

## **Terms of Reference (ToR) for final project evaluation**

**Project Title:** NETUCATE – NET(work and ed)UCATE Networked education creating a skills web for participation and sensitivity.

Also known as “ePACT - Education Partnership for Advocacy, Capacity-Building and Transformation”

**Countries:** Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Montenegro, (FYR) Macedonia, and Serbia.

**Duration:** November 1 2015 – January 31 2019

**Name of Partner Organisations:** Stichting Center for Democracy and Reconciliation in Southeast Europe (CDRSEE) and EUROCLIO – European Association of History Educators

**Funding Partner:** Austrian Development Agency (ADA)

**ADA Project Number:** 8322-00/2015

## **ABBREVIATIONS**

<b>ADA</b>	Austrian Development Agency
<b>ADC</b>	Austrian Development Cooperation
<b>CDRSEE</b>	Center for Democracy and Reconciliation in Southeast Europe
<b>DAC</b>	Development Assistance Committee
<b>ePACT</b>	Education Partnership for Advocacy, Capacity-Building and Transformation
<b>EUROCLIO</b>	European Association of History Educators
<b>NETUCATE</b>	NET(work and ed)UCATE Networked education creating a skills web for participation and sensitivity
<b>OECD</b>	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development

## 1. Introduction/Background

NETUCATE (ePACT) supports the implementation of an educational model aimed at sustaining the democratisation process and enhancing conflict sensitivity in the Western Balkans, by intensifying democratic education in the formal schooling system.

The project targets the pre-Accession area, an area entrenched in past conflicts that impede the democratisation process and slow down compliance with the Copenhagen criteria. In search for a more comprehensive strategy in education reform, the project focuses on the improvement in the quality of the teaching and learning processes and on building capacities that, in the long run, will enhance critical thinking and active citizenship.

The project's direct beneficiaries are estimated to more than 2000 including: primary and secondary school teachers, Ministries of Education of the Western Balkans, policy makers, curriculum developers, textbook and teaching material authors, school directors at primary and secondary school level, trainers, assessment experts, educational advisors and inspectors, educational staff in museums and institutes, board members of professional associations and representatives of parents associations.

The indirect beneficiaries are: all primary and secondary school teachers of the target countries, students and their parents, teachers associations, civil society representatives and state authorities, as well as all the citizens of the Western Balkans. Indirect beneficiaries will benefit from the knowledge built and the improvement in education policies achieved beyond the project cycle and in the course of the education reform process implemented within the timeframe of the National Strategy Plans, but primarily within that of the adoption of the EU acquis.

The project targets the following results:

**Result 1** – Policy Makers and curricula developers are able to design new evidence-based curricula for history education in particular and social science in general

**Result 2** – Participating school directors, history and social science teachers are able to multiply teacher competencies for multi-perspective and participative lessons

**Result 3** – Civil society and policy makers work together in a regional network and support schools in implementing new methodologies.

So far, the main activities implemented to support the achievement of these results are:

- An empirical Needs Assessment Study
- 6 National Peer-Training Seminars for up to 300 educators
- Publication of a Report containing the Needs Assessment Results
- Filming and broadcasting of one regional TV show on survey findings
- 11 out of 12 pilot seminars for 275 educators
- A platform with e-learning courses and materials available to educators from the region for free

- A summer school for exchanging practices between history educators

The original project duration was from 01 November 2015 until 31 October 2018. In June 2018 a three month no-cost extension was agreed extending the project to 31 January 2019. The total budget of the project comes up to € 550,000.00 from which 91% (€ 500,000.00) have been covered by the Austrian Development Cooperation (ADC) through the Austrian Development Agency (ADA) and the remaining 9% (€ 50,000.00) by the applicants (i.e. CDRSEE and Euroclio).

The project is in its final year of implementation and up to August 2018 more than 1400 members of the target group have directly benefitted from the project activities. The project is at the stage of preparation and implementation of the remaining activities prior to its completion, as well as at the stage of preparing recommendations and the roadmap to the future that will extend the outreach and ensure the sustainability of the project.

The geographical scope of the project is the region of the Western Balkans and more specifically the following countries: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Montenegro, (FYR) Macedonia, and Serbia.

## **2. Purpose**

The purpose of the evaluation is three-fold: (a) to provide accountability to the donor and other project stakeholders, (b) to promote learning by identifying lessons learned and good practices, and (c) to provide evidence for future decisions on whether and how the project could be continued/replicated.

The final project evaluation intends to assess the change that resulted from project activities, with a view to offer credible and substantial input with regard to the management of the project, the organisations' performance and the successes and failures in the practical support of objectives and expected outcomes.

The purpose of this evaluation touches upon all four dimensions (Learning from experience, Transparency, Deepening Understanding, Improved Communication) of an evaluation according to the requirements of ADA.<sup>1</sup>

## **3. Objective**

The main objectives of this evaluation are:

- Defining the project's pathway from the assessed need to the planned activities and outcomes (project's Theory of Change);

---

<sup>1</sup> Austrian Development Agency, Evaluation Unit. (2009). Guidelines for Project and Programme Evaluations. Vienna: Austrian Development Agency, p.4.

- Assessing the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the intervention
- Identifying lessons learned and good practices with a view to provide recommendations for the project key stakeholders (partners, donor, partner countries etc).

The evaluation and its recommendations shall be a useful tool for the following stakeholders: a) primary and secondary school teachers, trainers, education experts, school directors, inspectors, and members of professional associations who benefitted by project activities, b) donor representatives in field offices in the target countries, and c) policy makers, curriculum developers, civil society organisations, educational institutions and Ministries of Education who were involved in the project at different levels.

The independent, external evaluation shall be conducted in accordance with OECD/DAC evaluation criteria.<sup>2</sup>

#### **4. Subject and Focus**

The final evaluation of the project aims to determine the extent to which planned and unplanned objectives and outcomes were achieved, to identify the factors of success or failure, to assess the sustainability of the benefits generated and to draw conclusions that may inform future programming, policy making and overall organisational learning.

Evaluators will analyse the intervention logic and develop a Theory of Change with a view to help achieve a better understanding of the incremental change brought about by the project, by focusing on the articulation and measurement of outcomes.

For data collection purposes all the necessary project documents, reports compiled and relevant information will be made available to the evaluators by project partners.

The evaluation will cover project implementation since its start on 1 November 2015. The time scope of the evaluation will extend from October 25, 2018 to January 25, 2018 and it will be completed within 40 working days. In terms of geographical coverage, evaluators will base their assessment on case studies conducted in 3 out of the 6 countries targeted by the project. The selected area for field-evaluation will comprise of Albania, the FYR of Macedonia and Serbia, countries to which visits and interviews with the relevant stakeholders could be more easily organised from a practical point of view. In case financial constraints occur, the evaluators will consider reducing the selected visits to the aforementioned countries.

The proposed number of direct interviewees comes up to a minimum of 15 per country (a total of 90 people, individual or focus groups), each one being

---

<sup>2</sup> OECD. DAC Evaluation Network. DAC Evaluation Quality Standards. OECD. March 2007  
[http://www.oecd.org/site/0,3407,en\\_21571361\\_34047972\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_1,00.html](http://www.oecd.org/site/0,3407,en_21571361_34047972_1_1_1_1_1,00.html)

representative of the beneficiaries, and/or local partners, and/or institutions the project has addressed. The proposed number of interviewees serves the purposes of gathering in-depth qualitative and granular data through reactive, structured interviews. Furthermore, the project partners will make sure that a sufficient number of educators, teachers associations and relevant stakeholders involved in NETUCATE / ePACT will be accessible and available to participate in the evaluation, via skype/phone/email or questionnaires.

The evaluation process shall be in line with the international evaluation principles and standards, and evaluation questions should be formulated in accordance with the following OECD/DAC evaluation quality criteria: 1) Relevance, 2) Effectiveness, 3) Efficiency, and 4) Sustainability.

Impact will not be measured by this final project evaluation. It was deemed that the actual impact of this project could only be accurately measured in the long-term, therefore it is not equally relevant to this evaluation process.

The evaluation should also contain an assessment of cross-cutting issues. In particular it should examine the extent to which the project promotes gender equality and the extent to which socio-cultural aspects were taken into account during implementation.

## **5. Specific Evaluation Questions**

Addressing the 4 evaluation objectives will require that the evaluator(s) provide answers to the following specific questions:

### **Relevance**

- To what extent are the objectives of the project still valid for the partner countries, the partner organizations and the beneficiaries?
- Are there any aspects that the project did not address that should be included into future projects?

### **Effectiveness**

- To what extent have project objectives been reached? Have the pathways from activities to results and outcomes been adequate? (Consistency of logical framework).

- What were the major (facilitating/hindering) factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the outcomes/expected results?
- How have relationships between partners helped or hindered the 'delivery' of outcomes?
- Was the project managed as planned? If not, what issues occurred and why?
- To what extent have all project stakeholders collaborated as planned?
- Did the project contribute to capacity building as planned?
- What lessons have been learned?

### **Efficiency**

- How efficiently was the intervention implemented? Have any issues emerged, if so which ones and why?
- Were alternative approaches to achieving an output considered?
- Which factors have hampered or supported efficiency, if anything? How have arising challenges been addressed?

### **Sustainability**

- To what extent will the benefits of the project continue after the withdrawal of the donor? Did the project establish processes and systems that are likely to support the continued implementation of the project?
- If the project continues will it be integrated in local structures and/or funded by other sources?
- Did the project include any elements furthering its sustainability?
- What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project?
- Are the involved parties willing and able to continue the project activities on their own?

## 6. Approach and Methods

The evaluator(s) is(are) expected to undertake the evaluation in as rigorous manner as possible to produce information, draw conclusions and make recommendations that are sufficiently valid and reliable based on data and analysis. It is expected that the evaluator(s) will conduct a participatory evaluation that will involve project implementers and target beneficiaries. Existing project documents and progress reports will be shared with the evaluator(s) to facilitate completion of the tasks.

The evaluation consists of three phases:

### 1. INCEPTION PHASE

Contract and access to data: Contract is signed and first documents, including available data, are provided to the evaluation team.

Desk Study: The evaluation team studies all necessary project documents; re-constructs and analyses the intervention logic and theory of change and its assumptions. Existing data needs to be analysed and interpreted.

Inception Report and Remote Meeting: In the inception report the evaluators will describe the design of the evaluation and will elaborate on how data will be obtained and analysed on a first remote meeting (skype or video conference) with project partners. The use of a data collection planning worksheet or a similar tool is required. First interviews take place.

**Data triangulation and quality control are very important and need to be discussed in the inception report.**

The field trips will only take place upon official approval of the inception report by the donor.

### 2. DATA COLLECTION AND INTERVIEW PHASE

Data collection and interview phase: Data needs to be gathered, analysed and interpreted. Interviews with selected beneficiaries and stakeholders are conducted on the spot or remotely. It is expected that the evaluation will include quantitative and qualitative data disaggregated by sex.

Remote debriefing of partners: Presentation of preliminary findings after first collection of data and field trips, via skype or video conference.

### 3. DATA ANALYSIS AND FINAL REPORT

Submission of Final Report Draft: Submission of the draft of the final report, feedback received by project partners.

Data Analysis and Submission of Final Report: Data collected during the previous phase is analysed and Submission of final report, **see reporting requirements under point 9).**

All data collected needs to be disaggregated by sex.

It is expected that the evaluation team will present concrete recommendations which are addressed to the specific stakeholders.

It is currently estimated that at least 90 people need to be interviewed in 6 countries, both through direct and remote interviews (field trips are foreseen to only 3 out of 6 countries, therefore face-to-face interviews shall be combined with remote ones). The group of interviewees shall consist of a number of Ministry/authority representatives, local partners, trainers and educators that benefitted from project activities. Qualitative data may be also collected through questionnaires, online surveys or analysis of related documents.

The Guidelines for Project and Programme Evaluations developed by the Austrian Development Agency need to be considered throughout the entire evaluation process. OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards are to be applied and compliance with these standards is deemed necessary for the credibility of the evaluation.

Also see:  
[http://www.entwicklung.at/fileadmin/user\\_upload/Dokumente/Evaluierung/Evaluierungs\\_Leitfaeden/EN\\_Leitfaden\\_Evaluierung.pdf](http://www.entwicklung.at/fileadmin/user_upload/Dokumente/Evaluierung/Evaluierungs_Leitfaeden/EN_Leitfaden_Evaluierung.pdf)

## 7. Timetable and deliverables

A total of 40 working days is currently estimated for this assignment.

Within a 3-month evaluation period, the evaluators are expected to complete the above-mentioned scope of work.

The evaluation period will be from October 25 to January 25, 2018, inclusive of trips to 3 of the target countries (2 days stay in each one).

The inception phase should be completed by November 12, 2018.

The data collection and interview phase should be completed by December 20, 2018.

The submission of the final evaluation should be completed by January 25, 2019.

The timeframe of the assignment and the deliverables are as follows:

Phase and time frame	Deliverable	Time Estimate
Inception Phase (Three weeks)	Draft and Final Inception Report, including evaluation matrix, interview guidelines, case study outline, survey questionnaire and draft Theory of Change	10 working days
Data Collection and Interview Phase	Debriefing (presentation of initial findings) Interview protocols and survey data	17 working days
Data Analysis and Submission of Report	Triangulation matrix Draft Report Final Report	13 working days

## 8. The Evaluation Team

The evaluation should be conducted by one or two evaluator(s), with the following qualifications:

- A minimum of five years' proven work experience in the field/sector of democratization, with particular focus on education/education reform and conflict resolution.
- Led at least five evaluations over the last five years including at least three the field of education and education reform, of which at least one is published.
- Proven work experience in the region and familiarity with national stakeholders in the project countries; fluency in at least one of the languages of the region.
- Proven experience with quantitative and qualitative evaluation methods including case study and survey development and data analysis.
- Proven experience preparing and analysing a theory of change.
- Proven Experience and expertise in evaluating cross-cutting issues.
- Excellent oral and written English skills (Knowledge of any of the languages of the countries of the Western Balkans would be an asset).

**The consultants must not have been involved in the design, implementation or monitoring of this project.**

## 9. Reports

The consultants will submit the following reports:

- an inception report (between 4-6 pages without annexes),
- a final draft evaluation report (about 30 pages without annexes), including a draft executive summary **and the results-assessment form (part of the reporting requirement)**
- and the final evaluation report (30 pages without annexes), the final executive summary **and the results-assessment form (part of the reporting requirement)**

All reports need to be written in English.

The executive summary should summarize key findings and recommendations (three to five pages) and needs to be submitted as part of the final draft report.

The findings and recommendations of the draft final report and final report have to be structured according to the evaluation questions. An outline of the report's structure needs to be agreed upon during the inception phase.

The quality of the reports will be judged according to the following criteria:

- Is the results-matrix format part of the report?

- Does the report contain a comprehensive and clear executive summary?
- Were the Terms of Reference fulfilled and is this reflected in the report?
- Is the report structured according to the OECD/DAC criteria?
- Are all evaluation questions answered?
- Are the methods and processes of the evaluation sufficiently documented in the evaluation report?
- Does the report describe and assess the intervention logic (e.g. logframe, program theory) and present/analyze a theory of change and its underlying assumptions?
- Are cross-cutting issues analyzed in the report?
- Are the conclusions and recommendations based on findings and are they clearly stated in the report?
- Does the report clearly differentiate between conclusions, lessons learnt and recommendations?
- Are the recommendations realistic and is it clearly expressed to whom the recommendations are addressed to?
- Were the most significant stakeholders involved consulted?
- Does the report present the information contained in a presentable and clearly arranged form?
- Is the report free from spelling mistakes and unclear linguistic formulations?
- Can the report be distributed in the delivered form?

## **10. Co-Ordination/Responsibility**

Ms. Apostolia Gougousi will be the contact person for this evaluation.

Contact details: phone: +302310960820-1 E-mail: [apostolia@cdsee.org](mailto:apostolia@cdsee.org)

## **11. Annexes:**

- Results-Assessment Form, to be filled in by the evaluation team
- Logframe Matrix

**Annex 1: Results-Assessment Form for Mid-Term and Final Project Evaluations**

**This form has to be filled in electronically by the evaluator. No evaluation report will be accepted without this form. The form has to be included at the beginning of the evaluation report.**

Title of project/programme (please, spell out):			
Contract Period of project:			
ADC number of project:			
Name of project partner:			
Country and Region of project:			
Budget of this project:			
Name of evaluation company (spell out) and names of evaluators:			
Date of completion of evaluation:			
<b>Please tick appropriate box:</b>			
a) Evaluation managed by ADA/ADC Coordination Office		<input type="checkbox"/>	
b) Evaluation managed by project partner:		<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Please tick appropriate box:</b>			
a) Mid-Term Evaluation	b) Final Evaluation	c) Mid-Term Review	d) Final Review
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Others: please, specify:			
<b>Project Outcome (Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix):</b>			

**For Final Evaluation: Project Outcome: To what extent has the project already achieved its outcome(s) according to the Logframe Matrix? Please, tick appropriate box**

Outcome(s) was/were:

Fully achieved:	Almost achieved:	Partially achieved:	Not achieved:
-----------------	------------------	---------------------	---------------

**Please, also explain your assessment: What exactly was achieved and why? If not achieved, why not?** (Please, consider description of outcome and relevant indicators)

**Project Outputs: To what extent has the project already achieved its outputs<sup>3</sup> according to the Logframe Matrix ? Please, tick appropriate boxes**

**Output 1 (Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix):**

Output was:

Fully achieved:	Almost achieved:	Partially achieved:	Not achieved:
-----------------	------------------	---------------------	---------------

**Please, explain your assessment:** (Please, consider description of output and relevant indicators)

<sup>3</sup> In case there are more than three outputs, please, add them.

**Output 2 (Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix):**

Output 2 was:

Fully achieved:	Almost achieved:	Partially achieved:	Not achieved:
-----------------	------------------	---------------------	---------------

**Please, explain your assessment:** (Please, consider description of output and relevant indicators)

**Output 3 (Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix):**

Output 3 was:

Fully achieved:	Almost achieved:	Partially achieved:	Not achieved:
-----------------	------------------	---------------------	---------------

**Please, explain your assessment:** (Please, consider description of output and relevant indicators)

**In case there are more than three Outputs please, state as above.**

**Impact/Beneficiaries:**

How many women, men, girls, boys and people in total have already benefited from this project directly and indirectly? Please, explain

What exactly has already changed in the lives of women, men, girls, boys and/or institutions from this project? Please, explain:

Which positive and/or negative effects/impacts in terms of gender can be possibly be

attributed to the project? Please, explain:

If applicable, which institutions have benefitted from this project/programme and how?

**Mainstreaming cross-cutting issues:**

**Gender:** To what extent was gender mainstreaming included in the project? To what extent were the recommendations - if any- from the ADA internal gender-assessment considered and implemented?

**Social Standards:** To what extent were the social standards monitored by relevant partners? Have any issues emerged? Please, explain

**Overall/Other Comments:**