The Impact of Home Grown School Feeding Program(HGSFP) on Child Education and Nutrition in Nigeria.

Nwaobi, Godwin

QUANTITATIVE ECONOMIC RESEARCH BUREAU

29 April 2023

THE IMPACT OF HOME GROWN SCHOOL FEEDING PROGRAM (HGSFP) ON CHILD EDUCATION AND NURITION IN NIGERIA

GODWIN CHUKWUDUM NWAOBI

PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS

gcnwaobi@quanterb.org

gcnwaobi@gmail.com

+234-8035925021

QUANTITATIVE ECONOMIC RESEARCH BUREAU

P.O. BOX 7173, ABA ABIA STATE

NIGERIA, WEST AFRICA

www.quanterb.Org

info@quanterb.Org

1.0 BACKGROUND AND POLICY PROBLEM

As a lower income country with extreme poverty status, Nigeria is characterized by very large informal sector. Consequently, National Social investment programmes (NSIP) of the Nigerian government were created to enshrine the value and vision for graduating Nigerian citizens from poverty circles through capacity building, investment and direct support. As a holistic approach for delivering social investment portfolio, NSIP has four major arms.

- N – Power (Job creation and Youth Employment)
- NHGSFP (National Home Grown School Feeding Programme)
- NASS CO (National Social Safety Net Programmes)
- GEEP (Government Enterprise and Empowerment Programme).

Specially, the NHGSFP is a government led (cost effective) school feeding programme that uses food grown locally by small holding farmers. Essentially, this programme has the dual objectives of increasing national food production as well as ensuring that children go to school. Notably, this is done by combating hunger, increasing primary school enrolment as well as encouraging local and state-wide economic growth. As at the year 2020, the programme was providing free nutritious meals to about nine millions pupils of grade one to three in public primary schools across thirty states in Nigeria.

Similarly, about 101,000 Community Women have been engaged and trained to prepare locally grown food while serving local delicacies to primary beneficiaries of the in about 52,000 public primary schools. Furthermore, more

than 150,000 small holding farmers and youth have engaged in the overall value chain of the NHGSFP ranging from production to processing aggregation, packaging and distribution across different states in Nigeria. Basically the proposed project will be the first indigenous impact evaluations on the subject matter of investigation using Randomized Control Trial (RCT) methods.

Notably, the initial implementation of the program was in 2004 and was called the National Home Grown School Feeding Program. Operationally, the Federal Ministry of Education was the agency that was designed to implement the phased twelve pilot states selected from the six geo political zones (inclusive of Federal Capital Territory). However, the program stopped shortly after commencement; probably due to lack of continuity in government programmes. Yet, two states (Osun and

Kano) were able to continue with the programme. Clearly, by 2005 and 2006, it was observed that enrolment had improved in about five states while retention of pupils also spiked. Again, there was about 28 percent boost in access to schools whereas the retention ability of participating student increased by approximately 53%. Furthermore, there was a reduction in the level of malnutrition as well as improvements on the consumption of hygienic food increased with the children. Indeed, the value chain of increased agricultural output increased while more jobs were created. Yet, it is on record that despite the massive amount of money voted for the NHGSFP project, the problems still persist. Again, the overall impact has not been felt nationally; partly due to the fact that some states are not yet commenced and hence reluctant in its implementation. Consequently, impact evaluation on the existing programmes may help

in states decision to join in its implementation as well as assisting the government in strengthening the future operation of the programmes.

Basically, the program is targeted at giving the public school children (pupils 1 – 3 of the 36 States of Nigeria and FCT) a daily meal improving the nutritional and health status of the children. Essentially, these groups of children are from poor background, whose parents are unable to either finance their school expenses or provide stable nutritious meals that can enhance their mental and physical development. Usually, their lives are characterized by poor feeding lifestyles while they often end up dropping out of school or attending school irregularly in order to embark on child labor such as hawking, begging on the streets as well as engaging in farming as a means of assisting their parents. Since their

developmental issues are related to the basic needs of life (food, shelter and clothing), they are equally exposed to other developmental challenges such as low self–esteem, sexual harassment for the girl child, pick – pocketing, road accidents, loss of life or permanent injuries. Consequently, NHGSFP is concerned with Public Primary School children (and household members) in areas with inadequate food access.

Essentially, the programme is expected to improve adequate access to food for deprived and vulnerable rural family units. As a positive outcome, this will result in reduced poverty and malnutrition levels; enhanced education objectives (comprising increasing school enrolment, attendance and retention) as well as school academic performance which guarantees, sustainable school feeding scheme.

Specifically, the sourcing of locally produced food encourages small scale farmers to produce more of their farm produce so as to meet the local community school's food demand that results to better farmer's household profit. And since the NHGFP offers learners with food products sourced from the neighborhood; then one nourishing meal served per day could enhance better access to education for learners from rural areas. In other words, the intake of high quality data is vital for improved memory function which can result in enhanced educational effects. Therefore, the proposed programme has the potential and capacity to boost the local economy of Nigeria. Clearly, the products of the program is to have children that are healthy, well – fed, well nourished, capable of adapting to any academic challenge as well as highly motivated to be in school with the least force or coercion from the parents. Children are therefore more

likely to stay, attend and be able to learn through the provision of school meals. Thus, the program is expected to end or drastically reduce hunger and malnutrition while stimulating local production and investing in human capital. By providing social protection and poverty reduction; the programme helps to enhance the incomes and human capital needed to overcome poverty while building resilience and future livelihoods by way of facilitating education, health and nutrition outcomes for beneficiary families. Critically, if the school feeding programmes are made part of a package of investments in education; they will help in maximizing the return on these investments by way of increased children's attendance and learning capacity through reduced short – term hunger as well as improved nutrition, health and cognitive development. Indeed, if the program is adequately designed and implemented, school NHGFSP

can contribute to narrowing gender gaps in access to education as well as breaking the vicious cycle of discrimination against girls and other vulnerable group which can contribute to more inclusive development trajectories.

2.0 STUDY OBJECTIVES/RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

Basically, the long run objectives of the school feeding program is to assist in the promotion of universal primary education to the social – economically disadvantaged and nutritionally vulnerable children such as girls in pre-primary and primary school in targeted areas. Yet, in the short run, it is designed to increase enrolment, prevent dropout, stabilize attendance as well as assisting primary schools to improve the attention span and ultimately the learning capacity of students by relieving short term hunger.

Specifically, the main objective of this project is to evaluate the impact of a national home grown school feeding programme (NHGSFP) through a field experiment in Nigeria. Critically, the study will focus on four outcomes of interest, class attendance, retention, academic performance and culture. Similarly, we shall also examine whether there are unintended effects associated with the programme scheme. However, the research hypotheses are as follows:

H_O: There is no significant impact of NHGSFP on primary education in Nigeria.

H_I: There is significant impact of NHGSFP on primary education in Nigeria.

3.0 LITERATURE PREVIEW:

Empirically, it has been observed that the rate of school children dropout has consistently been on the increase in Nigeria. Notably, majority of the children who succeeded in school enrolment often skip meals in the morning before going to school or after school. Even where they manage to have the privilege of getting a meal before or after school; such meals are often not nutritious enough to provide the essential nutrients that can contribute to mental and physical development. In fact, all of these are consequent upon the high level of poverty that has become endemic within the average family. Even though the Nigerian government had attempted to address some of these challenges, findings of NHGSFP have been below average either because of lack of commitment, bureaucratic, complexities or institutional corruption. Even though the programme started since 2004 (and later re-

started in 2016) the rate of school children dropouts are still at alarming rate. Consequently, the federal government (through the office of the Vice President) initiated the NHGSFP in 2016 (by engaging the services of both the local farmers and food vendors that were being paid for their services). Essentially, the programme was aimed at tackling hunger and improved nutrition, increased children's access, participation and achievement in school as well as supporting local livelihoods. In order to facilitate the implementation of the program, the federal government had worked with key partners to capitalize on global experience and evidence. Specially, a recent study by LEAP (2017) as sponsored by UKAID on impact evaluation on Home Grown School Feeding Programme in Kano State presents some interesting findings. Notably, the study suggests the urgent need to do further in-depth evaluation on the national scale by

including other states where the programme has been implemented. However, for Kano State where the study was conducted, there was wide indication to suggest that the programme implementation was specially hinged on political motivation based on the political interest of the State governance as well as the main financers. Again, there was obvious lack of involvement of the civil society organization in the Kano State driven school feeding programme.

Although the Federal Government of Nigeria initiated the HGSFHP through the Universal Basic Education (UBE) Act in 2004; the Legislation stipulated that (at a minimum) all state primary schools must provide one meal a day to each student. And to jump start the programme, the Federal Government decided on a phased – pilot rollout involving thirteen states from six geo – political zones and

F.C.T. Thus, out of the original pilots, the state of Osun Home grown school feeding and health programme termed Elementary school feeding programme was the only one to continue which represents a model of good practice among other school feeding initiatives in Nigeria. However, no impact evaluations have been undertaken on the programme and consequently there is little or no empirical evidence on their impacts in the literature. Yet past experience shows that the key to success, scale – up and sustainability of the school health and nutrition programs was the development of the multisectoral understanding between

education and health as shown in the internationally recognized Focusing Resources on Effective School Health (FRESH) programming framework. Operationally, to support the transition from externally driven school feeding to Home Grown School Feeding (HGSF); the partnership for child development (PCD) launched a programme (PCD – HGSF) that support government action to deliver sustainable nationally owned school feeding programmes sourced from local farmers. As executed the programme provides directs, evidence based and context – specific support as well as expertise for the design and management of school feeding programmes linked to local agricultural production. Consequently, the transition strategy plan was developed at the request of the environment of the state of Osun to support the delivery of the state of Osun to support

feeding programme (O'meals). Basically, the plan was developed by engaging different stakeholders working across the disciplines of agriculture, education, health and nutrition. Specifically, the stakeholders involved in the process included policy makers, practitioners, researchers, civil society and the media. Here the scope of the activities followed a standard programme evaluation approach that sets outs to capture the needs of the programme as well as the characters of the target population. Similarly, a stakeholder mapping exercise was also undertaken to provide a clearer understanding of the key stakeholders; their policy position influence with regards to the Osun State school feeding programme and enabling environment dimensions.

Clearly, in analyzing the stake holders contribution to the rethinking school feeding standards; it was identified that

(at both the federal and state level) the leading role of the implementing ministries such as Universal Basic Education Board, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Education and National Planning Commission influence the policy and implementation of the Osun State home grown school feeding and health programme (OSHGSFHP). Yet, at the state level, the HGSF Secretariat Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development, State House of Assembly, State Universal Education Board were influential both at the policy and implementation levels. Similarly, at the local governance levels, actors such as Local Government Area Chairman, Local Government Area Education Secretary and Traditional Rulers contributed to programme implementation. Operationally, the Osun Elementary School feeding and Health programme (O'meals)

commenced as a pilot programme in may 2006. This was done to seek to reverse the very low academic performance of pupils in both internal and externals as well as the realization that good nutrition is necessary for proper cognitive development of pupils. However, the feeding under the initiative of the O'MEALS programme commenced in April, 2012. It was implemented in a total of 1375 primary schools across the state of Osun which caters for 190,000 children (in primary one to primary three). Here, the daily feeding allowance for each pupils was increased from the initial N30 (US$0.20) per child per day to N50.00 (US $0.31). Thus, in a week, a child is fed with N250.00 (US $1.56). Again, a total of 3,007 food vendors/cooks were employed and trained to serve the midday meals for pupils of classes 1, 2 and 3 in all primary schools in Osun State. Furthermore, the elementary school feeding and health programme

provides other school health and nutrition services to all kindergarten and primary school pupils in the reviewed State. Notably, one of such services is the school – based deworming programme which caters for 357533 children from primary one to six. As implemented, drugs are distributed from the ESFHP unit to the LGEA Secretariat and finally administered at school level by trained teachers.

As at September 2018, spaces for change (SAC) conducted an independent evaluation of the National Home Grown School Feeding programme to improve transparency in the management and performance of the initiative in Imo and Abia States. In fact, this evaluation began with a scoping study aimed at understanding the operational and institutional arrangements for program implementation. And during the scoping phase, SAC

consulted and directly engaged the coordinators and institutions coordinating the feeding programme in the states of Imo and Abia. Armed with the data generated from the desk research and consultations with state actors SAC developed instruments to guide robust information gathering on the field from a variety of stakeholders involved in the implementation of the home grown school feeding programme at the local and state levels. Subsequently, the functionality and relevance of the instruments were tested at pilot survey conducted at Owerri, Imo State (in 2018). Operationally, the coordination of the school feeding programme in about 1279 primary schools in Imo State was vested on Imo State Ministry of Happiness and purpose fulfillment while the office of the wife of the Abia State Governor coordinated the school feeding programme in about 800 primary schools in Abia State.

Specially, in Imo State, SAC administered questionnaires on 4958 pupils in 46 primary schools across the state. Through key informant interviews and focus group discussions, head teachers of primary schools, parents in public school as well as female food vendors were interviewed in the different parts of Imo State. Again, field visits were conducted to different locations where food was cooked for pupils as well as poultry farm that supplied agro produce to food vendors. In general, pupils, parents, public primary school in urban and rural areas, head and assistant head teachers as well as female food vendors were reached directly during the survey. In other words, a total of 9082 were engaged in the evaluation of homegrown school feeding program in Imo State. In contrast, SAC administered questionnaires in 3357 pupils across government – run primary schools in Abia State.

Here, head and assistant head teachers of public primary schools as well as female food vendors were interviewed in different parts of the state. Notably, many school children complained of being underfed as food rations are too often too small. However, many parents (especially in the rural areas) acknowledge experiencing financial savings as a result of the scheme. Yet other parents stated that they would have preferred free tuition to free feeding. Yet, some other parents wanted better infrastructure and better remuneration of teachers as against free feeding for their children.

Indeed, accurate data is critical to improve the implementation of the school feeding programs. Essentially, through these interventions, better informed pupils, parents, schools, vendors, communities have

gained greater awareness and capacity to report gaps noticed while advocating for future improvements.

4.0 NHGSFP STRUCTURES

Technically, information about the NHGSFP program is disseminated primarily through the National Social Investment Steering Committee Drawn from the federal Ministries of Health, Education, Agriculture, Labor and Productivity, Finance, Budget and Finance, Women Affairs as well as youths and sports. This Committee provides guidance and advice on the strategic directions on the programme. However, the steering Committee is driven by feeding core tea and national school feeding coordinating team. Structurally, the federal government has budgeted to take care of the feeding of primary one to three while the state is being encouraged to cater for

the feeding of primary four to six. Essentially, all pupils in public primary schools are eligible. Operationally, the cooks are recruited and assigned pupils to feed. And once the cooks bank account is cleared; she is able to receive funds from the federal government and commence feeding in her assigned school. But if a cook is not cleared by the bank, she cannot receive funds or commence feeding. Here, the state government presents the total number of primary schools through the local government education authority to the committee as appropriate.

Indeed, the coordination of the NHGSFP is multi – sectorial with relevant stakeholder ministries collaborating in programme implementation. In otherwords, the mix of these ministries makes the national home grown school feeding team. Here, the ministries involved are education,

health, justice agriculture as well as budget and national planning. Again other supporting ministries include Women Affairs, Trade and Commerce. However, the stakeholders that form part of the monitoring and evaluation process include parents, school board management committee, community leaders, women group, health workers, developments partners, private sector partners, non – governmental and civil society organizations. Clearly, the enabling structure within the government is sub – divided into three levels:

(I) Federal level (oversight and standardization) support which is the federal level political support that deals with policy formation, standard setting, resource mobilization and oversight.

(II) State coordination (programmed designed and capacity needs) which is the state coordination that deals with the overall structure of public

administration in the state, existing capacity at different levels as well as programme type to be executed.

(III) Community (school) level for implementation and monitoring or dealing with implementation and community engagement. Here, the implementation is uniform across the schools.

As operational duration, the program

works five days a week; twelve weeks in a term; and nine months in a year. This is approximately 180 days in a year. Yet, the program operates once a day. Here, the food is prepared in accordance to the health and safety guidelines to meet the nutritional requirements of the home grown school feeding programme before serving the food to the children. Operationally, it was projected that the programme will feed about ten million primary pupils per day in grades one to three.

And with state government cooperation, another five million pupils in grades four to six will be involved. Notably, as at August 2017, a total of fourteen states had begun the NHGSFP.

These states include Osun, Ogun, Anambra, Enugu, Kaduna, Oyo, Zamafara, Ebonyi, Benue, Delta, Bauchi, Plateau, Abia and Taraba. Technically, participating states are required to carry out capacity building workshops, establish multi-sectorial terms as well as determining their model and delivery flow. Again, cook – pupil mapping and digital enumeration of pupils are to be carried out in all the states while verification and monitoring exercise conducted in all participating states.

5.0 METHODOLOGY

As a structural Framework, the home grown school feeding programme (HGSFP) is concerned with government primary school children together with their

household members in areas with inadequate food access. Therefore, HGSFP is expected to improve adequate access to food for deprived and vulnerable rural family units which will result in reduced poverty and malnutrition levels; enhance educational objectives comprising increasing school enrollment, attendance and retention, as well as school academic performance; and guarantees sustainable school feeding programme scheme. Essentially, the sourcing of locally produced food encourages small scale farmers to produce more of their farm produce to meet the local community schools' food demand that results to better farmers' household profits (Ferguson and Kepe, 2011). Again, since the HGSFP offers learners with food products sourced from the neighbor hoods, then one nourishing meal served per day could enhance better access to education for learners from rural areas characterize by reverse food scarcity

(Bundy, 2005). Thus, the intake of a high quality diet is vital for improved memory functions which results in enhanced educational effects (Brigg et-al, 2003). In other words, it is anticipated that both learners and their household members benefit from the HSGFP scheme.

Consequently, this program has the potential and capacity to boost the local economics of Nigeria (Ceteris Paribus).

Practically, an impact evaluation study seeks to establish and quantify how an intervention affects the outcomes that are at interest to analysts and policy makers. Thus, to establish causality between a program and outcome, we shall use impact evaluation methods to rule out the possibility that any factor other than the program of interest explain the observed impact (Gertler, et-al, 2011;

Nwaobi, 2018). Basically, the impact evaluation formula is given as;

$\propto = (y_1 / p = 1) - (y_0/p=0)$ (5.1)

Where $\propto$ causal impact

P programme

y Outcome

$(y_1 / p = 1)$ Outcome with the programme

$(y_0 / p = 0)$ Outcome without the programme.

Illustratively, if p denotes a school feeding program and y denotes participant educational performance; then the causal impact of the program ($\propto$) is the difference between the participant educational performance (y_1) after participating in the program (p = 1) and the same participant educational performance (y_0) without program participation (p = 0).

Therefore, by comparing the same individual with herself at the same moment; we would have managed to eliminate any outside factors that might have explained the difference in outcomes. Basically, a key goal of an impact evaluation is to identify a group of program participants (treatment group) and a group of non-participants (comparison group) that are statistically identical in the absence of the program. Thus, our key challenge is to identify a valid comparison group that has the same characteristics as the treatment group. And when the required conditions are met, only the existence of the intervention program HGSFP should explain any differences in the outcome (Y) between the two groups. Yet, it is important to note that the estimated impact ($\propto$) could be called "INTENTION-TO-TREAT" estimate (ITT) or "TREATMENT TO TREATED" (TDT).

Specifically, we shall assure as OLS regressions where the regress or of interest is the indicator of whether an eligible schools and participants were randomly selected to participate in the HGSFP program (treatment group) or not to participate in the program (control group). Here, the empirical regression is of the following form:

yi= $\propto$ + β Treatment Group i fXi + Σi (5.2)

Where yi = the outcome of interest such as class attendance, retention, academic performance for each school learners (i) in the sample.

$\propto$ = constant

Treatment = the indicator for being assigned to the treatment group (Treatment Group = 1) or control group (Treatment group = 0).

Xi = Vector of school learners characteristics (including locality, sex, age, ownership, curriculum, style, orphanage).

Clearly, the estimate of β from the regression equation (5.2) corresponds to an intention to treat (ITT) estimator. We shall also compute the effect of the HGSFP from regressions of the outcomes of interest as a function of actual participation in the program (D) of the following form:

yi = $\propto$ + βDi + fXi +ξi(5.3)

with participation (D) instrumented by the random assignment variable (Treatment Group).

As an impact evaluation analytical approach, we shall adopt Difference-in-Difference (DD) estimator as shown in figure S.I as well as mixed-effects models or multi-level

regression models so as to account for the hierarchical nature of the dataset.

Design Group	Baseline	Follow-up	Difference
Treatment	A	B	B-A
Control	C	D	D-C
Difference	A-D	B-C	DD=(B-A)-(D-C)
FIG. 5.1 DD ESTIMATOR SCHEME			

In general, the treatment-effect estimators can be formalized using the potential-outcomes framework or counter factual framework. As a potential outcome, consider a school that did not receive treatment so that we observe (y_0). Then, what would (y_1) be for the same school if it were exposed to treatment and hence (y_0) can be regarded as potential or counterfactual outcome for such treated school.

Consequently, treatment-effect estimators allow us to estimate three basic parameters:

I) The POTENTIAL-OUTCOME means (poms) representing the means of y1 and y0 in the population.

II) THE AVERAGE TREATMENT EFFECT (ATE) representing the mean of the difference (y_1-y_0)

III) THE AVERAGE TREATMENT EFFECT ON THE TREATED (ATET) representing the mean of the difference (y_1-y_0) among the schools that actually receive the treatment.

Essentially, estimating on ATE is a missing-data problem and when coronets that affect the potential outcomes are related to treatment; we cannot use a difference in sample means because of informative missing data. Therefore treatment effect modeling involves the adoption of different estimators to accomplish this task:

REGRESSION ADJUSTMENT (RA), INVERSE PROBABILITY WEIGHTING (IPW), DOUBLY ROBUST METHODS, MARCHING METHODS, ETC.

And for the Binary-treatment case, the two potential outcomes for each school are $y_0 i$ and $y_1 i$; where

$y_0 i$ = the outcome that would be obtained if I does not get the treatment.

$y_1 i$ = the outcome that would be obtained if I gets the treatment.

$y_0 i$ and $y_1 i$ = realizations of the random variables (y_0 and y_1).

i = realizations of the corresponding unscripted random variables.

Notably, the parameters of interest summarize the distribution of the unobservable school-level treatment effect (y_1 and y_0): where

t = random treatment

ti = treatment received by school i

(t=1) = treatment level

(t=0) = control level

Therefore, the ATE is the average effect of the treatment in the population:

ATE = E (y_1 and y_0) (5.4)

Again, the POM for treatment level (t) is the average potential outcome for that treatment level.

$$POM_t = E(Y_t) \quad (5.5)$$

While the ATET is the average treatment t effect among those that receive the treatment.

$$ATET = E(y_1 \text{ and } y_0) \qquad (5.6)$$

As a potential-outcome model, we specify that the observed outcome variable y is y_0 when t = 0 and that y is y_1 when t = 1. Numerically, we assume that

$$y = (1-t)y_0 + ty_1 \qquad (5.7)$$

With the functional forms for y_0 and y_1 as:

$$y_o = x'\beta_o + \varepsilon_o \qquad (5.8)$$

$$y_1 = x'\beta_1 + \varepsilon_1 \qquad (5.9)$$

Where β_o and β_1 = coefficients to be estimated.

ε_o and ε_1 = error terms that are not related to x or w

However, this potential-outcome model separates each potential outcome into a predictable component ($X\beta_t$) and an unobservable error term (ξ_t).

Thus, the treatment assignment process is

$t = \varepsilon_0^1$ if $w' r + n > 0$ (5.10)

otherwise

Where r = coefficient vector

N unobservable error tem that is not related to either x or w

w' r = predictable component

n = unobservable error term.

6.0 DATA COLLEGION PLAN

Technically, this research study will utilize a mix of methodological approach to collect primary and secondary data necessary for the impact evaluation of the programme. Basically, the primary data collection includes the following: obtaining information through structured interview; schedules; group interactions, participant observation and individual interviews with key actors (agents). In contrast, the secondary data collection will involve obtaining information through desktop reviews such as journals, books, periodicals, news,

bulleting published by the collaborating federal government institutions (online or in print). Specifically, the interview schedules will consist of the following sections as highlighted below. These include demographic characteristic; school enrolment; school attendance and lesson topics retention; food sources; health status; academic performance; number of times that students skipped school based on health status; food security and parent participation; improvement of income among local farmers and food vendors, as well as improvement of market access through supplying food products to relevant schools. Furthermore, secondary data collection may consist of school registers, stock book as well as school academic record books. Statistically, the data will be collected on a quarterly basis since the academic calendar runs for three terms of three months each. Basically, this will enhance credibility, reliability and consistency to the observed trends. Operationally, the data collection process is automated

and collected by the monitoring and evaluation unit of the NHGSFP. Thus, the data gathering and processing will be carried out in collaboration with the research team for the purpose of quality assurance.

REFERENCES

Adman, S.W. et.al. (2008) "How effective are food for education programmes. Critical assessment of the evidence from developing countries", IFPRI Food Policy Review No 9.

Angrist, J. et. al. (1996) "Identification of casual effects using instrumental variables", Journal of American statistical association Vol 91 (434)

Bamberger, M. (2006) Conducting Quality Impact Evaluation under the Time and Budget Constraints, Washington. World Bank

Bundy, D.A.P. et. al. (2009) Rethinking School Feeding, Social Safety nets, child development and education sector, Washington. World Bank.

Brigg et al (2003) "Missing…presumed at random: Cost-analysis of incomplete data" Health Economics, Vol 12(5) pp377-392

Espejo, F, et. al. (2009) Home – Grown School Feeding. A Framework for Action, Washington. United Nations World Food Programme.

Ferguson and Kepe (2011) Agricultural Cooperatives and Social empowerment of women: A Ugandan Case Study" Development in Practice 21(3) pp. 421-429

FGN (2018) Investing in our People Policy Brief, Abuja. Federal Government of Nigeria (FGN).

FME (2006) National School Health Policy, Abuja. Federal Ministry of Education (FME).

FMNP (2017) Nigeria. Economic Recovery and Growth Plan (2017 – 2020) Abuja. Federal Ministry of Budget and National Planning (FMNP).

Gertler, P.J. (2011) Impact Evaluation in Practice, Washington. World Bank.

Hall, R.E. and J.B. Taylor (1997) Macro – Economics, New York. Norton.

IFPRI (2009) Global Hunger Index. Facts and Findings, Washington. International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI).

Meier, G.M. and J.E. Stigliz (2001) Frontiers of Development Economics, New York. Oxford University Press.

NBS (2017) Nigeria. Sustainable development goods (indicators Baseline Report). Abuja. National Bureau of Statistics (NBS).

NPCC (2008) Nigeria Demographic and health Survey, Abuja. National Population Commission (NPC).

Nwaobi, G.C. (2001) Modern Econometric Modelling for developing Economies I Abuja. Good Times Press.

Nwaobi, G.C. (2018) Modern Econometric Modelling for developing Economies II Abuja. Vine Press

Olajide, D. et. al. (2014) "Randomized Evaluation of Unconditional cash Transfer Scheme for the Elderly in Ekiti State Nigeria" SEP Baseline Survey.

UNDP (2010) Human Development Report (The Real Wealth of Nations. Pathways to Human Development) Washington: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

Virod, T. et. al. (1991) Restructuring Economics in Distress, Oxford. Oxford University Press.

YESSO (2016) Targeting the Poor and Vulnerable in Nigeria. Use of a Single Register, Abuja Federal Operations Coordinating Unit.

APPENDIX: BUDGET RULE

NIGERIA NHGSFP IMPACT EVALUATION: BUDGET ESTIMATION

S/N	TASKS/RESOURCES	COST ($)	TOTAL ($)
(I)	STAFF: (A) Research Assistants (B) Data Entry (C) Sub Total	25,000.00 5,000.00	 30,000.00
(II)	TRAVEL: (A) Vehicles (B) Petrol (C) Sub Total	14,000.00 6,000.00	 20,000.00
(III)	SERVICES: (A) Software's (B) Secretarial (C) Sub Total	8,000.00 7,000.00	 15,000.00
(IV)	SUPPLIES: (A) Stationeries (B) Utilities (C) Sub Total	1,000.00 3,000.00	 4,000.00
(V)	Local Conference Participation	3,000.00	3,000.00
(VI)	Honorarium: Principal Researcher	16,000.00	16,000.00
(VII)	Materials Production	5,000.00	5,000.00
(IX)	Dissemination and Miscellaneous	5,500.00	5,500.00
(X)	**GRAND TOTAL**		**109,500.00**