



203 - Development Cooperation

DF13 ToR for External Project Evaluation

Country:	Republic of Moldova
Project:	Intercultural Dialogue in Moldova
Commissioned by:	Pestalozzi Children's Foundation

These Terms of Reference for an external project evaluation are an integral part of the contract between Pestalozzi Children's Foundation (named PCF hereafter) and the evaluation team [name/s].

1 Background

1.1 Information on the project

Background and actual situation of the project

The main objective of the project "Intercultural Dialogue in Moldova" is to increase the level of tolerance and to develop the intercultural competencies of the young people in the pilot regions, thus creating a better environment for developing the intercultural communication between the ethnic groups living in Moldova and decreasing the level of intolerance and discrimination among children and youth.

Within the second phase of the project, National Youth Council of Moldova (CNTM) focuses on rights holders' and duty bearers' involvement in extra-curricular activities on intercultural education (ICE) and on pedagogical approach to interculturality within the formal education. The project is designed to help the school teachers in the pilot regions to develop and improve their skills for better teaching and promoting ICE in schools as part of their regular school classes.

Project outcome (for the second phase):

Rights holders (children and youth) and duty bearers (school teachers, school inspectors, school administration and parents) from the project regions developed intercultural competences through ICE integration in curricula and participation in formal and non-formal ICE activities.

Project outputs (for the second phase)

1. Improved and strengthened skills of the duty bearers (school teachers, school inspectors, school administration and parents) on intercultural dialogue and intercultural education;
2. Increased knowledge on intercultural dialogue and tolerance and developed competences on ICE of the rights holders;
3. Increased awareness of population on the intercultural dialog and intercultural education importance.

1.2 Dimensions of the evaluation

1.2.1 Purpose

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the achievements of the project outcome and outputs at the end of the second phase and to receive recommendations for planning the third phase of the project.

In the same time the purpose of evaluation is to assess the cooperation between the Operational Partner with 8 local partner organisations and other stakeholders.

1.2.2 Type

This is a summative (achievement of projects' results) as well as a formative evaluation (improve the planning design of the project) evaluation

2 Subject

2.1 Main objectives and evaluation questions

Evaluation of the performance of the project and/or the partner

The main objective of the evaluations is to assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and management of the project during the second phase according to the OECD-DAC definitions¹.

Relevance

- To what extent the topic of Intercultural Education is in line with National Strategies and laws (Education Code, Strategy for non discrimination)?
- How does the project answer the problem of persistent intolerance and discrimination between children and youth belonging to different ethnic, social- economic groups in Moldova?

Effectiveness

-Assess to what extent the planned results at outcome and output levels have been achieved based on indicators in the Logical Framework.

– Assess to what extent the external factors influenced the achievement of the planned outcome and outputs.

Evaluation questions at children level

- Assess if the duration and content of project activities (ICE work-shops, movie broadcasts, contests, and social theater) were sufficient in order to develop the intercultural competences for the children and young people?
- To what extent the Intercultural Exchange Program (IEP) has contributed to strengthening the capacities of children and young people?
- How did the IEP contribute to increasing the level of tolerance among participants in IEP towards their peers?

Evaluation questions at teacher and school administration level

- How do the teachers and school administration perceive the importance of ICE competence for children and youth?
- What are the main challenges in promoting ICE within the regular classes?
- To what extent do the teachers use the “Auxiliary Guide on ICE for teachers” during the classes? How does it help them to develop the Intercultural competence?
- To what extent is ICE competence monitored by school administration and Local Departments of Education?

Evaluation questions at local trainers level.

- How do local trainers perceive the importance of ICE in developing ICE competence for children and youth?
- How do they apply the knowledge and experience gained in working with children and youth? What project materials do they use when organizing their activities?
- What support do they receive from national trainers, project team and local coordinators in order to promote the ICE through non formal education?

Evaluation questions at parents' level

- How do parents perceive the importance of ICE for their children?
- In which activities did they participate?
- What were the changes after participating in project activities?
- How do they support their children to improve the ICE competence?

¹ Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management, <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/2754804.pdf>

Evaluation questions at Local Departments of Education (8 regions) level

- How is the cooperation between the Local Departments of Education with Local partners of the project?
- In which project activities did the representatives of Local Departments of Education participate?
- How do the representatives of Local Departments of Education perceive the importance of ICE competence for children and youth?
- What are the mechanisms for evaluating the development of ICE competence in curricula and extracurricular activities?
- What specialists from Local Departments of Education are responsible for the evaluation of ICE competence?

Assess how the Ministry of Education (MoE) supports the implementation of the project at national and local level.

- How is the cooperation between the MoE and National Youth Council of Moldova established?
- What mechanisms does the MoE apply for evaluating the ICE competence?
- What are the MoE strategies to promote the development of ICE competencies in formal education?

Assess the achievements regarding awareness raising and promotion of ICE in media.

- To what extent do the project awareness raising activities promote ICE for children and youth?
- What information sources have a better impact on promoting ICE?
- From which sources of information did the project participants hear about the ICE?

Efficiency

- Assess if the financial and human resources have been used efficiently to achieve the planned outcomes and outputs

- To what extent the financial resources planned within the project were economically used?
- Were there other possibilities to use more efficiently the financial resources?
- Were the human resources efficiently planned in order to contribute to reaching the project outcome and outputs? What other alternatives of using the financial and human resources were possible to use?

Sustainability

- What steps does CNTM take in order to ensure sustainability after the end of the project?
- What ICE activities are included in CNTM strategic plan?
- Which project activities show signs for sustainability (i.e. developed training modules, curricula and extra curricula activities as part of the school action plans etc.).
- To what extent are the local partners ready to implement ICE activities after the end of the project?
- What activities can continue without additional financial support?
- What additional support do the local partners need in order to continue the ICE activities?
- What steps do the local partners take in order to ensure sustainability after the end of the project?

Management: governance, general management and project management

- To what extent do CNTM and Local partners feel ownership of the project?
- How do the national trainers contribute to the project implementation? What is their role in project management?
- How did PCF contribute to strengthening the organisational and content capacities of CNTM, local partners and national trainers?
- How did the PCF emPower and Senior Professional Training programmes contribute to the professional development of the project staff?
- What is the added value for all partners from the cooperation with PCF?
- How does CNTM support the local partners in developing their planning and reporting?

- How is the decision-making process taking place during the project implementation? How are the local partners and national trainers involved in the decision making process?
-

Recommendations for the 3rd phase

- What activities would the children and young people suggest for the third phase in order to improve their ICE competences?
- What additional support would the teachers need in order to better develop intercultural competencies?
- What activities would the teachers suggest for improving their knowledge and skills in ICE?
- What additional support would the national and local trainers need in order to better promote ICE?
- What recommendations would the parents give to the project team in order to improve the quality of development of the ICE competence in schools?
- What support does the MoE/National School Inspectorate need in order to improve the monitoring/evaluation of ICE competence?
- How does PCF need to adapt activities on institutional and policy level, based on the MoE plan to continue integration of ICE in formal education? What are the needs of the National School Inspectorate for evaluation the development of ICE competence in school?
- How can the National School Inspectorate support the school teachers in improving the ICE competences?
- What additional support does CNTM need in order to continue the promotion of ICE activities after the 3rd phase?
- How can the cooperation between CNTM, national trainers and local partners be optimised in next phase in relation to overall project management?

2.2 Process

Step 1: Submission of proposal – 10 May, 2016 (the proposal should include a clear methodological approach, instruments/tools to be used and budget)

Step 2: Selection of the candidates – until 16 May 2016

Step 3: Finalising the ToR and signing the Cooperation Agreement – until 20th of May, 2016

Step 4: Organizing the data collection (field visits, interviews etc) – June 2016

Step 5: Data collection June-September 2016

Step 6: Draft evaluation report – 30 September 2016

Step 7: Presentation of the draft report

Step 8: Final evaluation report – 31 October 2016

Step 9: Dissemination of the Report. Presentation to the partner in October, 2016

2.3 Methods for data collection

Document review

Below are the main documents that will inform the evaluation:

- Cooperation Agreement between PCF and CNTM;
- Project Description with annexes (SWOT, Logframe, Strategic & Annual Action Plans, Financial Plan, Institutional Cooperation Agreement, Organigram)
- PCF program reports for 2014 and 2015
- Operational plan for 2014, 2015, 2016;
- Annual project reports 2014, 2015, semester report for 2016;
- Other relevant documents about the project and publications

Working Copy from March 2016

- Legislation, strategy papers, etc.

2.3.1 Interviews, focus groups and Survey

Below are the main stakeholder that should be interviewed:

1. PCF Country Representative and PCF Programme Director for SEE;
2. Operational Partner: Project Coordinator and Project Assistant
3. National trainers
4. Local Partners - local coordinators
5. Representatives of Teachers/ School Management
6. Parents of children and youth from partner schools
7. Children and youth from the partners' schools
8. Responsible at the Ministry of Education.
9. Representatives of Educational Center ProDidactica
10. Representatives of the Local Departments of Education from pilot regional
11. Representatives of National School Inspectorate
12. CNTM Board members

2.3.2 Data analysis

2.4 Evaluator should developed necessary instruments and proper methodology to ensure high quality of analyses of data collected. Deliverables

- Draft report (September 25th, 2016) received electronically by the PCF Country Representative;
- One presentation of the draft report
- Final evaluation report (October, 25th, 2016).
- One presentation of the final report

Structure, length and mode of delivery (electronic, paper) of the evaluation report

- The final evaluation report should not be longer than 30 pages (without annexes)
- The structure of the report should follow the structure of the ToR, containing analysis of the project results along the evaluation criteria as well as identified problems and challenges (in line with ToR), followed by clear recommendations.
- The report will also contain a description of the methods of work followed by the evaluator.
- PCF expects comprehensive, objective and clear evaluation report, with substantial recommendations.
- The report should be submitted in English and Romanian.
- Three signed copies of the final version of the report along with a digital version will be submitted to PCF.

2.5 Human Resources

2.5.1 Evaluation Team

External consultant (profile with qualifications and experience)

The evaluation team/ expert is expected to have:

- Experience in all stages of project management (planning, implementation, M&E);
- Knowledge of the country context, with the focus in the areas of children's rights, youth policies, education, intercultural education:
- Experience in conducting evaluation in the field of education
- Well acquainted with the national laws and strategies in the field of education (both formal and non-formal);
- Knowledge and skills in applying diverse evaluation methodology;
- Guided by professional standards and ethical principles when conducting the evaluation including the responsibility to handling confidential information.

2.5.2 Support Team

- Staff of partner organization (director, project coordinator and other project staff)

- PCF (Country Representative, and Programme Director for South East Europe)

Annexes

- Cooperation Agreement for the second phase
- Project planning documents for the second phase (SWOT Analysis, Log-frame, Strategic Action Plan, Budget); Annual plans and reports for 2014, 2015 and semester report for 2016
- Audit reports for 2014 and 2015
- List and contacts of local partners, stakeholders; List and contacts of partner schools