

Terms of Reference

Final Evaluation of “Bringing 10,125 Out Of School Children [OOSC] Back To School, Increasing Their Retention And Learning Outcomes In Garissa County

1) Introduction

UNICEF in cooperation with ROAD is implementing an **Out of School Children [OOSC] Back to School** in Garissa County, Kenya. The project is running from April 2017 to June 2018 with cost extension till 31st November 2018.

The commissioning organisations:

UNICEF works in 190 countries and territories to protect the rights of every child. UNICEF has spent 70 years working to improve the lives of children and their families. Education is a fundamental human right. Every girl and boy, everywhere, is entitled to attend school and learn. UNICEF is dedicated to making sure that all children can enjoy their right to a quality education, from early learning opportunities that lay the groundwork for success in school, all the way through secondary school. Across the world, some children are more likely to miss out on education than others. That deprivation has lifelong consequences that often mean that the next generation, too, will start out at a disadvantage. The resulting cycles of inequality and deprivation thwart the potential of both individuals and societies. To dismantle the barriers that stand in the way of getting all children in school and learning, UNICEF’s work focuses particularly on the children who are most often excluded.

Because merely getting children into school is not enough, Unicef promote child-friendly approaches that include securing safe and healthy school environments, and teaching and learning processes that speak to children’s individual needs – so that children can acquire the skills and knowledge they need. To reach the most vulnerable children in the most challenging situations around the world, we foster innovative solutions tailored to local contexts, and support countries in building robust and resilient education systems. Educating children is an investment in their futures, and in peaceful and prosperous societies. To achieve the Out of School Project, Unicef work in close partnership with EAC, GoK and ROAD

Rural Organisation for Advocacy and Development (ROAD) is a Non-Governmental Organization working in Northern Kenya providing humanitarian and assistance services to refugees in the areas of Community services, Education and sustainable livelihoods projects. ROAD as an implementing partner intends to carry out end of project evaluation for the project: The Bringing 10,125 Out Of School Children [OOSC] Back To School, Increasing Their Retention And Learning Outcomes In Garissa County

Aim of the Evaluation

To conduct an in-depth appraisal of the project to enable partners and other stakeholders to learn from evidence-based information about the project and ensure accountability. The key

findings will also inform the senior management in decision making with regards to the design and improvement of future, similar projects.

The project

Education is typically seen as a means of improving people's welfare. Global studies indicate that inequality declines as the average level of educational attainment increases, with secondary education producing the greatest payoff, especially for women. There is considerable evidence that even in settings where people are deprived of other essential services like sanitation or clean water, children of educated mothers have much better prospects of survival than do the children of uneducated mothers. Education is therefore typically viewed as a powerful factor in leveling the field of opportunity as it provides individuals with the capacity to obtain a higher income and standard of living. By learning to read and write and acquiring technical or professional skills, people increase their chances of obtaining decent, better-paying jobs. Thus ROAD is committed to ensuring that the big number of OOSC in Garissa County are brought back to school, retained and made to learn. The importance of equal access to a well-functioning education system, particularly in relation to reducing inequalities, cannot be overemphasized.

The Arid and Semi-Arid lands (ASAL) of Kenya is home to approximately 10 million Kenyans, 70% of whom live under the poverty line. The entire ASAL region contributes to about 46% of the total OOSC children in Kenya i.e. 1,292,675 and Garissa county contributes its fair share of the same (74,005:). According to the 2014 Basic Education Statistical Booklet (Ministry of Education and UNICEF) 43% of children are out of school in Garissa County and this represents a total of 74,005 children (20,552 Boys & 53,453 Girls). The low enrolment and retention rates are perpetuated by a myriad of factors. Over the years, communities in Garissa County have had high poverty levels attributable to prohibitive cultural practices, protracted cycles of drought, changing climate conditions and mainly inter-ethnic conflict over scarce resources. These factors make the county one of the most disadvantaged and emergency prone and as a result, its communities have adopted coping mechanisms that have kept children out of schools. These include nomadism, female genital mutilation, ushering girls into early marriages, various forms of child labour including herding of animals, moving to urban centers to stay in the streets or do casual labour for survival and petty business such as transport services with motorcycles. The available structures at community levels to address these child protection needs are not well equipped and often lack capacity to provide leadership in ensuring enrolments and retention of children in schools. On the other hand, learning environment in most schools are not conducive and are poorly equipped with infra-structure and teaching leaning materials making it difficult for children to concentrate hence poor performance and low transition rate to secondary school higher institutions of learning.

Further still, the period between 2014 and 2015 saw an outbreak of inter-clan clashes in the North Eastern region, coupled with frequent attacks from Al Shabaab (AS) militia insurgence. This has led to further population movements resulting in family displacements, the closure of schools and other health and social amenities. Cases have been documented where schools have been vandalized and learning materials taken away. The resultant insecurity has had

a major impact on health, education, livelihoods, and food security, on the general population, but even more on vulnerable groups. Conflicts have increased poverty and illiteracy levels in the counties. Loss of livestock to cattle raiders also meant that parents could no longer pay for their children's secondary education. Fighting has worsened education standards. Frequent conflicts among pastoralist communities in northern Kenya have prevented thousands of children from enrolling in school and made them more likely to commit acts of violence

The problem of access to education for children of school-going age is linked to a number of national priorities and policies, starting from the need for children's early childhood education and development. This is strongly supported by The Children's Act of 2001, which safeguards the rights and welfare of children from early childhood to adolescence.

In the case of Garissa County, the policy on Education in Emergency applies. According to UNICEF, access to quality education is a right that should be sustained for all children under the most difficult of circumstances. The right to education is most at risk during emergencies. Further still, the Educational for all (EFA) movement commits to provide quality basic education for all children. This is also covered by the fourth goal of the Sustainable Development Goals (SGD 4), which aims to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all. Target 4.1 clearly emphasizes that by 2030, ensure that all girls and boys complete free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education leading to relevant and effective learning outcomes. In Kenya, access to education is addressed by the policy on free primary education as well as the Kenya Vision 2030, whose social pillar is education and training.

In line with these policies, and to respond to the problem at hand, this project aims at improving access to education for the 10,125 targeted children through enhanced enrolment of out-of school children in the target regions of Garissa county of North-Eastern Kenya. Conscious of the added benefits of keeping children in school, the project aims at conducting massive sensitization and awareness among parents and children; encourage large-scale enrollment of out-of-school children; provide supporting facilities and materials that will encourage staying in school; and engage in educational and other social activities all aimed at bringing and keeping out-of-school children in schools. In the process, the project indirectly cushion school-going children from some of the impact of the violence and drought around them by contributing to a stable peaceful environment enabling other support (e.g. health, nutrition, WASH, etc) to reach them easily during such crises.

The proposed project will strengthen in school teaching and learning processes in schools through child friendly school approach. In this case the project will equip school stakeholders with the skills/knowledge to promote the five themes of child friendly schools. This will contribute to improving on the quality of education and creating demand hence increase enrolment.

2) Cause and objective of the evaluation

The evaluation will be an end-of-project evaluation and is mandatory. Baselines had been carried out. The reports are available. It will likely inform future project designs for the area as well as identify some best practices and lessons learnt for partners/ donors /stakeholders in general.

The purpose of the evaluation is:

- Have recommendations of baseline surveys been translated into action
- Has the response has been relevant to the education needs of the locals
- To assess and report on the performance and results achieved (intended or unintended, positive and negative) of the project against the OECD DAC criteria
- Identify best practice and lessons learnt, with particular focus on the modality, Project implementation mechanism, accountability to beneficiaries

Though it is not planned for now to extend the project or set up a follow-up project, the results will be valuable for Partners/ stakeholders/donors in the first place to understand if the Out of School Children Project has been successful and how and where the approach can be transferred to other contexts.

3) Key questions

RELEVANCE (Are we doing the right thing?)

- Areas for analysis will include the extent to which the objectives, targeting, choice of activities, training/ sensitization/ capacity building modalities (as well as conditionality and restrictions) and mechanisms:
 - were appropriate to the needs of the target population (What are the top needs of the schools , children and host community and were the interventions aligned with those needs)
 - were coherent with relevant stated national policies, including sector policies and strategies
 - Were aligned with the priorities of Unicef and ROAD?
 - were aligned with the priorities of the donor's (UNICEF/EAC) funding programme:
 - Beneficiaries' feedback and how the feedback received through current monitoring and has been processed and resulted in adjustments to the project
 - level of ownership among beneficiaries
 - Were there any deliberate actions taken to reduce risks, insecurity, inflation, etc

EFFECTIVENESS (Are the objectives of the project being achieved?)

- Has the project been effective in achieving the intended outputs, objectives and outcomes which are:

- Outcome Statement:

Increased Enrolment, retention and quality of learning for 10,125 (50% girls) Out of School Childre(OOSC) - boys and girls - in Lagdera, Olugo, Ijara and Dadaab sub-counties of Garissa County by December, 2018.

Performance Indicators:

- (1) Number of boys and girls enrolled back to school;
- (2) % retention & transition rates of newly enrolled boys and girls
- (3) % of boys and girls transitioning to their next grade/level at school after successfully passing their annual examinations

EFFICIENCY (Have the objectives been achieved in an economically viable manner?)

- Has the project been efficient in achieving the intended objectives and outputs?
- Were the activities implemented in the most efficient way ?
- Was the budget and available financial resources realistic for the achievement of the intended objectives and outputs?
- Has there been enough time allowed for the achievement of the intended objectives and outputs?
- Is there enough staff, of appropriate competency, for the achievement of the intended objective and outputs?
- Are there appropriate financial systems in place?
- Are there appropriate logistics system, monitoring and HR system in place?
- Was the selected service provider good value for money?
- How effective were the communication plans with the vendors, beneficiaries and other stakeholders?
- Is there an appropriate system of management and communication in place to support staff?
- Is new learning being captured and acted upon during implementation? If yes, how and what? If no, why not?

IMPACT (Did the project contribute to a positive change / avert negative change)

- What evidence is there of the impact that the project has had to date? Which changes are evident and attributable to the project?
- What psychological effects has the response had (e.g. do beneficiaries feel dignified, empowered, trusted and respected due to education)
- Does the review team observe any unintended changes or side-effects, positive or negative that have stemmed from the project?
- Particularly, are there positive or negative changes in the host community /school communities and which are attributable to the project?
- Have any changes occurred or lessons learnt on the collaboration with the service provider?
- Was the school rehabilitations sufficient to boost the demand side an extent that it has had an impact on the economical relations between schools and host communities?
- Was the school rehabilitations sufficient from the beneficiaries' perspective to cover their specific educations needs?

COVERAGE AND STAKEHOLDER PERSPECTIVES (incl protection concerns)

- Who was supported by the education interventions? Which groups were taken into account and which not?
- Was the project response well coordinated and aligned to technical guidance of the education working group?
- Was the project well coordinated with other NGOs implementing education in Garissa County and were lessons learnt from previous, similar responses been taken into consideration?
- Is the project reaching the key groups who are at greatest risk? Have all of those in need of protection received protection during the interventions?
- What do the beneficiaries think of the project? Its relevance, appropriateness and outcomes? What would they like to see differently?
- Do beneficiaries find the vulnerability criteria fair and transparent (do they know why they were selected)? Are any groups missed out in their opinion?
- What is the perspective of other primary and secondary stakeholders (e.g. working group, Service Provider, community leadership, local government officials, UN)? Are the most vulnerable being reached?
- Are there appropriate systems of downwards accountability (participation, information sharing and feedback) that beneficiaries are using? How was the beneficiaries' feedback taken into consideration?

CONNECTIVENESS/ Sustainability (Are project activities carried out in a context that takes longer-term and interconnected problems into account?)

- Which positive changes will have a lasting effect?
- To what extent have relationships between host community and refugees changed?
- To what extent has there been a multiplier effect of beneficiaries education needs and response? How has the additional education interventions contributed to the sustainability of local business?
- What success factors and challenges have emerged from the collaboration of NGO and the financial service provider? Did sustainable aspects emerge from this collaboration, or the use of the OOSC mechanism?
- Has the use of technology resulted in particularly sustainable aspects attributable to the project?
- Has the project had a sustainable impact on the market?
- Were there any deliberate actions taken to reduce risks of inflation?

Focus on Key Lessons Learnt and recommendations

- Could the approach be replicated in other areas, in other contexts
- What must be in place to ensure that the project results can last over the project running time?

- How could the approach be used in other interventions to serve nutrition, health and protection needs?

4) Principles for Evaluation

When evaluating programmes and projects it is useful to consider the OECD. The following further explains the criteria and provides some sample questions to illustrate how they may be used in practice:

- What do the partners consider to be the critical issues for future support and moving from immediate response to recovery?
- How are other actors responding and relating to ROAD and its partner's response?
- What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non achievement Of sustainability of the programme or project?

5) Evaluation design/methods

- Desk review of secondary data (proposals, progress reports and baseline survey Reports, Monitoring reports and previous studies)
- Review of finance documents and budget
- Compare the project documents with relevant and guiding documents of the Project PCA
- Key Informant Interviews with regional teams, advisers and project officers and partner staff
- Focus Group Discussions with beneficiaries (incl disaggregation by gender)
- Visits to selected project sites
- Key Informant Interviews with other stakeholders (e.g. local authorities and , donors, other NGOs) non-beneficiaries)
- Sharing of initial findings and learning with regional team and partners in country

6) Time Frame

The broad and general timelines for the exercise are provided below. The exact dates of each activity shall be discussed during kick off and clarification meeting:

- 24-30 September 2018: Obtaining offers
- 1-3 September 2018: Selecting evaluators
- 3-5 September 2018: Concluding the contract
- 5-8 September 2018: Kick off and clarification meeting
- 8-15 September 2018: Inception report (to discuss the draft report) within seven days after commencement of the exercise
- 15-20 September 2018: Debriefing/Presentation of results
- 20-30 September 2018: Assessment of the final report

7) Expected products

- Inception report
- Presentation of the main results and key lessons learned for future OOSC interventions at a workshop in Nairobi
- Final report incl separate Executive summary not exceeding 50 pages
- Brochure presenting key lessons learnt and recommendations on mobile cash transfer in a camp context
- 4 case studies (incl photos in Jpeg) to be produced to demonstrate project impact
- Another case study to be produced to highlight successful collaboration with specific success factors, as well as recommendations.

8) Content of evaluator's offer

- CV of all evaluators involved

a) University degree, preferably Master's Degree (for individual consultant) and has qualified staffs with similar educational level to be engaged in the review/evaluation (for consulting firm). The consultancy firm must have substantive experience of 7 years and more in project evaluation and reporting preferably on Education

b) A maximum of one and half pages Expression of Interest outlining the understanding of the TORs

c) A detailed activities schedule/work plans with time frames.

d) A profile of the consultant, copies of CVs for the lead consultant(s) and the supporting team outlining who will undertake the different roles within the assignment if applicable

e) Description of at least 3 relevant examples of recent work

f) At least one referee for whom the consultant has carried out similar work(stating the organization, assignment undertaken, date and duration, contact person's name, email address and contact number)

- Short explanation and justification of the methods to be deployed

- Financial proposal

a) The consultant should indicate the consultancy fees for the evaluation

b) Provide breakdown of additional chargeable expenses including field work related costs and other administrative cost

c) Note that transport to and accommodations in the course of the work/field will be provided and arranged by the consultant

- Submission deadline is 30th August 2018

- Applications should be sent by email to info@road-international.org with the words EVALUATION “**Bringing 10,125 Out Of School Children [OOSC] Back To School, Increasing Their Retention And Learning Outcomes In Garissa County**” as the email title.

Any additional clarification on the consultancy should be addressed to Program Manager- ROAD Email: info@road-international.org