



TERMS OF REFERENCE EVALUATION

BASIC INFORMATION

Title of the evaluation: Evaluation of the Sports and Culture for Development Programme in dormitory schools and other centres - 2013 – 2018.

Country Office: Guyana and Suriname

Date: August 12 – December 31 - 70 Working days over

Type of consultancy: Individual Consultancy

1. BACKGROUND/CONTEXT

Globally, Sport and Culture have proven to be effective and flexible tools for promoting peace and development objectives. In the UN General Assembly resolution 70/1, entitled “Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development”, the roles of sport and culture in advancing social progress are acknowledged as important enablers of sustainable development. Sport and culture are recognised for their growing contribution to the realisation of development and peace in the promotion of tolerance and respect for children and women. Sport and Culture contribute to the achievement of SDG 3, 4, 5, 11, 16 and 17.

Across the Caribbean, Sport and or Culture programmes draw upon adolescents’ intrinsic attraction and build personal, social and emotional character, while promoting health and positive lifestyles. Through these complementary areas, children are offered an opportunity to develop their leadership skills and creativity while playing sport and being involved in culture.

In Guyana, recognising that structured sports, physical activities and cultural expressions are healthy and safe alternatives for adolescents (10-19 years), and recognising that sports and culture are preventive and responsive interventions for adolescents who are exposed/at risk to violence and abuse (physical, sexual, emotional), the Government of Guyana and UNICEF included Sport and Culture for Development (SC4D) in the 2012-2016 and 2017-2021 programmes of cooperation.

The Government of the Cooperative Republic of Guyana over the years has accommodated over 4,000 secondary school children 11-17 years old, who live too far from the school to allow a daily commute, at dormitory schools. During joint GoG-UNICEF programmatic visits, it was noted that there was a lack of extra-curricular activities in Dormitory Schools in the hinterland Regions i.e.1, 7, 8, 9 and 10 and for children in detention (Region 2) and children in rural communities. Due to the copious poorly supervised free time students were exposed to risky behaviours, resulting in high incidences of adolescent pregnancy, violence, suicide, substance abuse and school dropout. To fill this gap, a baseline survey was conducted, and the data was analysed and used by the Government of Guyana in partnership with UNICEF, and with support from the UNICEF UK National Committee, designed and launched the Sport and Culture for Development (SC4D) Programme in 2013.

It was expected that over the first two years of the programme at least 2,360 children and adolescents in seven hinterland dormitory schools; one Juvenile detention facility and holding centre and two rural communities with high incidences of teenage pregnancy, violence, suicide and substance abuse, will benefit. This programme is expected to provide access to sports and cultural



activities but also to critical life skills such as Communication, Leadership, Decision-Making, Problem Solving and Critical-thinking, and information on their rights and responsibilities to support staying in school to complete their primary and secondary education. UNICEF partnered with the Ministry of Education (MoE) and two NGOs – the Linden Care Foundation located in Region 10 and FACT (an NGO in a rural community) in Region 6 and with vulnerable youth at the community level. Once girls and boys identified the sport of their choice and the requisite equipment were procured to ensure that both girls and boys have enough equipment for activities.

This successful pilot was used to inform the implementation of the SC4D programme, from 2015 and 2017, from seven (7) to eighteen (18) dormitory schools in seven regions in Guyana, from two (2) to eleven (11) communities and from one (1) to two (2) juvenile detention/holding centre and one (1) State-run institution for vulnerable children in need of care. To determine the changes made by the programme (contribution/attribution) and to ascertain where the programme can be expanded to all secondary schools in Guyana, it is necessary that a Summative evaluation is conducted at this time.

This evaluation follows the norms and standards established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) (<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>) as well as the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system (<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100>) and will have to be endorsed by the Evaluators during the evaluation process.

2. THE OBJECT OF THE EVALUATION (THE 'WHAT')

Sports and Culture for Development (SC4D) is a Government of Guyana (Ministry of Education) programme that is implemented in collaboration with UNICEF from 2013 to present in eighteen (18) dormitory schools in seven regions in Guyana; eleven (11) communities, two (2) juvenile detention/holding centres and one (1) State-run institution for vulnerable children in need of care. These centres are in 7 of the 10 administrative regions of Guyana i.e. Regions 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 and all children who are in these centres, benefit from this programme but especially children who live in the Dorms.

The Ministry of Education does not have a documented theory of change for this programme. However, the description of the situation that this programme aims to address, the strategies that are used, the expected outputs and outcomes can be drawn from separate sources including monitoring reports that are submitted monthly.

This evaluation is intended to provide stakeholders with adequate information on the functionality and or the dysfunctions of the programme i.e. every facet of it. The report should help decision-makers to:

- Determine where the programme is working well i.e. school/centre, regions and who are the key stakeholders (Government, community, civil society, faith-based, volunteers, development and multilateral partners).
- Weigh the contributions of stakeholders and comment on their capacity to contribute at the same scope and extent for the next five years and what are the enablers that are already in place and adjustments that are necessary.
- Identify and explore the challenges directly or indirectly related to the programme i.e. identify and group challenges by those that affect the programme, school/centre; the implementers (paid or volunteers) of the programme; the students, parents and all stakeholders and document clearly and specifically how these can be addressed.



- Identify and categorise best practices and to provide adequate information on their scope and scale
- Identify opportunities for additional qualitative and quantitative investigations in this programme.

3. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION (THE 'WHY')

This is a summative evaluation and it is part of UNICEF's exit plan as the main financier (funds were provided to UNICEF from the British NatCom) and technical-support lead for the programme. This evaluation aims to assess the effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, impact, sustainability and crosscutting contributions of the programme and the findings will inform decisions and preparation for a whole-country implementation i.e. in all primary and secondary schools along with all current centres.

The evaluation aims to:

1. Determine the extent to which the Sports and Culture for Development Programme (SC4D) in dormitory schools is achieving its objectives.
2. Based on number 1, identify challenges and facilitating factors encountered in the delivery of the SC4D programme
3. Drawing on 1 and 2 compile lessons learned and recommendations to inform the future rollout of the SC4D programme in Guyana.
4. Determine how the approach has been sustainable and provide recommendations to ensure its sustainability

The knowledge sought by this evaluation will:

- Provide information on the reduction, in the past 5 years, related to adolescent pregnancy, violence, suicide, substance abuse and school dropout, that can be attributed, (if any) to this programme and the specific contributions of the programme.
- Inform policy and other decision makers, at the national and sub-national levels if and to what extent each programme outcomes is achieved and to inform a review of outcomes/outputs and other modifications before the whole-country implementation.
- Identify and report over the past five years, on current and possible bottlenecks/barriers, risks and assumptions, enablers and strategies that should be considered for continued implementation and scale up.
- Use the **values for money** calculations for Cost-Effectiveness, Cost-Utility Analyses, Cost-Benefit and Social Return on Investment (SROI) analyses, to determine if this program gives value for money and or if there are other viable alternatives to achieve the same output/outcomes.

4. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

This evaluation shall concentrate efforts on the implementation of the SC4D from 2013 to present in eighteen (18) dormitory schools in seven regions in Guyana, eleven (11) communities, two (2) juvenile detention/holding centre and one (1) State-run institution for vulnerable children in need of care. These schools/centres are in 7 of the 10 administrative regions of Guyana i.e. Regions 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10. The other regions will not be considered as the programme was not implemented in other regions/schools/centres. However, just as in the baseline, some schools not implementing



the programme in the stated region would be engaged for comparative purposes. The evaluation will utilise a whole-school/centre approach i.e. if the school/centre is implementing the programme irrespective of the levels that are implementing, this evaluation will be conducted at the school level. Other specific scopes that will be considered are:

- **Time:** the evaluation caters to implementation of this programme between January 2013 and December 2018. This excludes any related efforts before and after this period as the technical and financial assistance, from UNICEF and development partners, intensified in this period which enabled full-fledged implementation.
- **Programmatic:** The evaluator will concentrate on the SC4D programme exclusively. The Health and Family Life Education (HFLE) programme though related will not be included in the evaluation. This will be important to consider when the attribution/contribution of the programme is evaluated. The evaluation will consider all criteria according to the SC4D guidelines
- **Stakeholders:** All stakeholders who the evaluation deem relevant to a thorough evaluation will be engaged.
- **Value for Money:** The evaluation will consider the element of Economy, Cost-effectiveness and cost efficiency as additional criteria which are related but sufficiently different and will be piloted to inform a decision on a permanent union between Value for Money and evaluation. This will only be done in schools/centres implementing the SC4D programme.

5. EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

The evaluation criteria as aligned with the definition of OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC)¹ evaluation criteria, that is the framework mainly used by the United Nations (see UNEG norms and standards).

The evaluation will provide answers to the following questions:

Relevance (*refers to the extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor*)

- To what extent does the SC4D programme contribute to the achievement of the SDGs 3, 4, 5, 11, 16, 17
- To what extent does the SC4D programme is consistent with the global/regional national priorities for adolescents' development?
- To what extent has the programme contributed to strategies to address challenges among student in dorm schools/other centres?
- Is the SC4D programme delivered in a culturally appropriate manner?

Effectiveness (*refers to the measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives*)

¹ Definition of OECD/DAC evaluation criteria:

www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/dacriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm



- The SC4D initiative aims to reduce unwanted social behaviours including adolescent pregnancy, violence, suicide, substance abuse and school dropout. To what extent were these, intended outputs/outcomes, realised? What were the enablers? What were the bottlenecks and how, if at all, were they addressed?
- What are the challenges encountered by the teachers in the implementation of SC4D and how they have been addressed?
- To what extent does the SC4D implementation cater to the needs of boys and girls in an equitable way?
- Has the SC4D programme guidelines been implemented in a standardised way? If so, to what extent?
- To what extent has the SC4D programme in each school and Region been implemented according to more than 90 percent of the guidelines?
- What are the enabling factors for and/or hindrances to the effective implementation of the SC4D?
- How was information shared and managed between and among partners? How, if at all did this affect the achievement of results in this programme?

Efficiency (measures the outputs -- qualitative and quantitative -- in relation to the inputs)

- How cost efficient is the current approach to manage and implement the SC4D programme (ensuring value for money)?
- Are there alternative/existing mechanisms and programmes that can be integrated into the SC4D programme to maximise resources?
- To what extent was the school curriculum complementary to the principles of the SC4D programme? Please explore instances of differences.

Impact (refers to the positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended)

- How have the social challenges, including adolescent pregnancy, violence, suicide, substance abuse and school dropout, changed in the school/centres where the SC4D programme was implemented? How has it changed in the school/centres where the programme was not implemented?
- How has the SC4D programme impacted on the academic performance of children?
- How have peer-to-peer social behaviours changed in the school/centres where the SC4D programme was implemented?

Sustainability (concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has been withdrawn)

- To what extent is the SC4D implementation, including management arrangements and funding, sustainable? Can SC4D be sustained in the long term without UNICEF's support?
- What recommendations and lessons learnt in the SC4D programme should be considered for the future?
- What are the barriers and or opportunities to expanding SC4D to all primary and secondary schools in Guyana?



1. Value for Money Criteria

Economy (relates to the price at which inputs are purchased. Evaluators in the design phase, targeting costs, management information systems, payment mechanisms, independent evaluations).

- Were supplies for this programme procured and transported to the schools/centres? Were alternatives assessed and was the best alternative used?
- How, if at all, were the resources allocated by the Ministry of Education compensate for the shortfall in the inputs for the SC4D programme? What could have been done differently?
- What were the mechanisms used for cash transfers for this programme? Were the **possible payment** modalities formally assessed based on Partner's risks? Were cash transfers and other support provided in an equitable way?

Cost-efficiency (focuses on the relationship between the costs of a social transfer programme and the value of the transfers delivered to beneficiaries.)

- What were the **direct and indirect; tangible and intangible; costs** of the SC4D programme and how have these costs changed as the programme matured?
- Using VfM calculations, determine the benefit and or utility received by each category of beneficiary, at the various costs? How did benefit increase at the injection of additional resources? What is the threshold of cost-benefit for this programme?
- What are the social returns on investment for the SC4D programme
- To what extent were the demands for the skills to implement this programme met?

Cost-effectiveness (measures the cost of achieving intended programme outcomes and impacts and can compare the costs of alternative ways of producing the same or similar benefits.)

- Using VfM calculation, determine the effectiveness of the programme at costs? Are there cheaper ways to achieve the same results?
- Have key institutional challenges been considered in the planning, implementation and monitoring of this programme?
- Are there financial, technical and institutional constraints to scaling up?

The evaluation team will be required to prepare an evaluation matrix, that indicates precisely how each question will be measured and through which criteria.

6. METHODOLOGY

6.1. METHODOLOGICAL DESIGN

Evaluation design

As was used when the baseline was collected, a quasi-experimental design will be used in this evaluation.

The Methodology for this mixed-method evaluation is advanced. The Evaluators are expected to further develop and submit a more advanced draft in the inception report for review. The proposed mixed-method approach is informed by the need to measure the qualitative and quantitative results (including impact) of this programme. The mixed-method report from the baseline will be shared with the Evaluators to contribute to the measurement of the impact of this programme. The



evaluators are expected to triangulate data collection methods and audiences to ensure the credibility and validity of the findings.

The Evaluators will pull together/construct a theory of change for the programme, (for further information, please consult: www.betterevaluation.org/en/resources/guide/theory_of_change), based on desk review and interviews with stakeholders. Some teachers who were trained originally for this programme are no longer at the same school/centre hence the institutional knowledge would be available to the same extent to which it was passed on by the original teachers.

The Evaluators will commence work on August 12 and by December 31, 2019 would have concluded and submitted the final report which would have incorporated feedback from stakeholders. The Evaluators are expected to work closely with the key officials of the Ministry of Education, Allied Arts Unit and UNICEF through every phase of the evaluation.

Sampling

Given that this is a mixed method evaluation, the sampling methodology is also mixed. For the selection of regions, schools/centres and personnel who will participate in this evaluation, a non-probability purposive sampling will be used, since the programme was implemented in specific locations.

The stratified sampling method will be used to select schools that did not implement this programme but will be engaged for comparison. This was chosen since the selection of these schools will be random but within the regions that the programme was implemented. A similar method of sampling was used when the data was collected for the baseline.

Phase 1: Inception: Desk review, interviews with key stakeholders, development of research instruments, and submission of the inception report

Desk review: Review of literature will include but not be limited to relevant materials listed below which will be made available to the Evaluators. The Evaluators are expected to review and reference all literature cited in the inception and final reports. The Evaluators will, on his/her own accord, source other materials.

- The SC4D programme document
 - The SC4D implementation manual
 - Completed Monitoring forms and reports of the SC4D programme
 - Budget for the programme, workplans, monitoring system, etc.
 - Administrative data related to schools (drop-out, performance of students, enrollment, etc.), data on adolescents' pregnancy, violence in schools, etc.
-
- **Key stakeholder interviews:** The Allied Arts Officers of MoE, the Adolescent Development and Participation officer and the M&E Specialist of UNICEF will be part of the initial engagement.
 - The guides for Key Informant Interviews (KII), Focus Group Discussions (FGD) and Classroom Observations will be developed during the inception phase.

Phase 2: Data collection

The Evaluators are expected to:



- Conduct KII and FGDs with District and Regional Education Officers, probation and guidance and counselling officers; Head and other teachers; community members, students, dorms parents/caregivers; families of students, and other key stakeholders.
- Conduct Classroom Observation in schools/centres that are implementing the SC4D programme.
- Manage all data in the field in accordance with principles of anonymity and confidentiality. The safety of data during the data collection phase will be the total responsibility of the evaluators.
- Collect the necessary data to respond to the VfM criteria and conduct the appropriate analyses.

NB: No data collected and or reviewed for this evaluation or data to which the evaluator is privileged during time of the evaluation- as a direct or indirect result of being the evaluator for this evaluation- can be shared and or be used by the evaluator neither can s/he approve the use of the whole or any part of it for personal or professional purposes without approval in writing from the Ministry of Education and UNICEF combined.

Phase 3: Data Analysis, sharing of findings and writing of the report

The Evaluator will be responsible for the data analysis, writing the report and presentation of findings to partners

- For the data analysis, the grounded theory methodology will be used, involving verbatim transcription, coding of data, development of themes, comparison and contrasting of themes and recording of findings and theoretical propositions.
- The main findings will be presented by the Evaluator to National Stakeholders and three weeks will be allocated for comments.
- The writing of the report should be done in constant communication with UNICEF and MoE.
- The final report will be approved by UNICEF and MoE.

6.2. EVALUATION NORMS AND ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The Evaluators will follow the Ethical Guidelines for UN Evaluations (<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102>) and UNICEF procedure for ethical standards in research, evaluation, data collection and analysis (https://www.unicef.org/supply/files/ATTACHMENT_IV-UNICEF_Procedure_for_Ethical_Standards.PDF).

To ensure that the key ethical principles for the conduct of evaluation involving human subjects are followed, each potential respondent will be given full information about the evaluation including the purpose and potential benefits of the evaluation, their rights, and how the information collected will be used. They will also be informed that all data will be kept confidentially being only accessible by members of the assessment team. Verbal consent will be collected from all those who agree to participate. Written ascent from Parents/guardians and consent from children will be obtained. All participants will be informed of their right to discontinue their participation at any point and approaches for ensuring confidentiality will be described. Since children are expected to participate in the interviews, the inception report and methodology (including data collection tools, consent forms and protection protocols) will need to go through an external ethical board for review. The



evaluation will not be able to proceed with the data collection **before being approved** by the ethical review committee. If the institution has its own ethical review mechanisms, they could substitute for the external committee, provided that these mechanisms comply with the minimum quality standards established in UNICEF's policy. In its methodological proposal, the evaluation team should clearly indicate any possible ethical issues and specify the supervision and the ethical review mechanisms of that are applicable to the evaluation process. In this regard, it is critical that the evaluation team consult and respect the norms and standards outlined in the document "Ethical Research Involving Children": <http://childethics.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/ERIC-compendium-approved-digital-web.pdf>. Overall, the Evaluator is expected to be impartial, credible, responsible, honest², portray integrity³ and maintain respect for the dignity and diversity of the individuals interviewed, and respect for human rights, gender equity and equality⁴ throughout the evaluation process.

The evaluator is required to disclose in writing any experience, of himself or immediate family, which may give rise to a potential conflict of interest, and to deal honestly in resolving any conflict of interest which may arise during the evaluation. The External Ethical Advisory Group to give clearance of all processes.

7.3 DISSEMINATION

The preliminary findings of the evaluation will be presented to stakeholders including the evaluation technical committee, at a workshop, to be followed by a question and answer session. The comments/concerns will be addressed by the Evaluator and the necessary changes made to the final report. Once completed, this report will be handed over to UNICEF and the Ministry of Education and then distributed in hard and soft copies to policy makers, heads of agencies, technical officers, development partners and civil society. Copies will also be sent to schools, communities and other stakeholders to persons who were engaged in the data collection process. Summaries and child-friendly copies of the findings of the evaluation will be prepared and disseminated.

7. QUALITY ASSURANCE OF DELIVERABLES

A Technical Reference Group, composed of immediate stakeholders at the country level will be established to ensure quality assurance. The Reference Group will include UNICEF staff (Education Specialist, M&E Specialist, Regional Evaluation Specialist) and government counterparts (MoE) and other relevant stakeholders (head teachers for example). The Reference Group will assess the quality of key evaluation products, including methodology and evaluation instruments, inception and final reports. It will validate all intermediary documents. If not all members of the Reference Group can respond, a minimal quorum will be established. Comments by the Reference group will be submitted according to a deadline respecting the agreed chronogram. The Evaluation proposal should include a minimum of two weeks for any comments of validation by the Reference group and the External Ethical Review Group will also review the final report.

² The evaluation team must comply with the UNEG/UNICEF standards and guidelines:

Ethical Guidelines for UN Evaluations (2008): Available from www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102 and **Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system** (2008): Available from www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100

³ The evaluation team must comply with the UNEG/UNICEF standards and guidelines:

Ethical Guidelines for UN Evaluations (2008): Available from www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102 and **Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system** (2008): Available from www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/100

⁴ **Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation – 2011**

Towards UNEG Guidance,
www.uneval.org/document/detail/980



All reports (inception and final reports) will have to comply with UNICEF and UNEG reporting standards:

[https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/files/UNICEF adapted reporting standards updated June 2017 FINAL.pdf](https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/files/UNICEF_adapted_reporting_standards_updated_June_2017_FINAL.pdf) and <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/608>. The final evaluation report will be uploaded to UNICEF Evidence Information Systems Integration (EISI) and will be rated through the Global Evaluation Reports Oversight System (GEROS)⁵.

The following deliverables are expected at the proposed timelines

Deliverable	# of days	% of Fee	Deadline
Inception Report (Please see proposed deadline)	20	20	By September 4
Draft Report (in line with UNEG and UNICEF’s Global guidelines on reporting standards) Visual summary presentation (PPT or other dissemination tools)	40	40	By October 31
Final Report (in line with UNEG and UNICEF’s Global guidelines on reporting standards) addressing all comments and recommendations made to the draft report. Visual summary presentation (PPT or other dissemination tool)	10	40	By November 30

The evaluator is expected to consult and follow the quality standards of the UNICEF evaluation reports, available at:

Inception report:

[www.unicef.org/evaluation/files/UNICEF UNEG TOR Checklist updated June 2017.pdf](http://www.unicef.org/evaluation/files/UNICEF_UNEG_TOR_Checklist_updated_June_2017.pdf);

Final report

[www.unicef.org/evaluation/files/UNICEF adapted reporting standards updated June 2017 FINAL.pdf](http://www.unicef.org/evaluation/files/UNICEF_adapted_reporting_standards_updated_June_2017_FINAL.pdf)

To facilitate alignment with UNICEF standards, a template will be provided to the evaluators for the inception and the final report. The templates will follow this minimum recommended structure:

Inception report

- i) Presentation of the **context and object of evaluation**;

⁵⁵ GEROS is a UNICEF organisation-wide system which aims at assessing the quality of final evaluation reports, information related to this system and its rating criteria can be found at: https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/index_GEROS.html



- ii) **Purpose, objectives and scope** of the evaluation;
- iii) Reconstruction of the **theory of change** (if absent);
- iv) Evaluation **framework** (evaluation **criteria and questions**), with an **evaluation matrix** (disaggregating each evaluation criterion, with evaluation questions, indicators, information sources and methods of gathering information); it is recommended to share the example in annex 1 as an annex to all the ToR;
- v) A complete **methodology** with:
 - A) an explanation and rationale of the **methodological design**;
 - B) **sample** and **list of people to interview** and **sites to visit**;
 - C) **data collection tools** (questionnaire, interview guidelines, etc.);
 - D) **limitations** and **mitigation measures**;
 - E) **ethical considerations**;
 - F) data **analysis** (how the data will be analysed, what technique will be used, software, etc.);
 - G) **dissemination of the evaluation**;
- vi) A **work plan** and description of the **role and responsibilities** of each team member.
- vii) **Deliverables** and quality assurance.

Final report:

- i. Executive Summary (max. 5 pages)
- ii. Context and presentation of the object of the evaluation
- iii. Purpose, objectives and scope of the Evaluation
- iv. Evaluation criteria and questions
- v. Methodology
- vi. Limitations of the evaluation
- vii. Ethical considerations
- viii. Findings (by evaluation criterion)
- ix. Conclusions
- x. Learned lessons
- xi. Recommendations
- xii. Annexes: - ToR
 - Theory of change
 - Evaluation matrix
 - Information collection tools
 - List of sites visited and list of interviewees
 - List of documents consulted
 - Other relevant documents

All deliverables will be reviewed and quality assured by UNICEF (Country and Regional offices) and the technical reference group. It is expected that the evaluator will respond to each comment received and the feedback provided will be integrated into the deliverable and a revised version will be submitted. The payment of each output will only be made when the revised version of the report is received and approved.

8. PROFILE OF THE EVALUATION TEAM



These terms of reference are for a team of Evaluators (3-4 persons) with at least 10 years of experience conducting evaluations, between them. The contract will be for a period of 6 months. The following characteristics are required and desirable. The evaluation Team Profile should include at least a General Coordinator; a Specialised Evaluator (Culture and Sports specialisation as an advantage); a quantitative and qualitative Methods responsible person; a Value for Money expert, and a fieldwork operations officer.

Required:

This consultancy is for a team of Evaluators (3-4 persons) who must possess the following competencies:

- The General Coordinator should possess an Advanced University Degree in Social Sciences, Anthropology, Sociology, education a specialisation in Sport and Culture (theatre arts) will be an advantage - the other team members should have bachelor's degrees in relevant fields.
- A minimum of 10 years of professional experience in leading and managing outcome and impact evaluations.
- Proven experience in conducting evaluations and research;
- Proven experience in the design and methods of qualitative and quantitative evaluation and research.
- Proven experience in conducting value-for-money and cost-efficiency/effectiveness analysis (and lease one team member should be a VfM expert)
- A demonstrable understanding of equity issues in education
- Proven experience in facilitating and collecting information, including data collection with children
- Knowledge of the SC4D programme in Guyana
- Knowledge of the equity and gender approaches and their application;
- Knowledge of Results-Based Management;
- Fluency in spoken and written English
- Good ability to write reports clearly and concisely.
- Strong organisational, and presentation skills

Desirable:

- Previous work experience with the United Nations System;
- Knowledge of UNEG evaluation standards;

It is recommended that a description of the role and responsibilities of each team member and an explanation of his or her competencies (i.e. matching the required skills) be provided.

Responsibilities of Key stakeholders

UNICEF will:

- Meet initially with the Consultant, the Chief Planning Officer and the Allied Arts unit of the Ministry of Education (MoE), and other staff identified by the MOE
- Follow-up and provide support to the consultant throughout the consultancy
- Review inception report and provide feedback for adjustment
- Review data collection instruments prepared by consultant



- Attend briefing meetings
- Review and provide feedback on draft deliverables
- Review and approve final report before final payment is made to Evaluator
- Review and approve the summary presentation of results

The MOE will:

- Initiate meeting with MOE Officials and other stakeholders
- Inform Regional Education Officers, Head teachers and parents outlining the purpose of the consultancy and the role they are expected to play.
- Provide the consultant with letters to be presented to key stakeholders including head teachers, parents and Regional Education Officers
- Provide the consultant with materials which will include various monitoring and other reports as requested by the consultant.
- Review and provide feedback on draft deliverables

The Evaluator will:

- Meet initially with officials from the MOE and UNICEF to discuss the consultancy and timelines in detail.
- Will review all documents as provided by MoE
- Submit inception report with all relevant annexes.
- Incorporate feedback from UNICEF and MOE and finalise inception report before proceeding for fieldwork
- Conduct fieldwork and coordinate all activities
- Prepare and present draft report to stakeholders and incorporate feedback
- Prepare and submit comprehensive final report that addresses all comments and recommendations made by UNICEF and MoE
- Prepare and submit summary presentation of results (PPT or other visual tool) for dissemination.
- The consultant shall act in a manner within the laws of the country of Guyana and the core values of UNICEF.

9. WORK PLAN

The Evaluation team is expected to provide a statement of health. The Evaluator will be fully responsible for the quality of that statement. The MoE and UNICEF shall assume no liability for health and safety of Evaluator; nor will MoE and UNICEF assume responsibility for the loss or damage of equipment or transport vehicles or any injury done to a third party used in conjunction with this work.

The Evaluators are expected to travel in country which should be catered for in the financial and technical proposals. UNICEF's Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist will monitor the progress of the Evaluator's work and will be closely involved in providing quality assurance. The evaluator will work from his/her private space and use his/her computer and other equipment if necessary and will submit final report in an electronic format

An **example of a work plan** is presented in Annex 1.

10. APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS



Interested person are asked to apply by July 19 online (link will be provided in Advertisement). Please ensure the following is shared with the expression of interest. Successful candidates will be notified by UNICEF Human Resources officer by the end of the second week after application closes.

- A technical proposal for the assignment
- A financial proposal for the assignment

The **technical proposal** should include a detailed methodological proposal, a CV, a motivation letter, examples of previous evaluations, and other relevant information to ensure the quality of the presented proposal and minimise the disqualifications.

The Technical Proposal will be weighted thus:

Area	Maximum score
Quality of methodological proposal	20
Relevance of Qualification and experience	15
Motivation letter	10
Examples of previous evaluations (5 copies of contracts that prove participation in previous evaluation)	10
Availability for the assignment	5
Total	60

The **financial proposal** should be as detailed as possible, and it is recommended that the proposal be broken down by the proposed number of days work and the daily rate, travel costs and per diem.

The Financial Proposal will be weighted thus:

Area	Maximum score
Proposed number of days for assignment	15
Daily rate	15
Travel cost and Per diem	10
Total	40



ANNEX 1: Proposed workplan

Tasks	August					September				October				November				December				
	wk1	wk2	wk3	wk4	wk5	wk1	wk2	wk3	wk4	wk1	wk2	wk3	wk4	wk1	wk2	wk3	wk4	wk1	wk2	wk3	wk4	
Contract prepared and signed																						
Inception Phase																						
Kick off meeting																						
Inception phase - Review of secondary data sources																						
Delivery of Inception report																						
Review and feedback by local evaluation technical committee																						
Review by the ethical board																						
Integration of comments submission of final Inception report + ethical review approval																						
Fieldwork																						
Data collection																						
data analysis and Triangulation																						
Presentation and validation of findings																						
Final report																						
Preparation and submission of draft evaluation report																						
Review and feedback by local evaluation technical committee																						
Integration of comments submission of final Inception report																						
Final workshop and Dissemination of finding																						
Preparation of Management response to the evaluation																						

