



TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE PROJECT FINAL EVALUATION

**“Promotion of Safe Schools in the municipality of Datu
Odin Sinsuat (Mindanao)”**

2017/PRYC/000500

Financier: Spanish Agency for International Cooperation and
Development (AECID)

Partner: Plan International Spain

Implementing Partner: Plan International Philippines

Local Partner: Kadtuntaya Foundation, Inc. (KFI)



CONTENTS

1. Introduction
2. Evaluation purpose and background
3. Actors Involved
4. Scope of the Evaluation
5. Questions and evaluation criteria
6. Assessment methodology and work plan
7. Documents and information sources
8. Structure and presentation of the evaluation report
9. Evaluation team
10. Premises of the assessment, authoring and publishing
11. Deadlines for completion of the evaluation
12. Presentation of the technical offer and valuation criteria



1. INTRODUCTION

- **Title of the intervention:** “Promotion of Safe Schools in the Municipality of Datu Odin Sinsuat (Mindanao)”
- **Evaluation Type:** Final External Evaluation
- **Organization name's:** Plan International Spain
- **Name of Local counterpart:** Plan International Philippines
- **Reference project:** 2017/PRYC/000500
- **Total cost intervention:** 362.431 €
 - **AECID:** 344.488 €
 - **Plan contribution Spain:** 17.943 €

These ToR specify the details for the final technical external evaluation of the above-mentioned project implemented by the organisation Plan International Spain and Plan International Philippines, and the local partner Kadtuntaya Foundation, Inc. (KFI). The main financier of this project is AECID, and the duration of the project is from 1st April, 2018 to 31 March 2020 (it is scheduled to last 24 months).

The Philippines is a medium-low income country and exposure to natural hazards that mainly affect the most vulnerable people. In the whole of the country, Mindanao Island is considered one of the most fragile areas, exposed to natural catastrophes and disasters caused by humans. The project is implemented in 5 Schools in the municipality of Datu Odin Sinsuat (Mindanao). Although the law requires all schools to be prepared to deal with disasters, deficient infrastructures and the absence of prevention and management mechanisms do not allow a truly effective response. This makes impossible the correct functioning of educational centers, negatively impacting the education and safety of children. This project aims to contribute to increasing the resilience of the population in the island through the support to several educational centers. It includes knowledge management actions and lessons learned, with the aim of the initiative to be able to be reproduced in other centers of the country.

2. EVALUATION PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

2.1 Project Objective

Children are vulnerable to the impact of natural and man-made disasters. In case of a disaster, schools should become safe spaces at the service of the children as well as the rest of the community. This project implemented by Plan International with funding



from AECID, aims to contribute to the strengthening of the Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) strategy in the Philippines. The general objective is to increase the resilience of the educational community in Maguindanao province to cope with disasters through a Safe Schools strategy. More specifically, it aims to support five educational centers in Datu Odin Sinsuat municipality (Mindanao) by improving their capacity to deal with disasters through a participatory prevention and response plan with a gender and child-centered approach.

Overall objective: Strengthening resilience to disasters in Mindanao through Safe Schools.

Specific goal: Five Schools in Datu Odin Sinsuat Improve Disaster Response Capacity

Result 1: The educational community improves its knowledge about DRM and generates a safe educational space.

Result 2: Risks in schools are evaluated and actions are implemented to improve safety.

Result 3: Schools have emergency teams prepared for their activation in case of a disaster.

Direct beneficiaries of the intervention are five schools that hold the Datu Odin Sinsuat municipality: Taviran, Bongued, Linek, Sapalan and Neketan Elementary Schools. The rights holders are 1,803 students (874 children and 929 girls) between the ages of 6 and 11, as well as 52 teachers (12 men and 40 women) from the five schools. In an indirect way, the intervention aims to reach 7,322 people (3,699 men and 3,623 women) who represent, together with the minors, the community in which the schools are located.

2.2 Evaluation Objective

The evaluation will focus on the assessment of the implemented and whether the activities lead to the achievement of the planned results as well as to the project objectives. The evaluation will include a rigorous analysis of the project design, participation counterpart, ownership, administration and management of resources and the impact on the beneficiaries (direct and indirect).

As a result of this evaluation, recommendations from the evaluator/s are expected in order to improve the quality of future projects. The findings, lessons learned, and recommendations obtained in the evaluation will be disseminated among Spanish and



Philippine actors involved in the intervention, and will be used by those responsible for project implementation mechanisms to improve resource management. The evaluation work will take place in Philippines.

3. ACTORS INVOLVED

Actors involved in the intervention and assessment were selected with a gender perspective, taking into account working groups disaggregated by gender and age to promote equal access for women, men and children:

Participation of stakeholders:

- Communities and leaders
- Participation in focus groups: Population of the target communities

With regard to disaster preparedness and increased resilience of the educational community, an effort was made to effectively incorporate:

- The technical staff of the Department (Ministry) of Education responsible for curriculum and educational materials
- Teachers and youth movements or local student organizations
- Child Rights Network (CRN)
- Agents of the Department of Education at the local level.
- Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA) initiative
- Representatives of the village councils and the technical representatives responsible for DRM at the municipal level.
- Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG),
- the National Disaster Risk Reduction & Management Council (NDRRMC)
- the Mindanao Peacebuilding Institute.
- AECID Technical Cooperation Office (OTC) in Manila.
- Red Cross and its Disaster Management Service
- Coordination with UNICEF, UNHCR, and UNFPA through the Humanitarian Country Team
- Parent Teachers Association (PTA).
- School Governing Councils (SGC).

4. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The final evaluation shall cover a period of 24 months from the start of the project on April 1, 2018 until the end of the project on 31 March 2020. The evaluation will cover 5 Elementary Schools of the following locations:

- Taviran
- Bongued
- Linek
- Sapalan
- Neketan

The final evaluation will cover the main areas of intervention and evaluate the main results concerning the indicators in the financing agreement of the project, considering the impact of gender and inclusion of the project. The main areas / activities are:

Risk assessments; training sessions on Risk Management (natural hazards, human-induced disasters and climate change); courses Safe Schools framework; preparation of School Improvement Plans; rehabilitation of the Educational Centers; strengthening the school disaster risk reduction management office (SDRRMOs); strengthening Student-Led Emergency Response Teams (ERT); ERT equipments and communication materials.

5. QUESTIONS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

Questions

Methodology and relevance of the intervention strategy:

- Was a proper project design and strategy implemented? Did the intervention correspond to the priorities and needs of the target population?
- Were the proposed solutions best suited to solve the problems identified?
- How was the project adapted according to the context and its evolution?
- How did the proposal conform to the priorities in emergency education as outlined by local and national authorities in the area of intervention?
- What other aspects should have been considered?
- To which extent were the target group well defined and did they include the most vulnerable groups?
- Were appropriate partners chosen?

- How and what was the level of participation of beneficiaries during the implementation phase adequate?
- How was the design appropriate to achieve its objectives and expected results?
- How was the gender approach applied during the formulation and implementation of the intervention?

Effectiveness:

- To what extent has the project achieved the desired results?
- Have other unforeseen effects been achieved? And how
- Was the empowerment of the implementation team sufficient for effective implementation?
- To what extent has the project reached girls, boys, women, men, and the most marginalized populations?
- To what extent has the project promoted community participation especially among girls, boys, women, men and other marginalized groups in the implementation of the project?
- How well has the project managed partnerships with the school management, Department of Education, and local government units? How did the quality of partnerships affect the delivery of the project outputs?

Efficiency:

- Were respective budgets initially established in the document?
- Was an efficient use of available resources observed?
- Was the material acquired for training and awareness priced correctly?
- Was the material acquired for the construction adequate?
- Have they respected the timetable envisaged?
- Was the pace of spending appropriate?
- Did human resources provide for the implementation of the intervention correctly?

Impact:

- To which extent and how did it gain access equipment and communication materials by students and teachers (disaggregated by age and gender)?
- To which extent and how did it manage to implement School Improvement Plans?
- To which extent and how did it create Student-Led Emergency Response Teams (ERT) and management offices for Risk Reduction in schools (SDRRMOs)?



- To which extent and how did the rehabilitation improve the safety of the Educational Centers?

Sustainability:

- Were long-term sustainable results reached upon completion of external support?
- Is there commitment of local institutions to guarantee the sustainability of the project?
- To which extent and how did community women / leaders develop their own capabilities to facilitate improved community preparedness themselves?
- Is there a degree of ownership by the beneficiaries to support the continuity of the project once completed external support?
- Is an adequate level of human and institutional capacity put in place in order to ensure safe schools, and children and teachers are prepared for disaster after the project?

Evaluation criteria:

After this, analysis seeks to obtain a rigorous understanding on the relevance of the report, the involvement of partners, ownership, administration and management of resources and impact on the target population:

Coherence: It will analyze what the problems identified with the proposed objectives are, if correctly defined the structure of objectives, results and activities of intervention, and if planned activities were appropriate to achieve the objectives of the intervention.

Relevance: The evaluation group will analyze and assess the performance of the project to its intended objectives and the needs identified.

Appropriation: The evaluation should also refer to the degree of ownership of the project by the beneficiaries and local institutions participating in the project.

Effectiveness and efficiency: The analysis will determine if you are managing human, technical and financial resources in an efficient and appropriate manner.

Gender approach: Mainstreaming of a gender perspective will be analyzed in all the activities and the project's contribution to gender equality in participating communities.

Impact on the target population: The evaluation will include an analysis of impact on the target population.



Sustainability: The continuation of the process initiated by the project in the community will be checked.

Alignment: It will analyze how budgetary and administrative procedures of intervention to local institutions adapt.

Recommendations for the future: The evaluation should include recommendations and proposals applicable to a possible second phase of the project whose planning is already underway.

The analysis will include evaluation criteria that reveal the extent to which the project is being effective, efficient, relevant, viable, and which is still its impact and analysis of participation in it. The evaluation should conduct an analysis of the context in which the project is running. Factors to consider in this regard are as follows: Policy support, institutional capacity, socio-cultural aspects, gender in development, technological factors, environmental factors and economic and financial factors. In addition, the consultants should review and analyze all other factors considered relevant and include them prominently in its evaluation report.

6. ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY AND WORK PLAN

Methodology

The methodological approach to this evaluation shall be generally a mixed methods approach combining literature review and primary data collection. Considering gender and age, disability and ethnicity approaches.

1. Phase cabinet. To be held at the Country office of Plan International Philippines in Manila. Plan and workplace consultant, and in which all documentation related to the project including secondary sources, that will define the main information needs will be analyzed. The evaluation should produce the information needed to meet the information needs identified in the first phase and evaluate the components and factors mentioned in section 5 of these ToR.
2. Fieldwork phase. To be held in Plan Philippines – Cotabato office and communities where the project is implemented.
3. Phase preparation of the final report. The wording of this report must comply with the detailed characteristics present in the ToR, and should be discussed in a draft with those responsible for the draft Plan Spain and Plan Philippines.



Prior to the initiation of the second phase, the evaluation team will present a plan of field work mentioned above responsible for review and possible suggestions. The Work Plan will include a presentation of the methodology to be followed during the fieldwork, including the indicative list of people to interview, as well as an array with the different evaluation criteria and questions and key indicators for each criterion.

The evaluation will be conducted following the Core Humanitarian Standards and all regulations and agreements regarding the protection of children in Humanitarian contexts (Minimum Standards for the Protection of Children in Humanitarian Action and INEE Minimum Standards) and gender in emergencies (IASC Gender Handbook for Humanitarian Action). Also evaluated the contribution of the project to the objectives of the II National Action Plan for Women, Peace and Security 2017-2023 Government of Spain will be assessed.

Workplan:

The evaluation team will include a work schedule in the proposal presented; in that schedule it will take into account the following expected deliverables:

1. Inception Report: 10 days from the signing of the contract
2. Evaluation Work Plan: 10 days from the signing of the contract
3. Draft report for review with qualitative and quantitative data analysis interface in MS Excel or SPSS: 40 days from the signing of the contract
4. Final Report: 70 days from the signing of the contract

All deliverables should be submitted to Carolina Bonache Regidor (Program manager Plan International Spain) and Mar Bustria (Acting Program Development and Grants Manager, Plan International Philippines).

The results of the evaluation should be presented in an Evaluation Report (in Spanish and English), and will follow the structure detailed in section 8.

7. DOCUMENTS AND INFORMATION SOURCES:

- Project design document and annexes.
- Project contractual documents and further amendments;
- Documents produced throughout the project;

- Evidence of impact collected by the project, including mid-term reports
- All reports to the donor to date.
- Reports of studies of knowledge, attitudes and practices.
- Verification sources identified in the logical framework.
- Documents visibility and dissemination of the project.
- Material awareness and training of childrens and teachers.
- Other documents considered of interest to properly evaluate the project.
- Comprehensive School Safety Framework.

Furthermore, the evaluation should be built on interviews with:

- Plan International CO in Philippines Project Manager
- Beneficiaries as well as partner (KFI) and participants
- Other stakeholders such as municipalities and other actors (to be defined)

8. STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION OF THE EVALUATION REPORT:

0. Executive Summary

1. Introduction

- Background and Purpose of the evaluation.
- leading questions and value criteria: definition.

2. Summary of the intervention evaluated, with particular reference to compliance expectations in the intermediate time (conventions) or end (as appropriate) in which the evaluation is carried description; summary of the history, organization and management, stakeholders and context in which the intervention takes place.

3. Methodology used in the evaluation

- Methodology and applied techniques.
- Conditions and limits of the study conducted.

4. Analysis of the collected information and evidence about the matters set forth above. Interpretation of the evidence relating to the evaluation questions set out.

5. Evaluation findings regarding the evaluation criteria established.

6. Lessons that emerge from the general conclusions that indicate good practice and can be extrapolated and feedback on the actions of intervention execution or for future interventions, as appropriate.

7. The recommendations from the evaluation classified according to the criteria chosen by the evaluation team (eg.: a short / long term, according to evaluation criteria

depending on dimension or component of the intervention, intervention by zone ...). In any case whenever possible, to mention the actor (or actors) to whom it is addressed particularly the recommendation.

8. Annexes which will include:

- ToR.
- The work plan, the composition and the description of the mission.
- Proposed methodology, techniques and sources used to gather information:
 - o Document Review: list of secondary sources used.
 - o Interviews: list of informants, interview guide, transcripts and notes.
 - o Polls: models, collected raw data and statistical analysis.
 - o Participatory workshops: Rapporteur and products.
- Allegations and comments from various stakeholders on the draft report if relevant, especially if there are disagreements and have not been reflected in the report body. (See premise liability).
- Tab-evaluation summary (CAD24 model).

The evaluation report will be accompanied by an executive summary of the report, which will outline broadly the scheme indicated and will respect the technical specifications of presentation (number of pages, format, etc.) that Spain Plan will provide the evaluation team. Next to the tables executive report assessing compliance of aid targets and performance appraisal of the intervention will be contemplated. Also, the consultant team must submit a Plan Spain, in computer support is indicated, a record-evaluation summary.

The consultant team will deliver a copy of the draft version of the final report (containing a minimum of 30 pages) and an executive summary (maximum 10 pages) to be discussed prior to the preparation of the final version, and two copies of this last paper, binded in A4 format as well as in electronic format to be determined. Both the draft and the final report will be presented translated into Spanish.

At the end of the field work the evaluation team will hold a meeting with the staff of Plan International Philippines, to advance the conclusions and recommendations mentioned in the evaluation report.



9. EVALUATION TEAM

The consulting team shall indicate in its proposal the exact estimated number of members of the evaluation team (will positively be joint and inclusive asset), the profile of people and professional qualifications (diplomas, language, professional experience in the sector, cooperation international, design and implementation of assessments, social research and evaluation techniques). The evaluation team coordinator will be the person / consultant / a principal, who will have the ultimate responsibility for the work and function of contact Unit Evaluation Management.

According to the IV Master Plan and its commitment to strengthen the capacities of local partners, preference will be given to professionals, local companies and individuals. If it is not possible to engage in the local market or a minimum quality in the local market is not guaranteed, whatever the amount, must be justified in writing and obtain authorization from the OTC or the Embassy of Spain.

For consideration:

- All pollsters support people in the field and data collection staff should come from the intervention communities unless these skills are not available in these communities, in which case it might resort to external personnel. The composition of the survey team should be equal between women and men.
- The evaluation team must ensure its independence from the intervention evaluated without being tied to their management or any element that compose. Also, they must not have worked for the executing agency of the grant or its local partners at least for the identification and implementation of intervention to be evaluated.
- The executing agency will provide information and support to the evaluation team needs and to offer to accompany him, but will determine whether it is appropriate for the entity or its local partners are present during development of the assessment work, as this could affect results evaluation.
- As part of its technical expertise, it is responsible for the evaluation teams highlight issues not specifically mentioned in the Terms of Reference, if necessary to obtain a more complete analysis of the intervention. Although the draft report can be agreed in the monitoring committee with the other actors, the

evaluation team should record their assessment even if the executing agency of the grant or other actors disagree with option to clarify where discrepancies.

- It should also be noted that, when the legislation provides for the simultaneous presentation of the terms of reference and proposals to the AECID, teams of potential evaluation of the terms of reference of the AECID out should take a review of them after presentation of its proposal, and that such review may lead to changes in the terms of reference to guide for evaluation.

10. PREMISES OF THE EVALUATION, AUTHORING AND PUBLISHING:

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

- **Confidentiality:** Since the evaluation is participatory, the evaluation team must commit to respect the right of people to provide information ensuring their anonymity and confidentiality.
- **Responsibility:** Any disagreement or difference of opinion that may arise between team members or between them and those responsible for the intervention in relation to conclusions and / or recommendations must be mentioned in the report. Any claims must be supported by your computer or to record the disagreement on it.
- **Integrity:** Evaluators will be responsible for highlighting issues not specifically mentioned in the ToR, if necessary to obtain a more complete analysis of the intervention.
- **Independence:** Evaluators shall ensure independence of the evaluated intervention, not being linked to its management or any element that composes.
- **Validation of information:** It is the evaluation team ensure the accuracy of the information collected for the preparation of reports, and ultimately be responsible for the information presented in the Evaluation Report.
- **Incidents:** In the event of the occurrence of problems while performing field work or at any other stage of the evaluation, they must be reported immediately to the executing agency of the grant and this, if necessary will notify the AECID . Otherwise, the existence of such problems may never be used to justify the failure to obtain the results required by the institution in the present ToR.
- **Copyright and disclosure:** Clarifies that all copyright rests with the contracting entity evaluation. Disclosure of the information collected and the final report is



the prerogative of the executing agency of the grant and contracting of the evaluation. However, the AECID reserves the right to reproduce, distribute or publicly communicate the assessment report without prior agreement with that entity, when required by the proper conduct of administrative procedures and will do so with prior approval of the same, when required for other reasons.

Child Protection and Ethical Consideration

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

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

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

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

11. DEADLINES FOR THE CONDUCT OF EVALUATION:

The start date of the final evaluation will be the day of signing the contract with the selected consultant team of Plan International.

The final terms of delivery shall be stipulated in the contract, although the final version of the report, as revised by Plan International, will be submitted before 70 days from the signing of the contract.

The budget for the evaluation must be estimated and established:

1. Consulting fees / day (single payment)
2. Logistics costs, daily fees pollsters / as, per diem, transportation and materials.
3. Accommodations in Mindanao
4. Translation and draft report in English and Spanish

The maximum available budget for this consultancy is 6.000€, all costs and taxes included.

12. PRESENTATION OF TECHNICAL OFFER AND VALUATION CRITERIA:

The proposals will be submitted before 9th December 2019 at 17h. (Spain time) via email to Carolina Bonache (carolina.bonache@plan-international.org) and Mar Bustria (mar.bustria@plan-international.org).

The proposal for this final evaluation of the AECID will be presented as follows:

1. Technical Proposal
2. Financial Proposal / detailed budget
3. Implementation Plan or proposed calendars
4. Professional profile of the team involved in the evaluation.
5. Previous experience

The selection is based on the following criteria:

Sections to value	Description of contents	Punctuation
Technical offer	Preliminary evaluation matrix as a working hypothesis taking into account the present terms of reference and work proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methodology. 	50%

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instruments. • Child protection and Gender approach in emergencies. <p>Note: The / the consultant / a should include in its technical proposal a proposed conceptual approach to the criteria for assessment and development factors</p>	
Economic supply and availability	Budget and schedule actions detailed breakdown for fieldwork.	15%
Experience component of the evaluation team	<p>the multidisciplinary teams will be particularly valued in the fields related to the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Experience in the field of education in emergencies. • Gender expertise in Emergency and Humanitarian Action. • Experience in evaluations of humanitarian action. • Experience in project cycle management in Philippines. • Experience in work funded by AECID 	25%
Knowledge of Plan International organization		10%