



Terms of Reference

ADRA Norway is seeking proposals from relevant parties to take on the role of External Evaluator for the final evaluation of two of our **education programs** in line with the below Terms of Reference.

1. Background

ADRA Norway is one of the leading international education development and humanitarian organisations in Norway. Through our work, we strive to achieve equality, dignity and freedom for all, irrespective of their religious, political, social, ethical or national background. ADRA Norway prioritises both humanitarian and long-term relief and development work. It has a strong interest in the field of education and fragility, and works to strengthen its approaches in the development-humanitarian-peace nexus.

ADRA Norway has an integrated approach to education, by means of “whole school approach” that involves students, teachers, parents, the community and the government working together to enable all children to access a quality and inclusive education in both fragile and longer term development settings. ADRA employs a rights-based approach where, through partnerships with children, women, their families, civil society and government, we uplift the voices of the excluded and marginalised to be heard on issues that affect them. This builds mutual understanding between the rights holders and the duty bearers and promotes the rights of vulnerable groups to fully participate in and benefit from their societies.

ADRA Norway is a member of the international ADRA network with about 120 locally governed country offices, eight regional offices and an international network office. ADRA Norway works in direct partnership with local ADRA partners in developing countries to act as a catalyst for change, inspiring, engaging and empowering people to strive together to overcome poverty and injustice, and managing the risks and impacts of disasters.

2. Project background / context

1.Strengthening Equity, Access and Quality in Education (SEAQE2) (2019-2023) is implemented by The Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA) Norway in partnership with ADRA offices in Somalia, South Sudan, Ethiopia and Myanmar with financial support from Norad. It is the second phase of the SEAQE programme, building on the successes and learning from SEAQE 1 (2013 – 2018).

The overall goal of the programme is that *all learners are equipped with the attitudes and skills that will help them access opportunities and achieve their fullest potential*. The objective is that *all learners, regardless of background, ability and gender, equitably access, engage and learn in inclusive educational institutions*. These include primary and secondary schools, non-formal education and Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) in project countries. Overall, SEAQE2 works with 70,450 students (50% girls). SEAQE2 promotes inclusive, gender-responsive education; facilitates healthy, safe and protective learning environments with appropriate infrastructure, policies and action; strengthens effective teaching, learning and school management; engages students, families and communities as active participants in education; and builds civil society to hold government accountable for education systems, policies, practices and investment. Under SEAQE2, TVET has shifted from being supply-focused to demand-driven and competency-

based programs, with close links with private sector and a strong focus on blended learning. Cutting across SEAQE2 will be inclusion, gender equality, conflict sensitivity, resilience and child protection. Outcomes and outputs are described in the Annex 1. SEAQE2 Results Framework.

2. Education in Emergency (EiE) in Upper Nile, South Sudan (2020-2023) is implemented by ADRA Norway in partnership with ADRA South Sudan.

The main objective of the EiE Upper Nile program is that all learners, regardless of background, ability and gender, equitably access, engage in and learn in inclusive educational institutions. The program targets areas of Maiwut and Nasir of Upper Nile. The primary beneficiaries targeted by the project include 9,507 Conflict-affected children, their parents, teachers and communities.

3. Purpose/Objectives of the evaluation

The purpose of this external and independent evaluation is to assess to what extent has the SEAQE2 and EiE programs had an impact on inclusion, access to education and quality of education services. Particular attention will be paid to stakeholder’s perspectives, engagement and ownership, with a focus on children, parents (and PTA/SMCs), teachers, head teachers, civil society organizations and education authorities. The evaluation will take place in Somalia, Ethiopia, South Sudan and Myanmar. Exceptions, will be considered when the current context does not allow data collection.

Additionally, the study will assess students learning outcomes using literacy and numeracy ACER tests.

The final evaluation should identify key learning to inform future policy and programming. The findings from the evaluation will primarily be used by:

- ADRA Norway, project partners and stakeholders to understand the impact to date of the project and to inform future programming with a special focus on the inclusion of vulnerable groups, gender and protection.
- the community, project partners and implementing country governments to inform their own support to beneficiaries and to support systemic change.
- ADRA Norway and partners to share learning and recommendations with the communities, schools and beneficiaries with whom the project works and ensure meaningful accountability to these stakeholder groups.
- ADRA Norway to demonstrate accountability for the funding received from Norad.
- The ADRA network, academic institutions and education networks to inform learning and wider policy debates concerning the education for marginalised children in these four countries.

4. Evaluation questions

The evaluation should include findings and recommendations based on the OECD DAC evaluation criteria¹ listed below. The evaluation questions have been set collaboratively by ADRA Norway and country partners, but there will be an opportunity for them to be further refined and prioritized during the inception phase of the evaluation.

Evaluation criteria	Main evaluation questions and sub-questions for both SEAQE and EiE
Relevance	To what extent did the projects meet its objectives, including the underlying theory of change?

¹ <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

	<p>Sub-questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How did different components of the projects promote equity and inclusion? • How have the projects worked to protect children and youth? • What did the projects teams learn? • What has worked or not worked for learners with disabilities learning (according to their perspective)?
Efficiency	<p>To what extent did the projects deliver value for money?</p> <p>Sub question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were the projects implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?
Effectiveness	<p>To what extent were the objectives and intended results of the projects achieved?</p> <p>Sub questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives and intended results? • How relevant and practical were trainings provided by the program to teachers' performance (teachers' perspective)? • Were there any in-service teacher training approaches that were piloted, that are promising and can be scaled?
Impact	<p>To what extent did the projects generate or contribute to the generation of higher-level effects (social, environmental and economic), whether positive or negative, intended or unintended?</p> <p>Sub-questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which elements of the program have had the greatest impact on gender equality and inclusion, and which the least? • Does the program avoid creating tensions within the community (between different ethnic groups or between different non-state actors within the area)?
Sustainability ²	<p>It is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially sustainable.</p> <p>Sub-questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent will the benefits of the programmes continue after donor funding ceases? • What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability? • Has the program had any intended or unintended impact on the environment? • To what extent have different stakeholders, especially communities, and civil society organizations been empowered by the project?

² Sustainability is about delivering and enabling long lasting empowerment for learners through education, for current and future generations, by working with learners, families, communities, schools and systems and creating enabling environments for change. For SEAQE2, sustainable change and impact should be embedded in the Theory of Change.

5. Scope of work, methodology and approach

A combination of existing and new data is needed to measure the impact of ADRA's inputs in SEAQE2 and EiE. The projects have extensive monitoring data available for all indicators. Additionally, the evaluation team will collect additional data using qualitative methods, ensuring in-depth analysis of status of objective, outcome and output indicators. Qualitative methods, primarily key informant interviews, and focus group discussions will be the main methods used by the Evaluation Team and partners to collect data for the assessment. Stakeholders include, among others, students, community members and leaders, PTA/SMCs, teachers and head teachers, education officials at relevant levels including school inspectors, ADRA partners and other local NGOs working in the area. We expect that the new data that need to be collected will be rather minimal, with exceptional to the literacy and numeracy ACER tests.

The Evaluation Team should ensure the evaluation is conducted in a participatory manner and that the exercise enables participating staff to gain useful data collection and analysis skills. Children (including children living with disabilities), SMCs and PTAs, education officials and authorities, ADRA, and other stakeholders should be meaningfully and fully involved in the survey. The Evaluation Team is expected to coordinate planning, data collector training, tool testing, data collection and analysis. The methodology to be proposed by the Evaluation Team in the technical proposal will be reviewed by ADRA Norway who will approve it prior to commencement. ADRA Norway recommends that data collection is conducted by the staff of implementing partners, to the extent possible. This should be included in the proposals by interested candidates.

Bidders are invited to take note of the following when outlining their proposed evaluation approach:

Qualitative research: Qualitative data is a crucial element of the evaluation and is expected to provide insights into why and how change has happened. We will expect the Evaluation Team to articulate a detailed qualitative methodology in their proposal, including how qualitative data will be fully integrated into the analysis.

Using existing MEAL data: The Evaluation Team will need to consider how they extract data relevant to answering the research questions from the data already captured across the monitoring, evaluation, accountability and learning (MEAL) tools and in target schools. The Evaluation Team will be expected to draw on existing project monitoring (which will be made available) and data from the Mid-term Review (MTR) that was completed a year ago to inform the evaluation and should outline a broad approach to doing so in their submission. ADRA Norway will work with the successful Evaluation Partner to identify any new methods of data capture required.

Measuring learning: Learning remains a core outcome of the SEAQE2 and EiE projects. We expect that the evaluation team can collect data on math and literacy using ACER tests. This can be done by project staff or local enumerators that the ADRA partners will facilitate and pay independently from this task. However, the Evaluation Team is not expected to assess learning outcomes by administering ACER tests to a statistically significant sample of children. Alternative approaches could be explored to demonstrating the project's impacts upon learners within a distance learning model and throughout a period of fragmented educational facilitation. ADRA Norway hopes to find an evaluation team that has past experience in administering ACER or similar test and reserves the right to not include this task as part of the contract.

Integrating gender-sensitive and participatory methods for working with marginalised children, and children living with disabilities: The Evaluation Team should integrate methods tailored to working with marginalised children and children with disabilities, including creative and participatory

ways to engage beneficiaries in the process of gathering and interpreting data. The design and implementation of the evaluation must adhere to ADRA Norway's safeguarding policies, policies on child protection and ethical standards in monitoring, evaluation, accountability and learning. Within the proposal, the Evaluation Team will need to clearly outline their approach to managing and reporting safeguarding risks, including suspected or actual cases of abuse.

Responsibility of the project:

1. To provide the project proposal, logframe, Theory of Change, MEAL Framework, other evaluations and reviews, reports and other relevant documents;
2. Overview of the project, list of communities and schools per district;
3. Contact list of key program staff available locally;
4. Support identifying suitable local enumerators if needed;
5. Support in setting up introductory meetings with relevant stakeholders and communities;
6. Data collection logistics support and constraints (school timings, holidays, testing schedules, access to respondent groups, etc.), as required;
7. Collaborative workshops with Evaluation Team to finalise evaluation questions and methodology;

Responsibility of the External Evaluator/s:

1. Submit a full list of contacts for all staff involved in the Evaluation Team during the inception meeting;
2. Describe the overall evaluation approach, prior evaluation reports and available datasets;
3. Collaborate with the project and contracting authority to agree on evaluation questions;
4. Identify options for methodologies and possible tools for the agreed evaluation questions;
5. Design or modify tools where necessary, in consultation with the ADRA Norway MEAL staff and secure approval for all data collection tools;
6. Report any safeguarding or child protection concerns as soon as possible and within 24 hours to the ADRA Norway Safeguarding Focal Points;³
7. Perform child protection and safeguarding background checks on all their staff involved in evaluation activities, including contractors;
8. Submit (by email) to the ADRA Norway MEAL Advisor weekly progress reports during the evaluation period, summarising activities / tasks completed to date (% achieved), challenges and mitigation strategies, time spent, etc.;
9. Run analysis of the findings and produce reports which sufficiently explore and explain the results;
10. Develop and agree on a reporting structure and format with ADRA Norway, including early presentations of emerging findings and produce any other relevant dissemination materials, and share findings with the partners;
11. Review the project's self-reporting of achievements and progress towards lasting impact, including through the collection of evidence to triangulate the project's claims;
12. Conduct a thorough desk review, including examining available data from prior evaluations and from monitoring, from other country-specific reports and activities to inform tools, analysis, reporting.

For fieldwork, please note these may not all be appropriate based on the context at the time of data collection:

13. Contact the ADRA Norway MEAL Advisor on a daily basis during the fieldwork stage of the evaluation;
14. Train enumerators for the assessment;

³ Relevant contact details will be shared with the External Evaluator once appointed.

15. Make own logistical arrangements to reach the selected schools and / or communities and organise interviews and ensure full logistical support for the entire exercise across all districts;
16. Ensure individual data collection reports outlining progress achieved and any challenges are completed by enumerators and that these are compiled into an overall data collection report

6. Country field visits

We expect the Evaluation Team to work with in-country partners who can access the communities we work with. We would expect the successful Evaluation Partner to demonstrate flexibility and creativity in adapting the evaluation approach as necessary to respond to existing circumstances, while ensuring that the evaluation fulfils the fundamental requirements of research questions and methodology requirements outlined above.

7. Ethics and risk management

Research ethics plan: Bidders are required to set out their approach to ensuring complete compliance with international good practice relating to research ethics and protocols, particularly with regards to safeguarding children and vulnerable groups (including girls and people with disabilities). Consideration should be given to:

- Administrative, technical and physical safeguards to protect the confidentiality of those participating in research;
- Safeguards for those conducting research;
- Do No Harm safeguards for children participating in research, including child-safe physical safeguards as well as emotional/psychosocial safeguards;
- Appropriate time allocated to engage with children participating in the research;
- Parental or caregiver consent concerning data collection from children or collation of data about children;
- Age- and ability-appropriate assent processes based on reasonable assumptions about comprehension for the ages of children and the disabilities they intend to involve in the research;
- Appropriate spaces and methodologies tailored in consideration of unique needs of girls and boys, including those with disabilities and for vulnerable adults;
- Appropriate language and communication for different ages and the disabilities of children involved in the research.

Ethical approval will need to be secured from ADRA Norway before data collection activities can commence. This will include the submission of complete research tools and protocols. Further information will be provided to the successful Evaluation Partner.

Risk management plan: It is important the successful Evaluation Partner has taken all reasonable measures to mitigate any potential risks to research participants and the delivery of the required outputs for this evaluation. Therefore, the Evaluation Team should submit a comprehensive risk management plan covering:

- Specific safeguarding risks (for both children and adults) and mitigating strategies, including reference to the child protection policy and procedures that will be in place;
- Health and safety issues that may require significant duty of care precautions, with particular consideration paid to risks relating to COVID-19.

8. Planning and deliverables

The deadline for proposals is 27 October, 2023. It is expected a contractor will be selected on or before 10 November, 2023.

The successful contractor will provide the following deliverables against the following suggested timeline (to be agreed in the inception phase):

Item	Description	Timeframe
1	Inception report	15 December 2023
2	Tools, mapping of tools and available data to evaluation questions and logframe, sampling frame	15 December 2023
3	Presentation of emerging findings to ADRA Norway, proposed report outline submitted for feedback	15 February 2024
4	Evaluation report, including annexes	28 February 2024

The draft and final evaluation report should be no longer than 50 pages, excluding the executive summary and annexes. The report should indicatively be structured as follows:

- Executive summary
- Introduction
- Description of the project, including the Theory of Change
- Overview of the evaluation approach, the evaluation methodology and methods used, including limitations and challenges (detailed methodology to be provided in annex)
- Findings
- Conclusions and recommendations
- Annexes

All reports should be submitted in electronic form and should be submitted in English.

In addition to the above:

1. Applicants are required to provide a **detailed workplan** incorporating all relevant tasks and milestones of the evaluation, from start to finish; they are also required to include in their detailed workplans the milestones set out below (please note final dates will be confirmed once evaluators are recruited and initial discussions are scoped with the Evaluation Team).
2. The Evaluation Team will be required to deliver an online **presentation** of the evaluation findings, as an integral part of the submission process. An in-country presentation is desirable; however, an online interactive webinar may also be considered given the current context.
3. Other **communication materials** for dissemination are encouraged. The project is particularly interested in materials which will help us feed back to the beneficiaries and communities we work alongside, engaging stakeholders more widely. These will be agreed with the project team during the inception phase.
4. **Final Data Collection Tools** – The Evaluation Team and ADRA Norway will work collaboratively on all methods of data capture for the evaluation. At the end of the evaluation, the Evaluation Team will be expected to return these tools to ADRA Norway, including a clean copy of all data collection tools developed and used in the study.

5. **Cleaned Data Set (including transcripts)** – The Evaluation Team will be expected to provide a fully ‘cleaned-up and anonymised’ dataset for both the qualitative and quantitative aspects of the evaluation.

13. General guidelines, submission and selection criteria

A technical proposal and a financial proposal should be submitted in two separate PDF documents to with the subject line “Confidential proposal for Final Evaluation of SEAQE2 and EIE”.

The deadline for proposals is 27 October 2023, COB, Norwegian time to the following email address: elidon.bardhi@adranorge.no. Questions can be asked throughout the pre-submission planning phase. Technical proposals should, as a minimum, include a section on:

- i. Background and contract management capacity of the evaluator
- ii. Understanding of the terms of reference
- iii. Proposed approach and methodology
- iv. Proposed methods and sampling
- v. Workplan including deliverables
- vi. Proposed team including roles and responsibilities and time-input allocation for each team members, as well as CVs of each member of the Evaluation Team (no more than 3 pages), detailing relevant skills and experience including any examples of published research
- vii. Quality Assurance plan that sets out the systems and processes for quality assuring the evaluation and research process and deliverables of the project from start to finish
- viii. Ethics and Child Safeguarding approaches: applicants are required to set out their approach to ensuring complete compliance with international good practice with regards to research ethics and protocols
- ix. Risk Management plan
- x. Relevant annexes that further substantiate the technical bid, including but not limited to:
 - a. Two examples of relevant previous work undertaken by the Evaluation Team (involving both quantitative and qualitative analysis);
 - b. References: Please provide two references who we may contact to discuss experiences of working with you

The currency of the financial proposal is in NOK, USD or EURO. Please assure that the technical proposal does not refer to any financial figures of the bid.

All eligible proposals will be assessed based on this Terms of Reference and awarded scores following objective technical criteria under four categories. The weighting for each criterion is given in brackets.

- A. Expertise of the firm or consultant (15%)
 - Minimum of 10 years of experience in conducting programmatic evaluations in the development sector.
 - Strong experience in education, gender, inclusion and international development programme evaluations.
 - Experience with Norad funding is desirable.
- B. Proposed approach, methodology and workplan (30%)
 - The technical proposal should include and clearly articulate the approach, methodology and methods proposed for the evaluation.
 - The proposal should include a clear workplan with roles and responsibilities and allocation of days for different team members specified.
- C. Qualifications and experience of the Evaluation Team (35%)

- All core team members should have at least an advanced university degree in education, international development or social sciences; or significant experience within the sector.
- The team should have experience of:
 - The global discourse on SDGs, and education 2030 agenda.
 - Experience in evaluating programmes in the context of least developed country settings; the Evaluation Team should be able to demonstrate they have the appropriate language skills within their wider team to conduct the research required in the context.
 - Specialised thematic expertise on the subject matter evaluated, i.e. gender in education, quality in education, teacher development, safe learning environment, inclusive education.
 - Proficiency in English in the core team is mandatory. Proficiency in [national language(s) to be added by the project] in the wider team is an advantage.
 - Strong research capacity including rigorous quantitative and qualitative data collection, analysis and data visualisation skills.
 - Conducting research with children using interactive, child-friendly and participatory methodologies.
 - Conducting research with persons with disabilities, including children: experience with the Washington Group methodology would be particularly appreciated.
 - Conducting gender-sensitive research methods
 - Experience of alternative forms of impact assessment is desired
 - Strong interactive presentation and workshop facilitation skills
 - Strong English reporting skills
 - Strong communication, inter-personal, people and team management skills to facilitate a smooth process of the evaluation.
- The team leader should have a minimum of 15 years of professional evaluation experience in programme/policy evaluation in education or international development, as well as oral and writing skills in English of the highest standard.
- A gender balanced team of international and national experts is strongly desired.
- Experts can only be part of one proposal for these terms of reference. Contractors can only submit one proposal.

D. Pricing (20%)

The budget should include all costs. Travel in-country to the field by SEAQE2 partners, where appropriate and within reason, is covered by ADRA Norway. The budget should provide details so that costs of expertise, travel and other expenses are visible. The costing should be done for the data collection scenarios described in Section 9 above.

The budget should specify clearly how much the literacy and numeracy ACER tests and their analysis will cost, and bidders should be ready to accept a contract excluding this component.

The proposed payment schedule is:

- 20% at approval of inception report
- 40% at approval of draft evaluation report
- 40% at approval of final evaluation report

Annexes

Annex 1: 2021 SEAQE2 Results Framework

Annex 2: 2021 EiE Results Framework

Annex 3: Theory of Change