



United Mission to Nepal
EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

Evaluation Title : End of Project Evaluation – DREAM Project
Project Name : Disability Rights and Education Advancement in Mugu (DREAM) Project
Implementing Partners: Gramin Samudaik Sanstha (GSS), Mugu
Project Locations : Soru Rural Municipality (Wards 1-7 & 9) Mugu
Period Reviewed : 7/07/2020 - 16/07/2023 (36 months)
Funding Partner : Tearfund Australia/ Australian Aid and Gossner Mission

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 Project Description

"Right to education for all" is ensured by Nepal's constitution 2015. However, many children of Mugu district are still not accessing school education. Hence, this Disability Rights and Education Advancement in Mugu (DREAM) Project which is prepared and implemented in support of Tear Fund Australia /Australian Aid and Gossner Mission, intends to address this issue in collaboration with local Rural Municipality (RM), their units and schools to help the poor, marginalised, Dalit and children/people with disabilities (C/PwD) of Soru RM access quality school education, including education in emergencies (EiE). Supporting RM, their units, and schools in strengthening their capacities and systems and helping them to be prepared for inclusive quality education, including EiE; building their capacities on school governance and management, child-friendly and inclusive education; empowering children and parents to raise their voices and pressurise the duty-bearers to ensure their right to education; and providing educational supports and parenting education are the as main strategies of project implementation where the RM and schools will develop alternative mechanisms to continue children's learning in emergencies including COVID-19.

The project is also designed to address the exclusion and social discrimination faced by C/PwD. Herein, the project focus is also given to change the mindset of communities and stakeholders to ensure the mainstreaming of C/PwD in all development initiatives and help them access their specific needs/entitlements and empower them to speak for themselves. Capacity building of relevant stakeholders, coordinating and collaborating with them for mobilising resources and creating an enabling environment in all places of Soru are the main strategies for addressing disability issues. Herein, this project has been designed to address the issues of education, disability, and crisis in Soru communities.

The total population of Soru is 12,238 (49.9% female). But the project focuses only in 8 out of 11 wards (1-7 & 9) with 8,778 population (4,363 males and 4,415 females)¹. A total of 305 persons with disability, 4,180 school children (2,114 girls and 2,066 boys), and 167 school leaders (124 males and

¹ CBS Report, 2011

43 females), including the school management committee, parent-teacher association, parents, local government, and other stakeholders are the target groups of the project.

C.7 Project Participants	Total in the category	Project covered	
		Direct	Indirect
Female under 18 years (with disability)	37	11	22
Female under 18 years (without disability)	2,029	609	1,218
Male under 18 years (with disability)	29	9	18
Male under 18 years (without disability)	2,085	626	1,252
Female 18-59 years (with disability)	89	19	38
Female 18-59 years (without disability)	1,914	450	900
Male 18-59 years (with disability)	72	19	38
Male 18-59 years (without disability)	1,897	569	1318
Female 60 years and over (with disability)	40	-	-
Female 60 years and over (without disability)	252	-	-
Male 60 years and over (with disability)	38	-	-
Male 60 years and over (without disability)	295	-	-
Totals	8,777	2,402	4804
Grand total (direct + indirect beneficiaries)			7,206*

1.2 Expected Project Results from the Project Proposal

Impact / Goal

Education rights of children, including children with disability and their families, are upheld.

Outcome / Purpose

1. Children have access to quality school education
2. Persons with disabilities have improved access to their entitlements and services
3. RM and schools take actions to mitigate the risk of ongoing/future crises, including COVID – 19

Outputs

- 1.1 Inclusive-child-friendly teaching-learning practices adopted by schools
- 1.2 School governance and management in the targeted schools are strengthened
- 1.3 Increased responsiveness of local government on quality education
- 1.4 Increased awareness of children and parents on the importance of education
- 2.1 Increased awareness of concerned stakeholders (duty bearers) on disability rights and responsibilities towards PWDs
- 2.2 PwD and their groups/ committees/networks are capacitated to identify their needs and take appropriate actions to raise their voices (Capacity building of PwD)
- 2.3 ADLs of PwD are improved for their better livelihoods
- 3.1 Target communities provided with immediate support in response to the risk of the COVID-19
- 3.2 Capacity of RM and schools enhanced in responding to ongoing/future crises, particularly Education in Emergency (EiE)

2. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

This is an end-of-project evaluation focusing on relevance, effectiveness, and sustainability. The

learnings and recommendations from the evaluation will be essential to assist UMN in designing a second phase of the project and in its future implementation of similar projects in other locations.

The evaluation will consider the following objectives:

- 3.1 Assessment of the success (and failure) of UMN in achieving the project's goals, outcomes and targets as outlined in the project proposal.
- 3.2 Assessment of the effectiveness of the project approaches and strategies to achieve the outcomes and sustain the benefits and recommend how sustainability can be strengthened in the next phase.
- 3.3 The evaluation will also examine the ability of the project to encourage inclusion and participation, and ownership of the project activities by the project stakeholders, including the target community. Please refer to annexe 2 for details of the meaningful participation.
- 3.4 Identification of learnings, challenges, and programme adaptations for the next phase of the project.

The results/findings and recommendations of the evaluation will be shared with Tearfund Australia, Australian Aid, Gossner Mission, local implementing partners, community members and other key stakeholders using appropriate mediums. The evaluation findings and recommendations will be used as learnings to adapt and design the second phase of the project and other future projects.

3. SUBJECT and FOCUS

The Consultant will review the results of the Disability Rights and Education Advancement in Mugu (DREAM) project from 7/07/2020 to 16/07/2023, using Key Evaluation Questions (KEQs).

The KEQs for this evaluation is tied to the criteria developed by the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). Even though the DAC criteria identifies five “pillars” that should be considered in an evaluation of a development intervention, this evaluation will focus on the following three criteria:

- **Relevance:** The extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities, needs and policies of the target group.
- **Effectiveness:** The extent to which the project has achieved its intended objectives.
- **Sustainability:** Sustainability 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.
- **UMN's Cross-cutting Issues:** The evaluation will also assess the extent to which UMN's cross-cutting issues, namely, (i) gender, (ii) conflict sensitivity, (iii) environment and climate change, and (iv) disability, have been considered in the design, implementation, monitoring and reporting of the project.

4. KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS (KEQs)

The evaluation will make an in-depth assessment of the following central themes:

- The extent to which the project has brought about change and impact
- The extent to which the community and participants are taking ownership of the project
- The extent to which the project was able to reach and benefit the most vulnerable and marginalised in the target communities
- Key learnings that can be taken from the project so far to shape the next phase

To assess the above-mentioned central themes, the following questions have been suggested which will be discussed and agreed with the consultant.

A. Relevance

1. How relevant was the project design to the priorities and needs of the target group? What were the strengths and gaps of the project design?
2. How can relevance be ensured in the design and implementation of the next phase of the project?
3. Is there evidence that the project made changes in response to community feedback and learnings reviews/reflections? How did that help in improving the outcomes of the project?
4. Were the beneficiaries satisfied with the quality and delivery of services? If not, in what way did the services not meet beneficiary expectations and why?
5. Did this project contribute to the education plan of local government? What were the major contributions by the project to achieve their priorities in education?

B. Effectiveness

1. Planned vs Actual
 - 1.1 To what extent has the project delivered the activities outlined in the log frame?
 - 1.2 With reference to the log frame indicators and contribution of the activities, to what extent have the planned results been achieved?
2. To what extent did the project have adequate staffing with relevant experience and expertise to carry out the planned activities?
3. Cross-cutting Issues: To what extent have (i) gender, (ii) conflict sensitivity, (iii) environment and climate change, and (iv) disability issues been considered in the design and implementation of the project?
4. Which approaches/strategies were effective and should be continued in the next phase, and which should be adjusted and / or stopped? Why? Highlight any good practice or innovation which should be celebrated and repeated in future project interventions.
5. To what extent did the project activities/interventions invite coordination and resource sharing with other actors working in the target areas?
6. What changes have been produced in the attitudes, behaviours, practices, policies and relationships in favour of the target groups? What contributions have the project made in producing these changes?
7. What were the direct and indirect, intended and unintended, positive and negative impacts of the projects? What real difference did these changes make in the life of the target group?
8. What lessons learned could be used (i) in the next phase of the project, (ii) within the Cluster, and

(iii) across UMN?

9. Why was the project successful/unsuccessful? Are there any unique factors responsible for it?
10. What aspects of the project, if any, could be used to influence policy locally and nationally?

C. Sustainability

1. What is the current level of community ownership? What actions have been taken to ensure ownership by the beneficiaries, local communities, local government, and other project stakeholders?
2. To what extent have the target community members been able to link with and access resources from other agencies and actors in their areas?
3. What recommendations are there to strengthen sustainability in the next phase?

D. Participation and Inclusion

1. To what extent did the project reach and include the most vulnerable and marginalised in target communities (e.g., members of marginalised groups/caste, women, people with disability, girls, boys etc.)?
2. How can the inclusion of the most vulnerable and marginalised groups be improved in future projects?
3. How has the project promoted the visibility of support and related organisations, and how has it impacted/influenced the communities positively?

1. EVALUATION APPROACHES and METHODS

The evaluation will mainly consider the participatory evaluation methods, collecting qualitative data with a wide range of views, perceptions and experiences of beneficiaries and stakeholders. Therefore, the sampling must ensure that all the key stakeholders of the project are adequately represented in the data collection. Quantitative data could be used to triangulate and validate the conclusions from the qualitative data and when specific indicators require numeric data.

Stakeholder participation is essential. The Consultant is expected to conduct a participatory evaluation providing for active and meaningful involvement of beneficiaries, implementing partners, supporting partners and other relevant parties. It is also expected that two to three representatives from the target groups are included in the evaluation team, who may not lead the evaluation but will form an important part of the team for discussions and reflections on the findings. Senior students or members of child clubs/adolescent groups could be considered for this role, and it is also important to consider gender balance while selecting these community evaluators.

The consultant is expected to use participatory tools that invite equal participation of all the respondents to be consulted. The tools should be appropriate and friendly to different types of respondent groups, such as school children, adolescent girls and boys, community members, schoolteachers and management committees and other relevant stakeholders.

The evaluation methods, tools and sampling should be established in consultation with the Consultant, UMN MEAL Team, Thematic Lead – Education and the Project Manager.

The evaluator should propose the precise combination of methods to be used in carrying out the evaluation, describe how the methods will be combined, and propose the source of information and

data collection procedure.

The following is a reference to the types of activities likely to be required.

1. Review of documents before the field visits. Key documents include:
 - a. Project Proposal
 - b. Theory of Change (ToC)
 - c. Project Annual Reports
 - d. Review/reflection reports
 - e. Policies on UMN's cross-cutting issues
 - f. Mid-term evaluation report
2. Visit the project sites. Key activities may include:
 - a. Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) using appropriate participatory tools
 - b. One-on-one interviews
 - c. Case study
 - d. Observation
 - e. Collection of relevant secondary data from relevant agencies.
 - f. Daily reflections and debriefs and end of field visit feedback session to review and discuss information and impressions
3. Data analysis – descriptions of how the data will be consolidated and analysed. Mention if any specific data analysis tool/s will be used.

2. REPORTS

Inception Report

The Consultant will prepare an inception report to operationalise and direct the evaluation. The inception report will describe how the evaluation will be carried out, bringing refinements, specificity and elaboration to the Terms of Reference. It will be approved by UMN's MEAL Team Lead and concerned Technical Team Lead and/or Cluster Team Leader, and act as the agreement between parties for how the evaluation will be conducted.

The inception report will address the following reporting elements:

- Overview
- Understanding of the assignment / Expectations of Evaluation (including restrictions/refinements to ToR)
- Roles and Responsibilities
- Evaluation Framework
- Evaluation Methodology (including tools and sample size of respondent groups and individuals)
- Data collection and analysis
- Reporting
- Work Schedule

Evaluation Report

The Consultant will prepare an evaluation report that describes the evaluation and puts forward the findings, recommendations and lessons learned. The presentation of results is to be intrinsically linked to the evaluation issues, establishing a flow of logic development derived from the information collected.

All Key Evaluation Questions (KEQs) in the ToR must be addressed and answered by the Consultant to the extent the evaluation process has allowed them to do so, except where the Consultant has previously expressed constraints/limitations. Any KEQs not addressed should be explained in the limitation section of the report.

The final report should be a maximum of 35 pages, excluding annexes, and be written in English. It should contain an executive summary of a maximum of 2 to 3 pages. The report should follow the following format:

- Title page
- Short description of the Consultant
- Acronym list
- Executive Summary
- Introduction/context
- Project description and overview
- Evaluation objectives
- Evaluation methodology
- Constraints/limitations
- Findings (i.e. answer to all the questions posed in the ToR)
- Learnings
- Conclusions and Recommendations
- Annexes

The report may include quotes, photos, graphs, case studies etc.

Recommendations should be practical and specific. If there are a large number of recommendations, they should be given priority according to the importance of future project work.

3. TIMETABLE

The final evaluation report should be delivered to UMN before 25 January 2023.

Draft Inception Report

A draft work plan outlining the proposed methods to be used, target respondents, as well as the method of engagement with project staff will be submitted within one (1) week of the signing of the Contract (by 5 December 2022).

Final Inception Report

Within one (1) week of receiving UMN's comments on the draft inception report, the Consultant will produce a final inception report (by 9 December 2022).

Field Mission

The field mission is expected to be approximately 12-15 days (from 15 December to 30 December 2022) in duration. This is subject to reviewing coverage.

Draft Evaluation Report

The Consultant will submit a draft evaluation report in the prescribed reporting format for review by UMN within 2 (weeks) of returning from the field mission by 16 January 2023.

Final Evaluation Report

Within 5 days of receiving UMN's comments on the draft report, the Consultant will submit a final evaluation report. The final report should be submitted to UMN by no later than 25 January 2023.

Presentation of Key Findings

The Consultant will present the key findings of the evaluation, including the recommendations and lessons learned in UMN, within one month of submission of the final report or on a mutually agreed date.

4. EVALUATION TEAM and RESPONSIBILITY

The evaluation team will consist of at least 1 external Consultant. The Consultant may make recommendations regarding how many members the team requires.

UMN staff members will also be attached to the evaluation team to observe the process and to support the Consultant where necessary.

It is also expected that two to three representatives from the target group will be included in the evaluation team. They will form an important part of the team and will attend the field consultations and daily reflections and debriefs.

The Consultant will be responsible for the following:

- Providing guidance and directions to achieve the purpose and objectives of the evaluation.
- Conducting the evaluation.
- Providing the day-to-day management of operations of the evaluation assignment.
- Facilitating an in-Cluster and Kathmandu-level debriefs.
- Consolidating and presenting the evaluation findings and writing the final evaluation report. Ensuring that the production of deliverables is in accordance to the contractual requirements.

UMN will be responsible for:

- Arranging for the logistics
- Providing relevant documentation for preparation and data collection
- Arranging meetings with community people and stakeholders during data collection
- Providing other support to the evaluation team as required to meet key stakeholders during

the entire evaluation period.

The Consultant will report to UMN's MEAL Team Lead, with the concerned Technical Team Lead and/or Cluster Team Leader copied in.

5. CONSULTANT QUALIFICATIONS

The Consultant will need to have the following abilities and experiences:

- Have extensive experience in conducting evaluations and a proven record in delivering professional results. S/he should have solid theoretical and practical knowledge and experience of qualitative research methodologies.
- Have good knowledge and experience in education in general and child-friendly education, including child rights. S/he should have experience in evaluating education and child-focused projects.
- Have good experience in using participatory, strengths-based approaches to the evaluation.
- Ability to engage openly with the local community and listen to and synthesize varied perspectives.
- Ability to ensure that gender, conflict sensitivity, environment and climate change and disability issues are assessed as a part of the evaluation.
- Have advanced skills and knowledge in monitoring, evaluation and learning methods and approaches, conducting community-based evaluations, and project sustainability mechanisms and processes.
- Be fluent in English (written and spoken) and Nepali (spoken) languages. Familiarity with the local language will be an added value.
- Should be willing to follow and agree to abide by UMN's processes, rules, and policies, including Safeguarding Policy.

The Consultant should have:

- Experience and skills in facilitation, particularly with people having low or no literacy skills.
- Sensitivity to local culture, customs and traditions.
- Experience and skills in participatory processes, rural and social development, and cross-cutting issues such as gender, conflict sensitivity, and disability.
- Experience and skills in learning-oriented data processing, data analysis and report writing.
- Commitment to accomplish work by the given time.

6. OWNERSHIP, CONFIDENTIALITY and ETHICS

The evaluation report will become the property of UMN. The Consultant agrees that the information obtained remains confidential and that any publication or citation needs prior written approval from UMN.

In addition – this is not compulsory – if the evaluator discovers issues of particularly sensitive nature that they do not feel are appropriate to include in the general report, a separate, confidential report can be sent to the MEAL Team Leader and copied to Programme Partner Team Leader.

The Consultant will ensure that no one, either direct or indirect beneficiary of the project, will be forced to participate in the evaluation process or provide information.

The evaluation team will be sensitive to local context and culture while conducting evaluation activities and present themselves with modesty and humility while dealing with issues related to women, children, disabilities and marginalised groups. Any person found guilty of child abuse, gender-based violence, or any other criminal offence will not form part of the evaluation team. **The Consultant will sign UMN’s Code of Conduct for Safeguarding Children and Vulnerable Adults, which will form part of the Contract (Annex 1).**

7. COSTS

A consultancy fee amount will be agreed upon based on the number of days required for the evaluation. The consultancy fee will be subject to tax liability as per the tax rule of Nepal. The following table shows an estimated time required for the evaluation.

Evaluation Activities	Estimated time
Literature review	4 days
Workplan and tools (Inception Report) – draft and final	2 days
Field visit for data collection	12 days
Data analysis and draft report preparation	5 days
Feedback and finalise the report	1.5 day
Presentation workshop	0.5 day
Total	25 days

Acceptance of Terms of Reference

I declare that I have received and read the Terms of Reference and commit to evaluating as per its guidelines and agree to meet the requirements stated.

<p>Consultant</p> <p>Signature:</p> <p>Name:</p> <p>Company:</p> <p>Date:</p>
<p>UMN</p> <p>Signature</p>

Name:

Designation:

Date:

Annex 1: UMN's Code of Conduct for Safeguarding Children and Vulnerable Adults

UMN staff, representatives and agents must:

- Familiarise themselves with the Safeguarding Policy and indicate their acceptance of it by signing a copy of the Code of Conduct.
- Ensure they always work with children and vulnerable adults, where possible, with the knowledge and informed consent of those responsible for them.
- Report any allegations relating to potential breaches of this policy to the relevant Safeguarding Advocate.
- Co-operate with any investigation process formed under the relevant procedure within this policy.
- Not disclose the nature or details of an investigation to any unauthorised person.
- Abide by the Good Practice Guidelines in respect of electronic communication (see Appendix 2)

UMN staff, representatives, and agents must not:

- Threaten or use any form of physical punishment or hitting against a child or vulnerable adult.
- Use language or behaviour towards the child or vulnerable adult that is inappropriate, harassing, abusive, sexually provocative, demeaning or culturally inappropriate.
- Spend excessive amounts of time alone with children or vulnerable adults. Meetings with individual children should occur within sight of others, and such meetings must occur with the knowledge of UMN supervisors and those responsible for the child or vulnerable adult.
- Fondle, hold, kiss, cuddle, tickle or touch children in an inappropriate or culturally insensitive way. Physical touch between adults and children can be healthy but should occur in public places. A general guideline is not to touch children in areas that are normally covered by shorts and t- shirt.
- Take or use images of children or vulnerable adults which are detrimental to their dignity. (See UMN Visual Images Policy and Guidelines.)
- Use resources such as telephone, mobile phones and/or other IT/electronic/digital resources to develop inappropriate relationships with children or vulnerable adults or to store or view explicit or degrading images.
- Fail to report when they have concerns about harm to a child or vulnerable adult.
- Hire children or vulnerable adult for domestic or other labour which is inappropriate given their age or development stage, which interferes with their time available for education and

recreational activities, or places them at a significant risk of injury.

I have read and understood this information. I understand that behaviour contravening these guidelines may be investigated by UMN and, if warranted, be reported to the appropriate legal authorities.

Signed

Name

Date

Witnessed by a UMN staff member

Signed

Name

Designation

Date

Annexe 2:

The Ladder of Citizen Participation (Proposed by Sherry Arnstein in 1969)

