

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

Issue Date: January 21, 2026

Subject: Request for Quotation for Endline/Baseline Evaluation for McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Project in Senegal

RFP Number: CPI-FFE_1131/MEAL-GENOP-00518-01-2026_evaluations

Questions Deadline: February 2, 2026; 5:00 pm (EST)

Proposal Deadline: February 20, 2026; 5:00 pm (EST)

Submit proposals to: Official Email Address

Counterpart International (hereinafter Counterpart) is seeks offers to conduct a combined **Endline and Baseline Evaluation for the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition projects (hereinafter McGovern-Dole), entitled *Sukaabe Janngo II and III*** as described in this Request for Quotation (RFQ). The project is funded by the United States Department of Agriculture (hereinafter USDA).

Combining the Endline evaluation of the existing project (*Sukaabe Janngo II*) with the Baseline assessment for the new project (*Sukaabe Janngo III*) is both methodologically sound and operationally efficient. The Endline of the current project will capture the most recent and comprehensive data on project outcomes and results. Leveraging these Endline results as the Baseline for the new project ensures continuity in measurement, allows for consistency in indicators, and reduces duplication of data collection efforts.

Firms invited by Counterpart (hereinafter “bidders or Offerors”) to submit offers (hereinafter “bids” or “offers”) for the services described in the attached supply schedules are under no obligation to do so. The Bidder shall bear all costs associated with the preparation and submission of the Proposal.

This Request for Proposal includes the following sections:

- I. Instructions to Offerors
- II. Technical Specifications
- III. Annexes

All correspondence and/or inquiries regarding this RFP should be requested in accordance with the enclosed Instructions to Proposals (Section I, Clause 10, Clarifications).

The Instructions to Offerors (Section I) shall not form part of the proposals. They are intended to aid Offerors in the preparation of their Proposals. For the purposes of interpretation of Section I, unless otherwise stated, the number of days stated herein shall be consecutive calendar days.

Submission of bids should be completed in accordance with the enclosed instructions to Bidders (Section I, clause 11, Submission of Bids).

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL	1
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL	2
TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
SECTION I: INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS.....	3
1. Introduction.....	3
2. Eligible Source Countries for Goods and Services.....	3
3. Preparation of Proposals	3
4. Proposal Content.....	3
5. Format and Signing of Proposal	4
6. Price Quote.....	4
7. Statement of Qualifications.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
8. Proposal Validity Period	Error! Bookmark not defined.
9. Deadline and Late Proposals.....	5
10. Clarification of Bidding Documents	Error! Bookmark not defined.
11. Submission of Proposals	5
12. Amendment of Bidding Documents	5
13. Modification of Proposals.....	5
14. Criteria for Award and Evaluation.....	5
15. Counterpart’s Right to Accept Any Proposal and to Reject Any or All Proposals.....	6
16. Notification of Award.....	6
17. Acceptance of Privacy Policy and Terms and Conditions.....	6
SECTION II – TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS	7
1. General Background	7
2. Program Overview	8
3. Objectives	10
4. Research Questions	Error! Bookmark not defined.
5. Methodology	17
6. Ethical considerations and Other Conditions.....	25
7. Assignment Duration and Deliverables	26
8. Staff Structure	26
9. Qualifications.....	27
10. Monitoring and Reporting.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
11. Evaluation Criteria	29
12. Method of payment	Error! Bookmark not defined.
SECTION III: ANNEXES	
A. Theory of Change	
B. Results Framework	
C. Table of Performance Indicators	

SECTION I: INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS

1. *Introduction*

RFQ No. CPI-FFE_1131/MEAL-GENOP-00518-01-2026_evaluations, dated **January 21, 2026**: Counterpart hereby invites qualified firms to submit proposals to conduct the Endline Evaluation of the Sukaabe Janngo II project and Baseline Evaluation of the Sukaabe Janngo III project in Senegal as detailed in Section II, Technical Specifications.

2. *Eligibility Restrictions for Goods and Services Providers*

Offerors will be considered ineligible if they have been suspended, debarred, or otherwise ineligible, as Indicated on either (1) the “List of Parties Excluded from Federal Non-procurement Programs” and/or (2) the “Consolidated Lists of Designated Nationals”.

3. *Preparation of Proposals*

3.1 Offerors are expected to thoroughly review and comply with all specifications, and all requirements contained in the RFP. Failure to do so shall be at the Offeror’s own risk and result in disqualification.

3.2 All proposals, as well as any correspondence or communication exchanged between the Offeror and Counterpart International, shall be submitted in French and English.

4. *Proposal Content*

Proposals submitted in response to the RFP must consist of the following three components:

- A. Technical Proposal
- B. Cost proposal
- C. References

A. *Technical Proposal (Maximum 15 pages):*

The Technical proposal will be submitted as single Microsoft World file and must include in annexes the following documents:

- i. **CVs** for the following staff:
 - a. Lead Evaluator
 - b. Associate Evaluator

CVs must demonstrate that the proposed personnel meet the minimum qualifications outlined in Clause 7, Staff Structure, of Section II, Technical Specifications.

- ii. **Proposed Methodology and Evaluation Structure**, The Offeror shall provide a detailed description of the proposed technical approach, including:
 - a. Proposed sampling methodology
 - b. Proposed evaluation design with a description of tools to be used
 - c. Evaluator team composition and structure
 - d. Quality control method(s) and tools
- iii. **Gantt chart** with a detailed timeline of activities in weeks with proposed number of days for each stage of the endline/baseline evaluation. It is important to note that this

evaluation should not exceed six months from contract signature to submission of the final report to USDA.

B. Cost proposal: *The cost proposal shall be submitted in Microsoft Excel format, unlocked and with all formulas intact, and must include:*

- a. A detailed (line-item) cost breakdown and (2) the total price of the services offered in response to this RFP.
- b. Unit cost in USD for each deliverable, item description, quantity, and total cost.
- c. An acknowledgment that **Counterpart anticipates issuing one or two firm fixed price (FFP) contract(s)** as a result of this RFP.
- d. A statement confirming that **the total proposed budget** should not exceed a total of **USD \$180,000 (\$120,000 quantitative/qualitative evaluation & \$60,000 EGRA)**. Counterpart **prefers to issue one contract** which integrates the EGRA data; however, if there is no single offer meeting the needs, two FFPs can be awarded.
- e. All logistical costs including transportation, lodging, per diem, and other related expenses must be incorporated into the Offeror's budget, as **Counterpart will not directly reimburse or assume these costs under any circumstances.**

C. References (Maximum 1 page):

The Offeror shall provide **three (3) professional references** in Microsoft Word or PDF format from organizations for which similar services were provided within the last five (5) years.

Each reference entry must include:

- Name and title of the contact person
- Organization
- Email address
- Telephone number
- Brief description of the services provided

Counterpart will directly contact the listed references and will not accept copies of letter of recommendation or third-party certification in lieu of verifiable references.

5. Format and Signing of Proposal

The Offeror shall prepare **one complete proposal** consisting of three distinct parts: 1) Technical Proposal, 2) Cost Proposal, 3) References. Each part must include all required sections and information as outlined in **Clause 4, Proposal Content** of this RFP. The proposal must be signed and dated by an individual duly authorized to represent and bind the Offeror to the terms of the proposal, unsigned proposals may be deemed non-responsive and rejected without further consideration.

6. Proposal Validity Period

All proposals must remain **valid and open for acceptance for a minimum period of ninety (90) calendar days** from the proposal submission deadline indicated on the cover page of this RFP. Counterpart International reserves the right to request an extension of the validity period prior to its expiration.

7. **Deadline and Late Proposals**

It is the **sole responsibility of the Offeror** to ensure that its complete proposal is received by Counterpart International **on or before the submission deadline** specified on the cover page of this RFP. Proposals received **after the stated deadline** will be considered **late and ineligible for review** and will not be evaluated under any circumstances.

8. **Clarification of Bidding Documents**

Clarifications of the administrative and technical requirements of this RFP must be submitted in writing no later than the questions deadline indicated on the cover page to mgd.senegal@counterpart.org. with the subject line “Clarifications for proposition «CPI-FFE_1131/MEAL-GENOP-00518-01-2026_evaluations »” Questions, and the answers thereto, will be consolidated and returned to all Offerors that submitted questions within five (5) business days of the questions deadline indicated on the cover page. The questions and answers will also be published publicly wherever the RFP is initially published.

9. **Submission of Proposals**

Only electronic submissions will be accepted, please email mgd.senegal@counterpart.org and include in the subject line "Baseline/Endline Evaluation of Sukaabe Janngo II project." All questions relating to this call for tenders must be submitted by February 2, 2026; 5:00 pm (EST. Questions will be answered within three (3) business days by email. Questions and answers will be published publicly. Questions may be submitted, in writing, to mgd.senegal@counterpart.org. Counterpart will not accept hardcopy or faxed proposals under any circumstances.

Ensuring successful transmission and receipt of the proposals is the responsibility of the Offeror. It is recommended that no e-mail exceeds the size of 10 MB, inclusive of attachments.

10. **Amendment of Bidding Documents**

Counterpart may at its discretion, for any reason, whether at its own initiative or in response to a clarification by a Bidder, modify bidding documents by amendment. All prospective Bidders that have received bidding documents will be notified of the amendment by e-mail and such amendments will be binding on them.

11. **Modification of proposals**

Any Offeror has the right to withdraw, modify, or correct its proposal after it has been delivered to Counterpart, provided the request for such a withdrawal, modification, or correction is received by Counterpart at the email address given above before the deadline. Counterpart may ask any Offeror for clarification of its proposal; nevertheless, no Offeror will be permitted to alter its proposal Price or make any other material modification after the deadline unless the RFP has been amended or the deadline extended.

12. **Criteria for Award and Evaluation**

Subject to the eligibility requirements in this RFP, Counterpart will award to the Offeror, if any, whose proposal is deemed acceptable and that offers the best value based upon the evaluation criteria in Section II, Technical Specifications, Clause 9, Evaluation Criteria. For a proposal to be deemed acceptable, it must comply with all the terms and conditions of this RFP without material modification. In addition, the successful Offeror must be determined to be responsible. A responsible offeror is one who has technical expertise, management capability, workload capacity, and financial resources to perform the work. Counterpart may, at its option, reject all proposals.

13. Counterpart's Right to Accept Any Bid and to Reject Any or All proposals

Counterpart will reject any proposal that is nonresponsive. Further, Counterpart reserves the right to reject the proposal of any Offeror if, in Counterpart's judgment, the Offeror is not fully qualified to provide the services, or to reject all proposals.

14. Notification of Award

Before the expiration of the period of proposal validity, Counterpart will notify the successful Offeror in writing that its proposal has been accepted.

Upon the successful Offeror acknowledging receipt of the Notification of Award, Counterpart will promptly notify the unsuccessful Offerors that their proposals were rejected. If after notification of award, a Offeror wishes to ascertain the grounds on which its proposal was not selected, it should address its request to Counterpart in writing.

17. Acceptance of Privacy Policy and Terms and Conditions.

By Submitting quotation/proposal to Counterpart International, the company or the individual consents to Counterpart's privacy policy terms and conditions (<https://www.counterpart.org/terms-and-conditions/>), and provides Counterpart International permission to process the company's or individual's personal data specifically for the performance of, and purposes identified in, this solicitation document and in compliance with Counterpart's legal obligations under applicable United States and European Union laws, data protection and regulations and any other applicable legal requirements. The company/Individual may withdraw their consent at any time by contacting privacy@counterpart.org. If consent is withdrawn, Counterpart reserves the right to accept or reject the offer.

SECTION II – TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS

1. General Background

Counterpart International (Counterpart) is a global development organization that partners with local communities, institutions, and governments to build inclusive, sustainable, and resilient societies. In Senegal, Counterpart is implementing the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Project (McGovern-Dole) – Sukaabe Janngo II (2020–2025) for a total funding of \$25,000,000, funded by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). Building on the successes and lessons learned from this phase, Counterpart has recently been awarded the next five-year phase of the program, titled Sukaabe Janngo III, (2025–2031) for a total funding of \$40,000,000 meaning “Children of Tomorrow” in the local Pulaar language.

The McGovern-Dole program supports the Government of Senegal (GoS) in strengthening its national school feeding and literacy strategy by improving children’s literacy, nutrition, and overall health while fostering community ownership and government-led sustainability. Counterpart works as a trusted partner to USDA and the GoS at both national and sub-national levels, collaborating closely with regional education authorities and local communities to implement activities that promote self-reliant and resilient school stakeholders.

Under Sukaabe Janngo II, the project operates in the Casamance, targeting five departments across the regions of Sédhiou and Kolda, to improve literacy and primary education, reduce hunger, and enhance food security. The project currently supports 285 schools through integrated interventions in literacy, school feeding, WASH, nutrition, and community capacity strengthening. Under Sukaabe Janngo III, Counterpart will expand to a sixth department, Goudump, while continuing in the current departments and adding 113 new schools in all departments in addition to the current schools for a total of 398 elementary and preschools. Core activities remain the same with some scale up while some pilot activities are being discontinued.

As part of the transition from the current project to the new one, Counterpart International seeks a qualified and experienced firm to conduct:


- A combined evaluation which includes the Endline Evaluation of the ongoing Sukaabe Janngo II (2020–2025) project and the Baseline Evaluation for the newly awarded Sukaabe Janngo III (2025–2031) project.

The two parts of the evaluation will be conducted concurrently to ensure methodological consistency, data comparability, and operational efficiency. The Endline Evaluation will assess the performance, achievements, and lessons learned from Sukaabe Janngo II, while the Baseline Evaluation will establish the benchmark values for Sukaabe Janngo III, prior to the start of implementation.

Findings from the Endline Evaluation in the current 285 schools will measure the extent to which the target indicators for Sukaabe Janngo II were achieved and will assess the results as compared at the baseline to the endline (before and after). The data from the Endline will serve as the baseline targets and annual performance benchmarks for Sukaabe Janngo III. In addition to this, baseline information from the 113 new schools will also be gathered. Results of the baseline will serve as a reference point for tracking progress over time, revising the annual targets of the project’s performance indicators, informing midterm and final evaluations, and validating the new project’s

theory of change and learning agenda. Data from the baseline will serve as a benchmark to measure performance on a semi-annual basis, and the data will be used by the project management to refine the project design.

By commissioning this combined Endline/Baseline evaluation, Counterpart aims to ensure data continuity, generate evidence for adaptive management, and strengthen the alignment of USDA-funded school feeding initiatives with Senegal’s National School Feeding Program and Education Sector Plan.



2. Program Overview

Sukaabe Janngo III is a proposed six-year initiative that builds upon the success of Sukaabe Janngo II to expand the reach and impact of school feeding in the Casamance area of Senegal. Leveraging lessons learned, the project will expand from 285 to 398 schools in all six departments of Sédhiou and Kolda. The program will scale the use of USDA-sourced agriculture commodities while delivering an integrated package of interventions in school feeding, nutrition, health, WASH, literacy, infrastructure, and school gardening.

Operating at community, departmental, regional, and national levels, Counterpart will reinforce the capacity of key stakeholders, including parents and caregivers, teachers, cooks and school canteen volunteers, school management committees (SMCs), and government actors. These actors will form a coordinated ecosystem capable of sustaining high-quality school feeding operations.

Sukaabe Janngo III will drive improvements in student attendance, classroom participation and literacy outcomes, it will increase parental engagement in education and enhance sustainability of school canteens through expanded local production, procurement, and community driven operation and school-linked gardens. Additionally, the project will support the GoS to develop and operationalize policies and strategies that advance national ownership and funding for canteens.

Under the project, Counterpart’s ongoing technical assistance to the GoS in coordination with the multisectoral group on school meals and nutrition (GMSANE) will result in the finalization of the school feeding policy, law, and financing strategy. Increased community contributions as well as budget allocations from the GoS will directly contribute to our strategy to increase community contributions over time, ultimately resulting in a full transition from USG financed commodities by the end of the project.

The project will reach 398 public schools and benefit approximately 135,424 school-aged children, providing over 57,182,780 million nutritious school meals made primarily from 8,690 metric tons of U.S.-donated commodities, 2,366 MT of locally procured cowpea, and complemented by community contributions. With a total budget of USD 40 million, Sukaabe Janngo III will operate through a consortium led by Counterpart International, with partners ARED and Virginia Tech, combining expertise in literacy education and agricultural innovation.

Results and activities:

Counterpart will implement Sukaabe Janngo III in 398 schools (61 preschool and 337 elementary schools) across six departments in the Sédhiou and Kolda regions of Senegal. The project builds on the foundation of 285 schools (47 preschools and 238 elementary schools) currently supported under Sukaabe Janngo II and expands to 113 additional schools (14 preschools and 99 elementary schools) through a comprehensive, integrated package school feeding, nutrition, and strengthening local systems. See Table 1 for details.

Table 1. Activities with Anticipated Result & Associated Indicator (SJIII)

Activity	Anticipated Results	Associated Standard Indicators
Activity 1	Improve student attendance and support overall cognitive development and growth by providing nutritious daily school meals with predominantly U.S.-provided agricultural commodities to maximize reach across targeted preschools and elementary schools	MGD 2, 9, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 LRP 5, 6
Activity 2	Schools have improved infrastructure, particularly kitchens and storerooms for implementing school feeding programs, while improved WASH facilities at schools including access to safe drinking water enable safe and hygienic preparation of school meals. Improvement of Latrines contributes to improved hygiene and sanitation in schools, resulting in improved health and a more conducive environment for learning.	MGD 2, 8, 11, 12, 27, 28 LRP 9
Activity 3	Strengthening literacy, pedagogical and management skills of teachers and school directors, resulting in improved literacy outcomes for students in grades 3-6.	MGD 1, 4, 5, 6, 7
Activity 4	Increase literacy and overall student performance through the promotion of reading and learning in and out of the classroom for 2 nd and 3 graders.	MGD 1, 2, 3, 9
Activity 5	Increase the participation, commitment, and capacity of communities and SMCs to manage canteens and schools.	MGD 13
Activity 6	Increase awareness, capacity and support for financing school feeding across government, while strengthening the capacity of municipal, department, regional, and national school feeding government actors.	MGD 10, 11, 12
Activity 7	Strengthen health, nutrition and WASH practices by improving knowledge of good hygiene practices, providing access to preventive health services and enhancing knowledge of nutrition, food preparation and preservation.	MGD 14, 15, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25, 26, 29
Activity 8	Build commodity management and food safety capacity of school management committees, school directors, cooks and storeroom managers to store food safely and hygienically prepare and serve meals, while empowering IEF to assume responsibility of commodity management training and coaching.	MGD 20, 22

Activity 9	Expand and strengthen linkages between cowpea producers and school purchasing groups, while transitioning procurement to purchasing groups and empowering IEF to assume full responsibility for managing the procurement process for school canteens.	LRP 3, 4, 5, 6,7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15
Activity 10	Increase the production and productivity of school gardens and community-linked demonstration fields to serve as a learning tool and to sustainably supply food to school canteens.	LRP 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15
Cross-Cutting Indicators	MGD 30, 31, 32 LRP 1, 2, 16	

3. Objectives

The combined endline/baseline evaluation will ensure data continuity between phases and provide a foundation for ongoing performance tracking and learning. Both Sukaabe Janngo II (SJII) and Sukaabe Janngo III (SJIII) address three standard objectives, namely, Improved literacy of school-aged children (Strategic Objective (SO) 1), Increased use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary practices (SO2), and Improved Effectiveness of Food Assistance through Local and Regional Procurement (SO3) (See Results Framework in the Annex).

The findings from this external evaluation will be used (1) to measure outcomes and results from SJII against indicators and expected results, and (2) to establish some baseline targets which will be used to revise the project’s performance indicators and as benchmarks to measure performance (semi-annual, annual, and life of project (LOP)) for SJIII. At a more holistic level, this evaluation aims to:

- To validate our overall graduation and sustainability plan.
- To confirm the interconnectedness between project stakeholders and its importance for reaching goals to strengthen coordination among diverse actors.
- To validate and perhaps expand on the understanding of contextual factors that may affect project implementation; and
- To review and validate the project’s results framework to ensure a clear, common understanding of the project’s objectives and causal pathways, and ensure that the project’s “cause logic” is sound and grounded in the Senegalese context.

a. Objectives of the Assignment

Counterpart anticipates that the evaluation will provide an independent assessment of the outcomes and sustainability pathways for school meals programming in Senegal. To carry out the Endline Evaluation of the Sukaabe Janngo II project, the Evaluator must perform the following tasks:

Endline Evaluation Tasks:

- Determine at which extent Sukaabe Janngo II achieved its objectives and goal, and the effectiveness and impact of the activities from the consortium over the life of the project.
- Determine the progress and implementation of the recommendations from the midterm evaluation.
- Capture all achievements, challenges, lessons learned and recommendations from the Sukaabe Janngo II project and the project’s donor, prime implementer and local partners and stakeholders to inform the design of similar future projects in Senegal or elsewhere.
- Ensure the methodology and data collection tools are adapted and finalized for this combined evaluation. After data collection, conduct analyses comparing project schools

and control schools in the target regions using statistically valid methods (e.g., Difference-in-Differences or Propensity Score Matching).

- Conduct quantitative and qualitative data analysis to answer the evaluation research questions.
- Produce an endline evaluation report containing a) comparisons between the baseline and endline situations, as well as between beneficiary schools and a comparable control group; and b) rigorous analysis of the results, including statistical tests (and p-value results) to assess, where possible, whether the observed effects can be attributed to the project.

The objectives of the Endline Evaluation include the following:

- Assess performance regarding relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and project sustainability.
- Assess the performance of outcome indicators in comparison to baseline and midline evaluations.
- Assess the literacy outcomes of participating students using the Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA).
- Assess the level of community leadership in SMCs and the school canteen.
- Assess the level of community ownership in improving infrastructure and sanitation at target schools.
- Assess student knowledge and practices in health, nutrition, and WASH.
- Provide a clear picture of project strengths and weaknesses.
- Examine the links between program activities and results.
- Assess the pertinence of project design to the problems the project is aiming to solve.
- Document lessons learned and strategies for improving project design and performance.
- Assess the sustainability of project efforts using project-defined criterion, with particular attention to the extent to which the school feeding program is likely to continue beyond the life of the project through GoS and community ownership.

The following list includes, but is not limited to, illustrative research questions that will be answered cumulatively by the final evaluation.

Endline Research questions:

(1) Program Effectiveness and Performance

- Were the program's implementation and expected results achieved as planned? What contextual or operational obstacles influenced the achievement of results?
- Were outputs and outcome targets met, as outlined in the MGD indicator results table?
- How do the lowest-performing project schools compare to control schools, and what factors explain performance differentials across schools and regions?
- To what extent is it appropriate to use control schools as a benchmark for comparison, considering contextual, and operational differences?
- What added value or consequences are attributable to the program?
- How satisfied are stakeholders with program outcomes?
- What is the status of baseline and midterm evaluations recommendations?
- How well can local systems sustain outcomes, and which outcomes are more likely to persist?
- Compared to the region's recent school results, what can be attributed to the program?

(2) School Feeding and Nutrition

- How does school feeding affect attendance and enrollment?
- What is the interaction between school feeding and WASH practices?
- To what extent do students and cooks practice good WASH and nutrition behaviors?

(3) Health, Nutrition & WASH and Maternal & Child Health (community health)

- How does deworming and Vitamin A supplementation impact preschool student attendance?
- What is the impact of latrine and water access on student attendance?
- Are students showing improved handwashing behavior?
- How are the cooking demonstrations and information, education, and communication (IEC) campaign impacting pregnant and lactating women's behavior around nutrition, pregnancy, and birth?

(4) Methodology

- How should we address the spillover effect of the literacy activity which the Ministry of National Education uses with non-project schools?

(5) School Feeding Sustainability

- What is the government's capacity and commitment for managing school feeding?
- How are project activities perceived in supporting sustainability beyond the project?
- Which project investments can be sustained by the government and community?
- What lessons and best practices can be scaled to other USDA programs and which ones can be scaled up by the MEN ?

(6) Cross-Cutting Evaluation Questions

- What factors and constraints contributed to achieving or limiting objectives?
- What circumstances affected relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, including unintended results?
- What lessons learned can inform future USDA programs and project design?

Baseline Evaluation Tasks:

To carry out the Baseline Evaluation of the Sukaabe Janngo III (2025–2031) project, the Evaluator shall undertake the following key tasks:

- Determine values for all outcome and output indicators, including those with non-zero baselines, to measure progress against expected results over time. See Table 2.
- Ensure that the methodology and the data collection tools for the baseline are designed and tailored to the context and the needs of this evaluation.
- Conduct analysis comparing project schools and control schools in the target regions using statistically valid methods (e.g., Difference-in-Differences or Propensity Score Matching).
- Collect quantitative and qualitative data to establish benchmarks that will serve to measure future performance in a statistically accurate manner. This data will also serve to answer the research questions over the LOP.
- Produce a baseline evaluation report which a) provides a thorough understanding of the baseline situation in reference to expected inputs, outputs, and results of project implementation (centered on the project's 10 main activities), b) establishes a clear picture of the differences between beneficiary schools and a comparable control group, c) provides

descriptive statistics of all reference values including, where appropriate, disaggregation by sex, grade (EGRA), geographical department, and type of school (preschool/elementary; continuing/new), and d) includes data-driven recommendations on project methodology and suggestions for executing the subsequent evaluations.

Table 2: Indicators to Measure for the Baseline

Performance Indicator	Standard or Custom	Baseline			
		Required (Y/N)	Guidance for setting the value	Estimated Target	Justification/Description for Annual Percentage Increase
Percent of students who, by the end of two grades of primary schooling, demonstrate that they can read and understand the meaning of grade level text	MGD 1	Y	This indicator will have a non-zero baseline percentage, representing the actual percentage of stuts in targeted project schools who can read and understand the meaning of grade level text before the project begins.	Gr 4: 25% Gr 5: 28%	The literacy activities will target second and third grade classes, which will allow us to see the effectiveness of the approaches through the EGRA assessment in 4th grade, which is a very important grade for consolidation of reading skills, and 5 th grade.
Average student attendance rate in USDA supported classrooms/schools	MGD 2	Y	The baseline will be a non-zero number, reflecting the average attendance rate in schools before the project begins.	96%	For this indicator, the endline values for project 1105 have been carried over. It should be noted that in our SJII schools, we have a 98% attendance rate according to the midterm. We do not know what the rate will be in the 113 new schools. We therefore propose to start with 96% at baseline and slowly increase to 99%
Number of students enrolled in schools receiving USDA assistance	MGD 9	Y	The baseline for this indicator is a non-zero number. The baseline should reflect the actual enrollment in project schools before the project begins.	86,500	Based on our current school actual enrollment and an estimated average class size for the new schools.
Number of schools using an improved water source	MGD 27	Y	Recognizing that some schools may have an improved water source prior to project start, this indicator may have a non-zero baseline.	244	Based on 1105 baseline plus the construction we have completed in SJII.
Number of schools with improved sanitary facilities	MGD 28	Y	Recognizing that some schools may have improved sanitary facilities prior to project start, this indicator may have a non-zero baseline.	259	Based on 1105 baseline plus the construction we have completed in SJII.
Value of annual sales of farms and firms receiving USDA assistance	LRP 7	Y	Baseline data reflects value of sales in the year prior to programming and should be collected through records of assisted firms and/or a sample survey of producers via recall.	\$593,072.	Numbers are based on information gathered from the Association of Cowpea producers in Senegal. Based on their sales information from 2024.
Volume of commodities sold by farms and firms receiving USDA assistance	LRP 8	Y	Volume of agricultural commodities reported at baseline and for the reporting years should be the volume that	498	Numbers are based on information gathered from the Association of Cowpea producers in Senegal. Based on their sales information from 2024.

Table 2: Indicators to Measure for the Baseline

Performance Indicator	Standard or Custom	Baseline			
		Required (Y/N)	Guidance for setting the value	Estimated Target	Justification/Description for Annual Percentage Increase
			was sold and reported as sales in LRP Indicator 7.		
Number of individuals in the agriculture system who have applied improved management practices or technologies with USDA assistance	LRP 12	Y	Baseline is the number of participant producers and other actors applying improved management practices or technologies promoted by the activity at the start of the activity.	0	See calculations for all demonstration-based indicators on tab for STND 4
Host country budget amount allocated [by dedicated line item] to school feeding.	Custom 7	Y	The official budget of the GoS, specifically, the Ministry of Education, that is provided for school meals.	\$3,441,165.33	The official budget of the GoS, specifically, the Ministry of Education, that is provided for school meals.
Host country budget amount allocated per child for school feeding.	Custom 10	Y	based on the DCAS strategic plan simulation	42.05	based on the DCAS strategic plan simulation
Percentage of schools delivering ≥ 90% of planned school feeding days with documented community participation.	Custom 12	Y	Proportion of project-supported schools that deliver at least 90% of planned school canteen days during the academic year, with documented community participation and support (CGE/APE), indicating increased understanding and ownership of the benefits of primary education and school feeding.	50%	Proportion of project-supported schools that deliver at least 90% of planned school canteen days during the academic year, with documented community participation and support (CGE/APE), indicating increased understanding and ownership of the benefits of primary education and school feeding.

The objectives of the Baseline Evaluation include the following:

- Carry out an Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) for Grades 4 & 5 (French subtasks: listening, decoding, reading comprehension).
- Observe literacy teaching, teachers' use of materials, and students' reading behaviors and attention in class.
- Assess knowledge and practice of effective food storage management and food preparation.
- Assess knowledge and practices of nutrition (healthy eating habits), hygiene /WASH practices, and deworming for students, teachers, SMC, and parents.
- Assess school infrastructure (presence and conditions of latrines, storerooms, and cooking areas).
- Assess SMC knowledge and practice about school governance and community participation in school management.
- Assess the knowledge of school feeding in a broader stakeholder group, including ministry of education, local authorities, and the school community (parents).
- Capture the knowledge and attitudes of a wide range of respondent groups about the thematic areas to capture insights that are not feasible through surveys.

4. Baseline Evaluation Research Questions

The main evaluation questions for the baseline are as follows:

- What are the benchmarks for indicators?
- What are the factors (positive and negative) that might influence USDA-funded activities in project schools and their impact?
- What are the mitigating factors for uptake of project activities?

The following points below highlight the areas of particular interest for the baseline evaluation; they are not exhaustive and do not necessarily cover all the objectives of the evaluation. They are intended to guide the evaluator in defining the direction of this evaluation.

(1) Methodology

- Is the program flexible enough to adapt to changing contexts and population needs without compromising targets, given its broad thematic scope?
- How should the eleven indicators (MGD 1, MGD 2, MGD 9, MGD 27, MGD 28, LRP 7, LRP 8, LRP 12, Host country budget amount allocated [by dedicated line item] to school feeding, Host country budget amount allocated per child for school feeding, Percentage of schools providing $\geq 90\%$ of planned school feeding days with documented community involvement) with a non-zero target at baseline be measured?
- What enabling or constraining factors may influence the successful implementation of the project to achieve its literacy, nutrition, and WASH activities?
- How effective might the project's advocacy and capacity building interventions be in advancing national ownership, legislation, and financing for school feeding?
- To what extent are stakeholders (e.g., SMCs, teachers, local officials) aware of (and are prepared for – only in current schools) their roles in supporting a school canteen? To what extent are they ready to participate and contribute to a school canteen?

(2) Sustainability

- What is the current institutional capacity of the Department of School Canteens (DCaS) to support and manage a national school feeding program?
- How do mayors and the Education and Training Inspectorate (IEF) see their role in school

feeding? What is their capacity to manage a school feeding program at the regional level?

- What are the baseline capacity levels of communities and GoS to make financial or in-kind contributions to school feeding or related activities?

(3) Impact

- To what extent is the project design anticipated to have a positive impact while avoiding unintended negative impacts on project stakeholders?
- What are current perceptions among students, parents/caregivers, and teachers regarding the effect of school meals and WASH on attendance and student engagement in class?
- What are the current ideas about how to best link school meals with community-based, local agricultural production?
- What value do students and parents place on education?
- What do teachers think are the most effective pedagogical practices to help students increase their reading and writing skills?
- What do stakeholders (students, parents, and teachers) know about healthy nutritional practices and good WASH practices?

5. Evaluation Approach and Methodologies

Counterpart International will conduct an integrated Endline Evaluation for Sukaabe Janngo II (2021–2026) and a Baseline Evaluation for Sukaabe Janngo III (2025–2031) in the Kolda and Sédhiou regions of Senegal. This evaluation will be implemented by an independent evaluator to ensure methodological rigor, objectivity, and alignment with U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) requirements for McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition programs.

The evaluation will adhere to the six criteria (relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact) established by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) and will incorporate mixed-method, quasi-experimental approaches to ensure validity and comparability of results. In addition to these formal evaluations, Counterpart will maintain continuous performance monitoring throughout the program cycle, tracking student enrollment, attendance, learning outcomes, and community participation to inform adaptive management. Complementing these efforts, a collaborating, learning, and adapting (CLA) approach will be applied to foster evidence-based decision-making and continuous improvement through structured reflection, stakeholder consultations, and data-driven action planning.

a. Evaluation Design

For this evaluation, Counterpart will employ a **mixed-method, quasi-experimental model using a Difference-in-Difference (DiD) methodology**. For the baseline, the treatment/project group will consist of 398 schools (285 existing, 113 new) under SJIII, with the control group including comparable non-beneficiary schools selected using propensity score matching. For the endline, the treatment/project group will consist of 285 schools under SJII. This design allows for attribution of observed changes in key outcomes such as literacy, attendance, and health practices to the intervention. Counterpart selected this approach for its robustness and its utility for capturing program effects across timepoints.

Sampling will align with methodologies established under SJII, ensure continuity, historical comparison and longitudinal analysis. The evaluation will generate both quantitative and qualitative

data, supporting McGovern-Dole's strategic objectives of improving literacy and increasing the adoption of health, nutrition, and dietary practices.

Quantitative data collection will include EGRA, surveys conducted with teachers, school directors, cooks and students; as well as demographic and registration (e.g. enrolment and attendance) data.

Qualitative data collection will include in-depth interviews (IDIs) with teachers and school directors, key informant interviews (KIIs) with government representatives at the regional/ department and national levels, implementing partners, and stakeholders, focus group discussions (FGDs) with parents, SMC members, and classroom observations.

All data will be captured in the project's Activity and Output Monitoring and Tracking System to verify implementation and meet reporting and accountability requirements. The team will conduct regular documentation reviews, site visits, remote monitoring, and both scheduled and unannounced spot checks.

A concurrent triangulation approach will be used to integrate data types collecting quantitative and qualitative data in parallel, analyzing them separately, and synthesizing findings. This will ensure robust interpretation, contextualize trends, and support adaptive decision-making.

EGRA: Counterpart has a rich history of supporting EGRAs in Senegal and is aligned with Ministry of National Education (MEN) practices. Counterpart has previously worked with the National Institute of Study and Action for the Development of Education (INEADE) to produce a modified EGRA (questionnaires and tools based on the curriculum) for grades 4 to 6 (as it was originally designed for grades 1 to 3). For Sukaabe Janngo III, we will utilize an EGRA in French and/or local languages (Pulaar, Wolof, etc.) with subtasks to measure the literacy skills among students in Grade 4 (CE2) and Grade 5 (CM1) using listening, decoding, and reading comprehension. For the SJII endline, we will include Grade 6 (CM2) as this data was gathered at the baseline and midterm.

The EGRA will include subtasks designed to 1) report against the required McGovern-Dole Standard Indicator #1 of reading ability at the end of two years of schooling (but which we are modifying to be at the end of 4 years of schooling); 2) assess the abilities of students at their grade level (i.e., Grades 4 and 5) to inform project interventions; and 3) identify any gaps in key literacy skills to further inform project activities.

The results will be used to adapt and refine program interventions in real time. For example, by identifying areas where additional coaching, tutoring, or material support is needed; informing teacher training content; or triggering early corrective actions if students are consistently underperforming in specific literacy domains. Results will also be shared with MEN and IEFs to strengthen system-wide decision-making and reinforce their capacity to monitor and respond to literacy outcomes.

Counterpart will conduct an EGRA during the midterm and final evaluations that will consist of a representative sample of all 398 treatment schools under Sukaabe Janngo III. To avoid duplication and ensure methodological rigor, analysis of EGRA results will be disaggregated between the existing 285 schools continuing from Sukaabe Janngo II and the 113 new schools for SJIII. Disaggregation at baseline avoids redundancy while maintaining comparability, as the same EGRA tool, sampling methodology, and evaluation standards will be applied across cohorts at the midterm and final.

Disseminate learning and evidence with key stakeholders: Baseline, midterm, and final evaluation reports will be shared with USDA, the Government of Senegal (e.g., MEN), and community stakeholders (e.g., teachers, SMCs, mayors) and made publicly available in line with USDA's M&E policy. The M&E Manager and DCOP will lead a series of in-person and virtual dissemination events to promote learning and inform future USDA programming. Stakeholder feedback will be used to

refine the learning agenda, enhance technical guidance, and strengthen graduation and sustainability planning.

Sampling Overview for Baseline and Final Evaluations: The evaluation samples will be based on a two-stage random cluster sampling plan. In the first stage, we will randomly select schools from within targeted “treatment clusters” across the 6 departments in the Sédhiou and Kolda region and match these to schools with similar characteristics in “comparison clusters” using a Propensity Score Matching approach. This matching approach utilizes a range of variables, including school size, number of schools in the cluster, student performance data on standardized assessments (as available), and additional parameters that will be identified in the needs’ assessment. Following the selection of target and control schools, students, teachers, school administrators, SMC members, parents, canteen volunteers, and cooks from sampled schools will be selected. The sampling framework will be conducted by Counterpart in partnership with the Academic Inspection at the regional level (IA), and the final sample size will be reviewed in coordination with MEN prior to commencing field work.

The sample size for the sample unit (student) was calculated using a continuous outcome measure. Optimal Design software was used to calculate the sample sizes with the standard 80% power, 5% significance level, and an ICC of 0.30 and an average cluster size of 18 students 6 per Grade per school, the following parameters apply:

- Minimum detectable effect size (MDES): 0.30 standard deviations (moderate)
- Sample size per arm (intervention vs. comparison): ~1,152 students per arm
- Number of clusters (schools): 75 intervention and 75 comparison schools
- Students per school: 18 students randomly sampled from Grade 4, 5, 6

This results in a total sample of 2,304 students, balanced across treatment and control arms. Final sample sizes may be adjusted based on actual enrollment to maintain statistical power.

Control School Selection: The 75 matched comparison schools will be selected from similar geographic, linguistic, and demographic contexts, using propensity score matching or manual matching based on the MEN data base, school infrastructure, and historical performance metrics. If Sukaabe Janngo II final evaluation schools meet comparability criteria, they may be retained as control group counterparts for continuity. The evaluation will meet the attributes of McGovern-Dole Learning Agenda evidence gaps by ensuring that evaluations are across age groups and grades, and according to socioeconomic status and sex, so that trade-offs and returns to various combinations of treatment and outcomes can be estimated.

Student Absenteeism Management and Replacement Procedures

Student absenteeism on the day of data collection is a common operational risk in school-based assessments and may affect the achieved sample size. To ensure that the planned sample sizes are met and that the statistical validity of the findings is preserved, the following procedures will be implemented:

1. Initial Oversampling

For each school and targeted grade, an expanded sampling list will be prepared. In addition to

the 18 initially selected students, a reserve list of 5–7 additional students per school and per grade will be generated from the same sampling frame.

2. **Replacement Procedure on the Day of Assessment**

- If a selected student is absent on the assessment day, the student will be replaced by the first available student from the reserve list, belonging to the same grade and, where possible, the same sex.
- No replacement across grade levels will be permitted, except for descriptive, non-comparative analyses explicitly approved in advance.

3. **Minimum Acceptable Sample Size per School**

A minimum threshold of 18 completed assessments per school and per grade is defined as acceptable to maintain analytical robustness.

- If this threshold is not reached after exhausting the reserve list, the data collection team will document the situation in the field report.

4. **Documentation and Traceability**

Data collection teams will systematically record:

- the number of students initially selected,
- the number of absent students,
- the number of replacements conducted,
- the main reasons for absenteeism - where available.

This data will be incorporated into the dataset and considered during data analysis and interpretation.

5. **Preventive Measures**

To minimize absenteeism:

- school administrators will be notified of the assessment dates at least one week in advance;
- teachers will be sensitized to the importance of ensuring the presence of selected students on the assessment day.

Table 3: Summary of Evaluation Tools

Tool	SCHOOLS	Respondent	Purpose
Quantitative Tools			
EGRA	Project Baseline schools Control Baseline schools	Grade 4 & 5 students	Assess literacy skills in French and/or local languages
	Project Endline schools Control Endline schools	Grade 4, 5 & 6 students	
Cook survey	Project Baseline schools Project Endline schools	Cooks in elementary and preschools	Assess knowledge, attitudes, and practices related to secure food storage, hygienic food preparations, food safety in school meals, maintenance of school cooking areas/canteens. (All questions will be tailored to new or continuing schools.)
Teacher and School Director survey	Project Baseline schools Control Baseline schools Project Endline schools Control Endline schools	Teacher and School Director in elementary schools	Assess knowledge and practice of literacy instruction and use of other pedagogical methods, such as lesson planning and instruction. (All questions will be tailored to new or continuing schools.)
Health agents	Project Baseline schools Project Endline schools	ICP, CHW, and Debbo Galle/Badien Gokh	Assess knowledge of health practices which the project promotes, assess extent to which these actors are executing activities as reported (endline only)
Student survey	Project Baseline schools Control Baseline schools	Grade 4 & 5 students	Assess extent of participation in USDA-funded activities, including school meals, benefits from take home rations, in-class participation levels, use of in-class literacy materials, level of knowledge and practice around health, nutrition, and WASH. (All questions will be tailored to new or continuing schools.)
	Project Endline schools Control Endline schools	Grade 4, 5 & 6 students	
School checklist	Project Baseline schools Project Endline schools	Teacher and/or school director, observation of physical facilities	Assess extent of materials and facilities in place, including for example WASH facilities (e.g., water access, latrines, handwashing stations), literacy materials, canteen provisions (e.g., storeroom, cooking area, eating area, utensils), state of classrooms, and staffing. (All questions will be tailored to new or continuing schools.)
Performance measurement of indicators	Project schools (baseline) Project schools (endline)	Teacher and/or principal, observation of physical facilities	Endline: All Indicators Baseline: MGD 1, MGD 2, MGD 9, MGD 27, MGD 28, LRP 7, LRP 8, LRP 12, C1-Amount of the host country budget allocated [per dedicated line] for school feeding, C2-amount of the host country budget allocated per child for school feeding, C3-percentage of schools providing ≥ 90% of the planned school feeding days with documented community participation
Qualitative Tools			

FGDs	Project Baseline schools Project Endline schools	Teachers, SMC, parents and/or community members	Capture experiences in and benefits from participation in USDA-funded activities (endline). Capture perceptions and expectations around future participation in a school feeding project (baseline). Reach a wide range of respondent groups to capture perceptions which are not feasible through quantitative methods.
KIIs	Project Baseline schools Project Endline schools	MEN (IA, IEF) and MASAE (DRDR, MSAS (MCD, ICP, CHW), DRDR) officials at department and/or regional level	Examine the structures and processes that have contributed (endline)/ can contribute (baseline) to sustained outputs and outcomes among the target communities, policies and practices that advocate for sustained school feeding and nutrition programs beyond the life of the project.
Classroom observations	Project Baseline schools	Grades 4 & 5	Observe literacy instruction by teachers, use of materials and reading behaviors among students.
	Project Endline schools	Grades 4, 5, and 6	

Table 4: Anticipated Sample Sizes by Respondent Group for Baseline and Final Evaluations

Respondent Group	Proposed Sample Size
Schools	Total 150 schools: 75 project schools (25 baseline + 50 endline) and 75 control schools
Students (EGRA)	2,304 elementary students
School Directors	1 per school
Grade 2-6 classroom teachers	3 teachers per school (male and female per school, where applicable) depending on the type of school (existing or new)
SMC	2 members (1 male, 1 female per school, where applicable)
Cooks	5 per school
IA/IEF officials	2 per IA/IEF
Ministry of Education, GoS	5-10

Note on School and EGRA Sample Adjustment

The evaluation will cover a total of 150 schools across six departments in the Sédhiou and Kolda regions, including both elementary and preschool institutions.

Among the 150 schools:

- **22 schools are preschools**, consisting of:
 - 11 project preschools
 - 11 control preschools
- **128 schools are elementary schools**, consisting of:
 - 64 project elementary schools
 - 64 control elementary schools

While all 150 schools will be included in the overall evaluation activities, it is important to note that the EGRA assessment will be conducted exclusively in elementary schools, as the tool is not designed for preschool-level students.

As a result, the EGRA sample is calculated based solely on the 128 elementary schools, using the following parameters:

- 6 students per grade x 3 grades (SJII/final) x 40 schools = 720 x 2 = 1,440
- 9 students per grade x 2 grades (SJIII/baseline) x 24 schools = 432 x 2 = 864

This yields a total EGRA sample size of **2,304 students**

Preschool schools will be included in the evaluation through other quantitative and qualitative data collection but will be excluded from EGRA.

This clarification ensures consistency between the overall school coverage and the EGRA-specific sampling frame and supports accurate interpretation of the evaluation results.

For further details, please refer to Tables 5 and 6 below, which present the school sampling framework and an illustrative student sampling by IA and IEF, disaggregated by school type.

Table 5: Illustrative School Sampling by IA and IEF, disaggregated by type of school

Region/ Department	Pre-Schools				Elementary Schools				All Schools			
	Total program schools	Project	Control	Total	Total program Schools	Project	Control	Total	Total	Project	Control	Total Sample- all schools
Boukiling	7	1	1	2	45	8	8	16	52	9	9	18
Sédhiou	8	1	1	2	57	11	11	22	65	12	12	24
Goudomp	10	2	2	4	55	12	12	24	65	14	14	28
Sédhiou	25	5	5	10	157	31	31	62	182	36	36	72
Vélingara	9	1	1	2	80	14	14	28	89	15	15	30
Kolda	19	4	4	8	50	9	9	18	69	13	13	26
Medina Yoro Foulah	8	1	1	2	50	9	9	18	58	10	10	20
Kolda	36	6	6	12	180	33	33	66	216	39	39	78
Total	61	11	11	22	337	64	64	128	398	75	75	150

Table 6: Illustrative Student sampling by IA and IEF, disaggregated by type of school

Region/ Department	Pre-Schools				Elementary Schools				All Schools			
	Total program schools	Project	Control	Total	Total program Schools	Project	Control	Total	Total	Project	Control	Total Sample- all schools
Boukiling	7	0	0	0	45	144	144	288	52	144	144	288
Sédhiou	8	0	0	0	57	198	198	396	65	198	198	396
Goudomp	10	0	0	0	55	216	216	432	65	216	216	432
Sédhiou	25	0	0	0	157	558	558	1116	182	558	558	1116
Vélingara	9	0	0	0	80	252	252	504	89	252	252	504
Kolda	19	0	0	0	50	162	162	324	69	162	162	324
Medina Yoro Foulah	8	0	0	0	50	162	162	324	58	162	162	324
Kolda	36	0	0	0	180	594	594	1188	216	594	594	1188
Total	61	0	0	0	337	1152	1152	2304	398	1152	1152	2304

b. Reading Tools

Sukaabe Janngo II will utilize an EGRA in French and/or local languages against the required McGovern-Dole Standard Indicator #1 (customized) on reading ability at the end of 4th, 5th, and 6th grades; and (2) assess the abilities of students at their grade level (i.e., Grades 4, 5 and 6) to inform project interventions.

Other Tools

The evaluator must propose evaluation tools that will undergo a validation process involving pilot testing with a sample group to ensure cultural relevance and clarity of questions. (e.g., in-depth interviews [IDI], focus group discussions [FGD], key informant interviews [KII], observations, etc.) tools.

Data Entry, Cleaning, and Analysis

The evaluator is responsible for entering into all data collected under this evaluation. This includes double-entry of all survey data. Survey data must be entered into Excel files. Supervisor(s) will conduct thorough data checks and submit to Counterpart a final, clean dataset. The evaluation firm will also prepare and deliver a codebook to accompany the final dataset. Survey data analysis will be carried out using appropriate statistical packages such as R or STATA. Analysis will include means comparisons by gender, grade and department, along with tests of statistical significance.

The evaluation firm will identify and recruit local enumerators for data collection who should have at least a bachelor's degree and experience conducting applied research, surveys, and evaluations. Given the nature of the research, Counterpart has a strong preference for both female and male enumerators. During the data collection training, supervisors will be identified. The evaluation firm will be responsible for developing a data collection manual for review by Counterpart prior to training. The firm will also be responsible for printing all data collection instruments for training, incorporating (and translating) any revisions to instruments following the training and pilots, and printing all instruments for data collection

Dissemination of baseline findings

We will share findings from the Endline and baseline study with the Minister of Education at national/regional/departmental levels, Ministry of Health (DSME), and the Ministry of Agriculture (ANCAR), other stakeholders in school feeding (GRDR, WFP, etc.).

6. Ethical considerations and Other Conditions.

The location of schools is in the two regions in 6 departments: Kolda, Velingara, Medina Yoro Foula, Sedhiou, Goudomp and Bounkiling. The producer organizations are in the Kolda and Sedhiou regions. Ethical considerations must be considered during the survey:

- Research participants will not be subjected to harm in any way whatsoever.
- Respect for the dignity of research participants will be prioritized.
- Full consent must be obtained from the participants prior to the study.
- Individuals who do not have the *legal capacity to provide consent* (e.g. children or cognitively impaired adults) *will not be interviewed* in the survey or otherwise involved in the research without the consent of a parent or guardian.
- The protection of the privacy of research participants must be ensured.
- Adequate level of confidentiality of the research data must be ensured.
- Anonymity of individuals and organizations participating in the research must be ensured.
- Any deception or exaggeration about the aims and objectives of the research must be avoided.

- Affiliations in any form, sources of funding, as well as any possible conflicts of interests have to be declared.
- All communication with respect to data collection must be done with honesty and transparency.
- The use of Artificial Intelligence language or evaluation models to support any of the work conducted under this contract must be disclosed prior to use and discussed and approved by Counterpart International.

7. Assignment Duration and Timeline

The total estimated duration of the consultation is approximately five months. The table below presents the main deliverables of the evaluation process with the corresponding deadlines.

Table 7. Assignment and Deliverables Timeline

Deliverable	Estimated Deadline
Pre-Award Phase	
Questions submission deadline	February 2, 2026
Proposals deadline	February 20, 2026
Selection of firm and contract execution	March 6, 2026
Field Work Preparation Phase	
Submission of inception report (methodology, work plan, calendar, draft tools)	March 20, 2026
Finalized data collection tools	
Field Work Phase	
Training of data collectors	April 1 – April 30, 2026
Pilot survey and revisions (as needed)	
Data collection	
Data Analysis and Reporting Phase	
Data analysis	May 2 - 15, 2026
Debrief Counterpart on preliminary findings	May 4, 2026
First draft report submitted (May 22) & incorporate Feedback from CI	May 22/June 4, 2026
Submission to USDA (June 5) Feedback from USDA (done by CI)	June 5/June 26, 2026
Submission of final report (English and French), tools, datasets, and a 2-page brief to CI	July 8, 2026
Submission of final report (English and French), tools, datasets, and a 2-page brief to USDA (done by CI)	July 10, 2026
Presentation of final report (English and French) with USDA approval	July 25, 2026

Counterpart must approve all deliverables, and USDA must approve the final evaluation report.

8. Staff Structure

A. Evaluation lead (Counterpart):

The evaluation will be led by the Senegal-based project monitoring and evaluation manager. The main tasks and responsibilities of the evaluation lead are to:

- Select the evaluator from the offers received in response to the RFP (a collaboration between the Senegal team and HQ).
- Coordinate with all relevant stakeholders the implementation of the evaluation.

- Perform quality control throughout the evaluation process (provide feedback to the evaluation team, comment on drafts of the initial report, and preliminary and final evaluation reports, and approve the final report).
- Organize the meetings of the technical committee for monitoring the evaluation.
- Advise relevant stakeholders on evaluation issues.
- Organize a workshop for the presentation of the evaluation results.

B. Technical team (Counterpart):

The main tasks and responsibilities of the technical monitoring team are as follows:

- Oversee the evaluation process.
- Provide the consulting team with all available documentation on the project.
- Facilitate meetings between the evaluation team and various stakeholders.
- Review all draft deliverables and provide feedback to the evaluation team.
- Ensure that all feedback is incorporated in the final version of the evaluation report.
- Share the final evaluation report.

C. Evaluation team (External evaluator):

The evaluation will be carried out by a team of independent evaluators who will:

- Plan, organize, and execute the data collection.
- Be accountable for the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the evaluation.
- Report weekly by email to the Evaluation Manager (every Thursday) on the progress of the evaluation process.
- Produce all deliverables on time and ensure high quality. Final report must be submitted in English and French.
- Data collectors should be fluent in Pulaar or Wolof or Manding or Diola. Lead evaluator must be fluent in French and have strong writing skills in English. The lead evaluator must be physically present in Senegal during the evaluation until the post-data collection debriefing.

9. Qualifications

Bidders will be evaluated based on their ability to meet the below criteria and to respond to the methodology, core services, and specific tasks. See Section I, 16.2 for baseline criteria and priority rank.

Within the technical response, bidders should include information which will allow Counterpart to adequately assess the following qualifications:

- Evaluation Team Lead must have a masters or PhD degree in a social science discipline or related field
- Minimum 8 years experience designing and leading quantitative data collection and analysis in developing countries
- Experience designing and managing surveys
- Ability to research and write at a high level of technical mastery
- Ability to research and conduct interviews with key informants
- Skill with statistical software such as Stata or R.
- Experience working in Senegal required
- French and English fluency required (writing skills in English)

10. Key Deliverable Requirements

The evaluation team will be expected to submit key deliverables in line with the expectations and requirements outlined below for the Endline and Baseline Evaluations workplan.

Table 8. Endline and Baseline Evaluation Workplan Requirements

Requirements	Detailed Description
Report Basics	
Inception Report Length	Inception report should be no more than 15 pages, excluding the Table of Contents, Acronym List, and Annexes; Times New Roman font size 12.
Language	Must be written in French
Illustrative Inception Report Outline	
Table of Contents	Provide under the discretion of the evaluation team and in collaboration with Counterpart.
Acronym List	
Evaluation Purpose and Research Questions	The purpose of the evaluation must be clearly defined, including why it is necessary, what information is needed, who needs it and how it will be used. Address all evaluation questions in the Terms of Reference which should also take into account unintended consequences.
Project Background	Taken from the Terms of Reference and the Project Implementation Strategy.
Literature Review	Under the discretion of the evaluation team.
Proposed Evaluation Design 1. Proposed Methodology 2. Draft Sampling Strategy 3. Proposed List of Respondents/Key Informants 4. Data Collection Methods 5. Data Analysis Methods	Explain proposed evaluation methodology in detail, including evaluation location and target sample population demographics. The report should contain a clear description of the methodology and the involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation. It will detail what data will be collected, how it will be collected and by whom, as well as the possible limitations of the evaluation, etc.
Quality Assurance Plan	Under the discretion of the evaluation team.
Proposed Evaluation Schedule	Provide a summary of the evaluation schedule with dates for key items (tools, enumerator training, data collection, and all phases of reporting. A more detailed version of this timeline should be provided as an Annex in the form of a Gantt Chart.
Annexes	Include the following as annexes, at a minimum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed Gantt Chart (Excel format preferred) Data Collection Tools Terms of Reference Project Background Documents (including results framework, theory of change, critical assumptions, etc.)

Baseline Evaluation Report

The following table outlines requirements for the Final Baseline Evaluation Report:

Table 9. Final Endline and Baseline Evaluation Report Requirements

Requirements	Detailed Description
Report Basics	
Final Evaluation Report Length	The final report will be in two stand-alone sections, one for the baseline and one for the endline. Each section should be a maximum of 40 pages, excluding the Table of Contents, Acronym List, and Annexes; Times New Roman font size 12.
Language	Must be written in English and French (2 separate documents.)
Illustrative Report Outline	

Acknowledgements	Provide under the discretion of the evaluation team and in collaboration with Counterpart.
Table of Contents	
Acronym List	
Executive Summary	Include an Executive Summary that provides a brief description of the evaluation purpose, target audience, anticipated use of evaluation results, results framework, theory of change, critical assumptions, project implementation strategy, locations, target populations, stakeholder roles, timeline, project budget, project background, evaluation questions, methods, findings, and conclusions; must be written in English and French.
Evaluation Purpose and Research Questions	Address all evaluation questions in the Terms of Reference which should also take into account unintended consequences.
Project Background	Taken from the Terms of Reference and the Project Implementation Strategy.
Evaluation Method <i>1. Methodology</i> <i>2. Sampling Framework</i> <i>3. Data Sources</i> <i>4. Data Collection Methods</i> <i>5. Field Work</i> <i>6. Analysis Plan</i> <i>7. Strengths and Limitations</i>	Explain evaluation methodology in detail. The report should contain a clear description of the methodology and the involvement of stakeholders in the evaluation. A summary of the evaluation methodology can be included in the body of the report with a full description provided as an annex. Disclose evaluation limitations (e.g. selection bias, recall bias, etc.).
Findings/Results	The results will be objectively presented with data and evidence. The limitations /gaps in the data as well as the unanticipated results will be also presented and discussed. The reasons for non-realization of certain activities must be identified as much as possible. Finally, the results must be presented with clarity, logic, and consistency. Tables with baseline results, disaggregated by gender, department, and grade. Brief description of each table, including any context or explanation needed to help the reader in interpreting and understanding. Detailed description of findings for methodological research questions and key indicators as described in the Terms of Reference.
Conclusions and Recommendations <i>1. Summary of Findings</i> <i>2. Lessons Learned</i> <i>3. Recommendations</i>	Conclusions should address evaluation objectives and key issues, be evidence-based, and logically linked to the evaluation findings. It will provide an overview of the issues and successes. Provide recommendations, including consultation with stakeholders, and should identify the target group for each recommendation. Support recommendations with specific findings. Provide recommendations that are action-oriented, practical, and specific. Lessons learned are contributions to general knowledge. They must be well supported by the results and conclusions presented.
References	As needed.
Annexes	Include the following as annexes, at a minimum: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terms of Reference • All evaluation tools (questionnaires, checklists, discussion guides, surveys, etc.). • A list of sources of information (key informants, documents reviewed, other data sources) • A 5-page brief that provides a summary of the key takeaways from the final evaluation report Only if applicable, include as an annex Statement(s) of Differences regarding any significant unresolved differences of opinion on the part of funders, implementers, and/or members of the evaluation.

11. Evaluation Criteria

Offerors proposals should include information which will allow Counterpart to adequately assess the following:

Table 10: Evaluation Criteria

Criterion	Total Possible Points
-----------	-----------------------

Evaluation team's previous experience in conducting evaluations & references	25
Proposed overall methodology, including sampling method	25
Quality of proposed data collection and entry procedures	10
Schedule for delivery of evaluation deliverables	5
Quality control methods	5
Budget	20
Interview with Counterpart team	10
Total	100

When drafting the proposal, the evaluation team must ensure that all the information requested above is included. Failure to submit a complete application will result in the rejection of the proposal.

12. *Payment Schedule*

Table 11. Payment Schedule

Milestone	Payment %
Inception Report Validation	40% of total
Completion of Data Collection and Field Work with Debriefing	20% of total
Approval of Draft Evaluation Report Submission with all Data	20% of total
Approval of Final Report by USDA	20% of total

1. Annexes

A. Theory of Change

Theory of Change (ToC): Counterpart's ToC is grounded in extensive global and national research examining numerous studies and assessments demonstrating the benefits of integrated school feeding and literacy programs on child development, educational attainment, and household well-being. These studies confirm that school feeding alleviates hunger, reduces micronutrient deficiency and anemia, improves nutrition, increases school enrolment and retention, enhances cognitive and academic performance, promotes access to education, and transfers income to families.¹ According to Jomaa, McDonnell and Probat (2011), a literature review of school feeding programs revealed consistent positive effects of school feeding across multiple modalities on energy intake, micronutrients status, and school enrolment and attendance. A meta-analysis of school meals programs across 32 sub-Saharan African countries found that school meals, combined with take-home rations, increased the enrollment of girls by 12%.² Additional research underscores the value of integrating literacy and school feeding interventions on improving learning outcomes for children. Improving child nutrition can contribute to increasing school attendance and completion, enhancing cognitive development and learning, and reducing poverty among children and adults.³ By addressing hunger at the school level, children and families are: 1) incentivized to ensure school attendance; 2) gain access to nutritious meals that support attentiveness and learning; 3) are more likely to keep children in the educational system; and 4) benefit from the local market stimulation created by school feeding activities.

Research also shows that investments in education, particularly in children's early years have important implications for better nutrition and higher levels of learning, as well as long-term resilience and poverty.⁴ A cost-benefit analysis in 14 low- and middle-income countries estimated a return of up to \$9 for every \$1 invested in school feeding.⁵ In Senegal, where the limited availability of textbooks and learning materials continues to hamper education, Counterpart has shown that the production and timely distribution of learning materials, directly contributes to both teacher and student's performance. Additionally, *Sukaabe Janngo III's* investments in WASH are supported by data showing that inadequate toilet and water facilities significantly hinder school attendance, particularly among girls, and contributes to dropout rates.

Building on this evidence, *Sukaabe Janngo III's* ToC posits that integrated school feeding and literacy interventions, when locally owned and government supported, will increase school attendance, enhance learning outcomes, and promote long-term resilience and food security.

Cause-and-Effect Linkages Counterpart's ToC includes multiple causal pathways beginning with contextually grounded activities and assumptions that lead to the expected outcomes in the Results Framework. This ToC is rooted in the above research and the needs and opportunities outlined in the *Introduction and Strategic Analysis* section.

Overall

If students receive nutritious, diverse school meals (MGD 1.2.1.1, 1.3.1.1) and have increased access to quality learning and supplementary materials in local languages in a safe and well-governed environment; **AND IF** teachers and school directors are provided with sufficient professional development and adopt new pedagogical practices

Then students with improved attentiveness (MGD 1.2) and attendance (MGD 1.3) in target schools will enjoy better nutrition, health, and quality education and literacy outcomes through a school feeding program with greater participation and financial support from both communities and government.

¹ [Adelman and Lehrer, (2008); Aliyar, Gelli and Hamdan (2015); Bundy et al (2013); WFP (2013) and Drake et al (2017)

² School Meals Coalition, "What Works: School Meals Programs," April 2023.

³ Shekar et al (2017); USDA, "Research and Learning of the McGovern-Dole School Meals Program in Africa: Executive Summary," Mississippi State University Social Science Research Center, May 2022.


⁴ Akresh et al., 2018; Maluccio et al., 2009

⁵ School Meals Coalition, "What Works: School Meals Programs," April 2023.


Activity #	If	Then
<u>MGD SO1:</u> Improved Literacy of School-Age Children	<p>IF teachers and school directors are provided with professional development and adopt pedagogical practices that prioritize instruction (MGD 1.1.4/MGD 1.1.5); AND IF children have increased access to quality learning and supplementary materials (MGD 1.1.2 /MGD 1.1.3)</p> <p>If parents and SMCs have an increased understanding on how school feeding and education benefits their children (MGD 1.3.5); AND IF parents are more engaged in improving school infrastructure, participating in school feeding committees, and understanding the importance of reading and learning inside and outside the classroom;</p> <p>If community run school canteens are designed in partnership with the GoS, and provide diversified, nutritious, rotating meals that support local agriculture production;</p>	<p>Then incentivized and motivated teachers (MGD 1.1.1) that deliver quality literacy instruction and prioritize reading and learning both within and outside the classroom will maximize literacy and learning outcomes for school-aged children.</p> <p>Then greater local level support for education and school feeding will contribute to wider national level support for a school feeding law with a dedicated budget.</p> <p>Then children will have the energy to effectively participate and engage in school that supports their cognitive development, and the foundation for a nationally managed school feeding program.</p>
<u>MGD SO2:</u> Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices	<p>If children have access to clean water and sanitation facilities at school (MGD 2.4); AND IF children and communities, particularly pregnant and lactating women, have increased access to information about healthy diets, nutrition, health, and WASH (MGD 2.1/MGD 2.3);</p>	<p>Then the adoption of healthy and nutritious practices by learners, women, and the wider community will address malnutrition, support the growth and development of children, and strengthen the overall health and resilience of communities.</p>
<u>LRP SO 1:</u> Improved Effectiveness of Food Assistance through Local and Regional Procurement	<p>If producer associations improve productivity through GAP, training, and improved extension services (LRP 1.3.2.1/LRP 1.3.2.2); AND IF market linkages are strengthened between producer associations and schools with the support of private sector partners (LRP 1.3.2.3); AND IF current government processes are optimized (LRP 1.3.2.4);</p>	<p>Then farmers will have a more reliable market, schools will have access to timely, sufficient, diverse, culturally accepted and nutritious foods (LRP 1.2.3/1.3.1/1.3.3) that can be sourced locally, contributing to strengthened economies and local Market Systems (LRP 1.3.2)</p>



B. Results framework

Results Framework #1 Improved Literacy of School Age Children



Results Framework #2 Increased Use of Health, Nutrition, and Dietary Practices





Monitoring and Evaluation

C. Table of Performance Indicators (SJII/Baseline evaluation)

Project Title:		Country :	Activity Alignment		Proposed start date:		Proposed end date:						
Result	Performance Indicator	Standard or Custom	Activity #	Activity Name	Targets							Life of Project	
					Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6		
MGD SO1	Percent of students who, by the end of two grades of primary schooling, demonstrate that they can read and understand the meaning of grade level text	Standard 1	Activity 4 -	Establish Activities to Promote Literacy	Gr 4: 25 %	Gr 4: 25 %	Gr 4: 25 %	Gr4 : 32 %	Gr4 : 32 %	Gr4 : 32 %	Gr4: 37%	Gr4 : 37%	Gr5: 40%
MGD 1.3	Average student attendance rate in USDA supported classrooms/schools	Standard 2	Activity 1	Provide School Meals and Take Home Rations (THR)	96 %	97 %	97 %	98 %	98 %	99 %	99%	98%	
MGD 1.1.2	Number of teaching and learning materials provided as a result of USDA assistance	Standard 3	Activity 4 -	Establish Activities to Promote Literacy	0	0	43,455	3,911	3,911	0	0	51,277	
MGD 1.1.4	Number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants in target schools who demonstrate use of new and quality teaching techniques or tools as a result of USDA assistance	Standard 4	Activity 3 -	Training: Teachers and School Administrators	0	0	0	25	89	152	202	202	
MGD 1.1.4	Number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants trained or certified as a result of USDA assistance	Standard 5	Activity 3 -	Training: Teachers and School Administrators	0	0	874	143	44	44	0	1,104	
MGD 1.1.5	Number of school administrators and officials in target schools who demonstrate use of new techniques or tools as a result of USDA assistance	Standard 6	Activity 3 -	Training: Teachers and School Administrators	0	0	0	44	139	234	299	299	
MGD 1.1.5	Number of school administrators and officials trained or certified as a result of USDA assistance	Standard 7	Activity 3 -	Training: Teachers and School Administrators	0	0	136	0	0	0	0	136	
MGD 1.3.3/2.4	Number of educational facilities (i.e. school buildings, classrooms, improved water sources, and latrines) rehabilitated/constructed as a result of USDA assistance	Standard 8	Activity 2 -	Building/Rehabilitation: Kitchens, Storerooms, Latrines and Wells	0	0	63	63	0	0	0	126	

Project Title:		Country :	Activity Alignment		Proposed start date:			Proposed end date:				
MGD 1.3.4	Number of students enrolled in schools receiving USDA assistance	Standard 9	Activity 1	Provide School Meals and Take Home Rations (THR)	86,500	0	111,413	116,984	122,833	128,975	43,142	135,424
MGD 1.4.2/2.7.2	Number of policies, regulations, or administrative procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USDA assistance	Standard 10	Activity 6 -	Capacity Building: Local, regional, national level	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	4
MGD 1.4.3/1.4.4	Value of new USG commitments, and new public and private sector investments leveraged by USDA to support food security and nutrition	Standard 11	Activity 6 -	Capacity Building: Local, regional, national level	0	0	10,000	15,000	20,000	0	0	45,000
MGD 1.4.4	Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of USDA assistance	Standard 12	Activity 6 -	Capacity Building: Local, regional, national level	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	6
MGD 1.2.1/1.3.1/1.2.1.1/1.3.1.1	Quantity of take-home rations provided (in metric tons) as a result of USDA assistance	Standard 14	Activity 1	Provide School Meals and Take Home Rations (THR)	0	0	141	245	315	451	0	1,151
MGD 1.2.1/1.3.1/1.2.1.1/1.3.1.1	Number of individuals receiving take-home rations as a result of USDA assistance	Standard 15	Activity 1	Provide School Meals and Take Home Rations (THR)	0	0	2,850	5,500	7,100	9,700	0	25,150
MGD 1.2.1/1.3.1/1.2.1.1/1.3.1.1	Number of daily school meals (breakfast, snack, lunch) provided to school-age children as a result of USDA assistance	Standard 16	Activity 1	Provide School Meals and Take Home Rations (THR)	0	0	16,283,017	13,987,244	11,348,364	10,473,108	5,090,780	57,182,513
MGD 1.2.1/1.3.1/1.2.1.1/1.3.1.1/2.5	Number of school-age children receiving daily school meals (breakfast, snack, lunch) as a result of USDA assistance	Standard 17	Activity 1	Provide School Meals and Take Home Rations (THR)	0	0	111,413	116,984	122,833	128,975	43,142	135,424
MGD 1.2.1/1.3.1/1.2.1.1/1.3.1.1/2.5	Number of USDA social assistance beneficiaries participating in productive safety nets	Standard 18	Activity 1 -	Provide School Meals and Take Home Rations (THR)	0	0	125,702	131,154	137,269	143,794	43,142	160,439
MGD SO2	Number of individuals who demonstrate use of new child health and nutrition practices as a result of USDA assistance	Standard 19	Activity 7 -	Training: Good Health and Nutrition Practices	0	0	0	63	202	342	436	436

Monitoring and Evaluation

Project Title:		Country :	Activity Alignment		Proposed start date:			Proposed end date:				
MGD SO2	Number of individuals who demonstrate use of new safe food preparation and storage practices as a result of USDA assistance	Standard 20	Activity 6 -	Capacity Building: Local, regional, national level	0	0	0	97	325	554	697	697
MGD SO2	Percent of participants of community-level nutrition interventions who practice promoted infant and young child feeding behaviors	Standard 21	Activity 7 -	Training: Good Health and Nutrition Practices	0	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	Not to be collected. Indicator to be deleted.
MGD 2.2	Number of individuals trained in safe food preparation and storage as a result of USDA assistance	Standard 22	Activity 6 -	Capacity Building: Local, regional, national level	0	0	904	904	0	0	0	904
MGD 2.3	Number of individuals trained in child health and nutrition as a result of USDA assistance	Standard 23	Activity 7 -	Training: Good Health and Nutrition Practices	0	0	1,554	1,554	0	0	0	3,108
MGD 2.3	Number of children under five (0-59 months) reached with nutrition-specific interventions through USDA-supported programs	Standard 24	Activity 7 -	Training: Good Health and Nutrition Practices	0	0	10,279	11,027	11,392	11,775	0	11,775
MGD 2.3	Number of children under two (0-23 months) reached with community-level nutrition interventions through USDA-supported programs	Standard 25	Activity 7 -	Training: Good Health and Nutrition Practices	0	0	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	0	9,600
MGD 2.3	Number of pregnant women reached with nutrition-specific interventions through USDA-supported programs	Standard 26	Activity 7 -	Training: Good Health and Nutrition Practices	0	0	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	0	12,000
MGD 2.4	Number of schools using an improved water source	Standard 27	Activity 2 -	Building/Rehabilitation: Kitchens, Storerooms, Latrines and Wells	244	244	277	310	310	310	310	310
MGD 2.4	Number of schools with improved sanitary facilities	Standard 28	Activity 2 -	Building/Rehabilitation: Kitchens, Storerooms, Latrines and Wells	259	274	289	289	289	289	289	289
MGD 2.5	Number of students receiving deworming medication(s)	Standard 29	Activity 7 -	Training: Good Health and Nutrition Practices	0	0	10,279	11,027	11,392	11,775	0	11,775
MGD SO1 and SO2	Number of individuals participating in USDA food security programs	Standard 30	All	All Activities	0	0	118,727	123,431	128,277	134,419	43,142	159,168

Monitoring and Evaluation

Project Title:		Country :	Activity Alignment		Proposed start date:			Proposed end date:				
MGD SO1 and SO2	Number of individuals benefiting indirectly from USDA-funded interventions	Standard 31	All	All Activities	0	0	831,089	864,015	897,937	940,931	301,994	1,114,175
MGD SO1 and SO2	Number of schools reached as a result of USDA assistance	Standard 32	All	All Activities	0	0	398	398	398	398	398	398
LRP 1.1	Cost of transport, storage and handling of commodity procured as a result of USDA assistance (by commodity)	LRP 4	Activity 9	- Training: Local and Regional Procurement Mechanisms	0	0	29,939	30,772	25,774	24,108	0	110,593
LRP 1.1.1	Cost of commodity procured as a result of USDA assistance (by commodity and source country)	LRP 5	Activity 9	- Training: Local and Regional Procurement Mechanisms	0	0	580,662	626,140	549,983	537,283	121,520	2,415,587
LRP 1.3.2	Quantity of commodity procured (MT) as a result of USDA assistance (by commodity and source country)	LRP 6	Activity 9	- Training: Local and Regional Procurement Mechanisms	0	0	611	628	526	492	109	2,366
LRP 1.3.2.1	Value of annual sales of farms and firms receiving USDA assistance	LRP 7	Activity 9	- Training: Local and Regional Procurement Mechanisms	593,073	593,073	1,320,718	2,068,609	2,695,027	3,280,955	3,410,764	12,776,073
LRP 1.3.2.1	Volume of commodities sold by farms and firms receiving USDA assistance	LRP 8	Activity 9	- Training: Local and Regional Procurement Mechanisms	498	498	1,109	1,737	2,263	2,755	2,864	10,728
LRP 1.4.3	Number of individuals who have received short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training as a result of USDA assistance	LRP 11	Activity 9	- Training: Local and Regional Procurement Mechanisms	0	0	1,640	1,640	0	0	0	3,280
LRP 1.4.3	Number of individuals in the agriculture system who have applied improved management practices or technologies with USDA assistance	LRP 12	Activity 9	- Training: Local and Regional Procurement Mechanisms	0	0	0	65	227	389	486	486

Project Title:	Country:	Proposed start date:			Proposed end date:					
Performance Indicator	Standard or Custom		Targets							
		Baseline	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Life of Project	

Monitoring and Evaluation

Project Title:	Country:	Proposed start date:			Proposed end date:				
Number of individuals participating in USDA supported Community and School Gardens	Custom 1	0	0	1493	1493	2985	2985	0	2985
Number of individuals receiving coaching	Custom 2	0	0	997.5	997.5	2189	2189	0	2985
Number of school gardens or farms, established or supported thanks to USDA assistance	Custom 3			149	149	299	299	0	299
Number of students participating in tutoring	Custom 4			3960	3960	3960	3960	0	9900
Amount of community contributions in cash for school canteens	Custom 5			\$209,000	\$291,867	\$306,460	\$321,783	0	\$1,129,110
Amount of community contributions in MT of food for school canteens	Custom 6			28	31	34	37	0	130
Host country budget amount allocated [by dedicated line item] to school feeding.	Custom 7	\$3,441,165.33		\$5,454,545	\$7,272,727	\$9,090,909	\$10,909,091	0	\$32,727,273
Number of project schools 'handed over' to host country government and/or community to provide school meals.	Custom 8	0	0	0	0	0	100	398	\$398
Number of school feeding days 'handed over' to host country government and/or community to provide school meals.	Custom 9	0	0	1,782,608.00	3,743,488.00	3,930,656.00	8,254,400.00	4,141,632.00	\$21,852,784
Host country budget amount allocated per child for school feeding.	Custom 10	42.05		42.05	42.10	42.14	42.18		42.18
Number of literacy instructional manuals revised or developed in accordance with national standards and validated for classroom use. (ARED: writing project guide, tutoring guide)	Custom 11		0	102	1	2	0	0	105
Percentage of schools delivering ≥ 90% of planned school feeding days with documented community participation.	Custom 12	50%	0%	70%	75%	80%	90%	90%	90%

Monitoring and Evaluation

Project Title:	Country:	Proposed start date:			Proposed end date:				
Number of food preparation and storage tools and equipment provided through USDA assistance (to be confirmed with Soumaila regarding the number of items—bowls, pallets, etc.—to be procured).	Custom 13		0	10495	0	0	0	0	10495

Table of Performance Indicators (SJII/Endline evaluation)

Project Title: <i>Sukaabe Janngo II</i>		Country: Senegal		Proposed start date: October 1, 2021			Proposed end date: September 30, 2026			
Result	Performance Indicator	Standard or Custom	Baseline	Region	Y1 Target	Y2 Target	Y3 Target	Y4 Target	Y5 Target	Life of Project
MGD SO1	Percent of students who, by the end of grade four primary schooling, respectively demonstrate that they can read and understand the meaning of grade level text ⁶	Custom	82%	St. Louis, ASER reading assessment	0	52%	0	85%	0	85%
MGD SO1	Percent of students who, by the end of four, five, and six grades of primary schooling, respectively, demonstrate that they can reading and understand the meaning of grade level text ⁷	Custom	17% 18% 29%	Casamance, EGRA	20% 30% 40%	20% 30% 40%	25% 35% 45%	25% 35% 45%	30% 40% 50%	30% 40% 50%
MGD 1.3	Average student attendance rate in USDA supported classrooms/schools	Standard #2	95%	Casamance	85%	90%	95%	98%	98%	98%
MGD 1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.1	Number of teaching and learning materials provided as a result of USDA assistance	Standard #3	0	Casamance	0	24,038	260	2,640	0	26,938

⁶ Note: In alignment with the project’s focus on upper primary, instead of reporting against MGD SO1, “Percent of students who, by the end of two grades of primary schooling, demonstrate that they can read and understand the meaning of grade level text,” the project will report on a custom indicator: for St. Louis; students in Grades 4 will be assessed on Grade 2 content and judged against benchmarks set for their grade level.

⁷ Note: same comment as above related to the project’s focus on G4-6 in Casamance. The project will report on a custom indicator in place of SI 1 for the Casamance.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Project Title: <i>Sukaabe Janngo II</i>		Country: Senegal		Proposed start date: October 1, 2021			Proposed end date: September 30, 2026			
Result	Performance Indicator	Standard or Custom	Baseline	Region	Y1 Target	Y2 Target	Y3 Target	Y4 Target	Y5 Target	Life of Project
MGD 1.1., 1.1.4	Number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants in target schools who demonstrate use of new and quality teaching techniques or tools as a result of USDA assistance	Standard #4	0	Casamance	0	119	286	998	952	1,711
MGD 1.1, 1.1.1, 1.1.4	Number of teachers/educators/teaching assistants trained or certified as a result of USDA assistance	Standard #5	0	Casamance	0	238	476	1425	1190	2139
MGD 1.1, 1.1.1, 1.1.5	Number of school administrators and officials in target schools who demonstrate use of new techniques or tools as a result of USDA assistance	Standard #6	0	Casamance	0	145	0	450	0	480
MGD 1.1, 1.1.1, 1.1.5	Number of school administrators and officials trained or certified as a result of USDA assistance	Standard #7	0	Casamance	0	290	0	600	0	600
MGD 1.3.1	Number of students participating in reading summer camps as a result of USDA assistance	Custom	0	Casamance	0	3,000	4,500	6,000	0	13,500
MGD 1.3.1	Number of students receiving tutoring as a result of USDA assistance	Custom	0	Casamance	0	6,426	6,426	3,213	3,213	19,278
MGD 1.3.3, 1.1.1 and 2.4	Number of educational facilities (i.e., school buildings, classrooms, improved water sources, and latrines) rehabilitated/constructed as a result of USDA assistance	Standard #8	0	Casamance	0	0	120	50	0	170
MGD 1.3.4	Number of students enrolled in schools receiving USDA assistance	Standard #9	59,350	Casamance Primary	0	55,000	56,650	69,393	72,863	90,007
				Casamance Preschool	0	6,315	6,504	5,106	5,361	6,827
				St. Louis Primary	0	43,995	0	0	0	43,995
				St. Louis Preschool	0	6,285	0	0	0	6,285

Project Title: <i>Sukaabe Janngo II</i>		Country: Senegal		Proposed start date: October 1, 2021			Proposed end date: September 30, 2026			
Result	Performance Indicator	Standard or Custom	Baseline	Region	Y1 Target	Y2 Target	Y3 Target	Y4 Target	Y5 Target	Life of Project
				Cumulative	0	111,595	63,154	74,500	78,225	147,114
MGD 1.4.1, 1.4.2 2.7.1, and 2.7.2; LRP 1.4.1; LRP 1.4.2	Number of policies, regulations, or administrative procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USDA assistance	Standard #10	0	Overall	0	1	1	1	0	3
MGD 1.4.1, 1.4.2 2.7.1, and 2.7.2, 2.7.3	Number of Sustainability action plans (SAPs) completed and/or at various stages of implementation	Custom	0	Casamance	0	285	0	0	0	285
MGD 1.4.3 and 1.4.4	Value of new USG commitments, and new public and private sector investments leveraged by USDA to support food security and nutrition	Standard #11	0	Overall	0	\$0	\$10,000	\$20,000	0	\$30,000
MGD 1.4.4; LRP 1.4.4	Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of USDA assistance	Standard #12	0	Overall	0	0	1	2	0	3
MGD 1.4.4, 1.3.5	Number of Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs) or similar “school” governance structures supported as a result of USDA assistance	Standard #13	0	Casamance	0	285	285	285	285	285
MGD 1.4.4, 2.7.4	Amount of community contributions to canteens	Custom	0	Casamance	0	\$103,636	\$124,364	\$209,000	\$228,000	\$730,636
				St. Louis	0	\$662,727	0	0	0	\$662,727
				Cumulative	0	\$766,363	\$124,364	\$209,000	\$228,000	\$1,393,364
MGD 1.2.1, 1.3.1, 1.2.1.1/ 1.3.1.1	Quantity of take-home rations provided (in metric tons) as a result of USDA assistance	Standard #14	0	Casamance	0	27	27	27	27	108
				St. Louis	0	12	0	0	0	12
				Cumulative	0	39	27	27	27	120
			0	Casamance	0	750	750	1,440	1,440	4,380

Monitoring and Evaluation

Project Title: <i>Sukaabe Janngo II</i>		Country: Senegal		Proposed start date: October 1, 2021			Proposed end date: September 30, 2026			
Result	Performance Indicator	Standard or Custom	Baseline	Region	Y1 Target	Y2 Target	Y3 Target	Y4 Target	Y5 Target	Life of Project
MGD 1.2.1, 1.3.1, 1.2.1.1/1.3.1.1	Number of individuals receiving take-home rations as a result of USDA assistance	Standard #15		St. Louis	0	600	0	0	0	600
				Cumulative	0	1,350	750	1,440	1,440	4,980
MGD 1.2.1, 1.3.1, 1.2.1.1/1.3.1.1	Number of daily school meals (breakfast, snack, lunch) provided to school-age children as a result of USDA assistance	Standard #16	0	Casamance	0	8,026,134	7,440,226	6,883,763	6,023,293	29,292,044
				St. Louis	0	2,490,636	0	0	0	2,490,636
				Cumulative	0	10,516,770	7,440,226	6,883,763	6,023,293	31,782,680
MGD 1.2.1, 1.3.1, 1.2.1.1/1.3.1.1	Number of school-age children receiving daily school meals (breakfast, snack, lunch) as a result of USDA assistance	Standard #17	0	Casamance	0	58,296	60,045	74,500	78,225	96,562
				St. Louis	0	48,836	0	0	0	48,836
				Cumulative	0	107,132	60,045	74,500	78,225	145,398
MGD 1.2.1, 1.3.1, 1.2.1.1/1.3.1.1, 2.5	Number of USDA social assistance beneficiaries participating in productive safety nets	Standard #18	0	Casamance	0	66,774	68,471	76,944	80,141	116,346
				St. Louis	0	49,436	0	0	0	49,436
				Cumulative	0	116,210	68,471	76,944	80,141	165,782
MGD SO2, 2.1, 1.3.2	Number of individuals who demonstrate use of new child health and nutrition practices as a result of USDA assistance	Standard #19	0	Casamance	0	0	427	0	456	456
MGD SO2, 2.1, 2.6, 1.3.2	Number of individuals who demonstrate use of new safe food preparation and storage practices as a result of USDA assistance	Standard #20	0	Casamance	0	0	0	0	456	456
MGD 2.1, 2.2, 2.6, 1.3.2	Number of individuals trained in safe food preparation and storage as a result of USDA assistance	Standard #22	0	Casamance	0	570	0	1,140	1,140	1,140
MGD 2.1, 2.3, 1.3.2	Number of individuals trained in child health and nutrition as a result of USDA assistance	Standard #23	0	Casamance	0	570	0	1,140	0	1,140

Monitoring and Evaluation

Project Title: <i>Sukaabe Janngo II</i>		Country: Senegal		Proposed start date: October 1, 2021			Proposed end date: September 30, 2026			
Result	Performance Indicator	Standard or Custom	Baseline	Region	Y1 Target	Y2 Target	Y3 Target	Y4 Target	Y5 Target	Life of Project
MGD 2.1, 2.3	Number of children under five (0-59 months) reached with nutrition-specific interventions through USDA-supported programs	Standard #24	0	Casamance	0	6,189	6,374	5,004	5,254	6,690
MGD 2.1, 2.3	Number of children under two (0-23 months) reached with community-level nutrition interventions through USDA-supported programs	Standard #25	0	Casamance	0	3,200	3,200	0	0	6,400
MGD 2.1, 2.3	Number of pregnant women reached with nutrition-specific interventions through USDA-supported programs	Standard #26	0	Casamance	0	4,000	4,000	0	0	8,000
MGD 2.4	Number of schools using an improved water source	Standard #27	154	Casamance	154	0	0	179	204	204
MGD 2.4	Number of schools with improved sanitary facilities	Standard #28	179	Casamance	179	0	0	204	229	229
MGD 2.5	Number of students receiving deworming medication(s)	Standard #29	0	Casamance	0	58,249	59,997	4,850	5,092	6,485
MGD 2.5	Number of teachers and cooks receiving deworming medication(s)	Custom	0	Casamance	0	4,090	4,213	4,339	4,469	4,469
MGD 2.5	Number of children receiving vitamin A	Custom	0	Casamance	0	4,230	4,357	4,850	5,092	6,485
MGD SO1, SO2	Number of individuals participating in USDA food security programs	Standard #30	0	Casamance	0	73,000	74,102	78,544	81,539	112,485
				St. Louis	0	49,436	0	0	0	49,436
				Cumulative	0	122,436	74,102	78,544	81,539	161,921
MGD SO1, SO2	Number of individuals benefiting indirectly from USDA-funded interventions	Standard #31	0	Casamance	0	333,490	339,577	549,808	570,773	787,395
				St. Louis	0	307,538	0	0	0	307,538
				Cumulative	0	641,028	339,577	549,808	570,773	1,094,933
			0	Casamance	0	285	285	285	285	285

Monitoring and Evaluation

Project Title: <i>Sukaabe Janngo II</i>		Country: Senegal		Proposed start date: October 1, 2021			Proposed end date: September 30, 2026			
Result	Performance Indicator	Standard or Custom	Baseline	Region	Y1 Target	Y2 Target	Y3 Target	Y4 Target	Y5 Target	Life of Project
MGD SO1, SO2	Number of schools reached as a result of USDA assistance	Standard #32		St. Louis	0	270	0	0	0	270
				Cumulative	0	555	285	285	285	555
LRP SO1; LRP 1.1.; 1.2; 1.2.2; 1.3.3; 1.3.2.1	Number of producers who contribute to school canteens	Custom	0	Casamance	0	100	300	900	1000	1000
LRP SO1; 1.3.1; 1.4.3; 1.3	Number of school gardens or farms, established or supported thanks to USDA assistance	Custom	0	Casamance	0	20	25	108	110	110
LRP 1.1., 1.1.1; 1.1.2; 1.1.3; 1.2.1; 1.3.2.4	Cost of commodity procured as a result of USDA assistance (by commodity and source country)	LRP Standard #5	0	Casamance	0	0	\$511,290	\$324,590	\$194,754	\$942,392
LRP 1.2; 1.2.3; 1.3, 1.3.2; 1.3.2.2; 1.3.2.3;	Quantity of commodity procured (MT) as a result of USDA assistance (by commodity and source country)	LRP Standard #6	0	Casamance	0	0	690	150	100	940

Monitoring and Evaluation