

## TERMS OF REFERENCE END OF PROGRAM EVALUATION

### Regional Holistic Education Program in Jordan and Lebanon 2015 – 2018

#### 1. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

<b>Program title:</b>	Regional Holistic Education Program (RHEP) for Syrian refugee and vulnerable host community children in Jordan and Lebanon 2015-2018 Holistic Education Program (HEP) in Jordan 2017-2018
<b>Country:</b>	Jordan and Lebanon
<b>Program number:</b>	CA internal: 1509074 and 1709036 Austrian Development Cooperation contract number: 2694-03/2017
<b>Partner organizations:</b>	Caritas Austria (CA), Caritas Jordan (CJ), Caritas Lebanon (CL), Caritas Switzerland (CACH)
<b>Tentative timeframe of assignment:</b>	February – May 2019 (deadline for final report: 25 May 2019)
<b>Anticipated evaluation budget:</b>	EUR 10,000

In order to adequately respond to the needs of Syrian refugee children in the region, Caritas Austria (CA) together with partners Caritas Jordan (CJ) and Caritas Lebanon (CL) launched a three-year Regional Holistic Education Program (RHEP) in Jordan and Lebanon, with a program timeframe covering September 2015 until August 2018. The regional program applies a holistic approach, interlinking access to quality education with improved psychosocial well-being, physical safety, peace-building between host communities and refugees, and support to caregivers.

RHEP had the overall objective to 'contribute to the fulfilment of children's rights to relevant education and protection, and to foster respect for cultural diversity.' The program's specific objective was as follows: 'Syrian refugee and host community children in Lebanon and Jordan access relevant, quality and psychosocially supported education in a protective environment'. In order to achieve this objective, RHEP aimed to achieve the following four results corresponding with four layers of intervention:

**R1:** Vulnerable children from refugee and host communities access needs-based<sup>1</sup> and quality education.

**R2:** Vulnerable children experience improved psychosocial wellbeing and physical safety.

**R3:** Social stability in target communities has improved.

---

<sup>1</sup> Appropriate to a child's educational history, age, psychosocial condition, cultural background, skills and knowledge.

**R4:** Livelihoods are supported in order to mitigate barriers to access education.

The program aimed to reach a total of 8,400 beneficiaries<sup>2</sup> over the course of 3 years with a total budget of roughly 8.6 million Euros. It was planned to have a ratio of 70-75% Syrian beneficiaries 25-30% from vulnerable host communities. Given the 3-year programme approach, Caritas Austria and partners conducted annual program revisions, adapting program targets, activities and budgets as well as indicators based on evolving needs and policy priorities in Jordan and Lebanon.

<i>Summary of key results RHEP (2015-2018)</i>			
<i>Result</i>	<i>#/% of beneficiaries</i>	<i>Refugee / host community</i>	<i>Country</i>
Catch-up classes	1,180	Refugee	Jo
Remedial education	2,184	Refugee and host	Jo, Lb
Access to formal primary education	861	Refugee and host	Lb
Transition to a higher grade	92%	Refugee and host	Jo, Lb
Psychosocial support	4,475	Refugee and host	Jo, Lb
Improved psychosocial wellbeing	85%	Refugee and host	Jo, Lb
Life skills training for adolescents/adults	1.502	Refugee and host	Jo, Lb

Besides the implementing partners Caritas Lebanon (CL) and Caritas Jordan (CJ), RHEP also incorporated a strategic partnership with Catholic Relief Services (CRS) from September 2015 – February 2017 and a partnership with Caritas Switzerland (CACH) and their local partner Ana Aqra Association (AAA) starting fall 2016 until August 2018 specifically for the component of the quality of teaching in Lebanon. The Center for Applied Research in Education, at Lebanon’s Notre Dame University, has supported the RHEP through three research studies focusing on holistic education, early childhood education, and caregiver involvement.

In Lebanon, the RHEP has supported vulnerable refugee and host community children to enrol in formal education through partnerships with four semi-private and private schools in areas where spaces in public education are unavailable. Accordingly the programme complements the national RACE and RACE II strategies. Besides access to kindergarten, basic and complementary education, the programme has also provided homework support, teacher training, MHPSS services, recreational activities, and activities for parents and youth. RHEP is implemented by CL, with certain activities in the field of psychosocial support and peace-building subcontracted to Arc en Ciel and Seenaryo. Ana Aqra Association has implemented teacher training and coaching in RHEP schools.

In Jordan the RHEP has supported Syrian refugee children to access non-formal education opportunities including so called Learning Support Services (LSS), basic literacy/numeracy

---

<sup>2</sup> Providing access to quality education and psycho-social services to 7,350 children and 1,020 adolescents and student’s parents (340 per year).

classes<sup>3</sup>, LSS remedial classes, and pre-school. The RHEP is part of CJ's wider education programme and has been implemented in cooperation with a network of private charity schools. The programme has had a focus on psychosocial support, involvement of parents, and provision of life skills courses both to children and youth unable to access formal education as well as to female caregivers.

Part of the programme in Jordan, the Austrian Development Agency-funded Holistic Education Program (HEP) complemented the RHEP by allowing the inclusion of two schools in the north of Jordan during the 2017/2018 schoolyear alongside the introduction of new services such as summer schools across all RHEP schools during two successive years.

## **2. EVALUATION SCOPE AND PURPOSE**

### Scope

The full program evaluation covers the three years of the Regional Holistic Education Program in Jordan and Lebanon as well as the 14 months of the Holistic Education Program in Jordan. The evaluation will take place in Jordan and Lebanon in various project sites, covering the full scope of the program across all four results.

### General objective:

The general objective of the full program evaluation is to obtain a systematic and objective assessment of the RHEP, its design, implementation and results. The aim is to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability (as per the OECD/DAC criteria). Key references are the program's logical framework and program proposal (including annual revisions).

### Specific objectives of the evaluation

The full program evaluation builds on two prior annual evaluations carried out after the first (2015-2016) and second (2016-2017) years of implementation in both Lebanon and Jordan. Since these evaluations were mostly operationally-oriented, the full program evaluation is expected to return insights at a higher level; i.e. to

1. provide an assessment of the overall impact of RHEP against the specific and overall objectives as well as results as defined in the program's logical framework
2. deepen insight into assumptions and approaches underpinning the program, and how these compare to 1. the priorities and concerns of beneficiaries and 2. national education response frameworks in Jordan and Lebanon
3. enable CA and partners to justify results vis-à-vis donors, beneficiaries, and other stakeholders
4. provide guidance for the implementation and revision of the second phase of the Regional Holistic Education Program ('RHEP II') which started in September 2018, ends in August 2021, and is implemented in Lebanon, Jordan and Syria

---

<sup>3</sup> Please note that LSS basic literacy/ numeracy classes which before were called catch-up classes have phased out based on decreased need.

### 3. METHODOLOGY

CA and partners are keen to obtain a qualitative understanding of the medium- and longer-term impact of the RHEP on the lives of individual beneficiaries and their families, as well as on our partner schools. We expect the evaluator to carry out field research in both countries based on a qualitative methodology that allows for a ‘thick description’ of the impact of the program. In order to do so we foresee a limited number of in-depth case studies that elicit changes provoked by the RHEP in the lives of families and school communities. We expect an evaluation report that sheds light on the complexity and interconnectedness of factors that characterise education and child development in a context of displacement based on a sample of case studies; and thus accept that findings will not allow for generalisation (although hypothesis and informed assertions are welcomed).

We are interested in seeing drivers of, and barriers to, educational progress and socio-emotional wellbeing of children and youth, set within contexts of displacement and ongoing crisis. We are eager to understand the opportunities and constraints faced by partner schools (school leadership, teaching staff) in their attempts to accommodate refugee students, and the ways in which they felt supported by Caritas (or did not).

#### Sample

The sample shall cover *at least* the following subjects:

	Jordan	Lebanon
School principal	1	1
ECE teacher	1	
Primary level teacher		1
KG student	1M, 1F	
Primary level student (remedial)		1M, 1F
Catch-up student	1M, 1F	
Cash-for-work recipient (adult)		1

The evaluator shall be sensitive to the age of beneficiaries (including children 4-5y), gender disparities, seek to include persons with disabilities, and be prepared to probe about unintended outcomes of the RHEP. Importantly, as follows from the methodology, the evaluator shall avoid approaching the listed individuals in isolation from their social surroundings (i.e. parents and other caregivers are to be included in the student case studies, for instance). In Jordan, the sample should include beneficiaries in ADA-supported project sites (HEP). Finally, we request the evaluator to avoid selecting beneficiaries who have previously been consulted as part of evaluations, monitoring exercises, or communication visits, so as to make sure evaluation data are as ‘fresh’ as possible.

#### Methods

Although structured and unstructured interviews with above listed persons are likely part of the proposed research methodology, we strongly support employing complementary research methods (e.g. life histories, participant observation, projective exercises, focus

groups) not least when collecting data with minors, which requires explicit elaboration in the inception report.

Besides, the following activities are foreseen:

- Desk review of relevant documentation including policy framework in Jordan and Lebanon, RHEP-commissioned research work and prior evaluation reports, narrative reports, M&E data, and other program-related documentation
- Interviews, surveys, and/or focus group discussions with RHEP staff in CA, CACH, and implementing partners, as well as with other stakeholders as deemed necessary

#### Ethics/protection

The evaluator is requested to include a section on research ethics in the inception report which elaborates on protection issues and other ethical concerns. A child protection briefing by Caritas staff is part of the assignment.

### **4. EVALUATION QUESTIONS**

The evaluation report is expected to be structured along responses to the following questions, thereby distinguishing between findings for Lebanon and Jordan and marking which information was collected in ADA-supported project sites (Jordan only):

#### Relevance

- To what extent were the objectives of the program valid for the context in Jordan and Lebanon in terms of overall needs and policies?
- To what extent was the RHEP considered relevant by (i.e. did it meet the needs and aspirations of) direct beneficiaries, including school administrators, teachers, parents, and students?

#### Effectiveness

- Are the results/outcomes of the RHEP in line with the results and approach as formulated in the program's logical framework and proposal?
- What were factors (both internal and external) that determined whether or not the program's objectives were met?

#### Efficiency

- Was the project/programme implemented in the most efficient way (in terms of time and resource allocation, planning, coordination, and communication)?
- To what extent were services delivered in a way that differentiates between the needs of individual beneficiaries and schools, and prioritises responding to the most pressing concerns?
- How do gender differences impact the effectiveness of, and participation in, the program?

#### Impact

- Are the results/outcomes of the RHEP in line with the overall and specific objectives as formulated in the program's logical framework and specified in the proposal? If any, what were unintended impacts of the programme?
- What do beneficiaries consider the most significant changes brought about by the RHEP in their lives and in the schools they learn or work in? Distinguish between short, medium, and long-term impact.
- Which academic, social and emotional skills and competencies are considered most critical in education for children affected by the Syria crisis – according to children themselves, as well as their caregivers (parents, teachers)? Did RHEP respond to and support beneficiaries in the development of these competencies?
- What works for whom (and what does not)? Which services made the biggest impact on the academic and socio-emotional development of which beneficiaries? Include gender, disability, and other relevant cross-cutting themes in an analysis
- How do beneficiaries evaluate the impact of the RHEP in proportion to their overall needs?

#### Sustainability

- Are the positive effects of the RHEP sustainable?
- To what extent did the RHEP contribute to strengthening existing systems or to systemic change (such as school facilities, quality of teaching)?
- What are key considerations to keep in mind when developing an exit strategy for the program?

### **5. TIMELINE**

Timeline to be defined by evaluator in appended excel sheet. Deadline for submission of final report is 25 May 2019.

### **6. Responsibilities/conditions**

Confidentiality of information: All documents provided to the evaluator(s) and all data collected during field research must be treated as confidential and used solely for the purpose of this evaluation. Respondents shall not be identified in reports without their explicit written permission. Photo, video, and other research data that can be traced back to individual research participants shall be anonymised unless agreed otherwise, in writing, with the person concerned.

#### Ownership of data, findings, products

CA retains full ownership of all data, findings, and products produced as part of this evaluation. However, CA is committed to disseminating findings and contributing to debates on education in emergencies in general, and in the Middle East in specific, and is principally open to suggestions by the evaluator on ways to jointly disseminate findings.

Support by CA and partners: All relevant documents including program proposal, reports, etc. will be provided for the evaluator(s). Field research will be supported and facilitated by CL/CJ based upon the methodology and approach decided by the evaluator. Relevant contacts of other stakeholders will be shared upon the evaluator(s)' request.

Safeguarding and protection: Since data collection involves direct interactions with beneficiaries, the evaluator commits to safeguarding and protection policies and procedures that are shared and reiterated during the preparatory phase.

Distribution Policy: Intended users of deliverables are CJ and CL teams, CA, back donors of CA, other education partners of CJ and CL (e.g. CRS and Caritas Germany), CACH and back donors.

All deliverables generated through this evaluation will be subject to approval by CA before public dissemination.

## 7. DELIVERABLES

The evaluator is expected to submit the following deliverables:

- **Inception report** (10-15 pages without annexes), which needs CA approval before entering the research phase. The report should at a minimum:
  - o describe the conceptual framework reflecting the ToR
  - o highlight any reservations regarding the feasibility
  - o outline the methodology and provide a timeline for the field phase
  - o contain tools/ templates for data collection during field phase
  - o provide an analysis of consulted documentation
  - o present outline of the final report
- CA is aware that the limited timeframe for the evaluation can pose a challenge to building the trust/rapport required to get to in-depth conversations; the evaluator is invited to reflect on this in the inception report.
- **Raw data set** (interview transcripts, focus group reports, etc.)
- **Validation workshop** in each country with partner organizations CL, CJ and CACH for presentation of preliminary findings and recommendations
- **Draft evaluation report** including a draft executive summary and clear findings and recommendations per country to be read and commented by all program partners (CA, CL, CJ and CACH)
- **Final evaluation report** to be approved by CA

All deliverables shall be written in English. The evaluation report should be clear, well-structured (along the DAC criteria), and should not exceed 35,000 words. An executive summary of key findings and recommendations (three to five pages) is mandatory; a powerpoint presentation is optional. Findings and recommendations have to be disaggregated per country (if applicable) and should be based on a critical analysis.

An outline of the report's structure needs to be agreed upon during the inception phase, but should include at least following:

- Cover page, table of contents, list of abbreviations
- Executive summary including recommendations
- Description of the review objective(s), methodology and activities
- Discussion of findings (presented per the specific tasks – Relevance, efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact and Sustainability – and if applicable disaggregated per country)

- Conclusions and Recommendations
- Annexes (e.g. list of reference documents, list of interviewed persons, minutes of meeting)

## 8. REQUIRED PROFILE

### Eligible applicants

- must have the right to enter a contractual agreement with Caritas Austria
- must have no history of legal proceedings related to fraud, corruption or safeguarding of children and/or vulnerable adults
- must not have been involved in the design, implementation or monitoring of this program

This assignment will require an evaluator/ evaluators with the following qualifications and experience:

- Master degree in a relevant field and at least five years of professional experience in the sector of education in emergencies
- Extensive demonstrable experience in participatory, qualitative research methodologies, including child-centered research work
- Experience in conducting evaluations of education programs within emergency and refugee settings with proven track records in delivering professional results
- Knowledge of the education sector in Jordan and Lebanon and related policy frameworks and strategies
- Excellent facilitation and interpersonal skills
- Ability to work effectively as part of a multidisciplinary team
- Excellent oral and written English skills
- Full proficiency in Arabic (for team member/s collecting data)

## 9. HOW TO APPLY

Qualified applicants are requested to submit the completed application sheet (in Excel) to **Bewerbung-OECZ@caritas-austria.at** with the subject line **‘Evaluation RHEP 2015-2018’** by **10 February 2019 COB, CET**. In order to ensure a fair selection process, we cannot respond to requests for further details or clarifications.

All candidates will receive a confirmation of receipt of the proposal and will be informed on the outcome of the selection process.

We look forward to receiving your application!