



## TERMS OF REFERENCE

### Endline Survey for Community Based Education for Out of School and Vulnerable Children (COBE) Project in South Sudan, January 2023

#### 1 Background of Project

With funding from Global Affairs Canada (GAC), Stichting BRAC International is implementing the Community-Based Education for Out-of School Girls and Vulnerable Children (CoBE) project in the four South Sudanese states of Eastern Equatoria, Central Equatoria, Western Equatoria and Northern Bahr el Ghazal. The CoBE project is designed to expand access to education and learning opportunities for marginalized and vulnerable out-of-school children (OOSC) and youth, especially girls, by addressing institutional, social and cultural barriers to basic education.

CoBE project activities are aimed to reach, directly and indirectly, an estimated 78,372 people. At their core, the interventions aimed to *improve learning outcomes for 6,825 formerly out of school children and youth (OOSCY) (ages 8-18 years), primarily girls, in the states of Eastern Equatoria, Central Equatoria, Western Equatoria and Northern Bahr el Ghazal in South Sudan*. The project has two (2) result areas as follows;

- Increased availability of sustainable, safe, secure, quality and inclusive learning centers for marginalized children & youth, primarily girls, including students with disabilities.
- Improved equitable and coordinated provision of innovative, safe, quality, gender-responsive and evidence-based non-formal primary education for children, and adolescents, primarily girls, including those with disabilities

This has been engaged through the establishment of 101 non-formal schools (225 total cohorts) and the adoption of a community-based, non-formal basic education model that is aligned with the government of South Sudan's Alternative Education System (AES). CoBE uses two age-specific government curricula: (1) Community Girls' School (CGS) curriculum for children aged 8 to 12 and (2) the Accelerated Learning Program (ALP) curriculum for children aged 12 to 18. The 101 schools included 150 CGS cohorts and 75 ALP cohorts (comprising 39 single cohorts and 18 double cohorts) that reached a total of 6,755 children covering 10,132 parents. A total of 247 teachers and 747 SMC members have been trained and are involved in the project. The performance of students is being actively tracked, and school-based activities are supplemented with extensive efforts to sensitize communities, strengthen knowledge and skills on Covid-19 prevention, build critical life-skills, providing psychosocial support (PSS) and providing and strengthening student transition to the formal school system.

#### 2 Purpose/ overall objective

The purpose of the evaluation is to establish and document the impact and effectiveness of project interventions on short term learning outcomes and wellbeing, and evaluate the social economic effect on the learners and their families and the governance of social services delivery to assure lessons learned are captured assuring accountability to both the system and donor. The evaluation is expected to provide data on the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, coherence and sustainability of project interventions. The findings and recommendations will contribute to a learning process which enables BRAC to draw lessons from its experience in order to improve learning outcomes for out of school children and youth (OOSCY), primarily girls and document new knowledge and important topics for further inquiry, action, lobbying and



influence. The evaluation will also help to assess the effectiveness of community accountability systems and mechanisms that were used during the project implementation period.

## 2.1 Expected results and specific objectives

The evaluation will focus on the entire project duration, from April 2020 to January 2023. Within this period, the evaluation will assess project outcomes at all levels: including all result areas, beneficiaries and project stakeholders. The evaluation will, in particular, seek to assess the impact and relevance of the project’s intervention on contributing to improve learning outcomes for out of school children and youth (OOSCY), primarily girls in South Sudan.

### Objectives

The objectives of the evaluation are summarized below:

- To evaluate the project in terms of its effectiveness, relevance, coherence, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, with a priority on assessing the progress towards expected results, objectives and overall goal;
- To identify key lessons and potential best practices for learning and potential scale up;
- To assess the challenge, best practice and document the outcome for future programmes.

The evaluation will employ the six specific evaluation criteria for humanitarian action from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development – Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) to guide the study with special emphasis on sustainability.

Results Chain	KPIs
<p><b>Impact:</b> Improved learning outcomes for 6,825 formerly out of school children &amp; youth (ages 8 – 18), primarily girls, in the four states of Northern Bahr el Ghazal, Eastern Equatoria, Central Equatoria and Western Equatoria in South Sudan</p>	<p><b>Indicator 2:</b> % students who attained the required level of literacy and numeracy skills</p> <p><b>Indicator 4:</b> % of girls who demonstrated meaningful improvement in life skills knowledge, attitudes and practices</p>
<p><b>Outcome 1:</b> Increased equitable access to safe, secure, quality, inclusive education and learning by marginalized children and adolescents, primarily girls, including those with disabilities</p>	<p><b>Indicator 6:</b> % of children who reported that the school environment is safe, secure and disability friendly</p> <p><b>Indicator 8:</b> % of students who scored at least 60% on annual exams in mathematics, English and science</p> <p><b>Indicator 9:</b> % of students from community based schools that feel safe traveling to and from school</p> <p><b>Indicator 11:</b> % of community school students that drop out before end of school year</p>
<p><b>Outcome 2:</b> Improved equitable and coordinated provision of innovative, safe, quality, gender-responsive and evidence-based non-formal primary education for children, and adolescents, primarily girls, including those with disabilities</p>	<p><b>Indicator 12:</b> % of community school female students who report having a positive female teacher role model.</p> <p><b>Indicator 13:</b> % of schools that received technical and/or material support from state and non-state actors for project implementation and/or transition to formal government schools</p>



## 2.2 Target Population

The survey intends to reach the following project stakeholders learners, teachers, School Management Committee (SMC) members, Community members, including parents and caregivers, government staff and other partners' staff

## 2.3 Evaluation Criteria Lead Questions

The evaluation will be guided by the following questions:

No	Evaluation Criteria	Mandatory evaluation questions
1	<b>Effectiveness</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How appropriate was the management process in supporting delivery of project expected results?</li> <li>2. To what extent did the Project's M&amp;E mechanism contribute in meeting project results?</li> <li>3. How effective were the strategies and tools used in the implementation of the project?</li> <li>4. To what extent were the intended project goals, outcomes and outputs achieved and how?</li> <li>5. To what extent did the project reach the targeted beneficiaries at the project goal and outcome levels? How many beneficiaries have been reached?</li> </ol>
2	<b>Coherence</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To what extent does the project support or undermine other interventions ((particularly policies).</li> <li>2. Does the project have synergies and interlinkages with other BRAC implemented projects?</li> </ol>
3	<b>Relevance</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Was the project relevant to the identified needs of the target beneficiaries and the context?</li> <li>2. Were the project inputs and strategy (including its assumptions and theory of change) realistic, appropriate and adequate to achieve the results</li> <li>3. To what extent do achieved results (project goal, outcomes and outputs) continue to be relevant to improving the learning outcomes for out of school children and youth (OOSCY), primarily girls in South Sudan?</li> </ol>
4	<b>Efficiency</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How far the results achieved justified the cost incurred - were the resources effectively utilized?</li> <li>2. Did project activities overlap and duplicate other similar interventions (funded nationally and /or by other donors? Are there more efficient ways and means of delivering more and better results (outputs and outcomes) with the available inputs?</li> <li>3. Could a different approach have produced better results?</li> <li>4. How efficient and timely has this project been implemented and managed in accordance with the Project proposal?</li> </ol>
5	<b>Sustainability</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Are there any plans and or strategies to sustain the provision of service after the project?</li> <li>2. How effective were the exit strategies, and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the project?</li> <li>3. What are the key factors/areas that will require additional support/attention in order to improve prospects of sustainability of the project outcomes and the potential for replication of this approach?</li> <li>4. What are the recommendations for similar support in future?</li> </ol>
6	<b>Impact</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What are the unintended consequences as a result of the project activities?</li> <li>2. Are there any significant changes in the context as a result of the project intervention?</li> </ol>
	<b>Learning and Replicability</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What are some of the key lessons learned as a result of this project that can be shared and replicated?</li> <li>2. What are the recommendations for similar/future interventions?</li> </ol>

## 2.4 Evaluation Methodology



The evaluation should follow a collaborative and participatory mixed methods approach that draws on both existing and new quantitative and qualitative data to answer the evaluation questions particularly the impact/effectiveness of project. Qualitative data collection (FGDs, KIIs...) will complement and validate the quantitative component and will further explore the perceptions of the targeted beneficiaries regarding the proposed intervention in the targeted areas.

The evaluation should follow a theory-based approach. It is expected that the consultant will assess the quality of the project’s impact logic and if necessary, to develop a realistic impact logic based upon the interventions; and give due consideration to the information outlined in this ToR to ensure accuracy and rigor. The choice of method must also consider the needs and capacities of the different target groups and stakeholders. The consultant will report to BRAC following the modalities of communication, feedback

**Desk Review**

Desk review should be conducted by the consultant to inform the methodology and development of the tools. In addition, the conducted desk review should cover the following documents: project implementation plan, performance measurement framework, MEL plan and existing data collection tools in BRAC, sampling methodologies, and secondary literature studies related to the measurement of goal and outcome level indicators (Baseline Report). The desk review process should serve as a guide for the consultant to continue gathering resources that would enable him/her to carry out development of tools and End of Project planning.

**Sample size and sampling process**

The sampling strategy should be a validated and recognized approach that defines the targets of an accessible, representative and appropriate sample size and clearly outlines the sampling plan as identified and described by the consultant and pre-approved by BRAC. The overall sample should be representative. It should be also selected from all relevant different settings targeted by the project to ensure representation of all community members from all of the age groups, nationality and gender.

The sampling process should be identified and described by the consultant as relevant to the target groups and different settings in the different project locations taking into consideration the different target population dynamics. Selection should be based mostly on probability approaches. Data will be collected with individual respondents in the settings where project activities will be taking place.

**2.5 Evaluation Timeline**

The evaluation is expected to start on January and will last for 45 days working days including fieldwork/interviews and report writing and submission.

**3 Evaluation Deliverables and Timeline**

No.	Deliverables	Description	Timeline
1	<b>Inception Report</b>	The inception report should detail the evaluators’ understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods; proposed sources of data; and data collection procedures and tools. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks (work plan), activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task. Before accepted to become the guide for the evaluation, the inception report must be discussed and agreed	23 Jan



		with BRAC. Criteria to ensure the quality of the evaluation report should be well detailed in inception report. It should be submitted 5 days following the official commencement of the evaluation	
2	<b>Fieldwork Preparation</b>	Training of enumerators, pretesting of tools and final validation.	30 Jan
3	<b>Data Collection</b>	Briefing, deployment of enumerators, data collection and post field work debriefing.	6 -17 Feb
4	<b>Presentation of Data</b>	Lead Consultant to present to BRAC an-analyzed summary of field data before the writing of the first draft report. This will allow for review, questioning and field follow up and cross validation.	23 Feb
5	<b>Draft Evaluation Report</b>	The evaluator(s) must submit a draft report for review and comments by all parties involved after analysis of the field data. BRAC must review the draft evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation meets required quality criteria	10 March
6	<b>Final Report</b>	<p>This will be submitted 7- 10 days after receiving comments from the BRAC. The content and structure of the final analytical report must include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Executive Summary presenting the major findings and recommendations</li> <li>● Evaluation aims, objectives, and scope</li> <li>● Assessment of the project’s underlying impact logic</li> <li>● Description of the methodology used</li> <li>● Limitations</li> <li>● Description of the assessment context and process including its constraints and challenges</li> <li>● Detailed findings (related to the objectives and structured considering DAC criteria and questions)</li> <li>● Analysis of the findings (following the key questions outlined in the ToR)</li> <li>● Conclusions</li> <li>● Recommendations for the project approach</li> <li>● Lessons learnt, best practices and success stories</li> <li>● Reports on the capitalization of good practices.</li> <li>● Annexes</li> </ul>	20 March

### 3.1 Roles of BRAC

- Circulate TOR, select most appropriate consultant/s, and manage contract and payment.
- Provide relevant literature for desk research.
- Facilitate the process of appointments for interviews with project stakeholders.
- Provide input into the development of final project evaluation tools.
- Approve final report and other deliverables.

### 4 Required Qualifications and Expertise for Lead Evaluator/Entity

The Evaluator shall have the following expertise and qualification:

- Demonstrated expertise in operating effectively in several locations in South Sudan
- A minimum of a postgraduate University degree in Education, Development Studies, Social Sciences, Business Administration, Strategic Management or equivalent.
- Good facilitation and presentation skills.



- Strong interpersonal skills.
- Knowledge of education programming and the measurement of learning outcomes
- At least Ten years' work experience in International Development.
- A minimum of three years consulting experience as a team leader leading research projects.
- At least three review assignments/evaluations successfully completed.
- Experience in participatory methods of research, gathering and synthesizing the perspectives of stakeholders.
- Good knowledge of gender mainstreaming and inclusion issues.

Consultants are expected to conform with BRAC's Code of Conduct and its Safeguarding Policy. Offers will be evaluated on these criteria as well as the quality of the technical offer (proposed methodology, capacity to mobilize qualified personnel in the field, etc.) and the soundness of the financial offer.

### **5 Budget, logistics and management**

BRAC has approved funding of USD \$37 000 to commit to the evaluation, which is inclusive of costs, encompassing expenditures related to both logistics and the evaluation. Payments will be both upfront and linked to the delivery of the final report. The first 50% of remuneration associated with upfront costs such as travel and accommodation and field costs, will be paid in a first instalment upon submission of inception report, 20% will be paid upon submission of the draft report and we reserve the right to the final 30% payment upon the condition that we receive a satisfactory final approved report of sufficient quality. The total amount of consultancy fees is subject to 20% withholding tax in line with National Revenue Authority requirements.

### **6 Mode of Application:**

Interested, qualified and experienced person, group of persons or firms (**National**) must submit an Expression of Interest dossier by **6 January** to [n.moreen@brac.net](mailto:n.moreen@brac.net), [asanita.angella@brac.net](mailto:asanita.angella@brac.net) Copy [seth.mangare@brac.net](mailto:seth.mangare@brac.net), and [chido.musiya@brac.net](mailto:chido.musiya@brac.net).

The expression of interest should contain: (a) a technical offer and (b) a financial offer, comprising:

#### **A. Technical offer:**

- Up to date CV of the lead consultant/evaluator (showing education and expertise).
- Technical proposition detailing proposed methodology and resources needed.
- An example of a report from similar work which demonstrates evidence of the skills and experience required and a list of past evaluation produced by the lead consultant/evaluator.

#### **B. Financial offer:**

- Budget for the assignment including professional fees and logistics cost.