

## UNICEF STATE OF PALESTINE

### Terms of Reference: Final Evaluation of the State of Palestine Education Cannot Wait Multi-Year Resilience Programme (SoP ECW/MYRP)

<b>Title</b>	Summative external evaluation of the State of Palestine Education Cannot Wait/Multi-Year Resilience Programme (SoP ECW/MYRP). (UNICEF as main grantee, UNESCO, UNDP, UNRWA and Save the Children)
<b>Location</b>	West Bank and Gaza, State of Palestine
<b>Reporting to</b>	Monitoring & Evaluation (MEAL) Officer at the Programme Management Unit (PMU) of the SoP ECW/MYRP hosted by UNICEF, and under overall guidance of the Programme Manager, SoP PMU.
<b>Duration</b>	5.5 months.
<b>Start Date and End Date</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> March 2022- 15 <sup>th</sup> August 2022. (includes periods for MYRP partners' review)

#### PART ONE: EXTERNAL

### 1. Background

#### 1.1 SoP ECW/MYRP Context

The ECW Global fund was established during the [World Humanitarian Summit in 2016](#) to help reposition education as a priority on the humanitarian agenda, usher in a more collaborative approach among actors on the ground and foster additional funding to ensure that every crisis-affected child and young person is in education and learning. ECW is committed to supporting the delivery of inclusive and quality education to 8.9 million girls, boys, and youth most affected by emergencies and protracted crises by 2021. Working along the humanitarian – development nexus (HDN), ECW seeks not just to meet education needs, but to reduce risk and vulnerability to realize the common vision of a future in which no one is left behind.

Aligned to the global ECW; the SoP ECW/MYRP (2019-2022) is a vision for the education sector supported by the ECW seed fund (\$18 million in total), this funding kicks off the start of the MYRP, from where onwards new resources are to be mobilized to fund the total MYRP budget envelope of \$34 million, which allows for scale-up and expansion to pre-identified schools/learning centers and thereby reaching more crisis-affected children. The SoP ECW/MYRP seeks to see where it can harmonize among the three existing national education plans and strategies under **one coherent framework** connecting the humanitarian and development (HD) fields of interventions in education:

- the Education Sector Strategic Plan 2017 – 2022 (ESSP);
- the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP), and
- the UNRWA Mid-Term Strategy (with its Education in Emergencies components).

This overarching framework addresses the diffusion of education interventions and ensures that education priorities remain streamlined and focused, reinforcing linkages between emergency and development strategies. Moreover, it complements current interventions and resource streams and focuses on filling identified gaps through the provision of evidence-based and innovative interventions to support the learning needs of this targeted population.

There are approximately 1.3 million children enrolled in 2,963 primary and secondary schools in the State of Palestine (2,249 schools in West Bank and 714 in Gaza)<sup>1</sup>. Of this population, almost half a million children need humanitarian education assistance. Both girls and boys face obstacles to access education and at times cannot participate regularly in learning activities due to restrictions in movement, distance from school, military check points, harassment and sometimes violence by Israeli settlers, arbitrary detention, limited or debilitated school infrastructure, and lack of classroom space and materials. In addition to the education related obstacles, these same communities experience the highest levels of poverty, unemployment and limited access to services and resources, and are isolated in a manner that increases traditional practices such as child marriage that impact negatively especially on girls.

Moreover, due to the shortage of adequate infrastructure in Gaza, around 65 per cent of schools operate on a double-shift system, resulting in reduced hours in core subjects and foundation learning. Children's ability to access education, both at school and at home, is also undermined by Gaza's chronic electricity and internet deficit. These challenges have been significantly compounded by the outbreak of the COVID-19, which has led to the prolonged closures of schools and kindergartens as part of the measures to contain the pandemic. Adding to this, the political unrest that escalated in the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter of 2021 resulted in some children being killed and others injured, school infrastructure damaged, students in Gaza suffering learning loss, in addition to the psychosocial consequences as a result of the hostilities, where girls and boys suffer trauma and experience developmental challenges which, if left unaddressed, will negatively impact their educational attainment. For students with disabilities, prolonged hospitalized children, ex-detainee children and children under home arrest such negative consequences are compounded by their need for assistive devices and/or customized learning support that are largely unavailable due to financial constraints and a shortage of properly trained teachers. The cumulative result is a significant student population that is vulnerable, out-of-school, without psychosocial support and specific skills relevant for their educational and developmental needs.

Owing to this protracted conflict, it is within this population of nearly 500,000+<sup>2</sup> children that the SoP ECW/MYRP targets the most vulnerable and marginalized children since they reside in the areas most impacted by the Israeli occupation. The SoP ECW/MYRP aims to strengthen the resilience and development of these affected children, families and communities in Gaza, East Jerusalem, Hebron, and Area C. The programme seeks to bridge the gap between the short-term education humanitarian interventions and the broader long-term education priorities of the Ministry of Education (MoE). The existing humanitarian response plan (HRP) is providing short term interventions to address acute crises while the MoE leads the implementation of education related strategies with coordinated donor support focused on both operational costs as well as developmental interventions. The SoP ECW/MYRP investment fills this significant gap in between by providing vulnerable children in the areas most impacted by the Israeli occupation regular access to inclusive quality education in a safe learning environment, tailored to their specific needs and required follow up. More specifically, the programme

<sup>1</sup> Education Management Information System (EMIS) 2018/19

<sup>2</sup> The 27th May published United Nations and NGOs humanitarian Flash Appeal/plan to support Palestinians affected by the recent escalation outlines the immediate humanitarian and early recovery responses for the coming 3 months. The Flash appeal defined the number of school-age children in need of educational support at 612,985.

aims at ensuring that crisis-affected vulnerable and marginalized girls and boys (6-17 years) have sustained and safe access to improved quality and relevance of education in inclusive and protective environments. The programme seeks to achieve this through **THREE OUTCOMES**:

**Outcome 1:** Improved, sustained and safe equitable, inclusive and gender-responsive access to education and learning opportunities for crisis-affected vulnerable and marginalized girls and boys (6-17 years old);

**Outcome 2:** Improved quality and relevance of education for crisis-affected vulnerable and marginalized girls and boys (6-17 years old) in inclusive and protective environments; and

**Outcome 3:** Strengthened capacity of the education system to respond to chronic humanitarian needs and to deliver a coordinated and mainstreamed response.

The implementation of the SoP ECW/MYRP is carried out by 5 partners (UNICEF as main/lead grantee responsible for overall programmatic management and four sub-grantee/partners of UNESCO, UNDP, UNRWA and Save the Children “SCI”) who work with local implementing partners.

With these ToRs, the Programme Management Unit (PMU), an independent coordination body for SoP ECW/MYRP, seeks to contract an international evaluation firm to undertake a summative final evaluation of the SoP ECW/MYRP as part of the SoP ECW/MYRP Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan.

## 2. SoP ECW/MYRP Theory of Change and Results

This section outlines the SoP ECW/MYRP theory of change (ToC) and strategic approach that is assumed to contribute towards achieving the overarching goal of ensuring access to and continuity of quality and safe education opportunities for conflict-affected children in Palestine with linkages to ECW’s first response investment in Gaza. It also outlines the so far achieved results by the SoP ECW/MYRP.

### 2.1 State of Palestine ECW/MYRP Theory of Change

At this highest level, the ToC reflects and responds to the rights of all children to have access to basic education as enshrined in the 1960 UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education; 1989 UN Convention of the Right of the Child (CRC), ratified by the SoP; the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 4, 5 and 10 and to the rights of all children to a safe education as enshrined in Safe School Declaration 2015. SoP ECW/MYRP recognizes that this ToC is a tool for planning, management, and M&E, that will be reviewed through this consultancy in preparation for and to inform the design of future SoP ECW/MYRPs.

<p><b>Based on the problem statement and root causes detailed in the SoP ECW/MYRP Programme Document and briefly in section 1 of these ToR, the ToC statement focuses on:</b></p> <p><b>If</b> students can safely and regularly access</p>	<p><b>Then</b></p> <p>vulnerable students in Area C (Bedouin and Herder), Hebron H2, East Jerusalem</p>	<p><b>Series of assumptions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Government and partners are willing and committed to achieve better education outcomes for children and adolescents, based on generated evidence</li> <li>• High level of coordination and engagement of the MoE</li> <li>• Sustainability will result through said interventions</li> <li>• There is willingness in Gaza and the West Bank to communicate and share experiences</li> <li>• There is willingness among local officials, teachers, parents, and adolescents to acquire more knowledge and information to achieve better education</li> </ul>
---	---	---

<p>quality and appropriately equipped learning spaces; and</p> <p>If teachers and schools are enabled to provide relevant quality education support and inclusivity including life skills and PSS; and</p> <p>If the MoE can coordinate and manage the identifying, tracking and supporting of these students through strengthened systems and response mechanisms during crises and emergencies</p>	<p>and Gaza will experience improved quality educational opportunities, outcomes, and positive development processes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selected implementing partners have capacity to implement the planned project activities and produce high quality products (learning objects, coding platforms, etc.)</li> <li>• Teachers, principals, supervisors are open and willing to pilot innovation</li> <li>• Security situation allows for uninterrupted implementation of training activities</li> <li>• Innovative approaches presented will contribute to enhanced quality learning</li> <li>• Tested approaches will enhance quality learning in this context</li> <li>• All children will enroll in school regardless of their status or abilities</li> <li>• All teachers who are trained can apply the learned skill effectively</li> <li>• The school/education system is committed to improving its preparedness/DRR to better respond</li> <li>• Gender societal relations and norms can be positively influenced through classroom learning and support</li> <li>• MoE and education directorate in East Jerusalem, Area C and Gaza are committed and willing to achieve the expected results of the project.</li> </ul>
--	--	--

The ECW seed fund (\$18 million in total) kick-started the MYRP, from where onwards new resources are to be mobilized to fund the total MYRP budget envelope, which allows for scale-up and expansion to pre-identified schools/learning centers and thereby reaching more crisis-affected children and youth. The ToC of SoP ECW/MYRP is supported by a results framework for its **three collective outcomes** and outputs (Annex 1 on SoP ECW/MYRP ToC, Results framework and progress updates) i.e. 1) Improved access and continuity of inclusive, equitable education and learning opportunities for girls and boys (Total budget of \$5,198,505.45); 2) Improved relevance and quality of education in a protective and safe learning environment (Total budget of \$6,331,699.59); and 3) Strengthened capacity of the education system to respond to emergency needs and deliver a coordinated response in crises as part of the overall education system (Total budget of \$1,908,692.96).

Next to the collective beneficiary outcomes the SoP ECW/MYRP aims to work on the nexus of emergency, recovery, and development, bringing education actors together to strengthen the resilience of the education system (detailed in section 2.2). To achieve this, the SoP ECW/MYRP aims to contribute to **five systematic outcomes**: 1) Strengthened policies and domestic leadership, 2) Increased, more timely and predictable funding 3) Strengthened Joint planning and coordination 4) Strengthened national and local capacities, and 5) Increased availability of quality data, evidence and research. It is the quality of the SoP ECW/MYRP systemic outcomes that (in theory) affects the design, implementation approaches, and results for the beneficiaries of the SoP ECW/MYRP.

Implementation of the SoP ECW/MYRP takes place through the five grantees/partners. The PMU has no programme implementation role, it is an independent body from all MYRP partners including UNICEF

which has an implementation component under the MYRP. The PMU has influence but not full control over achievement of the programme's outcome results, while remaining jointly accountable on such results by retaining influence on programme management.

## 2.2 The SoP ECW/MYRP in More Detail (beneficiary collective vis-à-vis systematic outcomes)

By effectively bridging the humanitarian-development divide, the strategic intention of the SoP ECW/MYRP is to catalyse innovative approaches combined with evidence-based interventions to meet the needs of conflict-affected children and youth in the said targeted areas of the SoP and to strengthen the education system to manage and coordinate protracted conflicts and crises. The strategy seeks to specifically increase access and continuity of relevant education for conflict-affected girls and boys through interventions that promote protection, inclusion, equity, and quality of education as outlined below. This section details the programme strategy through highlighting both its collective beneficiary and systematic outcomes. It is believed that by detailing these strategies, the applicants are supported better to understand the objective of these ToR and propose solid methodologies to evaluate the SoP ECW/MYRP results.

### Beneficiary Collective Outcomes

The SoP ECW/MYRP is an extension of the UN system ongoing work in line with the 'New Way of Working' whereby collaborating and being jointly accountable towards collective education outcomes. The following is a brief on these outcomes, please refer to [Annex 2 \(The SoP ECW-MYRP in More Detail \(beneficiary collective vis-à-vis systematic outcomes\)\)](#) on ongoing efforts and how the SoP ECW/MYRP is specifically contributing to the achievement of these outcomes:

**Access and Continuity of Education:** The SoP ECW/MYRP aims to improve access and continuity of education to the most vulnerable children in targeted areas.

**Protective Environment:** The SoP ECW/MYRP is envisioned to improve the protection of the learning environment for girls and boys in the SoP targeted areas that are characterised by protracted armed conflict, recurrent disasters, and impoverishment.

**Inclusion and Equity** are promoted through the SoP ECW/MYRP for the most marginalised target groups. The MYRP aims to improve enrolment and prevent drop out of children and children with disability living in Area C, East Jerusalem, and Hebron H2 and schools at particular risk of military presence.

**Quality Education and Learning:** The SoP ECW/MYRP is contributing to strengthening the integration of life skills and inclusive education into the teaching and learning practices.

### System Strengthening

The SoP ECW/MYRP aims to not only to address the immediate needs of education in crises, but also invest in Education in Emergency (EiE) system-strengthening to transition from emergency into recovery, development, and resilience. To promote systemic change aspects such as education cluster/working group, emergency preparedness and disaster risk reduction are included in the response. The SoP ECW/MYRP is contributing to the following strategies/systematic outcomes:

**Strengthened national and local capacities:** The SoP ECW/MYRP contributes to strengthening the capacity of the education system to respond to shocks and sustain inclusive quality provision of education during and after emergencies both in the West Bank and Gaza. The programme focuses on the MoE capacity to coordinate response through robust internal contingency planning at Directorate and school levels as well as through close coordination with EiE Working Group partners.

**Strengthened policies and domestic leadership:** As pointed earlier under section 1.1 and section 2, the SoP ECW/MYRP is closely aligned to key national and international plans and strategies in education and brings together these strategies under the overarching MYRP coherent framework, bridging the gap between the HD work<sup>3</sup>. All consolidate the support to the education agenda in Palestine with emphasis on the most marginalized girls and boys. In terms of domestic leadership, the MoE has clearly expressed its commitment to and the importance of the SoP ECW/MYRP to the Education sector. In addition, the SoP ECW/MYRP partners have demonstrated many examples in strengthening the role of the MoE. (Annex 2).

**Increased, more timely and predictable funding:** Education remains one of the least funded areas of the humanitarian response in Palestine. The SoP ECW/MYRP was designed to serve an advocacy, financing, and resource mobilization role in Palestine. The SoP ECW/MYRP seed funding over three years kicked off the start of the MYRP, from where onwards new resources are to be mobilized to fund the total MYRP budget envelope. Please refer to Annex 2 for further details on MYRP's current predictability and flexibility of financing, initiatives, and platforms for presenting findings, addressing gaps, and mobilizing resources.

**Strengthened joint planning and coordination:** The SoP ECW/MYRP adopted a context-specific approach to education that positions the MYRP strategically within the HDN. Please refer to Annex 2 for details on the formulation of the ECW/MYRP, governance structure, funding modality structure and the continuous joint management, planning, coordination and M&E initiatives that are in line with the ECW global holistic 'whole-of-system' approach to joint programming.

**Increased availability of quality data, evidence, and research:** The SoP ECW/MYRP through joint efforts of its partners and the MoE has led several initiatives to increase availability of quality evidence-based data.

In brief, SoP ECW/MYRP promotes a multi-sectoral "whole-child approach" that responds to the diverse needs that children and youth affected by conflict and crisis face. The strategies followed and the support packages respond to both physical and mental health needs of teachers, children, and their caregivers. This is complemented with other educational needs which include support to teachers and pedagogy, school leadership, community engagement, organization and system strengthening aspects. The evaluability of the evaluation criteria and the type of questions relevant for the SoP is expected to be affected by the SoP political and socio-economic instability, limited capacities and limited government control that should be considered throughout the evaluation. **For the sake of maintaining and strengthening the SoP ECW/MYRP** established momentum in bridging the Humanitarian-Development divide and the whole of a system approach, it is crucial that these ToR examine the above strategies and their connectedness, as well as the results-framework and implementation approach.

## 2.3 State of Palestine ECW/MYRP Results

This section elaborates the SoP ECW/MYRP progress as of November 2021. The MYRP seeks to bridge the gap between the short-term humanitarian education interventions and the systemic, long-term education priorities of the MoE, in addition to strengthening the resilience of targeted affected communities, children, and their families. The ECW investment allows for three critical concurrent strands of work to take place during year 1: essential inception and assessment work; immediate support for underfunded prioritized education needs; and to test and pilot innovative interventions. This strengthens the quality of

<sup>3</sup>The Education Sector Strategic Plan 2017 – 2022 (ESSP), the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP), the Education Cluster Plans and the UNRWA Mid-Term Strategy (with its EIE components). And, international strategies such as 1960 UNESCO Convention against Discrimination in Education; 1989 UN Convention of the Right of the Child (CRC), ratified by the State of Palestine; and the SDGs 4, 5 and 1



the MYRP and ensures that in years 2 and 3, the ECW and additional funds then enable the programme to broaden effectively and efficiently in scale and scope.

Starting from June 2019 and until the reporting date, the ECW/MYRP targeted 899 schools (602 government, 297 UNRWA schools). Accordingly, 419,170 children (206,662 F; 212,508 M) of which 343,876 living in Gaza and 75,294 in the West Bank were reached with the ECW/MYRP assistance. This overall reached figure is controlled for double counting<sup>4</sup>, reaching 76% of the overall programme target of 552,680 (271,382F; 281,298 M) children<sup>5</sup>. Out of the children reached, 401,003 and 18,167 are children reached through formal and nonformal education respectively. Moreover, 304,886 are refugees and 8,166 children with disabilities<sup>6</sup>. These children were supported through the following interventions:

- 1) 42,966 children (20,191 F; 22,775 M) supported through school WASH and infrastructure rehabilitation.
- 2) 98,974 children (51,125 F; 47,849 M) of which 17,068 children (8,534 F; 8,534 M) were grade 12 students<sup>7</sup>, supported through delivering essential cleaning materials and digital thermometers for 186 centers that were used to conduct the final 2020 12<sup>th</sup> grade examinations in a safe manner. 81,906 children (42,591 F; 39,315 M) were from 219 MoE schools in the most vulnerable communities in Gaza supported through delivering hygiene kits to assist them in operationalizing the safe school protocols as part of the Back to School plan of the MoE.
- 3) 5,345 children (684 F, 4,661 M) benefitted from the provision of DRR equipment to schools.
- 4) 125,110 children (62,015 F; 63,095 M) benefitted from school level learning tool kits (science & IT/technology kits).
- 5) 77,832 children (37,463 F; 40,369 M) benefitted from the provision of worksheets and self-learning materials, of which 70,108 children (33,539 F; 36,569 M) from grades 3 and 4 in Arabic and Math in the second semester of the scholastic year 2019/2020 in Gaza, and 7,724 children (3,924 F; 3,800 M) in grades 1-9 in West Bank.
- 6) 6,616 children (2,752 F; 3,864 M) supported with school furniture/equipment for e-learning &/or recreational spaces.
- 7) 2,867 children (1,413 F; 1,454 M) supported with internet access.
- 8) 6,069 children (2,831 F; 3,238 M) supported with first aid and general safety equipment/supplies.
- 9) The training of 1,668 teachers, counsellors, and education personnel (1,006 F; 662 M) on several topics, e.g. inclusive education, digital entrepreneurship, and life skills, using DRR equipment, PSS and emergency planning and response. Moreover, the recruitment of 831 education staff members (522 F, 309 M). More specifically, the recruitment of 680 support teachers in Gaza and 146 psychosocial counsellors (91 F, 55 M) of which 127 are recruited in Gaza and 19 recruited in West Bank. These recruited and/or trained personal provided the following support:
  - 25,214 children (13,355 F; 11,859 M) with PSS and recreational activities including Arabic and math summer camps catch up classes (due to COVID-19),
  - 7,695 children (5,039 F; 2,656 M) supported through developing life skills using DEAL approach (Digital Entrepreneurial Adolescents Leadership), a platform that offers a virtual world that allows adolescents of age 13-17 to develop life skills,

<sup>4</sup> When a child is benefiting from more than one activity, s/he is counted only once.

<sup>5</sup> The original target as per the proposal was 320,000 children: 160,000 girls, 160,000 boys. Moreover, this figure ensures no double counting takes place.

<sup>6</sup> This figures was estimated higher at 11,618 then Adjusted and Estimated at 1% based on MoE latest 2019-2020 M&E report. However, UNRWA figures were maintained as received from UNRWA. MICS 2019 %14 of children age 5-17 years attending school have functional difficulty in at least one domain (out of 13 domains) for example 10% have anxiety.

<sup>7</sup> And their invigilators and exam markers.

- 33,777 children (16,380 F; 17,397 M) supported with additional learning needs (in Arabic and Math) focusing on children with disabilities and those with additional learning needs, including for those with conflict and crisis-related injuries or chronic health needs,
- 472 children (12 F, 460 M) in non-formal education were supported through providing legal consultations and representation in military courts for children under detention, and PSS, remedial education, vocational training and vocational tools for ex-detainee children and children under home arrest.

10) The recruitment of 5 field data collectors (1 F, 4 M) to ensure that proper documentation management and verification of violations in and around schools is taking place. These field data collectors have monitored and documented 236 cases of violations against students and school faculty in various locations. This intervention ensures that proper data is available to enable efficient and rapid response and advocacy to violations against education.

It is worth mentioning that 88.4% and 82.7% of under house arrest and ex-detainee children reported that they were satisfied with the alternative education intervention, respectively. Moreover, 99% and 92.6% of under house arrest and ex-detainee children witnessed minimized PTSD related symptoms as per the post-test scores, compared to 39.7% and 47.7% in the pre-test scores, respectively. 79% of children engaged in life skills training reported an enhancement on their knowledge and awareness in key life skills, compared to 41% in pre-score<sup>8</sup>.

Although it is early to reflect on outcome level indicators, as these will be measured independently under this consultancy, the preliminary data on outcome 2 indicator (% of children with minimum acquisition of life skills) shows that an increase of 10% from the baseline, as per the defined target, is being met. Moreover, a very small but not statistically representative sample of school principals reported 75% satisfaction with monitoring, response, and management at system level and at school level, compared to 57% pre-ECW intervention and hence exceeded the 70.7% defined end-of-the programme target.

In 2020, with support of the Education Cluster and its partners, the MoE developed its COVID-19 National Response Plan that presents the MoE's planned preparedness and response measures to ensure students' safety, psychosocial wellbeing and continuity of transferring knowledge to all students both in Gaza and West Bank. This plan was considered by MoE the umbrella framework for all interventions related to the immediate COVID-19 response and highlighted areas where external technical and financial support from donors and partners was required. The plan's total budget was 2.5 million USD, of which 1.5 million USD was covered by ECW funds: \$921,778 as of September 2020 by the COVID-19 reprogrammed ECW/MYRP funds and the rest by the ECW-FER resources received and managed directly by UNICEF and SCI. In addition, another \$45,300 was added to support the provision of hygiene kits for MoE Gaza schools' reopening and \$286,000 to support the provision of hygiene kits and learning materials for UNRWA Gaza schools from early 2021.<sup>9</sup>

Following the approval of the ear 3 funds from the ECW Secretariat, the MYRP partners, in close collaboration with the MoE, developed and submitted a year 3 reprogramming request which was approved by the ECW Secretariat in October 2021. The reprogramming is fully aligned to the MoE's new sector priorities and its new Recovery and Protection Priorities Plan for 2021-22.

<sup>8</sup> YMCA reports

<sup>9</sup> The SoP ECW/MYRP COVID-19 response/reprogramming to support the implementation of the MoE COVID-19 response request was intensively coordinated with the MoE, Education Cluster and all MYRP partners and approved by the ECW Secretariat. This placed MYRP to support MoE immediately but also at medium and longer-term as the programme aims to build resilience of the education system and actors and builds a bridge between the humanitarian and development continuum.



With regards to the common approaches, the technical dialogue among all partners is delayed due to the COVID-19 emergency taking priority and it is not prioritized in the latest reprogramming respecting the MoE's new priorities influenced by the COVID-19 pandemic and the crisis escalation. Originally, the aim of the common approaches was, in line with MoE adapted methodologies and tools, to identify lessons learnt and best practices and to develop policy guidelines for the benefit of MoE and the Education sector beyond ECW/MYRP<sup>10</sup>. Further details on results (and challenges) of the SoP ECW/MYRP on both collective beneficiary results and systematic outcomes, can be viewed in Annex 1.

## 2.4 State of Palestine ECW/MYRP implementation and management/governance approaches

The SoP ECW/MYRP governance structure and the ToRs of various committees were developed through a participatory and consultative process and were endorsed by the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee (SC) is a high-level advisory, advocacy, coordination and resource mobilization entity co-chaired by the Minister of Education and the UN Resident/Humanitarian Coordinator and its membership includes: 2 donor representatives (Norway and UK for the first 2 years), senior representatives of the five MYRP partners, 6 senior representatives from the MoE, 1 representative from a Palestinian civil society organization, the Education Cluster Coordinator and the Programme Management Unit (PMU), Programme Manager. Other development partners, including the ECW Secretariat, can be invited to the SC meetings as observers as per need. The initially prepared governance structure and ToRs were reviewed and updated again at the technical level in January-March 2020 based on the feedback from stakeholders, and strengthening MoE's engagement and ownership of the programme particularly through creating a new MoE Core team to manage its engagement and adding new MoE members to the SC & Technical Committee (TC). In 2021 the MoE established its internal technical committee to guide the work of ECW/MYRP, chaired by the Deputy Minister of Education and coordinated by a MoE focal point, Director of Field Follow Up. The five partners receive funding and work together to ensure that the programme outcomes are achieved. The PMU, an independent entity hosted by UNICEF, facilitates this process, provides technical assistance, monitors, and manages implementation. For a more detailed process flow for the design of a MYRP, please see [Annex 3: Workflow for MYRP grant applications](#) and [Annex 4: ECW-MYRP Governance Structure and ToRs](#).

The programme inception activities namely, planning, setting-up structures and systems for the SoP ECW/MYRP and initiating implementation were concluded during the first six months of the programme in June-December 2019: a consolidated workplan developed through a consultative process to ensure joint programming and common approaches, the PMU was established, partnership agreements between UNICEF as the lead grantee and the four sub-grantee partners were signed, year 1 funds were disbursed to all partners and the selection of some local implementing partners completed.

The PMU became fully operational in 2020 and led setting up of management systems/tools and finalization of guidance documents. The PMU in collaboration with the MoE manages ECW/MYRP, spearheading effective and efficient joint coordination, in terms of planning, implementation, communication/visibility, governance and developing and operationalizing MEAL, risk and financial

10 Common Approaches in the following areas: i) infrastructure and renovation, led by UNDP and UNRWA; ii) inclusive education, led by UNESCO with co-chairs of DFID and MoE; iii) psychosocial support, alternative/remedial education & reintegration and school-based emergency preparedness & response, led by SCI; iv) safe access, led by UNICEF with UNDP; and v) life skills education, led by UNICEF.

systems<sup>11</sup> for joint performance management. It successfully coordinated joint reprogramming for COVID-19. A baseline survey and needs assessment study<sup>12</sup> was conducted. Moreover, the PMU maintains effective donor relations and reporting; engaging with the Education Cluster and the Education Sector Working Group, and it secured and disbursed the year 2 funds. The partners have started initial actions towards resource mobilization such as providing inputs to the global ECW Secretariat's resource mobilization mapping tool, to ensure sustainability of the MYRP to deliver on planned results and recruiting technical support. With the lead of the PMU, the partners recruited an advocacy and resource mobilization consultant, who developed a desk review analysis, an advocacy/resource mobilization plan and a business case and related advocacy tools such as a generic donor proposal, impact stories, COVID-19 two-pager and generic talking points for the ECW/MYRP partners to use and share with their fundraising teams and donors.

Following extensive in-country consultations and an endorsement of the Steering Committee, the PMU submitted and received approval from the ECW Secretariat for year 3 reprogramming request, after having secured the year 3 funds and a no-cost extension until 31 December 2022. In the reprogramming, the MYRP partners proposed some programmatic adjustments, to better respond to the new priorities of the Education sector and the Ministry of Education, influenced by the COVID-19 pandemic and the crisis escalation in the country. However, the overall programme structure, goal statement, outcomes and outputs remained the same.

The ToC of SoP ECW/MYRP is supported by the above mentioned results' framework, risk and financial management systems in addition to other accountability frameworks, e.g. the governance structure and the MYRP partner-level accountability frameworks towards affected populations, ensuring continuous commitment to a rights-based approach and hence, ensuring their accountability to the primary stakeholders, i.e. girls and boys affected by the conflict. Partners and their IPs are continuously encouraged to report on results through the M&E system. Moreover, the risk management matrix and gender equality lens are used to inform these results, and which include accountability to affected populations (AAP). Different data collection tools, participatory and community-driven planning and monitoring mechanisms are emphasized to enhance the MYRP's AAP<sup>13</sup>. Achieved results are captured in a quantitative database. Data is disaggregated by gender, refugee status, disability, and level of education.

### 3. Purpose, Objectives, Use, Audience and Dissemination of Evaluation

The SoP ECW/MYRP is approaching the end of its second year of implementation which was originally planned to finish in June 2021, but a 6 months' no-cost extension was granted until December 2021. Moreover, a third year until December 2022 has been approved by the ECW Secretariat, with an additional fund of \$6,259,445. Hence, this is a summative and learning oriented evaluation that is necessary to

<sup>11</sup> Informed by the Results and Resources Framework for SoP ECW/MYRP 2019-2021, the programme developed and operationalized M&E, Financial and Risk management systems along with standardized data collection tools utilized by all MYRP partners. It ensures joint PMEL to assess and manage performance, inform decision making, take corrective measures and strategic improvements and informs accountability towards beneficiaries, donors, partners etc.; Streamline the processes of evidence and results-based reporting; through guided data collection, management, analysis, and generating of results-based progress reports. Outcomes, outputs and activities are monitored and compared against performance-based indicators over the three consecutive years. The data available for review and aggregation by PMU, is referenced against information collected through other verification activities. The system captures timely information on the MYRP performance with respect to capacity development interventions, knowledge generated, child individual support, school-class level support, education sector recruitment, challenges and response, and tracks affected population's complaints and complaint resolution mechanisms. Timely collected and analyzed data is used to inform the five partners' collaborative planning, implementation and M&E, ensure the provision of services to the most marginalized girls and boys, ensure greater accountability to populations affected by crises, and provide evidence for advocacy and resource mobilization for EIE. Along different data collection tools, participatory and community-driven planning and monitoring mechanisms and reflection sessions are emphasized to enhance the MYRP's accountability to affected populations (AAP) and understanding. collection and use of evidence-based data to inform strategic responses.

<sup>12</sup> The purpose of the study is to obtain baseline data for the outcome level performance indicators to enable the monitoring of progress towards the desired change through a solid results framework, and to provide a comprehensive needs assessment to better inform the design and implementation of MYRP interventions.

<sup>13</sup> Please refer to SoP ECW/MYRP progress reports for detailed contribution of partners towards AAP. ECW/MYRP supports the partners and their IPs' own existing mechanisms for AAP and builds on them.

evaluate beneficiary collective outcomes as well as progress towards the systemic outcomes and analysing the change processes, “contribution claims,” or “pathways of change” as envisioned in the SoP ECW/MYRP ToC. It is time to investigate whether the ToC holds “true”, as far as the SoP ECW/MYRP is concerned, and if the different actors play their role as envisioned.

### 3.1 Purpose

The main purpose of this evaluation is to learn and assess the SoP ECW/MYRP’s results and provide recommendations to improve any future SoP ECW/MYRP design and implementation modality, and guide the SoP ECW/MYRP partners and all relevant stakeholders on how to better set-up, develop, implement and and evaluate any future SoP ECW/MYRPs.

### 3.2 Objectives

The overarching objectives of the evaluation are as follows:

- A. Evaluate the development process, design, and implementation context and approaches of the SoP ECW/MYRP, its alignment with the SoP ECW/MYRP ToC and ECW’s role and support towards this.
- B. Evaluate and measure the systemic and collective beneficiary results of the SoP ECW/MYRP, with specific attention on whether ECW and its partners are fulfilling their expected roles and responsibilities efficiently, effectively, and collaboratively.
- C. Based on the findings, provide lessons learned and recommendations to inform and improve future SoP ECW/MYRP in-country processes, design, and implementation approaches.

To achieve the objectives, the national context of Education in Emergency and Protracted Crises (EiEPC), and the HDN is to be well understood. It is the quality of the SoP ECW/MYRP systemic outcomes that (in theory) affects the design, implementation approaches, and results for the beneficiaries of the SoP ECW/MYRP. If the ToC holds “true”, as far as the SoP ECW/MYRP is concerned, and if the different actors play their role as envisioned, is to be evaluated. It is also important to adopt an approach that integrates the aspects of gender, human rights, and equity throughout the evaluation and that these are applied across the analysis of the SoP ECW/MYRP.

### 3.3 Use and Audience of Evaluation

The primary users of the evaluation are the five MYRP partners and the MoE. In addition, the other secondary audiences and users of the evaluation report, and who are not directly involved or concerned with this evaluation, will be e.g. the MYRP sub-grantee implementing partners, Education Cluster partners, the Education Sector Working Group (ESWG) members, education NGOs, universities involved in education, and the donor community, specifically ECW.

The assignment will ensure evidence-based targeting and response to the needs within a national approach to education interventions in the SoP. Based on the findings, the evaluation results will be used to provide lessons learned and recommendations to improve the MYRP global and in-country processes, design, implementation approaches and the related SoP ECW/MYRP guidance documents and support that ensures the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and coherence of the response to children’s education needs in the most marginalized areas. The recommendations and the subsequent management responses by ECW globally and by the SoP ECW/MYRP are to be written to specific users.

### 3.4 Dissemination Strategies

The findings will be disseminated through diverse, effective, creative, and barrier-free methods once the evaluation is finalized to ensure its results go beyond a mere internal exercise as well as increasing the evaluation's utility and influence by the different stakeholders. These stakeholders include the SoP MYRP partners and their respective Regional Offices and HQs, to whom the lessons of this work could contribute to strategic thinking around integrated approaches to EiEPC in SoP, Middle East region and beyond.

PMU will utilize several dissemination strategy channels and formats that account for the needs of different audiences, the type of information to be distributed and its purpose. The SoP ECW/MYRP will consider the use of print formats, such as brochures, one-page descriptions, newsletters, executive summaries, or technical reports for the public, conference, workshop &/or roundtable for policymakers, donors, and other actors.

## 4. Scope of Work

The evaluation focuses on the SoP ECW/MYRP (June 2019-December 2022) and its activities as part of the MYRP modality. The SoP ECW/MYRP is implemented by the five MYRP partners who work with local implementing partners. The SoP ECW/MYRP has a national geographic scope of work, focusing on the most marginalized population groups that are most affected by the conflict, with emphasis on the targeted areas/schools across Area C, H2 Hebron, East Jerusalem and Gaza, as per the MYRP programme document and MoE priorities.

Originally the SoP ECW/MYRP targets the following **BENEFICIARIES** in the West Bank and Gaza:

- an estimated 320,000 girls and boys (6-17 years) with a focus on vulnerable children, out-of-school children and children at risk of dropping out in the hardest to reach areas of East Jerusalem, H2 area in Hebron, Area C and Gaza, and for both government and all UNRWA schools in Gaza which mainly serve refugee female and male students;
- teachers and educational personnel (for both government and UNRWA schools), particularly those in vulnerable, hard-to-reach, militarily encircled and besieged areas; and
- parents, caregivers, community members, and local education stakeholders.

The evaluation should pay attention to a core element of the SoP ECW/MYRP, related to **bridging the development-humanitarian gap (the nexus) as detailed above**. The SoP ECW/MYRP aims to bring together all relevant parties amidst a crisis to join forces, secure political support, mobilise resources and implement the MYRP. By bringing together these actors, the programme intends to facilitate joined programming & thereby respond to systemic education needs in the medium and longer term. The extent to which the SoP ECW/MYRP was able to bring the HD actors together and jointly work towards collective beneficiary results is an area that requires specific analysis. As an external party, the evaluation firm is expected to investigate the SoP ECW/MYRP contribution to bridging the HDN thoroughly. This can provide important learning for programming on the HDN, document the lessons learnt, best practices & challenges on how HDN programming will contribute to the eventual formulation of collective outcomes <sup>14</sup>.

14 This exercise will also inform future SoP ECW/MYRPs, contribute to the broader United Nations and Humanitarian Country Teams HDN effort of identifying best practices in working towards the formulation of collective outcomes and resilience building for the most vulnerable groups in the SoP. This will also contribute to the upcoming inter-agency development of the UN Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework expected duration: 2023-2027; the planning for which will begin in 2021.

The SoP ECW/MYRP initial investment will also be evaluated against its beneficiary results and will collect new data as well as incorporate all related data, information, and documentation available. Applying a gender, equity and human rights lens, the evaluation will cover all targeted groups by the MYRP (direct and indirect beneficiaries) including students, teachers, counsellors, caregivers, school principals, school emergency committees, MYRP grantees/partners, MoE staff, IPs/NGOs, donors and other relevant stakeholders.

These ToR will examine the above strategies and their connectedness, the results, risks and financial frameworks and implementation approach, the quality of the SoP ECW/MYRP systemic outcomes and to what extent it affects the development process, design, implementation approaches, and the collective beneficiaries' outcomes of the SoP ECW/MYRP and the ToC. It will also evaluate to what extent the ECW's role (governance structure including its different bodies/actors' division &/or roles and responsibilities) was coherent, effective, and efficient (i.e. fit for purpose/support towards this). Further, to what extent these outcomes served the HDN and "whole of a system" uptake/approach for the benefit of the most marginalized SoP children, to what extent was the SoP ECW/MYRP flexible/shock responsive in its programming, to what extent was its efficient and effective in developing partnerships and accountabilities, and to what extent were gender, disability and humanitarian principles taken into consideration in the programme design and implementation. Moreover, given that the SoP ECW/MYRP was designed to serve both an advocacy, financing and resource mobilization role for SoP being an EiE affected country, to what extent the SoP ECW/MYRP was efficient and effective in addressing quality and financing challenges for education that persist in the short-term humanitarian and long-term development investments, and if no in-country resources were mobilized, why and how this could be improved.

These ToR should contribute to the joint thinking and document the good practices and lessons learnt from the SoP ECW/MYRP efforts on programming excellence for at-scale results for children through developing the resilience of individuals, communities, and systems.

## 5. Proposed evaluation questions

The evaluation should include findings and recommendations based on the evaluation criteria listed below. These evaluation criteria are a combination of development and humanitarian action programmes' criteria set by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) - Development Assistance Committee (DAC) and Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance (ALNAP)<sup>15</sup> that are relevant to the MYRP modality. The evaluation questions will be validated and further refined during the inception phase of the evaluation. The inception phase should design an evaluation matrix framework that outlines the specific evaluation questions that are applicable for SoP ECW/MYRP. The main and sub evaluation questions are as follows:

Evaluation Criteria	Main evaluation questions and related sub-questions
	EQ1: How relevant, appropriate, and significant is the SoP ECW/MYRP at the country level? How can these aspects be strengthened in any future MYRPs in SoP?

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main/alnap-evaluation-humanitarian-action-2016.pdf>

<b>Relevance/ Appropriateness<sup>16</sup></b>	<i>Sub-questions: a) To what extent and how does the SoP ECW/MYRP respond to/reduce <sup>17</sup>differentiated age, gender, geographic, disability and/or socio-economic based inequalities and needs of the most conflict/crisis affected population groups i.e. boys and girls, IDPs/refugees children, children with disabilities? b) How well does it adapt to needs and contexts of the country? c) How well does it adapt to changing needs in the country?</i>
<b>Coherence</b>	<p>EQ2: To what extent is the SoP ECW/MYRP aligning with, complementing, and leveraging international and national humanitarian-development system(s) and related plans, policies, and frameworks? How can these aspects be strengthened in future SoP MYRPs?</p> <p>EQ3: How does the SoP ECW/MYRP align with, complement, and leverage ECW Global strategic plan, core functions and other investment modalities (FER)? How can this be strengthened?</p> <p><i>Sub-questions: a) To what extent does the SoP ECW/MYRP align and collaborate with other sources of funding (government, other donors or NGOs)? b) To what extent and how are the key actors (ECW, beneficiaries, Government, CSOs and MYRP partners) engaged in the design, planning, implementation, and monitoring of the interventions and how can this be strengthened? c) To what extent and how coherent is the MYRP with global humanitarian-development frameworks such as the Grand Bargain Commitments, New Way of Working, and SDG4, Global Compact for Refugees, key principles of Human Rights-based Approach to Programming etc.? d) To what extent and how is it coherent with in-country EiEPC initiatives/ strategies/policies/plans incl. MoE ESSP, MoE COVID-19 response plan, HRP and UNRWA Mid-Term Strategy, among others? (ensuring complementarity, harmonisation and co-ordination with others, including accounting for gaps, and the extent to which the intervention is adding value while avoiding duplication of effort.)</i></p>
<b>Efficiency</b>	<p>EQ4: To what extent is the SoP ECW/MYRP managed in an efficient, timely and transparent manner<sup>18</sup>? How can these aspects be strengthened in any future MYRPs?<sup>19</sup></p> <p><i>Sub-questions: a) How efficient is the organizational set-up and partnership approach (PMU, grantees/UNICEF, the SC and TC, MoE) arrangements of the SoP ECW/MYRP across the project cycle phases and has it been effective in its operations? b) To what extent and how the SoP ECW/MYRP's processes and actors ensure that programme is designed and delivered in a cost-efficient manner, and results achieved cost-effectively? c) How are SoP ECW/MYRP processes and actors balancing speed and quality of its design and delivery?</i></p> <p>EQ5: To what extent and how has the SoP ECW/MYRP created political commitment to address the needs of children and youth (boys/girls) affected by conflict and crisis on a global and in-country level?</p>
<b>Effectiveness</b>	<p>EQ6: To what extent and how has the SoP ECW/MYRP contributed directly &amp;/or indirectly to mobilizing and leveraging funds at country level? How can the MYRPs be strengthened in this regard?</p> <p>EQ7: To what extent and how did the SoP ECW/MYRP promote and strengthen a joint, (humanitarian-development) coordinated, evidence-based, and inclusive approach to EiEPC programming in Palestine? How can these aspects be strengthened in MYRP?</p> <p><i>Sub-questions: a) How was the MYRP used to mobilize funds for the COVID response? b) To what extent are the ECW seed funds complementing the additional generated SoP ECW/MYRP funding, if any? c) if in -country resources were mobilized, to what extent are</i></p>

<sup>16</sup> This includes Cross sectoral questions (HRBAP and Equity)

<sup>17</sup> "Respond to" includes that the objectives and design of the intervention are sensitive to the economic, environmental, equity, social, political economy, and capacity conditions in which it takes place.

<sup>18</sup> See the workflow for MYRP grant applications in annex 3

<sup>19</sup> For example: timeliness, cooperation/communication between actors, alignment with existing humanitarian coordination architecture and processes, funding allocations, Q&A of ECW, decision-making and approval process



	<p><i>these joint efforts addressing needs sufficiently and effectively? d) If no in-country resources were mobilized, why not and how this can be improved? e) To what extent are the SoP ECW/MYRP approaches replicable &amp;/or scalable to other conflict/crisis affected areas in the country? f) To what extent and how is accountability to affected populations considered in the SoP ECW/MYRP, and how can this be strengthened? g) to what extent are local organizations involved in the planning, implementation/monitoring, and re-design of the SoP ECW/MYRP?</i></p>
	<p>EQ8: To what extent and how did the SoP ECW/MYRP strengthen country and local capacities at individual, organizational and institutional levels for improved EiEPC programming? How can the MYRPs be strengthened in this regard?</p>
	<p><i>Sub-questions: a) To what extent and how did the SoP ECW/MYRP facilitate new and strengthen existing partnerships? b) How have the partnerships contributed to effective delivery of programme?</i></p>
	<p>EQ9: To what extent and how did the SoP ECW/MYRP promote and strengthen: (i) the availability of quality data on education needs/gaps in SoP, and (ii) the measurement of output and outcome results? How can the MYRPs be strengthened in this regard?</p>
	<p>EQ10: What is the progress made towards the different collective beneficiary results as identified in the country result frameworks (access, continuity, equity and gender equality, quality and learning, safety)? How can the MYRP be strengthened in this regard?</p>
	<p><i>Sub-question: a) To what extent and how is the SoP ECW/MYRP implementing a comprehensive multi-faceted packaged response so as to ensure continued access to safe quality education and improve life skills learning outcomes for children? b) To what extent and how has the MYRP taken equity considerations for different genders, the disabled and other marginalized population groups into account, and how can the MYRP be strengthened in this regard? c) Have there been any unintended positive or negative side-effects on beneficiaries because of the support provided under the MYRP; and if so, how was this dealt with by the grantees and implementing partners? d) How and to what extent have contextual factors beyond the implementers' control facilitated/hindered achievement of SoP ECW/MYRP outcomes? e) What unintended outcomes has the SoP ECW/MYRP produced?</i></p>
<b>Sustainability</b>	<p>EQ11: How is the SoP ECW/MYRP promoting and strengthening sustainable and resilient education systems and solutions so far? How can it be strengthened in this regard?</p>
	<p><i>Sub-questions: a) To what extent did the SoP ECW/MYRP address longer term institutional/systemic change i.e. capacity development, localization, standards (common approaches), system strengthening etc.? b) To what extent is it improving the resilience of the education system towards crisis settings in the SoP, and what are the major success factors towards doing so? c) To what extent has the SoP ECW/MYRP been conflict sensitive in its planning and implementation?</i></p>

## 6. Methodology and Approach

These Terms of Reference purposely do not impose specific methodologies since it is expected that the **proposals by the evaluation firms will suggest** adequate methodologies towards answering the evaluation questions. However, to clarify expectations, some recommended features of the methodologies to be proposed by the firm in its proposal include:

The COVID-19 pandemic influences how this evaluation can be conducted. The SoP ECW/MYRP aim is to adhere to the timeframe as stated below i.e. from March 2022 to August 2022. The SoP ECW/MYRP asks the evaluators to come up with appropriate approaches on how the evaluation can continue and achieve the stated objectives while adhering to the quality evaluation standards as outlined in the ECW's evaluation policy and UNICEF's Adapted UNEG Evaluation Reports Standards.

- Priority is given to physical visits and field work data collection over other virtual methods. However, given the global state of the COVID-19 pandemic at the start time of data collection, adapting online tools and field work including online surveys, FGDs, KIIs etc. might be necessary. The main study population will include applying a gender, equity and human rights lens, and the evaluation will cover a statistically accepted sample of the targeted groups by the MYRP (direct and indirect beneficiaries) including students, teachers, counsellors, caregivers, school principals, school emergency/disaster management committees, MYRP grantees/partners, MoE staff, IPs/NGOs, donors and other relevant stakeholders.
- The analysis is expected to perform an overall assessment of the entire SoP ECW/MYRP portfolio including its results, thematic and geographical focus, and other characteristics. The SoP ECW/MYRP expects the proposal to present how such a portfolio review will be carried out.
- The SoP ECW/MYRP expects a thorough analysis and assessment of the pathways of change of the programme connecting the different levels of results. A contribution analysis of the SoP ECW/MYRP on the different contribution claims of its ToC and the ECW global ToC would be welcomed.

While upholding independence and objectivity, a participatory approach whereby the evaluation team works closely with the SoP ECW/MYRP PMU, the MYRP partners and other key education actors (incl. those who did not receive funds) to ensure that the findings of the evaluation are credible, sustainable and can be used to improve programming, is mandatory. The SoP ECW/MYRP promotes and invites proposal applications to describe how the evaluators would apply such a participatory approach throughout all steps of the evaluation.

- Innovative approaches towards evaluating partnerships, particularly at the country level, are encouraged.
- A generic ToC on country level is expected to be developed, if the existing one needs updates. This can also facilitate a comparison on how MYRPs are designed in different contexts.
- An evaluation matrix that presents the final evaluation questions, data collection methods and sources of verification at the level of each question and sub-question is expected to be developed.
- Use of credible qualitative, quantitative, and possibly mixed method methodologies to allow for triangulation of information is expected.

The firm is expected to take full advantage of the available reports and data to inform its findings and recommendations. The MYRP proposal, progress and annual reports are available for review on progress made. The programme's financial expenditure information is also available. However, the evaluation will require the firm to conduct primary data collection **on beneficiary outcomes results**.

- The applicants should describe how it will ensure a human rights and gender transformative approach a throughout the design, data collection, analysis and reporting of the evaluation <sup>20</sup>.

20 UNEG Norm 8 Human rights and gender equality. The universally recognized values and principles of human rights and gender equality need to be integrated into all stages of an evaluation. It is the responsibility of evaluators to ensure that these values are respected, addressed and promoted, underpinning the commitment to the principle of 'no-one left behind.' Gender should be understood as a cross-cutting component of all aspects of the evaluation focusing on how gender has been mainstreamed in activities. Additionally, the analysis should be gender sensitive by disaggregating the evaluation data by sex, age and disability to determine the benefits of the programme on different gender and social categories. This evaluation shall be based on a rights-based approach and will be as participatory as possible. This will ensure that the beneficiary

## 7. Planning and deliverables

The evaluation is planned to commence by 1<sup>st</sup> March 2022. The evaluation firm will work in close coordination with the SoP ECW/MYRP PMU, MoE and all 5 MYRP partners and their IPs. The firm will provide the following deliverables (as a minimum) with suggested timeline:

Item	Phase/Deliverable	Description	Timeframe 2022
1	<b>Design phase:</b> Draft inception report	<p>The report includes an evaluation matrix framework with final evaluation questions, data collection methods and sources of verification at the level of each question and sub-question and an evaluation workplan (including timelines, activities, and people to meet).</p> <p>The design phase and consequent inception report (max. 50 pages) should focus on and describe, as a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A causal model and generic SoP in-country ToC of the MYRP funding modality based on the existing SoP ECW/MYRP ToC illustrated above.</li> <li>- Refined qualitative and quantitative evaluation methodologies combined with a clear data collection and analysis strategy, methods and tools and quality assurance in their alignment to ethical protocols (that include an Arabic version).</li> <li>- An evaluation matrix connecting evaluation questions with methods and lists of institutions and people to be surveyed/interviewed.</li> <li>- A robust, well-justified sampling strategy that ensures geographic, gendered and grant size balance.</li> <li>- Assess the availability of documentation and conduct a review of relevant and available primary<sup>21</sup> and secondary materials.</li> <li>- Ethical protocols aligned with principles outlined in ethical issues below. The firm should detail its ethical research process and should adhere to the United Nations evaluation norms and standards and the UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research and Evaluation, Data Collection and Analysis<sup>22</sup>.</li> <li>- A timeline with deadlines for all deliverables.</li> </ul> <p>✓ The inception period requires intake session with SoP ECW/MYRP evaluation committee (most likely virtual).</p> <p>✓ The inception report and proposed tools (provided in Arabic and English) should be cleared by the evaluation committee<sup>23</sup> before the start of the data collection phase. This will include an ethical review</p>	<p>± 4 weeks after signing the contract, i.e. from 1<sup>st</sup> March to 28<sup>th</sup> March 2022.</p> <p>1<sup>st</sup> draft in the 2<sup>nd</sup> week of March 2022.</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup> draft in the 4<sup>th</sup> week of March 2022.</p>

children are engaged and that findings are derived from a collective contribution. In line with the Standards for UN Evaluation developed by the UN Evaluation Group, all those engaged in designing, conducting and managing evaluation activities will aspire to conduct high quality and ethical work guided by professional standards and ethical and moral principles. The evaluation process will be guided by the 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) which spells out the rights to education and protection. Moreover, the evaluation process will be guided by other important treaties reinforcing rights that concern children. At the international level these include the 1979 Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), which is particularly pertinent to the rights of girls, and the 2006 Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), which the European Union ratified in 2010.

<https://www.ohchr.org/documents/professionalinterest/crc.pdf> <https://www.ohchr.org/documents/professionalinterest/cedaw.pdf> <https://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/convention/convoptprot-e.pdf>

21 ECW Global annual results reports can be found on their website. By the time this evaluation starts, ECW Palestine will have three annual reports 2019 report, 2020 reports and a 3rd expected on 31.3.2022.

22 Available at: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2787>. And, UNICEF adapted reporting standards updated June 2017\_FINAL.pdf

23 SoP ECW/MYRP envisioned instituting an Evaluation Committee to provide technical and logistic support and oversight to this evaluation exercise. The evaluation committee is composed of the following members involved in MYRP: ECW Secretariat Evaluation Specialist, PMU, MoE, UNICEF, UNESCO, SCI, UNRWA and UNDP and External evaluation team (one member).

		and approval ( <a href="#">Annex 5</a> : Ethical principles and premises of the evaluation).	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Evaluation Firm validates and adjusts the inception report upon feedback from the evaluation committee and shares the 2<sup>nd</sup> draft with the PMU</li> <li>✓ Evaluation Firm adjusts the second draft of inception report based on the feedback from the evaluation committee and ECW Secretariat M&amp;E Specialist and share the final version.</li> </ul>	
<b>2</b>	Final inception report	Incl. evaluation framework, final evaluation questions, updated evaluation workplan (max. 50 pages)	3 <sup>rd</sup> and final version ± 5 weeks after signing the contract. I.e. 1 <sup>st</sup> week of April 2022.
<b>3</b>	Findings - Feedback process	After the data collection period, a feedback process will be scheduled between the firm and SoP ECW/MYRP evaluation committee and other key stakeholders to discuss findings and determine if any changes/recommendations need to be made prior to drafting the report	1 <sup>st</sup> week of June 2022.
<b>4</b>	Draft evaluation report	<p>Incl. findings, conclusions, and recommendations with accompanying Power Point presentation in both Arabic and English. The draft and final evaluation report should be no longer than 60 pages excluding annexes. The final evaluation report shall be structured as per the UNICEF's Adapted UNEG Evaluation Reports Standard<sup>24</sup> and ECW evaluation policy should indicatively be structured as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Executive summary (a 10-page maximum standalone, non-technical summary, of relevant conciseness and depth for key users, useful to inform decision making and increase general interest in the results but does not overwhelm the reader with a long document. Includes all necessary elements (overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key conclusions on findings, lessons learned &amp; key recommendations).The summary should be in both English and Arabic to reach groups for whom the report may not be accessible due to language barriers)</li> <li>- Introduction</li> <li>- Brief description of the intervention and the intended rightsholders and duty barriers. i. SoP ECW/MYRP modality linked to the ToC incl. a generic ToC on country level, ii. Brief description of the SoP ECW/MYRP and its context, financial arrangements, areas of interventions, timing, implementation modalities and actors</li> <li>- Methodology and methods used incl. limitations of the study design</li> <li>- Analysis and findings considering all main and sub evaluation questions and criteria using a gender, equity, and human rights lens</li> <li>- Conclusions and recommendations</li> </ul>	<p>1<sup>st</sup> draft in 1<sup>st</sup> week of July 2022.</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup> draft 4<sup>th</sup> week of July 2022.</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup> and final version 2<sup>nd</sup> week of August 2022.</p>

<sup>24</sup> More detailed information of the UNICEF's Adapted UNEG Evaluation Reports standard is provided in the UNICEF Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS) Review Template, which will be shared at the start of the consultancy. The report shall be written in line with the UNICEF style guide, to be shared at the start of the consultancy

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Annexes (including the primary datasets files in Arabic and English that are SoP ECW/MYRP's property and cannot be used for other purposes without written agreement from ECW).</li> <li>✓ Evaluation Firm adjusts the evaluation report upon feedback from the evaluation committee, ECW M&amp;E Specialist and shares the 2<sup>nd</sup> draft evaluation report with the PMU</li> <li>✓ Evaluation Firm adjusts the second draft of evaluation report based on the feedback from the evaluation committee and ECW M&amp;E Specialist and share the final version.</li> </ul>	
5	Presentation of evaluation findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Presentation (in-person in a dissemination meeting or virtually) which includes a power point presentation with Arabic translation, meeting agenda, facilitation and discussion which should take place about ½ - ¾ of a day.</li> <li>- Evaluation firm shall onboard feedback/recommendations and ensure that SoP ECW/MYRP is satisfied with the accuracy of information and overall quality of the report.</li> </ul>	2 <sup>nd</sup> week of July 2022.
6	Final evaluation report	As in item # 4 and integrating all feedback incl. annexes and executive summary.	2 <sup>nd</sup> week of August 2022.

The PMU would welcome suggestions for additional deliverables when of added value such as for example factsheets, brochures, infographics, video scribe, videos, or others. **All deliverables must be written in English, while the executive summary, the power point presentations, the data collection tools, questions and the raw and clean datasets should be in both English and Arabic.** Deliverables 2 and 4 will be approved by the SoP ECW/MYRP before continuation.

The evaluation should be evidence-based. All findings and conclusions should be based on evidence which is presented in the evaluation report (including the annexes) and on the triangulation of different sources of evidence to verify and substantiate assessment. In cases where the source of information is interviews, the method of selecting those to be interviewed should be presented in the evaluation report and the findings noted as the views of a stakeholder or a group. In the case of surveys, the questionnaire, information on the population, samples, confidence intervals, margins of errors and the response rates should be presented in the report. The evaluation firm should ensure that all data are collected according to ethical standards (please refer to [Annex 5: Ethical principles and premises of the evaluation](#)) and that the collected data are organized, secured and preserved for potential re-analysis in the summative ECW evaluation. All qualitative and quantitative data and findings will remain the property of ECW/MYRP at the end of the evaluation contract.

## 8. Governance, quality assurance and tasks to be performed by the SoP ECW/MYRP Partners.

The following tasks will be performed:

- Contact persons for the evaluation will be appointed by the SoP ECW/MYRP PMU and the partners.
- The evaluation will be managed by the SoP ECW/MYRP PMU in close collaboration with the evaluation committee.

- Primary supervision will be provided by the SoP ECW/MYRP evaluation committee with PMU M&E (MEAL) Officer as the focal point and in close cooperation with the ECW M&E Specialist to ensure overall quality assurance.
  - The SoP ECW/MYRP PMU, MoE and grantees/partners will facilitate access to respondents in the country, provide technical inputs and manage operational requirements, including providing programme technical and financial documentation to the evaluation team, as required.
  - The SoP ECW/MYRP evaluation committee will work closely with the evaluation firm to ensure high standards and quality assurance. Quality assurance by ECW will take place at different stages of the evaluation process:
    - ✓ Ethical review at the stage of the Inception Report.
    - ✓ The Evaluation Committee will assess quality of key evaluation products, including methodology and evaluation instruments, inception and final reports, and ensure that the evaluation meets ECW quality standards and quality assurance processes.
    - ✓ The SoP ECW/MYRP Steering Committee, Technical Committee (including the evaluation committee), MoE Core Group and the PMU ensure that all the deliverables meet the quality assurance criteria.
    - ✓ The ECW Secretariat's M&E section will provide overall quality assurance and technical assistance to the SoP ECW/MYRP PMU in developing the ToR for the evaluation and review of inception and final reports.
  - After the data collection period, a feedback process will be scheduled between the firm and the SoP ECW/MYRP evaluation committee to discuss findings and determine if any changes/recommendations need to be made prior to drafting the report.
  - A comments matrix will be developed to explain the mechanism of disseminating/responding to the evaluation and its findings.
  - The evaluation firm will share the 1<sup>st</sup> draft of the report and the preliminary findings will be presented to all MYRP partners and accordingly, written feedback will be provided to the firm. A 2<sup>nd</sup> amended version of the report is shared for final feedback by all MYRP partners and ECW M&E section.
  - Evaluation firm shall onboard feedback/recommendations and ensure that the SoP ECW/MYRP is satisfied with the accuracy of information and overall quality of the report.
  - The SoP ECW/MYRP partners will have a maximum of three weeks to submit two rounds of comments on the draft evaluation report.
  - The evaluation firm will make formal contacts with stakeholders as necessary as well as provide logistics and operational support in conducting surveys/interviews/focus group discussions and/or organizing the end-of-evaluation workshop etc.
  - The evaluation firm will be responsible for the timely production of an evidence-based evaluation, including for the provision of high-quality recommendations.
  - The evaluation firm should ensure internal quality assurance of the entire evaluation process and products. In the event of unsatisfactory performance of the evaluation team, the firm should provide a clear action plan for the internal team co-ordination and backstopping arrangements as per the guidance of the evaluation committee.
- Contracting will follow UNICEFs rules and regulations as ECW follows UNICEFs administrative rules and regulations. Contracting is primarily done via the existing long-term agreements (LTAs).



If unsuccessful, the ToR will be advertised through normal channels.

## 9. General guidelines, submission, duration of contract, tentative dates, location, and selection criteria

The evaluation is planned to commence by 1<sup>st</sup> March 2022 and to be completed by 15<sup>th</sup> August 2022. Specific level of effort for the evaluation team will be based on the agreed work plan/inception report that will be finalized with the contract.

A draft evaluation report will be submitted by the end of data collection and will be reviewed by the SoP ECW/MYRP partners who will have a maximum of three weeks to submit two rounds of comments on the draft report.

The evaluation team will not be based at the UNICEF office.

### Technical proposals should as a minimum include a section on:

- Background and contract management capacity of the firm,
- Understanding of the ToR incl. feedback on the ToR,
- Approach and methodology,
- Methods and sampling,
- Workplan including deliverables,
- Proposed team including roles and responsibilities and time-input allocation for each team member,
- Relevant annexes of the proposal are expected to further substantiate the technical bid and include as a minimum the following: firm profile, updated relevant references including contact details of clients, a minimum of 2 examples of evaluation reports recently completed (preferably by members of the evaluation team) that are relevant to the subject of the evaluation<sup>25</sup>, recommendation letters are optional but recommended.

All eligible proposals will be assessed based on these Terms of Reference and the accompanied annexes. They will be granted scores following objective technical criteria under four categories. Percentages on how much each criterion influences the total score are given in brackets below:

#### A. Expertise of the firm or institution (15%):

- Minimum of 10 years of experience in conducting programmatic evaluations in both the humanitarian and development sector in conflict and (post) conflict countries is required. (3%)
- Strong expertise in education, international development, and EiE programme evaluations. (3%)
- Experience with the UN systems is desirable. (2%)
- Experience with evaluating multi-donor initiatives and funding mechanisms. (4%)
- The proposal should include a minimum of 2 examples of evaluation reports recently completed (preferably by members of the evaluation team) which are relevant to the subject of the evaluation. (3%)

#### B. Proposed approach, methodology and work-plan (30%):

25 Reference to already submitted reports as part of the LTA is allowed.

- The technical proposal will include and clearly articulate the approach, methodology, methods proposed for the evaluation<sup>26</sup>. (15%)
- Quality assurance (plan for the systematic M&E of the various aspects of the programme to ensure that standards of quality are being met) (2%), including a risk assessment/mitigation measures proposed (2%).
- The proposal should include a clear work-plan (6%) with roles/responsibilities (3%) and allocation of days for the different team members (2%)<sup>27</sup>

The evaluation firm selection will be undertaken in compliance with the UNICEF's contract management and administration procedures and contracts for institutional consultancies and contractors, and with the conditions stipulated in these ToR. The Team Leader is responsible for assembling and presenting the evaluation team. The team and team leader should prove to possess the following qualifications:

### C. Qualifications and experience of the evaluation team (35%)<sup>28</sup>:

- All team members should have at least an advanced university (Master's) degree in education, international development, organizational development, humanitarian, security and/or conflict/peace studies, social sciences including gender specific training, public policy or related areas (mandatory for all evaluation team members). (10%).
- The team should have experience of:
  - The global discourse on SDGs, education 2030 agenda, Grand Bargain, Refugee Education 2030: a strategy for refugee inclusion, different human and child rights laws and conventions (e.g. CRC, CEDAW, CRPD) and other global frameworks that guide international/humanitarian development. (3%).
  - Experience in evaluating joint programmes and policies in both the development and humanitarian context of the least developed country settings including in the SoP. (3%).
  - Specialized thematic expertise on the subject matter evaluated i.e. EiEPC settings, the IASC and refugee coordination architecture, quality in education, gender in education, equity, MHPSS, safe learning environment, teacher development. (2%).
  - Strong research capacity including a) rigorous quantitative and qualitative data collection, analysis, and data visualization skills as well as b) respect of the dignity and rights of children and adults. (2%).
  - Proficiency in English and Arabic is mandatory for facilitating field work, interviews, transcription, translation etc. (please note budget must include translation costs if the evaluation team or firm lacks Arabic language skills). (1%)

<sup>26</sup> Understanding of, and responsiveness to ECW global evaluation policy, UNICEF SoP evaluation requirements based on Terms of Reference; Understanding of scope, objectives and completeness of response; overall concord between ECW/MYRP requirements and the proposal; Understanding of Subject area. Thoroughness in defining research methodology and protocol, selection of a scientifically valid sample and development of good, concise research tools/questionnaires. The evaluation will deploy a mixed method (quantitative and qualitative methods) for affirming the validity and reliability of the information collected. Data should be disaggregated by gender in order to appropriately compare to baselines and target values. The methodology can include but not limited to the following:

- Secondary data: This will include desk review of available documents on EiEPC globally and locally, in addition to SoP ECW/MYRP related documents.
- Primary data collection through virtual and not virtual quantitative and qualitative methods. The evaluation team should propose the sequencing between quantitative and qualitative.
  - Quantitative methods may include:
    - Surveys (e.g. online perception or satisfaction surveys with representative sample of the population taking into consideration total number of and the different target groups of the beneficiaries benefitting from different types of the MYRP interventions per district).
    - The evaluation will use available routine monitoring data from the SoP ECW/MYRP database.
  - Qualitative data collection methods should be balanced based on type of information and evaluation questions; these could include:
    - Virtual Focus group discussion and Virtual Key informant interviews with local partners, beneficiaries, MoE, donors' other key stakeholders.

<sup>27</sup> A comprehensive work plan to deliver the overall requirement (ToR) including the main activities of the assignment, their content and duration, phasing and interrelations, milestones, key performance indicators (including interim approvals by the Client), and a list of deliverables (reports, products) within the estimated delivery timeframe and dates. 1) Consistency of the proposed work plan with the technical approach and methodology, showing understanding of the ToR. 2) The level of effort for each team member articulated and staff input throughout various stages/components explicitly laid out. 3) The plan must identify and present specific steps and component activities in a chronological manner and must have attached, a flow chart/ critical path analysis, activity plans, personas etc

<sup>28</sup> - The proposed structure and composition of the team for this assignment. The main disciplines of the assignment, the key expert responsible and proposed technical and support staff along with their curriculum vitae (CVs) provided. Team composition and tasks assigned  
- Range and depth of experience with similar projects/contracts/client

- A gender balanced team of international and/or national experts is mandatory (1%).
  - Strong English report writing skills. (1%)
  - Strong interactive presentation and workshop facilitation skills (1%)
  - Strong communication, inter-personal, people and team management skills and ability to Work in a multi-cultural environment to facilitate a smooth process of the evaluation. (1%).
- The team leader should have (10%):
    - A minimum of 15+ years of professional evaluation experience in programmes/policy evaluation in education and/or international (humanitarian) development with expertise in gender programming. (7%).
    - Oral and writing skills in English of the highest standard. (3%).

Core tasks, roles and responsibilities, and time input from each of the team members and the team leader are to be clearly articulated in the proposal.

**D. Pricing (20%): The Financial Proposal should include but not limited to the following:**

- The currency of the financial proposal is United States Dollars (USD).
- Resource costs: Daily rate multiplied by number of days of team members
- Travel Costs - in country (from/to Jerusalem, Gaza, and West Bank), visas and international travels (if applicable). All travel costs should be included as a lump sum fixed cost. For all travel costs, UNICEF will pay as per the lump sum fixed costs provided in the proposal. A breakdown of the lump sum travel costs should be provided in the financial proposal.  
Bidders are required to estimate travel costs in the Financial Proposal. Please note that if any international travel is involved this should be budgeted i) based on economy class fare regardless of the length of travel; and ii) costs for accommodation, meals and incidentals shall not exceed the applicable daily subsistence allowance (DSA) rates, as propagated by UNICEF.
- Data collection cost. This should include a detailed breakdown from the inception and main evaluation data collection and analysis.
- Key administrative cost including interpretation and translation.
- Any other cost the institution finds important to include.

The budget should take into consideration the evaluation payment plan in line with the deliverables in these ToRs. The budget should include all costs and details; so that the costs of expertise and other costs are made visible. Considering the COVID-19 pandemic, travel may not take place depending on availability of transport links and in-country quarantine restrictions. However, all logistics and costs, including translation and international and in-country travel, should be factored in and covered by the contractor. The contractor must demonstrate capacity to work in and/or travel to Gaza, West Bank and East Jerusalem. The contractor should clarify and suggest how field work will be conducted in the present or non-presence of a lockdown.

**Existing price-agreements of the Long-Term Agreements (LTA) with UNICEF (as ECW is a UNICEF-hosted fund) are to be followed. Make sure the financial proposal adheres to this.**

The total budget range for this proposal is between 70.000 – 100.000 USD. A lumpsum contract will be provided. Contracts are in USD.

## 10. Terms of Payment

The proposed payment schedules are by deliverables (as above):

- 20% at approval of deliverables 1 and 2.
- 30% at approval of deliverables 3 and 4.
- 50% at approval of deliverable 5 and 6.

**Recourse:** UNICEF reserves the right to withhold all or a portion of payment if performance is unsatisfactory, if work/outputs is incomplete, not delivered or for failure to meet deadlines.

## 11. Official Travel Involved:

Official in-country travel will be involved, as required. In light of the COVID-19 pandemic travel may not take place depending on availability of transport links and in-country quarantine restrictions.

## 12. Bibliography/Resources for Desk Review

Strategic documents of Global ECW such as the strategic plan, annual results reports and gender strategy can be found [here](#). MYRPs related programmes' information can be found [here](#). SoP ECW/MYRP specific documentation and secondary data will be shared electronically as requested with all applicants, such as:

- MoE COVID-19 Response Plan
- MoE Education Sector Strategic Plan 2017- 2022 (ESSP)
- MoE Recovery and Protection Priorities Ramallah - Palestine 2021 - 2022
- Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP)
- UNRWA Mid-Term Strategy (with its EiE components)
- Joint Advocacy and Protection Strategy
- SoP ECW/MYRP Programme Document and Consolidated Workplan
- SoP ECW/MYRP progress and annual technical and financial reports
- SoP ECW/MYRP Needs Assessment and Baseline Study
- All programme-related partnership agreements, implementing partners' (IPs) progress reports and Programmatic IPs' Field Visit reports
- SoP ECW/MYRP M&E Tool
- SoP ECW/MYRP Financial Monitoring Tool
- SoP ECW/MYRP Risk Management Matrix
- SoP ECW/MYRP governance structure/ToRs
- SoP ECW/MYRP advocacy and resource mobilization documents
- SoP ECW/MYRP Y3 reprogramming request documents
- Any manuals, tools and knowledge products, gender specific and related documentation communication and visibility products developed under the SoP ECW/MYRP.

Annex 1 to Annex 4 can be found in the shared folder link "please copy/paste to your browser" [https://unicef-my.sharepoint.com/:f/g/personal/ssamara\\_unicef\\_org/EvJnx6gWaBVCqBTtlbUsaIAB2LI8lGOnLYQevtut1xYLHw?e=UNjvyU](https://unicef-my.sharepoint.com/:f/g/personal/ssamara_unicef_org/EvJnx6gWaBVCqBTtlbUsaIAB2LI8lGOnLYQevtut1xYLHw?e=UNjvyU)

Annex 1: SoP ECW-MYRP ToC, Results Framework and Progress updates.

Annex 2: The SoP ECW-MYRP in More Detail (beneficiary collective vis-à-vis systematic outcomes).

Annex 3: Workflow for MYRP grant applications

Annex 4: ECW-MYRP Governance Structure and ToRs.

## Annex 5: Ethical principles and premises of the evaluation

The section below outlines the criteria for an ethical review checklist to indicate that this evaluation will in fact go through an ethical review process. Ethical protocols aligned with principles outlined in ethical issues below. The evaluation firm should detail its ethical research process and should adhere to the United Nations evaluation norms, standards and ethical guidelines and the UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research and Evaluation, Data Collection and Analysis, available at: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2787>. [UNICEF adapted reporting standards updated June 2017 FINAL.pdf](#)

Additionally, the evaluation will be carried out according to the ethical principles, standards, and norms established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) outlined below.

- a) **Anonymity and confidentiality.** The evaluation must respect the rights of individuals who provide information, ensuring their anonymity and confidentiality.
- b) **Responsibility.** The study report must mention any dispute or difference of opinion that may have arisen among the evaluation team or between the evaluation team and the commissioner of the evaluation in connection with the findings and/or recommendations. The team must corroborate all assertions, or disagreement with them noted.
- c) **Integrity.** The evaluator will be responsible for highlighting issues not specifically mentioned in the TOR if this is needed to obtain a more complete analysis of the intervention.
- d) **Independence.** Evaluation in the United Nations systems should be demonstrably free of bias. To this end, evaluators are recruited for their ability to exercise independent judgement. The evaluation team must be free of conflict of interests with respect to the composition and submission of this evaluation and must be willing to affirm that the observations and findings they are to present in the report are not tied to or associated with any external factors.
- e) **Incidents.** If problems arise during the fieldwork, or at any other stage of the evaluation, they must be reported immediately to the evaluation manager. If this is not done, the existence of such problems may in no case be used to justify the failure to obtain the results stipulated in these terms of reference.
- f) **Validation of information.** The evaluation team will be responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the information collected while preparing the reports and will be ultimately responsible for the information presented in the evaluation report.
- g) **Intellectual property.** In handling information sources, the evaluation team shall respect the intellectual property rights of the institutions and communities that are under review. All materials generated in the conduct of the evaluation are the property of ECW and UNICEF and can only be used by written permission.
- h) **Delivery of reports.** If delivery of the reports is delayed, or if the quality of the reports delivered is clearly lower than what was agreed, the penalties stipulated in these terms of reference will be applicable. In line with the Standards for UN Evaluation in the UN System, all those engaged in designing, conducting, and managing evaluation activities will aspire to conduct high quality and ethical work guided by professional standards and ethical and moral principles. The report should comply with the [UNEG Norms and Standards](#) and with [UNICEF's Reporting Standards \(2017\)](#)<sup>29</sup>.

Annex 6: Evaluability and Possible Limitations to the Evaluation  
Part of the limitations to the evaluability of the SoP ECW/MYRP are listed below:

<sup>29</sup> [Detail of Norms and Standards for Evaluation \(2016\) \(unevaluation.org\)](http://www.unevaluation.org).  
[https://unicef.sharepoint.com/sites/EO/DL1/Forms/AllItems.aspx?id=/sites/EO/DL1/UNICEF adapted reporting standards updated June 2017 FINAL.pdf&parent=/sites/EO/DL1](https://unicef.sharepoint.com/sites/EO/DL1/Forms/AllItems.aspx?id=/sites/EO/DL1/UNICEF%20adapted%20reporting%20standards%20updated%20June%202017%20FINAL.pdf&parent=/sites/EO/DL1)

- a) The Covid-19 pandemic may restrict field visits during data collection which will necessitate the use of alternative data collection approaches such as virtual tools (e.g. phone interviews, virtual Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and SMS, phone or online surveys, among other tools. Additionally, the Evaluation team will use pre-existing secondary data such as administrative datasets, field monitoring information and previous survey datasets to answer some evaluation questions).
- b) If the study limits its methodology to qualitative data collection; this will not be statistically representative and has limitations in investigating causality.
- c) The response rate may be low in certain areas given that some stakeholders, communities are conservative and may not openly participate in the evaluation questions.
- d) Ethics and sensitivity of talking directly to children and caregivers who have benefited from the various activities, particularly given the vulnerability of these children. It is suggested that the evaluation team overcome these challenges by signing non-disclosure agreements; and seeking the agreement of the implementing partners. The evaluation team will also be required to undergo the ECW/UNICEF ethical review process.
- e) To undertake this evaluation the Evaluation team may need to access monitoring data from the Ministries and partners, but this may not always be available.

#### Annex 7: General Conditions

No contract may commence unless the contract is signed by both UNICEF and the evaluation team or Contractor.

- The selection process for the consultancy firm will strictly follow UNICEF's internal procurement rules
- UNICEF will provide assistance where possible for necessary access and permits required for the evaluation
- The firm will provide fortnightly verbal or short email progress updates and have review meetings with UNICEF, ECW/MYRP on monthly basis (face to face, phone, or online meetings)
- The firm will provide draft report for review and amend as requested before submitting the final report
- UNICEF may request that the Consultancy firm submits original copies of all evaluation tools, discussion and interview guides, sampling procedures, field notes, completed questionnaires and any other material related to the implementation of the evaluation.

UNICEF will not provide office space to the team. All requirements including venues for workshops, transportation, visa, health insurance, secretariat services, interpreter, translator, etc., will not be covered by UNICEF. The UNICEF office will provide any documentation, letters to government, etc., to make sure that the evaluation is conducted in good conditions.

Other stakeholders, beneficiaries and implementing partners will support in establishing the focus and direction of this evaluation. The opinions, interests, concerns, and priorities of stakeholders will be solicited early in the evaluation process. Stakeholders might include internal staff, such as programme managers and officers, but should also include external stakeholders such as policymakers, researchers, community members, professional organizations and others who have interest, experience, and expertise in the programme or initiative being evaluated. Additionally, the stakeholders will provide the information, or the data required for this evaluation, mobilize the interview participants, and as well provide logistical and other support required for the successful implementation of the evaluation process.