**INTRODUCTION**

The programme is conceptualised primarily as an educational intervention aimed at: promoting proper school attendance; alleviating short-term hunger and improving concentration; contributing to general health development.

**REFERENCES**


**FINDINGS**

Two implementation models are followed and there are implementation variations per region.

**REGIONAL PROGRAMME**

- CENTRALISED MODEL: Food is delivered to schools by centrally-appointed and centrally-paid service providers.
- DECENTRALISED MODEL: Money is transferred to schools who appoint their own service providers.

**ABOUT THE EVALUATION**

A mixed methods evaluation design was followed, comprising various data collection methods:

- Document and literature review.
- Interviews with key government stakeholders and partners at various levels.
- Surveys with various school-level stakeholders (principal, programme co-ordinators, volunteer food handlers (VFHs), school governing body (SGB) members and learners) and observations in a representative sample of schools.

**ABOUT THE IMPLEMENTATION INDEX**

An implementation index was developed following preliminary data analysis to assist in synthesising data, summarizing key findings and demonstrating the extent to which implementation is successful and likely to lead to benefits.

Our index was informed by the literature review which identified key characteristics and contextual factors that determine the effectiveness of school nutrition programmes and the programme theory.

We constructed an index to summarise performance – relative to standards outlined in the programme theory – in those areas for which the indicators were identified from the surveys and observation conducted in the schools.

**DISCUSSION**

The index was developed by the evaluation team in the final stages of data analysis. The cornerstone of the evaluation and programme implementation was not satisfactorily engaged. The index is therefore tentative and requires refinement and validation, including testing validated by members of the programme implementation team and partners – and the indicators and the index appropriate? Are any components/indicators unnecessary? Are any additional components/indicators required? The majority of the three components should also be checked.

The programme was conceptualised as an educational intervention aimed at: promoting proper school attendance; alleviating short-term hunger and improving concentration; contributing to general health development.

The overall purpose of the programme is to improve the health and nutritional status of the poorest children (DBE and DPME 2014).

Three regions using the centralised model and one region using the decentralised model scored best, achieving mean scores above 12. However, there is considerable room for improvement, as the maximum score is 19. A region using the centralised model scored worst, achieving a mean score of 8.2. There was less variation amongst regions using the decentralised model. The overall mean score of each model is very similar, although the centralised model scored marginally better with a mean score of 11.5 as compared to 11.3 for the decentralised model.

Performance per region and model was disaggregated per component and sub-component (see previous table). Regions using the centralised model and one decentralised region scored slightly better in terms of food modularity and selection, whilst regions using the decentralised model and one centralised region scored slightly worse in terms of serving a nutritious meal comprising three food groups by 10:00 am. Regions using the decentralised model scored better in terms of procurement and logistics, specifically,absorbing funding and ordering, delivery and payment. On indicators related to food preparation and service regions using the centralised model performed better. Performance in indicators relating to M&E were similar for both models.

The implementation index provides a high-level overview of the extent to which learners are receiving quality meals and services.

The index was constructed to a scale ranging from 0 to 1 with 1 indicating best performance and 0 worst. Random variables were identified and principal component index was run to check the extent to which the variables were related.

The index was then created by summing the indicator variables for each school. Mean scores were calculated for each region and/or for the centralised and decentralised models.

**REFERENCES**

Brendy et al (2009) site six indicators used to assess nutrition programme, three of which are relevant to implementation:

- Government participation and logistics arrangements
- Management and implementation arrangements
- Transport, storage of food, infrastructure and equipment for preparation

**APPENDIX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASUREMENT</th>
<th>INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>RATING SCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FMB Logistics</td>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>best scoring regions worst scoring regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRALISED</td>
<td>DECENTRALISED</td>
<td>OVER-ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>