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16. **Introduction**

* **Title of the intervention:** “SAFE SPACE: comprehensive psychosocial support to war-affected Ukrainian schools
* **Duration:** 23rd December 2022 – 22nd December 2023 (12 months).
* **Evaluation type:** Final External Evaluation.
* **Organization’s name:** Fundación Plan International España.
* **Name of Local counterpart:** Plan International Ukraine and Words Help.
* **Reference project:** 2022/AHE/0000600010

These Terms of Reference (ToR) define the details for the final technical external evaluation of the above-mentioned project implemented by the organization Fundación Plan International España jointly with Plan International Ukraine and Words Help in Ukraine. The main donor of this project is the Spanish Cooperation Agency (AECID), which has funded 571.000 EUR out of 600.000 EUR granted for this project (which includes 29.000 EUR funded by Fundación Plan International España) in the framework of the call for proposal for Humanitarian Actions in Emergencies launched in 2022. The project period is 12 months, from 23 December 2022 to 22 December 2023.

Overall, Plan International strives to advance children’s rights and equality for girls all over the world. As an independent development and humanitarian organization, we work alongside children, young people, our supporters and partners to tackle the root causes of the challenges facing girls and all vulnerable children. We support children’s rights from birth until they reach adulthood and enable children to prepare for and respond to crises and adversity. We drive changes in practice and policy at local, national and global levels using our reach, experience and knowledge. For over 80 years we have been building powerful partnerships for children, and we are active in over 75 countries.

Plan International Ukraine is part of the global federation of Plan International and was registered as a National Organization in 2022 to operate in Ukraine, while Words Help aim to improve the quality of life for Ukrainians by enhancing the level of mental health, providing psychological education, and developing sustainable support models. Its specialists will help you navigate through stressful life situations, deal with complex emotions, and improve your well-being along Ukraine.

This project is part of Fundación Plan International España´s global response to the Ukraine crisis, following the outbreak of the conflict on 24 February 2022, which also include another AECID and a Madrid City Council funded projects both in Ukraine and in Moldova. This project that is implemented in the eastern areas of the country, specifically in the recently liberated rural areas where needs are higher, focuses on Education in Emergencies with the objective to address protection and education needs as well as to improve the present and future lives and the resilience of children and young people affected by crisis. The project´s outcomes are in line with the Ukrainian Ministry of Education and Science (MoEs) and Service for Quality Education (SSQ)´s response strategy and priorities to: 1. contribute to support schools to improve their services in MHPSS and create safe learning spaces for students, 2. strengthen resilience and well-being among learners, 3. enhance psychosocial response capacity of 400 schools during the conflict in Ukraine and 4. ensure access to quality humanitarian assistance in the education in emergencies sector for the war-affected population in Ukraine.

1. **Purpose of the evaluation and background**

**2.1 Project Objective**

The overall objective of the AECID funded project in Ukraine is **to contribute to ensure access to quality humanitarian assistance in the education in emergency sector for the war-affected population in Ukraine.**

In order to achieve the above objective, the project aims to reach 3.000 children and adolescents, 2.500 teachers (80% women), 100 school psychologists, 3.000 families/caregivers of children and 35 professional trainers of the "Safe Spaces" methodology from all over Ukraine, through the following specific objective, results and activities:

Specific Objective:

Strengthening resilience and well-being of students of 400 schools in conflict-affected schools in Ukraine.

Results:

* R1: Learning environments are safe and promote the protection and psychosocial well-being of learners, teachers and other education personnel.
* R2: Support and strengthen the monitoring mechanisms established through the project for teachers, learners, other education staff and trainers and ensure they work effectively.

Activities:

* Provide integrated Child Protection, Education and basic psychosocial support and access to available services to children and adolescents, young people and adults through support centers and mobile teams.
* Provide Specialized Mental Health Psychosocial Support and access to legal services to children, adolescents, their parents/caregivers and most vulnerable adults in the targeted communities.
* Provide capacity-building sessions on “Safe Space” methodology to teachers and school psychologists.
* Facilitate regular coordination meetings with local and national authorities, including representatives of the Ministry of Education and Science (MoEs).
* Distribution of school and PSS kits to teachers and students.
* Carry out multiple awareness building sessions with children and adolescents, young people and adults, including teachers on children rights, Child Protection, Sexual and Gender Based Violence (SGBV) and MHPPS risks, Education, PSEA and Code of Conduct.

**2.2 Overarching Evaluation Objective**

The Final External Evaluation is a contractual requirement as indicated in Section VI. 4 - Evaluations of the Resolution of 24 March 2009 and 31 October 2011 of the Presidency of the Spanish Agency for International Cooperation, which also outlines the rules for management, monitoring and reporting of humanitarian and development cooperation projects granted to non-governmental organizations by AECID, in addition to the requirements indicated in the AECID Call for Proposal for this specific project. This evaluation is to assess the performance of the project and capture project achievements, challenges and promising practises to inform future projects. It will also review the recommendations of the outcome monitoring exercise and assess the extent to which these were implemented

The overall objective for conducting a final external evaluation is:

* To comply with the requirements of the AECID and specifically concerning the Humanitarian funded project, which foresees a final external evaluation for reasons of transparency and accountability.
* To comply with Plan International best practices and leverage the results of the final evaluation to: 1. Increase the quality of aid provided by Plan International and its partners according to the organizations’ missions, 2. Enhance transparency and accountability towards the affected populations we serve, including local and national authorities and all the stakeholders involved in this project and 3. Broaden the organizations´ knowledge and learning by identifying best practices and added value across the different projects to inform response strategies and future programming.

Specifically, the purpose of this evaluation is to assess the performance of the intervention against the OECD DAC criteria for humanitarian action, including cross-cutting issues and potential additional criteria as well as to measure the organizations adherence to standards and best practices in terms of processes and quality of the implementation of project activities and the level of achievement of the planned project results/objective. For this reason, the evaluation shall be conducted through an evidence-based approach and analysis of data collected from a range of different stakeholders, in order to assess the, among others, the relevance of the project design, participation/involvement of local counterparts and affected population, ownership of the intervention, effective and efficient management of the resources, quality of the implementation and potential impact on the on beneficiaries (direct and indirect) as well as any challenges that might have arose during the implementation period and that might have affect the achievement of the proposed objective.

Moreover, the evaluation shall put emphasis on assessing specific technical aspects of the project, linked to the sectorial objectives, including: impact on/improvement of resilience and psychological well-being of school-age children in the targeted schools, improvement in terms of teachers’ capacity to address specific needs of the targeted school-age children and ensure a protective and inclusive education environment as well as gendered impacts and aspects that have been incorporated to ensure a gender and age responsive intervention.

Recommendations/results from the evaluation are expected to be shared internally as well as with partners and among different stakeholders that have been involved in the project, to inform future response strategies and ultimately improve the quality, efficiency and effectiveness of internal processes both for existing and future programming.

1. **Target groups**

The target group for this evaluation shall comprise a variety of stakeholders directly involved in the project at different levels (list below) and selected taking into consideration gender, age and inclusion-specific differentiation/aspects so to allow the collection of sex, age and disability-disaggregated information using a mix of different methods (both quantitative and qualitative analysis).

Key stakeholders:

* Direct and Indirect beneficiaries of the project affected by the Ukraine crisis, including children, adolescent, youth and adults/families (persons with disabilities, LGBTI+ community and any other group that shall be deemed necessary to be included for this evaluation) from both IPDs and Host population,
* Teachers and other education personnel, including PTAs, school psychologists and “Safe Space” trainers of targeted schools.
* Plan International Ukraine and Word Help personnel.
* Any national/local authority/institution representatives, specifically in education sector (i.e. Ukrainian Ministry of Education and Science (MoEs) and Service for Quality Education (SSQ), as well as any other relevant organizations/associations/service providers that have been involved/coordinating with Plan/Word Help during the implementation of the project.

**Evaluation Monitoring Committee/Unit:**

The evaluation process will be supervised by an Evaluation Monitoring Committee/Unit that shall be formed of Plan International Ukraine and Plan International Spain.

The Evaluation Monitoring Committee/Unit will be in charge of the overall evaluation process, which includes:

* Ensuring effective coordination with the evaluation teams and among the different stakeholders that will be involved in the process,
* Guaranteeing the overall quality and compliance with the evaluation requirements, including the validation of the final draft of the evaluation including the dissemination of findings and recommendations.
* Supporting and facilitating the field work that will be carried out by the evaluation teams, including contributing to the design and planning of the evaluation process as well as guaranteeing logistic, communication and safety and security aspects are taken into consideration and agreed upon before, during and after the evaluation exercise.

1. **Scope of the evaluation**

The final external evaluation shall cover a period of 12 months from the start of the project on 23rd December 2022 until the end of the project on 22nd December 2023. The evaluation will cover targeted locations along Ukraine:

The final evaluation will cover the main areas of intervention/activities (list below) and will assess the achievement of the project´s indicators, results and objectives in accordance with the approved logical framework/proposal, including cross-cutting aspects such as gender, age and inclusion, accountability towards the affected population, protection as well as potential environmental sustainability aspects incorporated into the project.

The main areas/activities that will be included in the evaluation are, but not limited to:

* Provide integrated Child Protection, Education and basic psychosocial support and access to available services to children and adolescents, young people and adults through support centers and mobile teams.
* Provide Specialized Mental Health Psychosocial Support and access to legal services to children, adolescents, their parents/caregivers and most vulnerable adults in the targeted communities.
* Provide capacity-building sessions on “Safe Space” methodology to teachers and school psychologists.
* Facilitate regular coordination meetings with local and national authorities, including representatives of the Ministry of Education and Science (MoEs).
* Distribution of school and PSS kits to teachers and students.

Carry out multiple awareness building sessions with children and adolescents, young people and adults, including teachers on children rights, Child Protection, Sexual and Gender Based Violence (SGBV) and MHPPS risks, Education, PSEA and Code of Conduct

1. **Evaluation questions and criteria**
   1. **Project indicators**

The evaluation will consider the following project indicators included in the logical framework of the project:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Specific objective:**  Strengthening resilience and well-being of students of 400 schools in conflict-affected schools in Ukraine. | * **SO1:** 400 schools across Ukraine benefit from the Project and include tailored gender, and age sensitive Psychosocial Support Services for learners, teachers and psychologists.      * **SO2:** 90% of the children, adolescents and teachers involved in the project report the interventions/services received are adequate, effective and adapted to their needs and provided in gender and age responsive manner. * **SO3:** # of individuals (60% F – 40% M) that have received adapted psychosocial support services to their needs and report are now better equipped to cope with emotional/psychological distress due to the on-going conflict |
| **Result 1:**  Learning environments are safe and promote the protection and psychosocial well-being of learners, teachers and other education personnel. | * **R1.1:** 2.500 teachers (60% female) benefit from continuous capacity building o “Safe Spaces” and they apply the methodology during their classes. * **R1.2:** 100 psychologist received specialized training sessions to adapt their professional skills and knowledge to the current conflict situation and the traumas resulting from it. * **R1.3:** 80% decrease in emotional and behavioral symptoms among students. * **R1.4:** 90% of learners (55% girls) who participate in psychological sessions improve their resilience. |
| **Result 2:**  Support and strengthen the monitoring mechanisms established through the project for teachers, learners, other education staff and trainers and ensure they work effectively. | * **R2.1:** Six coordination meetings have been held with the Ministry of Education and school staff. * **R2.2:** School staff, including teachers and psychologists, have gender- and age-appropriate tools and an understanding of the gender-differentiated impact on mental and psychosocial health. * **R2.3:** School psychologists have age- and gender-appropriate and inclusive kits to carry out recreational and PSS activities with children and adolescents. * **R2.4:** Programme trainers and staff involved say they feel good and motivated to continue providing psychosocial support and mental health work in emergencies. |

* 1. **Evaluation criteria and expected outcomes**

The evaluation exercise seeks to assess the following criteria: Relevance/Appropriateness, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Coherence, Coverage, Impact, Connectedness/Sustainability and Coordination, as well as cross-cutting aspects in line with the AECID´s policy and requirements concerning the evaluations of the Spanish Cooperation funded projects as well as Humanitarian OECD DAC Criteria:

**Relevance/Appropriateness:** to measure to what extent the project was in line with local needs and priorities (as well as donor policy) and to which extent the humanitarian activities are tailored to local needs, increased ownership, accountability and cost-effectiveness accordingly.

Examples of guiding questions:

* *Was a needs analysis carried out, in which the needs of men, women, boys and girls were identified?*
* *Did the intervention take into account the livelihood and capacities of the target group?*
* *Were interventions in some cases more relevant and more appropriate than in other cases?*
* *Do interventions meet evolving needs and are appropriate to crisis contexts?*
* *To what extent the project took into consideration and addressed the needs, priorities and capacities of the affected population/target group, especially women, girls and other vulnerable groups?*
* *Have women and girls’ needs, priorities and interests been assessed and taken into account?*
* *Have existing gender policies been analysed and included in the project?*
* *Have gender roles/norms been taken into account to facilitate different group participation?*
* *Have target group priorities changed during implementation? If so, has the intervention been adapted to new needs?*
* *How does the intervention align with ongoing government initiatives on education, especially to promote girls school attendance and retention?*
* *Have levels of exchange with different local organisations been prioritized to ensure the relevance of the activities to be developed?*

1. **Effectiveness:** to measure the extent to which the project´s activities achieved their purposes, or whether this can be expected to happen on the basis of the outputs. Implicit within this criterion of effectiveness is timeliness

Examples of guiding questions:

* *How was the decision taken regarding these results or objectives? Was a needs analysis conducted?*
* *To what extent have the objectives been achieved or not?*
* *Were the objectives clearly defined?*
* *Who participated in the decision-making process and the project planning phase?*
* *To what extent were the originally defined objectives of the project realistic?*
* *To what extent do they still meet the most recent requirements and the most recent standard of knowledge?*
* *Have other unintended effects been achieved?*
* *Do target group´s perceptions show that outcomes are meeting efficiency as framed by their needs?*
* *Were the selection criteria for the project’s target areas and beneficiaries justified on independent needs-based and principled approach?*
* *Did the interventions reach the target population?*
* *Are the statements of the main target group on the attainment of goals identical with the opinions of the actors having provided humanitarian assistance (e.g. employees of the respective organisation)?*
* *Have goods, services or other subsidies been delivered or offered at the right time according to the main target group?*
* *Have the interventions contributed to strengthening the core potentials of the target groups with regard to new risks?*

1. **Efficiency:** to measurethe extent to which resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) were converted to results. This requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving an output, to see whether the most efficient approach has been used. Examples of guiding questions:

* *Are the objectives achieved in a cost-efficient manner by the project?*
* *How big is the efficiency or utilisation ratio of the utilised resources?*
* *Is the relationship between input of resources and results achieved appropriate and justifiable?*
* *What is the cost-benefit ratio?*
* *To what extent have individual resources been used economically?*
* *Were there any alternatives identified for achieving the same results with less inputs/funds?*
* *Have the initial approved budget for the project been used in an efficient manner?*
* *To what extent timelines/deadlines set throughout the project been respected?*
* *What were the internal and external factors/constraints that have affected the project implementation and that were not foreseen in the project design?*
* *Were the human resources involved in the project already trained in human rights, gender, code of conduct, PSEAH, etc. and available to implement the actions? And if this was not possible, have the human resources recruited been trained in these aspects?*
* *Has the budget been adapted to the needs of the project incorporating gender and inclusion aspects?*

1. **Coherence:** to measure to what extent the project/objectives were coherent with humanitarian policies and standards, to ensure that there is consistency/complementarity with and, in particular, that they take into account humanitarian and human rights considerations.

Examples of guiding questions:

* *How was coordination (coherence) achieved, and/or why was there a lack in coherence?*
* *What political factors were specifically responsible for the coordination of assistances or relief items or what made the latter more difficult?*
* *Is coherence necessary or feasible in the present situation at all?*
* *To what extent were the cultural and socioeconomic aspects, including movement of population were considered in the design and implementation of the intervention?*
* *To what extent was the project coherent with key policies and programmes of other partners/stakeholders operating within the same context?*
* *How the proposal was aligned to the government priorities, especially regarding education in this context as outlined by local and national authorities?*

1. **Coverage:** to measure to what extent project needed to reach major population groups facing life-threatening risk wherever they are. Coverage is to be viewed in connection with effectiveness.

Examples of guiding questions:

* *Who was supported by the humanitarian interventions?*
* *Which groups were taken into account and which not and id the project reach the most vulnerable population?*
* *What were the main reasons for certain parts of the target groups having received support and protection and others having been excluded?*
* *To what extent have the different activities timely and adequately, taking into account the different impacts of the crisis to men, women, girls and boys (including people with disabilities) benefited the most vulnerable groups?*

1. **Impact:** to measure to what extent the wider effects of the project – social, economic, technical, and environmental – on individuals, gender- and age-groups, communities and institutions. Impacts can be intended and unintended, positive and negative, macro (sector) and micro (household).

Examples of guiding questions:

* *Did unexpected overarching (positive or negative) long-term effects occur? / Were there any intended and unintended overarching impacts (positive or negative)? If yes, what were they and what steps were taken in response?*
* *What are the immediate and long-term changes in the education, mental health and psychological well-being of the target population generated by the project?*
* *Were specific monitoring mechanisms put in place to assess that assistance was provided in independent manner and based on needs, taking into consideration “Do No Harm” principle, socio-cultural and physical accessibility, inclusion and participation?*

1. **Connectedness (also sustainability):** to assess the need to ensure that activities of a short-term emergency nature are carried out in a context that takes longer-term and interconnected problems into account (including nexus approach).

Examples of guiding questions:

* *Does a sensible exit strategy exist including schedule and guidelines for the transfer of responsibility and activities to government departments and/or development organisations?*
* *Is there a budget scenario for the time after the assistance?*
* *What influence did already existing networks have (e.g. national and international non-governmental organisations) on the implemented interventions?*
* *Has the project responded to the short-term humanitarian needs the capacity to be extended over time? Has it created durable structures/capacities?*
* *To what extent were local capacities developed or strengthened through the humanitarian interventions?*
* *Were any NEXUS strategies used and if so, were they adequate and appropriate?*
* *Is there any specific commitment of local institutions to guarantee the sustainability of the project?*
* *To which extent and how did target group have developed their own capacities to contribute to locally led preparedness plans for future crisis?*
* *Is there a degree of ownership by the local stakeholders, including the target group, to contribute to the continuity of the project in the long term (after the end of the project)?*
* *Is an adequate level of human and institutional capacity put in place in order to guarantee the sustainability of project activities?*
* *Which lessons learnt could be relevant for others?*

1. **Coordination:** cuts across several criteria, but is included under the heading of effectiveness, it refers to the systematic use of policy instruments to deliver humanitarian assistance in a cohesive and effective manner and used to assess the link between the project and those instruments, including strategic planning, gathering data and managing information, mobilising resources and ensuring accountability, orchestrating a functional division of labour, negotiating and maintaining a serviceable framework with host political authorities and providing leadership.

Examples of guiding questions:

* *Were plans for coordination in place, and followed?*
* *Were there any local coordination structures?*
* *Were there plans for these local coordination structures?*
* *How did the organisations harmonise and coordinate their interventions with other partners?*
* *How actively were organisations involved in the coordination?*
* *What partners were involved in the coordination and how?*
* *Were there any reasons for not participating or participating only to a small extent in the coordination?*

1. **Cross cutting approaches:** to assess how the design and the implementation of the project took into consideration and systematically mainstreamed cross-cutting elements, including gender and protection mainstreaming (to ensure that women, men, boys and girls of all ages can access quality, age and gender-friendly, flexible, relevant, and protective environment and services, according to their needs), as well as environmental and accountability towards affected population aspects.

Examples of guiding questions:

* *How have cross-cutting approaches been integrated into the design and implementation of projects?*
* *How has the gender perspective been integrated throughout the process?*
* *How has the anthropological and environmental approach been integrated explicitly and throughout the process?*
* *How were the specific needs and concerns of girls and women considered during the design and the implementation stages?*
* *What measures have been carried out or taken into account to implement the sexual abuse and harassment protocol?*
* *What consultation as well as specific feedback mechanisms were considered and implemented for this project?*
* *Were specific child protection and safeguarding mechanisms in place? Were they shared with the target group?*
* *Does the work carried out with the target population respect their social practices?*
* *To what extent was the protection approach was mainstreamed and monitored throughout the project? How were protection concerns addressed?*
* *To what extent did the education spaces and the “Safe Spaces” methodologies ensure the protection and inclusion of boys and girls during the project implementation?*
* *Was the participatory approach guaranteed and taken into account during the design and implementation of protection-level actions? What kind of mechanism were put in place to monitor the implementation of this approach?* 
  1. **Additional aspects to take into consideration:**

The evaluation shall also include a specific section on good practices, recommendations and lesson learned for future humanitarian programming, with special emphasis on Education in Emergencies and Child Protection interventions and approaches.

The evaluation shall take into consideration the magnitude of the crisis and the context in which the project has been implemented, including the following different assumption/preconditions: political elements of the crisis, institutional capacity, socio-cultural aspects, and gender related impacts of the Ukraine conflict, environmental and financing factors.

Child rights, gender and inclusion

In line with Plan International’s values and organisational ambition, all evaluations should seek to prioritise a specific child rights, gender and inclusion focus and to assess the extent to which the project or programme applied to gender and inclusion sensitive approaches and explicitly aimed for results that improve the rights of children and young people and gender equality.

* 1. **Users of the Evaluation**

### The results of the evaluation will afford the users a better understanding of the progress the project has made and will contribute to refine similar project design and implementation strategies for greater impact of activities.

### Plan Ukraine staff - these include project staff, program staff, management and administrative staff

### Other staff in Country office shall use the evaluation results to improve programming.

### Key stakeholders in the project such as government ministries or departments, local authorities, and communities are interested parties of the findings.

### The donor, through Spanish national office.

1. **Evaluation methodology and work plan**
   1. **Methodology**

The selected evaluation company is/are expected to:

* Review the example of guiding questions posed as well as the criterion chosen for the evaluation (section above).
* Develop/adapt specific tools for data collection and analysis.

Through:

* Mixed methods to collect and analyse data, integrate the findings, and draw inferences using both qualitative and quantitative approaches.
* Observation, Key Informant Interviews, Focus Group Discussions, Online interviews, literature review and primary data collection.

* 1. **Work plan**

The evaluation process shall be carried out in four main phases: inception/planning desk review, fieldwork and feedback/final report phase:

* **Planning Phase:** Prior to start the actual implementation of the evaluation process, Plan International, Words Help and the evaluation team will jointly work, review and agree on planning aspects of the evaluation, by defining: a detailed workplan (timelines and deliverables); methodology and tools for data collection; target groups for interviews; evaluation criteria and indicators; as well as interviews questions. During this phase, a validation meeting with the different stakeholders/organizations will be held to validate the planning exercise. This phase shall be carried out approximately within the 1 week from the signing of the contract.
* **Desk review phase:** it will be held at Plan International Ukraine and Word Help premises in Kyiv, where relevant project documents and second-hand information are stored, including online interviews with Plan International Spain staff. Documents and second-hand information, included relevant persons to be interviewed will be identified, selected for the review, and based on the scope and objectives of the evaluation as outlined in the other sections of this ToR and as agreed during the Inception/Planning phase. This phase shall be carried out in approximately 2 week from the closure of the planning phase.
* **Fieldwork phase:** it will be carried out in the schools and other relevant locations where the project has been implemented, through Observation, KIIs/FGDs, etc. including to direct/indirect target groups, government officials, community centres representatives, etc. as deemed needed according to the scope and objectives of this evaluation as outlined in the other sections of this ToR and as agreed during the Inception/Planning phase. This phase shall be implemented in approximately 2-week time.

A draft report regarding the desk and fieldwork phase will be shared with Plan International Spain, Ukraine and Words Help (Evaluation Monitoring Committee/Unit) for their review within approximately 2 weeks from the finalization of these 2 phases.

* **Final Dissemination and Reporting phase:** this phase shall entail the sharing of the final findings of the evaluation to Plan International/Word Help during a final/debriefing meeting and the submission of the final version of report (incorporating the comments from Plan International Spain, Ukraine and Words Help/Evaluation Monitoring Committee/Unit) prior to finalize the evaluation process by signing the final evaluation report. The final version of the report shall be submitted by the evaluation team approximately 3 weeks after the finalization of the review process regarding the draft report.

Overall, the evaluation process shall be conducted taking into account the Core Humanitarian Standards (CHS) commitments, international standards and principles for the protection of children in Humanitarian contexts (Minimum Standards for the Protection of Children in Humanitarian Action) as well as INEE Minimum Standards) and gender in emergencies (IASC Gender Handbook for Humanitarian Action).

Proposed Work Plan for evaluation phases:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PHASE** | **TASKS** | **WORK PLAN** | | | | | | | | | | **DELIVERABLES** | |
|  |  | W1 | W2 | W3 | W4 | W5 | W6 | W7 | W8 | W9 |  | |
| **Planning Phase** | Inception meeting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Detailed workplan/planning matrix | |
| Review: available second-hand information, resources and timing constraints, evaluation methodology /questions/tools, data sources and collection strategy (i.e. instruments and sampling techniques), plan for analysing the data, logistics, etc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Validation meeting |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Desk review phase** | Project Documents/second-hand information review and analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Review meeting | |
| Interviews with key staff from Plan International and Words Help |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Review meeting with Evaluation Monitoring Committee |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Fieldwork phase** | FGDs/KII with key selected stakeholders – data collection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Draft report | |
| Data analysis process |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Submission of draft report + preliminary findings |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Final Dissemination and Reporting phase** | Evaluation Monitoring Committee review of draft report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Final report | |
| Submission Final report |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Debriefing meeting with Evaluation Monitoring Committee |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# All the deliverables should be submitted to Lesia Tsipkun [lesia.tsipkun@plan-international.org](mailto:lesia.tsipkun@plan-international.org) and, in copy, Prokopets, Mykhailo at [mykhailo.prokopets@plan-international.org](mailto:mykhailo.prokopets@plan-international.org) The results/findings of the evaluation should be presented in an Evaluation Report (in English and Spanish, and will follow the structure detailed in section 8.

1. **Documents and sources of information**

* Analysis of programme and operational documents including: proposal/logical framework, budget, reports, sources of verification, visibility/research documents/materials, amendments, needs assessments, SOPs, awareness-raising materials, technical guidance documents, M&E Framework, etc.
* M&E tools developed to measure the outcomes of the project.
* Any agreements/relevant documents signed with local stakeholders directly/indirectly involved in the project/humanitarian response.
* Any strategic document developed by Plan International and the partner in the framework of the Ukraine crisis response
* Plan International and partner´s policies and protocols on gender, environment, safety and security, PSEAH, code of conduct, etc.
* Any other documents deemed relevant for the purpose of this evaluation and agreed during the planning phase.

Furthermore, the evaluation shall be also informed by in-depth interviews and focus groups with various stakeholders related to the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project:

* Plan International Spain and Ukraine, Words Help relevant staff.
* Representatives from the different target groups directly and indirectly involved in the project, including local authorities, other peer organizations, etc.
* Any other stakeholders deemed relevant for the purpose of this evaluation and agreed during the planning phase.

1. **Structure and presentation of the evaluation report**

The final report should be structured in the following way:

Cover page:

* Title of the evaluation report: (project, organisations, counterparts, country, sector(s);
* Evaluation period;
* Name of the evaluation company/evaluators;
* Specific mention that the report has been prepared at the request of Fundación Plan International España in the framework of the project funded by the AECID and that all the comments/findings included in the report solely reflect the opinion of the evaluator.

1. Table of contents.
2. Summary:

* Name of the local partner organisations;
* Purpose and duration of the evaluation;
* Key findings and recommendations in order of priority;

1. List of Abbreviations and Acronyms
2. Executive summary
3. Introduction
   1. Context of the crisis;
   2. Questions and evaluation criteria: definitions;
4. Summary of the project: including summary of the background/context, organizations and management, stakeholders, etc.
5. Methodology used in the evaluation.
   1. Evaluation methods used, sources of information analysed, interview schedule, etc.
   2. Conditions and limits of the evaluation exercise.
6. Analysis of the collected information, including evidence regarding the matters/aspects agreed for this evaluation. Quantitative and qualitative information should be blended while presenting the findings and the analysis with reference to the evaluation questions set out.
7. Evaluation findings with reference to the evaluation criteria established.
8. Lessons learnt to be drawn from the main findings including identifying good practices to inform future programming/interventions, as appropriate.
9. Recommendations to be drawn from the overall evaluation process and categorized according to the established criteria for the evaluation (e.g. a short/long-term, according to evaluation criteria and the specifics of the intervention). Whenever possible, to assign tasks/action plan to the stakeholders that shall be responsible to follow-up with the recommendations.
10. Annexes which will include:
    1. Terms of Reference (ToR).
    2. The work plan, the structure and details of the mission.
    3. Proposed methodology, techniques and sources/data used to gather information:
       1. Documents Review: list of second-hand sources/information.
       2. Interviews: list of interviewees, interview guidance, notes, etc.
       3. Interviews: models, collected raw data and statistical analysis.
    4. Allegations and comments from various stakeholders on the draft report if relevant, especially if there are disagreements and/or those have not been directly reflected in the report.
    5. Brief-evaluation summary (CAD model).

At the end of the fieldwork phase, the evaluation team will submit a digital copy of the draft version of the final report, including the executive summary to be reviewed and approved by the Evaluation Monitoring Committee prior to submit two hard copies of the Final Evaluation Report (A4 format) along with the digital copy of the same report.

1. **Evaluation Team**

The evaluation company shall indicate in its proposal the following details:

* Structure and estimated number of members that will form the evaluation team (a diverse team will be considered as an asset),
* The profile and professional qualifications/skills of the team, including academic background, language, previous experience in the sector, design and implementation of evaluation (methodology), assessments, social research, etc.

## Expected Qualifications

## 

The evaluation team/person is expected to:

* Have prior experience in emergencies/humanitarian actions/contexts, and specific expertise/knowledge on gender, protection, human rights and education will be considered as an asset).
* Have carried out similar evaluations/assessment(s) in the Ukraine context and/or other similar contexts that may be considered as an added value to this evaluation, including evaluating gender equality, child protection and/or child/youth-centred projects as well as to interview a variety of stakeholders, Moreover:

1. The evaluation team must guarantee its independence from the project that will be evaluated without being tied to their management or with any of its constituent elements. Likewise, they must not have been worked for Plan International and/or Word Help, at least during the identification, design and implementation of the project.
2. The implementing organizations (Plan International and Words Help) will provide all the information and support required by evaluation team to carry out the evaluation including accompanying the evaluation team during the fieldwork visits, ensuring that the presence of the implementing organizations will not affect the evaluation process and its findings.
3. As part of its technical expertise, it is the evaluation team´s responsibility to flag any relevant aspects/concerns that are not specifically mentioned in the Terms of Reference and that are needed to ensure a more comprehensive analysis of the project.
4. **Final Evaluation must be submitted in English**. The translation process and costs into the Spanish language, as per donor´s regulations, will be under Plan International´s responsibility.
5. **Ownership and Intellectual property of the evaluation**

It is expected that the evaluation team meets the following ethical and professional premises in the development of their work:

* **Confidentiality**: Since the evaluation is participatory, the evaluation team must commit to respect the right of people to provide information ensuring their anonymity and confidentiality.
* **Responsibility:** Any disagreement or difference of opinion that may arise between team members or between them and those responsible for the intervention in relation to conclusions and / or recommendations must be mentioned in the report. Any claims must be supported by your computer or to record the disagreement on it.
* **Integrity**: Evaluators will be responsible for flagging any issues not specifically mentioned in the ToR, if necessary to obtain a more reliable and comprehensive analysis of the project.
* **Independence**: Evaluators shall ensure the independence of the evaluated intervention, not being linked to its management or any of its constituent elements.
* **Validation of information**: It is the evaluation team responsibility to ensure the accuracy of the information collected for the preparation of reports, and ultimately be responsible for the information presented in the Evaluation Report.
* **Incidents**: In the event of the occurrence of problems while performing fieldwork or at any other stage of the evaluation, they must be reported immediately to the executing agency of the grant and this, if necessary will notify the AECID. Otherwise, the existence of such problems may never be used to justify the failure to obtain the results required by the institution in the present ToR.
* **Ownership/Copyright and disclosure of information**: Evaluation ownership /copyright remains with Plan International/contracting organization. Disclosure/dissemination of the information collected and/or the final evaluation report remains the prerogative of the Plan International/contracting organization. However, the AECID reserves the right to reproduce, distribute or publicly communicate the assessment report without prior agreement with that entity, when required by the proper conduct of administrative procedures and will do so with prior approval of the same, when required for other reasons.

Child Protection and Ethical Consideration

Plan International is committed to actively promoting safeguarding of children and youth from harm and ensuring children’s rights to protection are fully realized. Plan International takes seriously the commitment to promote child safe practices and protect children from harm, abuse, neglect, and any form of exploitation as they come into contact with Plan International supported interventions. Besides, we will take positive action to prevent child abusers from becoming involved with Plan International in any way and take stringent measures against any Plan International Staff and/or Associate who abuses a child. Decisions and actions in response to child protection concerns will be guided by the principle of ‘the best interests of the child.’

In doing so, the consultant shall adhere to the Child Protection Policy, PSEAH and Code of Conduct of Plan International. Ethical statements and behavioural protocols must be observed during the data collection, interviews and in the final reporting as well.

During data collection, the purposes should be clearly explained to the respondents and information will be collected on the basis of their consent. For children and adolescents, written consent should be taken from their parents/guardians. Confidentiality of data should be maintained and in the report name of the respondents should not be revealed.

In the inception report, the Consultant/Consulting firm will describe how they will ensure ethics and protection of children and adolescents in the different stages of the study — including recruitment and training of enumerators, data collection and analysis, visits, and report writing. It should be in line with Plan International’s child protection policy.

1. **Safeguarding Policy**

The project is directly implemented by Plan International Ukraine and Word Help, and therefore the members of the evaluation team shall comply with the Safeguarding Policy of Plan International. Any violation/ deviation in complying with Plan's Safeguarding Policy will not only result in termination of the agreement but also Plan will initiate appropriate action in order to make good the damages/ losses caused due to non-compliance of Plan's Safeguarding Policy.

1. **Risk Management**

The Consultant/s must take all reasonable measures to mitigate any potential risk to the delivery of the required outputs of this consultancy on time and meeting the expected quality. As such, applicants should submit a risk management plan that covers (at minimum):

* Key assumptions underpinning the successful completion of the assignment anticipated challenges and estimates of the level of risk for each risk identified.
* Contingency plans will be put in place to mitigate against any occurrence of each of the identified risks.

1. **Penalty clause**

Plan International will deduct 1% of the total amount for each day of delay in completing the assignment beyond the agreement provided that the delay occurs solely due to factor (s) relating Consultant. If the quality of deliverables is not in line with the requirements outlined in the present TOR, Plan International may deduct up to 5% of the total amount agreed in the contract and such decision shall be considered as final.

1. **Timelines of the evaluation**

The start date of the final evaluation process (as outlined in the section 6.2 of this ToR and/or as agreed bilaterally before signing the contract) will be from the day of signature of the contract between Plan International and the selected and approved evaluation team.

All the conditions regarding the submission of deliverables and their respective timelines shall be outlined in the contract, although the submission of final version of the final evaluation report, after the revision of the Evaluation Management Committee, shall not exceed 90 days from the signing of the contract.

The budget for the evaluation must include the following:

1. Consulting fees/day (single payment).
2. Logistics costs, daily fees/per diem, transportation, and materials.
3. Accommodation in Kyiv and visit to selected locations by WordsHelp.

Payment method for the evaluation services will be through bank transfer and according to the following disbursement calendar: 25% of the total amount awarded upon signature of the contract; 25% upon submission of the first draft report; and the remaining 50% upon delivery and validation of the final evaluation report.

1. **Presentation of the technical offer and assessment critria**

Interested candidates are requested to submit an electronic copy of their expression of interest/proposal by 20/12/2023 with the subject **REF: RFQ\_UA-17\_2023 Final Evaluation** to: [lesia.tsipkun@plan-international.org](mailto:lesia.tsipkun@plan-international.org), including the following documents:

1. Cover page stating:
   1. Name of the company or evaluator
   2. Title of the evaluation
   3. Contact details of the company or individual evaluator
2. Technical offer including:
   1. detailed CV of the company (if applicable)
   2. Detailed CVs of the members of the tendering company's evaluation team
   3. Detailed CV of the individual evaluator(s) (if any)
3. Financial proposal / budget breakdown
4. Proposed implementation plan or timetable including proposed Working methodology

The assessment criteria for the bids received will be as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Criteria** | | **Weight (%)** |
| **Criteria** | **Indicators** |  |
| Academic and Professional experience of the evaluation team/person | * Experience in similar evaluation services, particularly in humanitarian/emergency contexts and with children/youth population. * Experience in project cycle management. * Structure of the team (gender and inclusion) | 35 |
| * Experience in Gender and Child Protection in humanitarian actions. * Experience with projects including Mental Health/Psychosocial support and Education in Emergencies components. * Experience with projects addressing basic needs and resilience building and children/human rights approaches. |
| Quality/added value of the technical proposal | * Added value/alignment to the objectives of the ToR and the porpose methodology. * Clear, realistic and evidence based proposal. * Adequacy of child protection elements and gender mainstreaming. * Detail and effectiveness of the Work Plan. | 30 |
| Economic proposal and  Availability | * Value for Money (cost, efficiency and competitiveness) | 30 |
|  | * Knowledge of the Plan International organisation | 5 |
| **Total** |  | **100** |