade 2: % of students enrolled in grade 2 during the previous year who are not enrolled this year</li> <li>- Drop out rate in grade 3: % of students enrolled in grade 3 during the previous year who are not enrolled this year</li> <li>- Drop out rate in grade 4: % of students enrolled in grade 4 during the previous year who are not enrolled this year</li> <li>- Drop out rate in grade 5: % of students enrolled in grade 5 during the previous year who are not enrolled this year</li> <li>- Drop out rate in grade 6: % of students enrolled in grade 6 during the previous year who are not enrolled this year</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Alleviate disparities in access to/attendance to /completion of primary cycle	<p>To identify gender disparities → enrolment, attendance and drop out (see indicators above) disaggregated by sex</p> <p>To identify other disparities → enrolment, attendance and drop out (see indicators above) of orphans and/or other vulnerable children (selection of categories is country specific)</p>
Alleviate short-term hunger of primary students at school and thus improve their concentration and learning in class	<p><i>This topic can be operationalised in many different ways and it is usually not available in the official statistics. Among the indicators (or proxy-indicators) of short-term hunger there are:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- % of primary school students who do not eat at home before going to school and do not receive food assistance at school</li> <li>- % of primary school students who are hungry at school</li> <li>- % of primary school students poorly focussed on the lessons because of hunger</li> </ul>
Reduce repetition in primary education (in order to increase learning outcomes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• REPETITION RATE IN PRIMARY EDUCATION: % of children in a given grade in the previous school year that are repeating the grade in the current year               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- repetition rate in grade 1: % of students repeating grade 1</li> <li>- repetition rate in grade 2: % of students repeating grade 2</li> <li>- repetition rate in grade 3: % of students repeating grade 3</li> <li>- repetition rate in grade 4: % of students repeating grade 4</li> <li>- repetition rate in grade 5: % of students repeating grade 5</li> <li>- repetition rate in grade 6: % of students repeating grade 6</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

(\*) The survival rate is symmetrical to drop out rate. Both drop out and repetition can be used as proxy indicators of learning outcome.



These objectives (and the related indicators) play a key role in targeting of a FFE programme; however targeting can be further enriched by looking at other elements that can hamper children's education. Besides the topics that are usually covered by VAM (i.e., household food insecurity, vulnerability and poverty), there are other issues that specifically regard children and may have a direct impact on their education:

- **Child labour** may impede education by keeping children busy with other tasks.
- **Orphan status** may impede education because orphans may have to work to support themselves and are usually less supervised by adults.
- **Low household educational level** may impede education because parents with a low educational level are less sensitive to the importance of school. In addition, their poor economical status may force them to involve their children in labour in / out of the household.
- **Non participation in early childhood educational programmes:** children not attending an early childhood education programme are less likely to enrol to primary school. If they do, they have a lower level of performance compared to those that have been involved in an early childhood education programme.

Table 9 – Conditions that make children more exposed to educational gaps and related indicators (all the indicators should be disaggregated by age and gender)

Conditions that make children more exposed to educational gaps	INDICATORS
Child labour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of primary school-age children involved in (formal and informal) labour</li> <li>• Percent distribution of primary school-age children by the amount of time allocated to any (formal and informal) labour</li> </ul>
Orphan hood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of primary school-age children who are orphans (disaggregated by orphan status)</li> </ul>
Low household educational level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of primary school-age children living in a household with a low educational level</li> </ul>
Non-participation in an early childhood education programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of primary school-age children who did not participate in an early childhood education programme</li> </ul>

If we include these elements in the analysis, we are able to identify – not only areas where educational problems (e.g., drop out) are more serious, but also areas where children are more likely to have a poor educational attainment (more exposed).

In the previous chapter we have seen how these topics can be mainstreamed in a VAM study. If in a country a VAM exercise has recently been conducted and it included some of these indicators, the findings of the vulnerability assessment can be triangulated with the statistics available in the country. If not, the detailed geographic targeting has to rely only on the secondary data provided by the external sources. Statistics on educational status and level of children are usually provided by the national / local Government, the Ministry of Education (MoE), the national/central Institute of Statistics or other institutes / organizations (NGOs, DHS, MICS, etc.).

In some countries, statistics locally produced can be extremely relevant for WFP. For instance, the National Risk and Vulnerability Assessment (NRVA) conducted in 2005 by the Government of Afghanistan was the main source of data for targeting FFE in the country; whereas in Cambodia the Ministry of Education, Youths & Sports initiated with WFP an education needs mapping exercise. In other countries, statistics may be obsolete, may not cover all the objectives which are relevant for a FFE programme, may not be available at the desiderated geographic level. If there is the possibility to use statistics provided by different sources, it is important to explore the reliability of the data/sources of information, to cover all the established objectives, and to prioritize data very disaggregated at the geographic level.

*Optionally: If indicators relevant to FFE targeting have not been included in the VAM assessment, if the secondary data existing in the country are poor or obsolete, and funds are available, the Country Office may consider the possibility to conduct a rapid assessment of the educational status / level of primary school-age children. Educational indicators and conditions that make children more exposed to educational gaps may be explored collecting data either on a representative sample of households or on a representative sample of schools. If data are collected at the households, we suggest using the same modules / questions proposed for the VAM household level questionnaires (see section 1, chapter 3).*

### 2.3.2. Including other important factors for programme implementation and outcomes

Besides indicators related to the defined objectives, the detailed geographic targeting should include other factors that influence the implementation and outcomes of an FFE programme, such as the presence of partners providing complementary services, the implementation of other WFP activities, accessibility and security of schools, and the administrative organization of the country.

**Presence of partners providing complementary services:** An extensive consultation with WFP COs and RBs has been conducted in order to identify steps that are most frequently undertaken for FFE targeting. Several Country Offices and Regional Bureaux pointed out that during the detailed geographic targeting it is particularly important to consider the presence of potential partnerships that can guarantee a successful implementation of the FFE programme:

“[...] it is possible to look for schools in the outback of Africa which have support from another source. For example, we start by looking for viable partners to work with. Of course, our schools almost always have support from the Government (and sometimes from local community) but this is often not enough to make a viable educational experience for the children. When a local mission is involved – and UNICEF provides inputs, etc. – you are suddenly faced with an institution that is functional, productive, and has absorptive capacity for additional assistance such as FFE”.

[ODD Regional Bureau]

Effective partnerships with national and international agencies (working in the same area) can complement FFE assistance, increase the usefulness of WFP FFE programmes and avoid duplication of work. For this reason, the existence of partners already implementing an activity at the schools and the presence of other potential partners should be explored. Similarly to WFP, these partners are likely to concentrate their activities / programmes into one (or more) areas of the country. A geographic mapping of their presence is therefore useful to spot the areas where schools already receive food support or other activities / services which can complement food assistance.<sup>17</sup>

**Implementation of other WFP activities:** Not only the efficacy of FFE assistance on children’s education increases if other complementary activities/services are provided at the school (e.g., separate latrines, micronutrient supplementation, improved stoves, etc.), but food security of the most vulnerable and poor people is better improved if a sinergetic combination of several activities is put in place. For this reason, during the detailed geographic targeting, it is also important to take into account where the other WFP activities are / will be implemented.

The implementation of FFE in the same areas where other WFP activities are implemented contribute both to increase the outcomes of WFP assistance and to optimize the existing economic and human resources.

**Accessibility and security:** While implementation of other WFP activities and the presence of (actual and potential) partners increase the efficacy of FFE programmes, poor accessibility and security compromise the assistance and aggravate problems during the programme implementation (e.g., irregular food delivery). It is therefore necessary to identify areas which are difficult to access or have security problems.

**Administrative units of the country:** Targeting is usually better understood and accepted by the stakeholders and local communities if it takes into account the way in which the country is administratively divided. As a consequence, at the time of selecting the areas, it is suggested to target entire administrative units (e.g. district) and not to separate villages / areas that belong to the same administrative unit.

To the extent possible, chosen administrative units should be sufficiently small to present the same characteristics in order to avoid inclusion of villages / areas where FFE is less needed. The inclusion or exclusion of urban areas, which might be better off than rural areas, within targeted administrative units should be considered on a case-by-case basis. Targeted areas should be ranked by order of priority and assistance be provided in that order.

As much as possible, all qualified schools within a targeted area should be assisted before supporting another area. This helps to achieve greater programme effects (“cluster, not sprinkle”) and acceptance by local stakeholders (see under 3.1 below).

### 2.3.3. Adopting a participatory approach

Targeting of food assistance is a sensitive topic. It is therefore crucial to adopt a participatory approach during the whole process. This means that:

- i) All the possible sources of data should be identified and screened (*triangulation of data*).
- ii) The criteria used to conduct the detailed geographic targeting should be agreed upon jointly with the main stakeholders (representatives of national / local institutions, Ministry of Education, local communities, etc.) (*transparency*).
- iii) The main stakeholders should be involved in the targeting process. This is particularly important in those countries where data are obsolete or not reliable and can be done, for example, by setting up targeting committees, at regional/provincial level and composed of different stakeholders (representatives of MoE, MoA, WFP, etc.). In particular, key informants may be

---

<sup>17</sup> The specific components of the Essential Package should enter in the analysis (see par. 2.2).

asked to provide information on the areas of the country (regions, provinces, districts) and rank them with respect to specific educational problems (i.e., low enrolment, drop out, etc.) (*active participation*).

- iv) The results of the detailed geographic targeting should be shared with the national/local institutions and representatives of the local communities (*information*).

**Summary:**


The detailed geographic targeting of the FFE programme is done to identify the food-insecure areas (or sub-areas) where FFE assistance is most needed and will have the greatest effects. It is based on the specific objectives that have been identified for the FFE programme through a problem analysis.

In this section we have pointed out which indicator(s) relate to which objective of FFE programmes (see table 8). In addition, we have reviewed other factors that should be included in the detailed geographic targeting because they influence the implementation and outcomes of an FFE programme (e.g., presence of partners providing complementary services, the implementation of other WFP activities, the accessibility and security of the schools and the way the country is administratively divided).

Finally, we have highlighted how important it is to adopt a participatory approach during the whole process of targeting. This can be done in different ways: triangulating the data, explaining the targeting criteria to the stakeholders, actively involving them in the targeting process, disseminating the results of the national/local institutions and representatives of the local communities.

## Section 3 – School-level targeting

Fig. 4 – School-level targeting



*As mentioned above, in order to guarantee that food aid is used in the most effective and efficient way, an additional analysis of the schools is usually done before implementing a FFE programme. The school-level targeting can be considered as the final step of the targeting process. In this section we will see which minimum requirements should be screened for the school selection.*

### 3.1. School-level targeting

As explained in the previous chapter, the purpose of the detailed geographic targeting is to identify the food insecure areas where FFE assistance is most needed. In theory, all the primary schools (or other educational level, depending on the specific FFE programme) located in the areas/administrative units identified through the detailed geographic targeting should be eligible to receive FFE assistance, starting with the areas of greatest priority. In practice, not all the schools in a targeted areas actually receive the assistance.

The ultimate purpose of the school selection is to identify which schools located in the targeted areas meet the minimum requirements for the implementation of a FFE programme.

**Why:** the school selection is necessary because a very poor learning environment can reduce the efficacy of FFE assistance and the programme implementation can be hampered by insufficient FFE infrastructure or lack of parental commitment to the FFE programme.

**When:** the school selection is done after the detailed geographic targeting and within areas/administrative units identified and ranked through this process.

**How:** as mentioned above, schools should meet minimum requirements to receive FFE assistance. As a general rule, such requirements are set in consultation with counterparts from the Government (with inputs from appropriate United Nations and bilateral agencies).<sup>18</sup> The table below (see table 10) includes a list of minimum requirements whose presence should be checked during the school selection. They regard the school environment and the community involvement.

Table 10 – Minimum requirements for the school selection – check list

MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS	
<b>School environment</b>	<b>Hygiene</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Availability of safe water within / nearby the school compound</li> </ul>
	<b>Food Hygiene</b>
<b>Community involvement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Presence of food storage facilities (storeroom)</li> <li>▪ Presence of cooking facilities (kitchen)</li> </ul>
	<b>Security and accessibility</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Accessibility of the school for food transports and monitoring</li> <li>▪ Security of the area</li> </ul>
<b>Community involvement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Presence of a Parents/Teacher Association (PTA) or school-level FFE committee (with equal participation of women)</li> <li>▪ Readiness of the community/parents to support implementation of FFE programme</li> </ul>

**School environment:** Schools should provide an environment that is hygienic, that allows food storage and food preparation, that is accessible and secure for students as well as for WFP / implementing partners. To the extent possible WFP helps schools that do not meet the criteria in order to bring them up to the standard. When such needs go beyond the scope of WFP's capacity, schools are usually encouraged to mobilize other sources of support.<sup>19</sup> If these minimum requirements are not met, the implementation of the FFE itself is jeopardized: water guarantees a minimum level of hygiene and the possibility to cook the food; a safe storeroom is needed to stock up the commodities and protect them from theft or animal infestation; cooking facilities are necessary

<sup>18</sup> Examples of minimum requirements set by the countries for the school selection are reported in 3.3.

<sup>19</sup> WFP School Feeding Handbook

for food preparation; accessibility and security prevent children and implementing partners from dangers and facilitate food delivery and programme monitoring.

**Community involvement:** Schools have to put in place canteen or food management committees comprised of representatives of parents, teachers and students and involving an equal number of women. Committees act as an interface between the community and school and manage and ensure good utilisation of the food in the school. Active participation of communities, in particular through PTAs, is encouraged. In particular, the essential services required for operating a school feeding programme (cooks, kitchen helpers, guards) should be covered by the community, either by providing such services itself or by contributing cash to compensate those engaged in the services. Besides the essential services described above, broader community participation should be built into projects whenever feasible. For this reason the project formulation should include an assessment of the potential for incorporating various types of participation.<sup>20</sup> Community involvement in the programme implementation, not only guarantees a good implementation of the FFE programme, but promotes community organization, empowerment, ownership and social development.

Ideally, the degree to which each school meets these criteria should be verified before the first food delivery takes place. In some countries, schools have been asked to apply for inclusion in the programme which can be useful to ensure compliance with selection criteria as well as local interest and support for the programme.

### 3.2. Possible sources of data and tools for data collection

To the extent possible the assessment of the minimum requirements should be done by using data already available. Availability of data varies a lot according to the countries. Frequently, at least some information can be found at the national / local Government, Ministry of Education, implementing partners, Country Office / Sub Office (e.g., Monitoring & Evaluation system, Standardized School Feeding Surveys, etc.)

If secondary data are not available the CO can check the presence of the minimum requirements by using the check list reported in the previous chapter. A more detailed analysis can be done through the questions reported below. These questions should be seen as a suggestion: they are not country specific and can be further developed, refined or selected in order to reply to specific needs.

Table 11 – Questions to assess the status of the school with respect to the minimum requirements

<b>School hygiene: safe water</b>				
			Yes	No
<b>Q1</b>	<b>Does the school have access to water source(s) that are:</b>	Safe <sup>21</sup> and located within the school compound	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Safe and located within a 10 minutes walk from the school	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Available throughout the school year	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>School food and hygiene: safe and adequate food storage, food preparation</b>				
			Yes	No
<b>Q1</b>	<b>Is a storeroom available at the school?</b>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q2</b>	<b>Is a storeroom safe and adequate?</b>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q3</b>	<b>Is there a kitchen at the school?</b>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Q4</b>	<b>If wood or charcoal is used as fuel, what type of stove is used?</b> <i>(tick all that apply)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> A three-stone fire place <input type="checkbox"/> An improved stove without a smoke chimney <input type="checkbox"/> An improved stove with a smoke chimney		
<b>Accessibility and Security of the School</b>				
<b>Q1</b>	<b>What are the most common means of public transport used to reach the school?</b> <i>(Please tick all that apply)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> public transport <input type="checkbox"/> bicycles/other non-motorised means of transport <input type="checkbox"/> walk <input type="checkbox"/> other (specify: _____)		

<sup>20</sup> WFP Food For Education Handbook

<sup>21</sup> According to the guidelines of WHO/UNICEF: **safe water sources** are pipe connection, public standpipe, borehole, protected dug well, protected spring, rainwater collection; unsafe water sources are unprotected well, unprotected spring, rivers or ponds, vendor-provided water, bottled water (because of the limitations in the potential quantity), tanker truck water. Whereas, **sanitation facilities** are **improved** if they have connection to a public sewer, connection to a septic system, flush latrine, simple pit latrine, ventilated improved pit latrine. Open pit latrine, bucket latrine are not improved.

Q2	On average, how long does it take for the students to reach the school?	___ [hh]: ___ [mm]
Q3	Is it safe for the children to reach the school?	<input type="checkbox"/> safe <input type="checkbox"/> moderately safe <input type="checkbox"/> not safe
Q4	Is the food distribution safe?	<input type="checkbox"/> safe <input type="checkbox"/> moderately safe <input type="checkbox"/> not safe
<b>Community involvement in the School Management</b>		
Q1	Is there a PTA or a School Management Committee (SCM) at the school?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Q2	If yes, how many members participate in the PTA or SMC?	no. of men: _____ no. of women: _____
Q3	If yes, who participates in the PTA or SMC? (tick all that apply and specify how many)	<input type="checkbox"/> headmaster <input type="checkbox"/> teachers no. _____ <input type="checkbox"/> parents no. _____ <input type="checkbox"/> other (spec.: _____) no. _____
Q4	(if yes) How often do parents meet teachers and other school representatives?	<input type="checkbox"/> often <input type="checkbox"/> sometimes <input type="checkbox"/> rarely <input type="checkbox"/> never
Q5	During the meetings: (tick all that apply)	<input type="checkbox"/> parents are <u>only</u> informed of the decisions taken <input type="checkbox"/> parents explain needs / difficulties <input type="checkbox"/> parents participate in decisions
<b>Community involvement in FFE implementation</b> <sup>22</sup>		
<i>For each school where a FFE programme is already in place, please check the following:</i>		
Q1	Do parents contribute to the FFE Programme?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Q2	If yes, how do they contribute? (tick all that apply)	<input type="checkbox"/> cash <input type="checkbox"/> in kind <input type="checkbox"/> labour
Q3	If they contribute in kind, what do they provide?	_____
Q4	If they contribute with labour, what do they do?	<input type="checkbox"/> store the food <input type="checkbox"/> keep records <input type="checkbox"/> prepare the food <input type="checkbox"/> work in the school garden <input type="checkbox"/> other (specify: _____)
Q5	If they contribute with cash, is payment of a contribution a precondition for benefiting from FFE assistance?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Q6	How much do parents pay per child each month?	_____
Q7	Do all parents pay?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Q8	If no, about how many did not pay last month? (indicate an approximate percentage)	_____ %
Q9	Why?	_____

<sup>22</sup> Community involvement in the school management and implementation of FFE programme (if FFE assistance is already provided) can be considered as a proxy indicator of community capability / readiness to participate to future FFE programmes. A number of questions should be used in order to better understand how parents and community members participate to school management and FFE programme implementation.

### 3.3. A selection of experiences from WFP Country Offices

An extensive consultation with WFP COs and RBs has been carried out in order to identify steps that are most frequently undertaken for the school selection. Substantial feedback has been received and a selection of experiences is reported below:

In **The Gambia**, the next FFE programme will include new types of institutions (literacy classes and madrassas). As a consequence, the availability of complementary inputs to food should receive greater importance for the selection of these new institutions.

Institutions will be selected according to the following criteria: food-deficit areas; low enrolment (particularly for girls); ability of mobilising complementary resources; schools' / communities' / NGOs' capability to manage the programme.

Public schools located in these districts and responding to the following targeting criteria could also benefit from the project. In addition to low enrolment / attendance rates, each beneficiary school / community has to satisfy the following prerequisites:

- a source of potable water for drinking and cooking
- adequate sanitary facilities (separate latrines for boys and girls, if possible)
- adequate and safe food storage facilities
- adequate and hygienic cooking and serving facilities (kitchen, dining areas, utensils); and
- Sufficient number of cooks for a safe and efficient food preparation and serving.

Prior to inclusion of any school into the project, a quick appraisal by the WFP CO and project authorities will be carried out to ascertain whether the above conditions are met.

Taking into account the fact that the literacy component will be a pilot programme, only those classes run by efficient NGOs will be selected. The criteria of selection of these NGOs will include: at least 5 years of experience in running literacy classes and ability to mobilise complementary resources for literacy classes (i.e., literacy material, payment for teachers, functional programmes, co-operation with and supervision by DoSE).

[The Gambia CO]

In **Yemen**, baseline studies have been done to select the schools to be targeted.

Schools located in urban areas/district centres or in remote / inaccessible places, schools with less than 10 or more than 250 girls were excluded. To avoid "migration" of girls from non-assisted schools to assisted schools, neighbouring schools have been grouped into clusters. This process led to the selection of 1300 schools (out of 1700).

[Yemen CO]

In **Pakistan** – under CP 10091 and CP 10269.0 – WFP introduced the concept of "minimum quality standard". UNESCO provided the checklist "*Minimum Requirements for Rural Primary Schools in Pakistan*" to ensure that WFP does not attract girls to sub-standard schools. The check list included: 1) at least one teacher for five classes, 2) at least one matriculate teacher, 3) at least two classrooms, 4) fixed / moveable black boards, 5) mats or benches for all classes, 6) demarcation or fence, 7) play area/ open space for students, 8) water availability, 9) toilets for students and teacher.

The items of the checklist were further divided into 2 categories: essential criteria and desirable criteria. Schools for WFP assistance were selected following the essential criteria: 1) enrolment less than 50% and accessibility, 2) at least one matriculate teacher, 3) Mats or benches, 4) Blackboard.

WFP CO conducted dialogues / meetings with the Provincial Education Department for the selection of districts within provinces and schools within the districts. During the meetings the UNESCO criteria were partially modified according to the field situation and other factors were included: (a) food insecurity; (b) educational needs (low literacy rate, high gender gap); (c) accessibility by transport; (d) good security situation; (e) need for contingency of assisted districts to facilitate logistics and monitoring.

The final selection of schools was based on a detailed analysis of the Education Management Information System (EMIS) data and on an actual verification of schools by WFP staff. The low student/teacher ratio was also considered to make sure that the selected schools will be able to accommodate new students in future and to avoid "ghost" schools.

[Pakistan CO]

Food security, educational needs, potential partnerships and minimum standards remain the criteria that are most frequently used to target areas and schools. However, in some countries the targeting criteria can be different because they have to respond to the very peculiar conditions in which the vulnerable children live. This is the case of Georgia, where food insecurity and poverty aggravate the phenomenon of children being placed in institutions and the principal objective of WFP FFE programmes is to decrease the number of non-orphan children living in the orphanages.

In **Georgia** the main targeting criteria is the high rate of children living in institutions. As a matter of fact, high food insecurity and poverty rate of the school catchment area increase the risk of children from full families to drop out from the school and be placed in an orphanage. Therefore, this is the main topic of discussions with the key informants.

[Georgia CO]

**Summary:**

The school selection is necessary because a very poor learning environment can reduce the efficacy of FFE assistance and the programme implementation can be hampered by insufficient FFE infrastructure or lack of parental commitment to the FFE programme. The school selection is done after the detailed geographic targeting and within areas/administrative units identified and ranked through this process.

In this section we have outlined a list of minimum requirements related to school environment (safe water, adequate food storage and food preparation, accessibility and security) and community involvement (in the school management and FFE programme implementation) whose presence should be checked during the school selection.


To the extent possible the assessment of the minimum requirements should be done by using data already available (e.g., data provided by the national / local Government, Ministry of Education, implementing partners, Country Office / Sub Office, etc.). For those countries where secondary data are not available, we have prepared a check list (see table 10) in order to verify the presence of the minimum requirements and questions (see table 11) for conducting a more in-depth analysis.



## Section 4 – Standardized surveys providing data for FFE targeting

Fig. 5 – Standardized surveys providing data for FFE targeting

*The analysis / review of secondary data and reports can play a key role in targeting. It is therefore important to identify sources of information and to carefully select the data. The purpose of this section is to draw the attention to standardized surveys that offer educational data at sub-national level and describe the indicators available. The role of such indicators in targeting of FFE programmes will be also explained.*



### 4.1. Sources of information

The availability of data at national and sub-national level varies a lot according to the countries. At national level it is possible to have a list of indicators that are more frequently available, even though not all the countries are successful in producing them.<sup>23</sup> Obviously, the reliability and validity of the information depends on the countries. In general, indicators which require population data are the most difficult because their quality depends on several sources of information. Moreover, demographic data are mostly based on population, which can be conducted annually or less frequently, whereas educational data can be collected either yearly or monthly.

As a general rule, sub-national data are less readily available than country-level data. We have screened several sources of information in order to identify sources that can be consulted systematically in a sub-national level analysis. Unfortunately, most of the sources provide data only at national level. Those giving a sub-national breakdown do not include data specifically related to children's education or children's vulnerability (e.g., child labour, living without parents, etc.).<sup>24</sup> However, two standardized surveys, MICS and DHS provide national and sub-national data on education of primary school-age children. Being standardized, they make it possible to compare countries.

**MICS (Multiple Indicators Cluster Surveys):** In relation to the *World Summit for Children* goals, in 1998, UNICEF embarked on a process of helping countries to assess progress for children at end-decade. The list of global indicators being used to assess progress at end-decade (MICS2) was developed through extensive consultation with WHO, UNESCO and ILO. The development of the end-decade MICS questionnaire and manual has drawn on an even wider spread of organizations.<sup>25</sup> Not only MICS2 has put greater efforts in documenting the results published in the country reports, but also in maximizing the use of micro data sets. Fifty-six country reports and forty-four data sets from the end-decade assessment are currently posted on the UNICEF Statistic website and are available for consultation ([www.childinfo.org](http://www.childinfo.org)). Data from MICS3 will be available in 2007.

**DHS (Demographic and Health Surveys):** The Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) provide data for informed decisions in population, health and nutrition. They are nationally-representative household surveys conducted in large sample sizes (usually between 5,000 and 30,000 households).

<sup>23</sup> Indicators that are frequently available at national level are: gross enrolment in Early Childhood Development Programmes; percentage of entrants in Grade 1 who attended some form of organized early childhood programmes; gross and net intake rates; gross and net enrolment rates; public expenditure in primary education as a percentage of GNP; public expenditure per pupil as a percentage of GNP per capita; public expenditure on primary education as a percentage of total public education expenditure; percentage of school teachers having the required academic qualifications; percentage of basic education teachers who are certified to teach according to national standards; pupils to teacher ratio; repetition rate by grade; survival rate to grade 5; coefficient of efficiency; literacy rate of 15-54 years old; adult literacy rate; literacy gender parity index; percentage of children having reached at least grade 4 of primary schooling who master a set of nationally defined basic learning competencies; completion rate.

<sup>24</sup> World Bank LSMS; Human Development Reports; UNDP Group; Common Country Assessments (CCA); Famine Early Warning Network System (FEWNET); UNESCO - Institute for Statistics; World Development Indicators; African Population Database Documentation; UN Statistics Division Census are some of the sources screened during the review.

<sup>25</sup> WHO, UNESCO, ILO, UNAIDS, the United Nations Statistical Division, CDC Atlanta, MEASURE (USAID), Johns Hopkins University, Columbia University, the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, and others were involved in the process.

DHS surveys provide data for a wide range of monitoring and impact evaluation indicators in the areas of population, health and nutrition. Typically, they are conducted every 5 years, to allow comparisons over time. DHS uses a standardized core questionnaire to allow comparisons across different countries. Special modules are also added to questionnaires in order to meet host-country and USAID data needs.

The standard DHS survey consists of a household questionnaire and a women's questionnaire. Data sets and / or country reports are currently available for 75 countries. Some of the countries have conducted more than one survey. Both the data sets and the country reports are available for consultation ([www.measuredhs.com](http://www.measuredhs.com)).

#### Some remarks on MICS and DHS:

- The mid-decade assessment conducted in 1996 (MICS I) involved 100 countries collecting data using the Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys. In 1999-2000 many countries conducted the end-decade assessment (MICS II). DHS surveys started at the end of the 1980ies and are usually conducted every 5 years. As a consequence, MICS and DHS reports may be not updated enough for targeting of FFE programmes.
- DHS and MICS are conducted in many countries but are not world-wide surveys. For this reason not all the WFP assisted countries can take advantage of these data in targeting of FFE programmes.
- In most cases, DHS and MICS make reports and data sets available. However, it is suggested to rely on the reports rather than perform a proper secondary data analysis in order to avoid a misunderstanding on the raw data, especially if there is no solid statistical expertise available.
- WFP Country Offices and Regional Bureaux regard MICS and DHS as more useful to target nutritional and health activities for mothers and young children than FFE programmes. For targeting of FFE programmes, they prefer referring to data / reports developed by the Government, the Ministry of Education (MoE), the Central / National Statistical Office, NGOs and other research institutes.
- During the targeting of FFE programmes, it is strongly suggested to use several sources of information and triangulate the information. DHS and MICS data, if available, should be compared with the statistics produced by the Government, the Ministry of Education (MoE), the Central / National Statistical Office, NGOs and other research institutes. If there is poor consistency between the data, it is crucial to identify the most reliable and updated sources of information.

#### **4.2. Educational indicators provided by MICS and DHS**

The table below includes sub-national level indicators of children's education that are often available in MICS and / or DHS reports. For each indicator, its definition, role in FFE targeting and source(s) are reported. Most of the indicators collected during the field work are actually mentioned in the reports. Some of them, marked with an asterisk (\*), can be computed by working on the data sets.

Table 12 – Educational Indicators available in DHS and / or MICS. Name, definition, role in FFE targeting and sources are reported. Indicators marked with an asterisk (\*) are usually collected but not mentioned in the reports.

<b>EDUCATIONAL INDICATORS (NAME AND DEFINITION)</b>	<b>ROLE IN FFE TARGETING</b>	<b>SOURCE</b>
<b>ATTENDANCE AND REASONS FOR NON ATTENDANCE</b>		
<b>1. Non attendance rate:</b> % of children that have never attended school	Identify areas where the percentage of primary school-age children who have never attended school is high	MICS (*) DHS (*)
<b>2. Current net attendance ratio (NAR) in primary school:</b> % of primary school-age children that are currently attending primary school (1)	Identify areas where the percentage of primary school-age children who are currently not attending school is high	MICS DHS
<b>3. Current gross attendance ratio (GAR) in primary school:</b> primary school students expressed as a percentage of the official primary school-age population (1)	Identify areas where the no. of students attending primary school is low compared to the no. of primary school-age children	DHS
<b>4. Gender Parity Index in primary school:</b> ratio of the GAR for females to the GAR for males	Identify areas where there is a high gender disparity in attending primary school	DHS
<b>5. Occurrence of attendance:</b> percent distribution of children attending school by the days of presence at school	Identify areas where attendance among primary school students is low	MICS (*)

EDUCATIONAL INDICATORS (NAME AND DEFINITION)	ROLE IN FFE TARGETING	SOURCE
<b>PROGRESS IN EDUCATION</b>		
<p><b>6. Drop out rate in primary education:</b> % of children in a given grade in the previous school year who are not attending school this year (2)</p> <p><b>6.1</b> Drop out rate in grade 1: % of children in grade 1 during the previous year who are not attending this year</p> <p><b>6.2</b> Drop out rate in grade 2: % of children in grade 2 during the previous year who are not attending this year</p> <p><b>6.3</b> Drop out rate in grade 3: % of children in grade 3 during the previous year who are not attending this year</p> <p><b>6.4</b> Drop out rate in grade 4: % of children in grade 4 during the previous year who are not attending this year</p> <p><b>6.5</b> Drop out rate in grade 5: % of children in grade 5 during the previous year who are not attending this year</p> <p><b>6.6</b> Drop out rate in grade 6: % of children in grade 6 during the previous year who are not attending this year</p>	Identify areas where percentage of children dropping out from primary school is high	DHS
<p><b>7. Repetition rate in primary education:</b> % of children in a given grade in the previous school year that are repeating the grade in the current year</p> <p><b>7.1</b> repetition rate in grade 1: % of students repeating grade 1</p> <p><b>7.2</b> repetition rate in grade 2: % of students repeating grade 2</p> <p><b>7.3</b> repetition rate in grade 3: % of students repeating grade 3</p> <p><b>7.4</b> repetition rate in grade 4: % of students repeating grade 4</p> <p><b>7.5</b> repetition rate in grade 5: % of students repeating grade 5</p> <p><b>7.6</b> repetition rate in grade 6: % of students repeating grade 6</p>	Identify areas where percentage of primary school students repeating the same grade is high	DHS
<p><b>8. Completion rate:</b> % of children enrolled in grade 1 that eventually reached grade 5</p>	Identify areas where the percentage of children completing primary school is low (proxy indicator of learning index)	MICS
<b>EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT</b>		
<p><b>9. Literacy Rate:</b> % of population aged 15 years and older that is literate (i.e., can write a letter or read a newspaper)</p>	Identify areas where the level of alphabetization of adult population is low	MICS DHS
<p><b>10. Educational attainment of the household population:</b> percent distribution of the household population aged six years and older by the highest level of education completed</p>	Identify areas where the educational attainment of adult population is low	DHS
<p><b>11. Maternal Educational Level:</b> percent distribution of under five years old children by the educational level of their mother</p>	Identify areas where maternal educational attainment is low	MICS (*)
<p><b>12. Pre-primary attendance rate:</b> % of children aged 36-59 months who are attending some form of organized early childhood education programme</p>	Identify areas where the percentage of young children receiving childhood education is low	MICS
<p><b>13. child labour:</b> % of children 5 - 14 years of age who are currently working (paid or unpaid; inside or outside home)</p>	Identify areas where the percentage of children attracted by labour market is high	MICS

- (1) MICS and DHS use the term “attendance” and do not distinguish between attendance and enrolment. However, enrolment is at the end collected because parents report whether their children are enrolled in school or not.
- (2) The survival rate is symmetrical to drop out rate.

**Summary:**

The analysis / review of secondary data / reports can play a key role in targeting of food-insecure areas and of FFE programmes. It is therefore important to identify sources of information and to carefully select the data.

In this section we have drawn the attention to two standardized surveys (DHS and MICS) that offer educational data at sub-national level and described the indicators available. The role of such indicators in targeting of FFE programmes has been also explained.

Obviously, in each country further data can be retrieved: national / local government, Ministry of Education, the central / national Office of Statistics, NGOs and other research institutes are the most likely sources of information.

## Summary:

In **section 1** we have seen how education, and events that obstacle education, are usually covered during a VAM study. New questions / modules have been presented and explained with the ultimate purpose of incorporating indicators that are relevant to FFE targeting into WFP vulnerability assessments.

### Proposals for the VAM household questionnaire

We have outlined two different methods for collecting relevant data for FFE targeting: the individual-level and the household-level method. The household-level approach encompasses the same issues as those included in the individual-level approach: non-enrolment, absenteeism, drop-out, repetition, short-term hunger, child labour, orphan status and household educational attainment. However, the information is different: through the household-level approach, parents review the educational status / level of the children living in the household and give a summary; they do not report for each child separately. As a result, we obtain an outline of the household, not individual profiles of the children.

### Proposals for the VAM community questionnaire

From the FFE targeting perspective, it would be important to refine the sections regarding the presence of schools and the attendance of children living in the village. Questions regarding daily activities of children, their health problems, shocks and their consequences on education and external assistance received by the community do not require any further development.

The detailed geographic targeting of the FFE programme is done to identify the food-insecure areas (or sub-areas) where FFE assistance is most needed and will have the greatest effects. It is based on the specific objectives that have been identified for the FFE programme through a problem analysis.

In this **section 2** we have pointed out which indicator(s) relate to which objective of FFE programmes (see table 8). In addition, we have reviewed other factors that should be included in the detailed geographic targeting because they influence the implementation and outcomes of an FFE programme (e.g., presence of partners providing complementary services, the implementation of other WFP activities, the accessibility and security of the schools and the way the country is administratively divided).

Finally, we have highlighted how important it is to adopt a participatory approach during the whole process of targeting. This can be done in different ways: triangulating the data, explaining the targeting criteria to the stakeholders, actively involving them in the targeting process, disseminating the results of the national/local institutions and representatives of the local communities.

The school selection is necessary because a very poor learning environment can reduce the efficacy of FFE assistance and the programme implementation can be hampered by insufficient FFE infrastructure or lack of parental commitment to the FFE programme. The school selection is done after the detailed geographic targeting and within areas/administrative units identified and ranked through this process. In **section 3** we have outlined a list of minimum requirements related to school environment (safe water, adequate food storage and food preparation, accessibility and security) and community involvement (in the school management and FFE programme implementation) whose presence should be checked during the school selection.

To the extent possible the assessment of the minimum requirements should be done by using data already available (e.g., data provided by the national / local Government, Ministry of Education, implementing partners, Country Office / Sub Office, etc.). For those countries where secondary data are not available, we have prepared a check list (see table 10) in order to verify the presence of the minimum requirements and questions (see table 11) for conducting a more in-depth analysis.

The analysis / review of secondary data / reports can play a key role in targeting of food-insecure areas and of FFE programmes. It is therefore important to identify sources of information and to carefully select the data.

In this **section 4** we have drawn the attention to two standardized surveys (DHS and MICS) that offer educational data at sub-national level and described the indicators available. The role of such indicators in targeting of FFE programmes has been also explained.

Obviously, in each country further data can be retrieved: national / local government, Ministry of Education, the central / national Office of Statistics, NGOs and other research institutes are the most likely sources of information.