

UNICEF Angola

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Consultancy to conduct summative evaluation of UNICEF contribution to education sector in Angola (2015 – 2019)

Part I		
Objective	Summative evaluation of UNICEF support to the education sector in Angola (2015 – 2019).	
Section	Education	
Place	Luanda and selected provinces	
Duration	60 working days	
Dates	From: December 2019	To: February 2020

Part II		
Evaluation Manager	Carlos Javier Rodriguez Cuellar M&E Specialist	
Experience required	Evaluation consulting firm with proven experience in evaluation assignments on country programme about education and learning, partnerships, gender, human right-based approach, institutional development, child rights, knowledgeable of Angolan context and with Portuguese and English communication skills.	
Budget Code	6810/A0/06/880/003/003 - Non-grant GC	
RWP	2019	
Activity planned as part of the RWP	Yes	<u>No</u>
Selection process method	Call for proposals (LTAS-holders and others)	

Part III:			
Function	Name	Signature	Date
Prepared by:	Carlos Javier Rodriguez Cuellar M&E Specialist		
Reviewed by:	Robert Carlos Thomas Chief – PME section		
Reviewed by:	Barno Mukhamadieva Chief – Education section		
Approved by:	Patricia Portela de Souza Deputy Representative		

1. Background

The present Country Programme of Cooperation (CPC) 2015-2019 between the Government of Angola and UNICEF has been originally anchored in the National Plan of Development 2013-2017 and in the key sectoral development policies and strategies. The CPC has been also aligned with United Nations Partnership Assistance Framework (UNPAF) 2015-2019 and implemented in the framework of the current National Plan of Development 2018 – 2022.

In the framework of the current CP, which will be finalized December this year, UNICEF Angola Country Office (ACO) has been supporting government efforts to reduce disparities in social indicators with a focus on the child population of Angola. To do so, the CPC was pursuing a systematic focus on interventions that have proven potential to benefit the most vulnerable individuals, families and communities. Over the last five years, the CPC has been gearing its action towards improvements in three key areas that have emerged as potentially the most crucial for the country's development agenda:

- Substantial decrease in child and maternal mortality.
- Expansion of birth registration within the civil registration and vital statistics system.
- Expansion of large-scale social assistance scheme to vulnerable families.

A deliberate focus on reducing disparities has been underpinning all interventions. This strategic approach has been implemented across all ACO sections by prioritizing strategic interventions with proven capacity to decrease disparities by reaching the most vulnerable families and children.

ACO Education Programme objectives and the theory of change for the current country programme (2015-2019) were defined in 2014. In the current CP (2015-2019), the education outcome is Outcome 3, which aims to achieve “Improved and equitable access to and completion of quality, inclusive education with a focus on improving learning outcomes”. Under this overarching Outcome, ACO Education Programme has detailed three outputs to achieve by the end of 2019:

Output 3.1: Increased equitable access to schools, by increasing enrolment and including vulnerable children.

Output 3.2: The Government of Angola has increased national capacity to improve quality of teaching and learning, thereby improving learning results.

Output 3.3: Schools have increased capacity in school management, with active participation from parents.

Up to the mid-term of the CP (2017), the focus of ACO Education Programme has been on three interrelated objectives: ensuring equitable access to education for all children, improving the quality of teaching and learning, and strengthening the institutional capacity of government partners in school management and data collection. To successfully reach these goals, ACO Education Programme has conducted combined

interventions at policy and ground levels in various fields, including Early Child Development (ECD) and primary education, learning assessment, inclusive education and data management.

Due to growing importance of pre-primary and the development of the National ECD Policy, and the transfer of ECD and early learning activities from the Ministry of Social Action (MASFAMU) to the Ministry of Education (MoE), it was decided to single out ECD and Early learning as a separate output and combine outputs on the quality of education and access to education. In the last two years of the current CP (2015 – 2019), the education outcome has remained unchanged, with two redefined outputs:

Output 3.1: More children aged 0-5 benefit from increased access to early childhood development and affordable early learning services.

Output 3.2: More children, especially girls, access and complete quality education in safe and conducive school environment (grades 1 -9).

Now ACO Education Programme implements interventions under these two areas of work, with strong focus on policy development around ECD policy, and policy on inclusive education and implementation of interventions at municipal level with due attention to modelling, documentation of good practices and costing.

Along its five years of implementation, ACO Education Programme has supported key sectoral priorities. In 2015, for instance, the main investments were focused, among others, on: a) the finalization of a national policy on special education, b) the formulation of a national Education For All initiative, c) the generation of knowledge about education sector based on administrative data, d) the training of teacher on early child education, e) the promotion of awareness on the relationship between education and emergency, f) etc.

The second year of the cycle of cooperation (2016), the efforts were concentrated around: a) the formulation of a public policy on teachers training, b) the elaboration of evidences regarding the effects of the emergency events in the education sector, c) the training of staff responsible of schools which provide early child education, d) the identification of the situation of out of school children, e) etc.

The agenda of work along its third year of implementation (2017) was driven mainly by: a) the establishment of a national teachers training strategy, b) the finalization of a national policy on early child education, c) the capacity development on information management system, d) the promotion of emergency awareness and response in the education sector, e) the training of teachers on life skills, f) etc.

In the framework of a national context with urgent demands in terms of multisectoral emergency response to DRC refugees in the north of the country, ACO Education Programme focused its work along 2018 mostly on: a) the provision of technical and logistical support to MoE for taking strategic actions in the humanitarian settings, b) the support to an integrated community project which included education services for vulnerable population, c) the training of teachers on math curriculum, d) the elaboration of statistical

document regarding the supply and demand of education services, e) the participation of sectoral authorities in a international event on early child development, f) etc.

Along its last year of the current cycle of cooperation (2019), ACO Education Programme converged its resources predominantly on: a) the finalization of the mid-term evaluation of a project focused on child friendly schools in two provinces, b) the design and implementation of a national event on early childhood, c) the dissemination of Portuguese curriculum, d) the extension of the child friendly school project to a new province, d) the generation of evidences regarding the cost of early child education and development opportunities for adolescent and young people, e) the training of teachers on the national special education plan, f) the support to the implementation of a community strategy for promoting the development of the early childhood, g) etc.

2. Evaluation purpose

This year ACO is finalizing its current cycle of Country Programme (CP) in Angola (2015 – 2019) and, at the same time, preparing the operationalization of a new one a little shorter in temporal terms (2020 – 2022). This is an opportunity for starting to put in place one of the priority actions stated by the approved ESARO 2019 – 2021 Regional Evaluation Framework and Action Plan (UNICEF, 2019c): to assess gradually all the programmes proposed for continuation in the subsequent CP. One of programmes that ACO decided jointly with the GoA to maintain is the Education Programme.

As ACO has supported intensively the education sector in the country along this CP (either in regular or emergency environments) and agreed with the GoA to continue during the next CP, this summative evaluation has two specific purposes: first, to weigh up the key contributions done by ACO in the education sector in the last five years and, second, to gather the specification about what made valuable that contribution and how it can be replicated and adapted in the next CP. In other words, the unambiguous purposes of this proposed summative evaluation are accountability and learning.

According to Stockmann (2011), the accountability purpose of this summative evaluation is linked to an evaluation control goal: the requirement to identify the level of concordance between what was planned and what was accomplished. It will imply to appraise what ACO Education section proposed to do when starting 2015 - 2019 CP against what was achieved. This analysis must be based on objective facts. Stockmann (2011, 27) affirms that the evaluation control goal implies "...a matter of ascertaining whether or not the aims specified in the planning phase have been achieved."

Following the same author, the learning purpose of this summative evaluation is related to an evaluation development goal: the evidence-based knowledge extracted from the summative evaluation can be used in the design and execution of new initiatives within the new CP. Stockmann (2011, 28) characterized by the following statement this purpose: "With this evaluation function, learning processes predominate, learning processes which will be used for the further development of programmes."

As this summative evaluation represents an exercise to review ACO's contributions to the education sector in Angola along the last five years, the key recipients of this proposed summative evaluation are not only the members of ACO Education section, but management and other programme sections, in general, at CO and RO. So, the audience is composed, mainly, by UNICEF staff. Although, as the Ministry of Education (MoE), at national and subnational level, has been the major partner and direct receptor of ACO's contributions, its key management staff is part of the audience, too. Following some specifications about the expected clusters of recipients:

- **ACO Education team:** staff engaged in the implementation of the current CP and formulation of the next one. They would expect to receive, first, a clear description and explanation, based on evidences and covering the proposed evaluation criteria, about what contributions were done by UNICEF to respond to education sector needs and priorities in the country and, second, a summary of functional knowledge extracted from the evaluation and feasible to be applied and adapted in the next CP framed based on an integrated approach.
- **ACO management:** staff accountable for the widely definition, operationalization and results of the courses of action and resources of the CO. They would demand to find evidence-based judgements regarding the strategic add value offered by ACO to the education sector in Angola and the specific and functional know-how derived from those contributions which could be used and adjusted in the new cycle of cooperation.
- **Programme sections at CO and RO level:** staff in charge of different lines of programmatic work and with a varied level of responsibility. They would request to get summarized information about what substantial changes were promoted within the education sector based on the investments done by ACO and how the distilled and success strategies could be transferred and adapted to other sectors and national contexts.
- **Key management staff from the MoE:** governmental functionaries in charge of the definition and operationalization of public policies in the education field at national and subnational level. They would envisage to access to a report which concretize and reflect the transformations happened within the sector based on ACO contributions and aligned to their sectoral needs and priorities. At the same time, they would like to identify how this change can continue in the future.

Regarding the use of the results of the proposed summative evaluation, in general there is a common perspective: it is expected that in the new CP (2020 – 2022), the evaluation results could be utilized and adapted to the innovative approach. Following some specifications regarding the specific use of the evaluation by the different audiences:

- **ACO Education team:** it is expected that the evaluation recommendations must be used in the regular revision and update of the Rolling Work Plan (RWP) to be established with the MoE. The

identified strategies used to produce key changes in the education sector in the current CP (2015 – 2019) must be adapted to the new integrated approach.

- **ACO management:** it is expected that the projected know-how about what and how to influence and achieve results in the education sector in Angola must be scaled up widely among ACO sections. The management must impulse, accompany and assess this process based on the evaluation results and the formulation and approval of the evaluation management response.
- **Programme sections at CO and RO level:** it is expected that, in the context of the new CP (2020 – 2022), ACO sections will work in a convergent manner, which must be an opportunity to adopt and adapt the identified practices of success derived from the evaluation results. At RO level, it is expected that the key messages extracted from the evaluation results must be disseminated among Cos in the region.
- **Key management staff from the MoE:** it is expected that, based on the clear identification of the sectoral changes that happened due UNICEF contributions, the governmental officials must establish the legal and operational mechanisms and means to assure the continuity and expansion of the transformations at national and subnational level.

3. Evaluation objectives

As mentioned previously, ACO, in general, and Education section, in special, want to take stock critically about the main areas of contribution developed with the Ministry of Education, at national and sub-national level, along the last five years (2015 – 2019) and to identify lessons learnt and good practices related to that contribution. Based on its results, it is expected to adjust the operationalization of the next cycle of cooperation (2020 – 2022) which is focused on a integrated programming at decentralized level in favour of the child rights in the country, as stated in the approved new Angola CPD (UNICEF, 2019b).

So, this evaluation has a summative nature due the aim to identify the outcomes and outputs of UNICEF contributions in the field of education in Angola. So, this kind of evaluation expects to assess, as proposed by Patton (2017), “the overall merit, worth, and significance...” of the work done by UNICEF related to this governmental sector in the last years. In other words, through this evaluation ACO and Education section will do an exercise of accountability. But, at the same time, this evaluation has a learning character due the aspiration to recognize from the developed experience how the contribution in the education sector in Angola was done.

The objectives of this summative evaluation are the following:

General:

Evaluate the contribution of ACO Education Programme to the improvement of the institutional capacity and service provision of the education sector in Angola (at national and sub-national level) along 2015 – 2019 Country Programme (CP) based on international evaluation standards and norms, using gender, equity and child rights approaches, and considering political, social, economic, institutional, etc. challenges, constraints and opportunities.

Specific:

- a) Examine critically ACO Education Programme performance during the mentioned period in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability in development contexts and in terms of coherence, coverage and coordination in emergency settings along the CP 2015 – 2019.
- b) Provide in-depth evidences regarding the achievement or not of planned and unplanned ACO Education Programme results at national and sub-national level and the main factors which promoted or limited them.
- c) Revise critically the theory of change and assumptions undertaken by ACO Education Programme during 2015 – 2019 and its changes along that period identifying how gender, equity and child rights approaches were included, promoted and implemented.
- d) Identify the key components of the current cycle of cooperation which can be taken to scale into the new one considering its new accent in integrated programming at decentralized level and the programmatic prioritization on ECE, young girls and information management.
- e) Propose evidence-based findings and conclusions regarding the contribution of ACO Education Programme to the education system and service in Angola and functional recommendations to be used in the operationalization of the new cycle of cooperation.

4. Evaluation scope

In the framework of this summative evaluation, the term “contributions” means the set of strategic transformations / changes happened and documented within the education sector in the country due direct UNICEF support. It doesn’t imply that the involvement of another social actors within the education sector is negated, but here the intention is to identify in what specific education areas UNICEF played a crucial and strategic role where other institutions, organizations, entities, etc. did not cooperate.

The current CP (2015 – 2019) defines the temporal boundaries of the proposed summative evaluation. As mentioned previously, the focus is the contributions done by UNICEF to the education sector in Angola. So, the summative evaluation is focused on ACO Education Programme in terms of what, why, how and where was planned to support to this governmental sector and its actual achievements.

The analytical revision of the promoted transformations within the MoE in terms of policies, legislation, capacities, mechanisms, practices, materials, etc., will be done considering child rights, gender and equity approaches. It means that the examination of the supported transformations must make visible at what extent those approaches were promoted by ACO Education Programme and used and operationalized by the MoE.

In terms of geographical coverage, this summative evaluation will address the contribution done at national level (transformations applied in all the education sector along the country) and at subnational level (changes applied in specific subnational territories). In other words, the analysis of what alterations happened in the education sector due UNICEF intervention will be done specifically at headquarters (Luanda) and in some targeted provinces (for instance: Bié and Moxico).

5. Evaluation criteria and questions

As mentioned previously, this summative evaluation will use two sets of evaluation criteria. The first set is composed by those ones applicable in an invariant institutional context of development (when education services are provided regularly): relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. The second set of evaluation criteria is constituted by those ones used in humanitarian settings (due events which are threatening people in terms of health, safety or wellbeing): coherence, coverage and coordination.

In the framework of this summative evaluation, while the first set of evaluation criteria will be handled to analyze the contributions of ACO Education Programme in most of the current cycle of cooperation, the second set of evaluation criteria will be employed to scrutinize the contributions of ACO Education Programme in the emergency situations happened in the country along these last five years.

In the next sections, evaluation questions have been formulated based on the two sets of evaluation criteria. As affirmed by Booth et al (2016), the evaluation questions define, orient, structure, etc. the collection, organization and analysis of information, reporting of findings, drafting of conclusions and elaboration of recommendations.¹

In the following paragraphs, the evaluation questions related to each evaluation criteria are described after presenting an operational definition of each chosen criterion:²

Evaluation criteria and questions in the context of development programme:

¹ In practical terms, when the evaluation questions are formulated based on some specific evaluation criteria, the scope of any kind of study, research, evaluation, etc., is defined.

² Some initial evaluation questions are specified here. Based on the analysis of the TORs, each proponent is invited to reformulate, customize, rebuild, adapt them and propose additional evaluation questions which can cover all the topics relative to the object of evaluation (evaluand).

a) Relevance:

This criterion examines at what extent ACO Education Programme has been functional to national and provincial education priorities and needs in Angola along the CP 2015 - 2019. Some initial evaluation questions which cover this dimension of analysis are the following:

- What were the sectoral priorities and needs that the MoE defined for the last five years at national and subnational level, at what extent ACO Education Programme responded to them through the CP 2015 – 2019 and what evidences are available on it?
- At what extent did the theory of change that supported ACO Education Programme have significance to the sectoral priorities and needs during the period of 2015 – 2019, what changes were made along the years and what evidences are available on it?
- How were articulated conceptually and operationally by ACO Education Programme aspects as gender, equity and child rights, how them responded to the priorities and needs of the MoE at national and subnational level and what evidences are available on it?
- At what extent is possible to affirm that ACO Education Programme was developed and implemented in a context of complexity which demanded frequent readjustments and planning processes and what evidences are available on it?
- How were included and operationalized into ACO Education Programme the national contribution for achieving SDGs goals, targets and indicators and reporting them along the current CP (2015 – 2019) and what evidences are available on it?
- What were the main contributions done by ACO Education Programme for enhancing the institutional performance of the MoE and the provision of its services at national and subnational level and what evidences are available on it?
- What lessons in terms of relevance can be extracted from the relationship established between ACO Education Programme and MoE to be used and / or adapted in the new cycle of cooperation (2020 – 2022) shaped around an integrated approach?

b) Effectiveness:

This criterion scans at what extent the execution of planned and unplanned activities of ACO Education Programme accomplishes planned or unplanned outcomes and outputs. This principle involves an analysis of the (potential / actual) causality relationship existent among its components. Some initial evaluation questions which cover this dimension of analysis are the following:

- At what level were the planned results of ACO Education Programme (in its original and modified version, if apply) accomplished at national and subnational level and what unbiased evidences can be shown on it?
- What were the main political, economic, social, institutional, etc. determinants which facilitated or limited the achievement or not of planned and unplanned ACO Education Programme outcomes and outputs and what evidences are available on it?
- How were gender, equity and child rights included and treated or not into the execution of planned and unplanned activities to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs of ACO Education Programme and what evidences are available on it?
- At what extent has ACO Education Programme contributed to achieve the expected results defined in the previous (2013 – 2017) and current National Development Plan (2018 – 2022) and the targets of the SDGs and what evidences are available on it?
- What were the crucial planned and unplanned strategies / activities delivered by ACO Education Programme for enhancing institutional performance of the MoE and the provision of its services at national and subnational level and what evidences are available on it?
- What lessons in terms of effectiveness can be extracted from ACO Education Programme to be used and / or adapted in the implementation of the new CP 2020 – 2022 which was shaped around an integrated approach?

c) Efficiency:

This criterion explores at what extent the use of the resources to achieve the expected results was cost-efficient and interrogates on alternative ways to get the things done by ACO Education Programme during the current CP (2015 – 2019). Some initial evaluation questions which cover this dimension of analysis are the following:

- Was the utilization of the human and financial resources of ACO Education Programme based on a cost-efficient rationality along the current CP (2015 – 2019) and what evidences are available on it?
- Were the outcomes and outputs of ACO Education Programme reached according to the planned timeline and what evidences are available on it? Did other alternative way to get the things done exist along the current CP (2015 – 2019) and what evidences are available on it?
- In what manner did ACO Education Programme take into consideration aspects as gender, equity and child rights in the allocation and use of the resources and what evidences are available on it?

- What were the key decision made by ACO Education Programme in terms of use of human and financial resources for enhancing institutional performance of the MoE and the provision of its services at national and subnational level and what evidences are available on it?
- What lessons in terms of efficiency can be extracted from ACO Education Programme to be used and / or adapted in the implementation of the new CP 2020 – 2022 which was shaped around an integrated approach?

d) Sustainability:

This criterion analyses at what extent the (expected and non-expected) changes promoted by ACO Education Programme will persist in the time. Some initial evaluation questions which cover this dimension of analysis are the following:

- What were the existent and created local conditions, supported directly by ACO Education Programme, to preserve the continuity of the transformations / changes achieved in the education sector along the current CP (2015 – 20199) and what evidences are available on it?
- What would be the circumstances which could affect in a positive or negative way the continuity of the transformations / changes achieved in the education sector with the direct support of ACO Education Programme and what evidences are available on it?
- At what extent the continuity of the expected or unexpected transformations / changes achieved in the education sector relative to gender, equity and child rights is or not possible and what evidences are available?
- At what extent is possible to identify the ownership of the MoE regarding all the transformations / changes achieved in the education sector with the direct support of ACO Education Programme and what evidences are available on it?
- At what extent has been enhanced the technical capacity of staff of the MoE at national and subnational level engaged in the transformations / changes achieved in the education sector with the direct support of ACO Education Programme and what evidences are available on it?
- What lessons in terms of promotion of sustainability can be extracted from ACO Education Programme to be used and / or adapted in the implementation of the new CP 2020 – 2022 which was shaped around an integrated approach?

Evaluation criteria and questions in the context of humanitarian settings:

a) Coherence

This criterion is focused on at what extent exists consistency (no contradiction) between all the implemented interventions / provided services in a humanitarian setting. Some initial evaluation questions which cover this dimension of analysis are the following:

- At what extent the engagement of ACO Education Programme in humanitarian settings in Angola was planned and prepared to complement existent intervention / services and what evidences are available on it?
- How was assured the positive alignment of ACO Education Programme in humanitarian settings to the implemented interventions / provided services and what evidences are available on it?
- How did ACO Education Programme promoted and used consistently equity, gender and child rights approaches in the formulation and implementation of interventions / services in humanitarian settings and what evidences are available on it?
- At what extent ACO Education Programme contributed for enhancing institutional performance of the MoE and the provision of its services at national and subnational level in humanitarian settings and what evidences are available on it?
- What lessons in terms of coherence in humanitarian settings can be extracted from ACO Education Programme to be used and / or adapted in the implementation of the new CP 2020 – 2022 which was shaped around an integrated approach?

b) Coverage

This criterion is focused on the analysis if the population exposed to the most risk threats are covered or not by the implemented interventions / provided services in a humanitarian setting. Some initial evaluation questions which cover this dimension of analysis are the following:

- At what extent the interventions implemented / services provided by ACO Education Programme in humanitarian settings in Angola were focused on the most risked population and what evidences are available on it?
- How did ACO Education Programme engaged MoE regularly in the implementation of interventions / provision of services for the most vulnerable population and what evidences are available on it?

- At what extent gender, equity and child rights approaches were promoted and used by ACO Education Programme when defining to reach the most risked population in humanitarian settings and what evidences are available on it?
- What lessons in terms of coverage in humanitarian settings can be extracted from ACO Education Programme to be used and / or adapted in the implementation of the new CP 2020 – 2022 which was shaped around an integrated approach?

a) **Coordination**

This criterion is focused on the utilization of policy instruments / tools to deliver cohesively and effectively interventions / services in a humanitarian setting. Some initial evaluation questions which cover this dimension of analysis are the following:

- At what extent did ACO Education Programme advocate and use coordination structures / mechanisms / instruments / tools to define humanitarian responses and what evidences are available on it?
- What were the internal and external factors that promoted / limited the use coordination structures / mechanisms / instruments / tools to define humanitarian responses and what evidences are available on it?
- At what extent gender, equity and child rights approaches were promoted and used by ACO Education Programme when policy instruments / tools were used for defining how to perform cohesively among all the humanitarian actors and what evidences are available on it?
- What lessons in terms of coordination in humanitarian settings can be extracted from ACO Education Programme to be used and / or adapted in the implementation of the new CP 2020 – 2022 which was shaped around an integrated approach?

As the current CP (2015 – 2019) will end on December, there is no possibility to include impact as an evaluation criterion which is focused on the analysis of the very long lasting positive and negative implications caused by the intervention.

6. Evaluation methodology

This summative evaluation must imply the use of mixed method and the participation of different stakeholders along all its phases of implementation. The methodology to be defined for delivering this

summative evaluation must integrate international evaluation norms and standards³ and ethical principles⁴ as it is stated in UNICEF Evaluation Policy (2018).⁵

As referred by Mertens (2018), mixed method includes, first, the development of quantitative and qualitative strategies to collect and analyze information relative to the evaluation questions (which operationalize the evaluation objectives), and, second, the combination of the results of those strategies (usually named as triangulation). So, the selected evaluation consulting firm will collect, produce and use primary and secondary data and amalgamize smoothly the evaluation results.

The primary information is comprised by the declaration, speech, performance, etc. of all the stakeholders engaged (directly and indirectly) with ACO Education Programme. It is expected that, according to Booth et al (2016), the collection of qualitative information must cover standard questions: who / what / when / where / how / why regarding the relationship between ACO Education Programme and MoE.

Some techniques to be used for producing the expected primary information are the following: participant observation, in-depth interview, ethnography, focus group, etc. The evaluation consulting firms must propose what qualitative techniques will be delivered in the fieldwork period of the summative evaluation.

The secondary information is composted by all the existent sources of information referring ACO Education Programme or produce by itself. Sources of information as Country Office Annual Reports (COARs), Results Assessment Module (RAM), Strategic Management Questions (SMQs), donor reports, quarterly planning matrices, databases, financial statements, institutional letters, results of consultancies (studies, researches or surveys), internal minutes, mid-term evaluation report, monitoring reports, etc. are part of that kind of information.

As suggested by Bryman (2016), the quantitative information to be used and / or produced in the framework of the summative evaluation of ACO Education Programme must take into consideration key aspects as the measurement, causality, generalization and replication of the used information.

The following core activities will be completed by the selected evaluation consulting firm:

- a) **Comprehensive documentary review:** the evaluation consulting firm is expected to analyse key secondary sources of information (mentioned previously) relative to the design, planning and execution of ACO Education Programme from 2015 to 2019. This critical revision must include the current situation of the MoE and the education sector in the country. In other words, the

³ The following link specifies the latest version of the evaluation norms and standards promoted globally by the United National Evaluation Group: <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1914>

⁴ More information about how to deliver an evaluation on an ethical mode can be founded in the following link: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102>

⁵ This policy was reviewed and updated in 2018 based on the reflection of UNICEF staff and counterparts. More details at: https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/files/Revised_Evaluation_Policy_Interactive.pdf

evaluation consulting firm will do a background research (Kara, 2017) on the nature, performance and results of the mentioned programme.

- b) **Produce a detailed inception report:** based on the results of the documentary review, it is expected that the evaluation consulting firm elaborate a complete inception report (first deliverable) according to the structure drafted in the point 7.1.1 of these TORs, which outlines the following components among others: a summary of the integrated approach pilot (including theory of change and assumptions, if possible), a selection of evaluation approach and criteria to be used, a definition of the scope and methodology, an evaluation matrix (including criteria and questions) and evaluation tools, a tentative evaluation schedule (specifying proposed sequence of activities), a definition of the structure, length and characterization of the evaluation report, and description of expected evaluation deliverables.

More evaluation components could be added to the inception report by the selected evaluation consulting firm. The maximum length of the inception report must be 15 pages (excluding annexes). This document must be approved by UNICEF ACO.

- c) **Collect, analyse and triangulate evidences relative to ACO Education Programme:** in addition to the desk review and after the approval of the inception report, the selected evaluation consulting firm will gather qualitative and quantitative information, aligned to the evaluation objectives, matrix and questions, regarding the contributions of ACO Education Programme to the education sector in Angola.

The fieldwork to be implemented in Luanda and some selected provinces must be aligned to the proposed timeframe described in the inception report. The collection, analysis and integration of the information to be collected must be defined based on the approved evaluation matrix (evaluation criteria and questions) mentioned previously.

The planning phase of the fieldwork must be done, at least, three weeks before the selected evaluation consulting firm arrives to Luanda. Along its implementation, just the approved evaluation tools will be applied, and the evaluation team will be supported by ACO in terms of schedule of meeting with governmental and non-governmental counterparts.

The first and the last day of the fieldwork, the evaluation consulting firm will have a briefing and debriefing meeting, respectively, with UNICEF management and technical staff. In the first meeting, the main summative evaluation goals and strategy will be discussed. In the last meeting, the most relevant evidence-based evaluation findings and thoughts will be shared.

- d) **Formulate a draft version of the summative evaluation report:** based on the triangulation of the collected (quantitative and qualitative) information and according to the evaluation matrix, the selected evaluation consulting firm will elaborate the draft version of the summative evaluation report offering straight forward evidence-based answers to the evaluation criteria and questions and

highlighting the evidences relative to the work done by ACO Education Programme around gender, equity and child rights.

When elaborating the report, the evaluation consulting firm must assume the perspective of the reader: the language to be used must be simple and direct, the arguments must contain substance and show quality, etc. (Booth et al, 2016).⁶ The structure of the evaluation report will be the one proposed and approved on the inception report. The maximum length of the draft version of the summative evaluation report must be around 35 pages (excluding annexes).

- e) **Facilitate a validation workshop on the summative evaluation results:** with the participation of governmental and non-governmental stakeholders at national and sub-national level and ACO management and technical staff, the selected evaluation consulting firm must present the main findings, conclusions and recommendations of the summative evaluation in the framework of a validation workshop. The presentation of the evaluation results must promote the discussion about the feasibility and pertinency of the recommendations.
- f) **Produce the last version of the summative evaluation report:** this last evaluation report will include all the feedback received from different stakeholders (derived from the validation workshop). The structure of the summative evaluation report will be the same one proposed and approved on the inception report and used in its draft version. As mentioned relative to the draft version, the considerations relative to language and arguments are applicable here. The maximum length of the summative evaluation report must be 45 pages (excluding annexes).

With the support of ACO, the evaluation consulting firm will overcome some of the potential constraints along the fieldwork. It is expected that the evaluation consulting firm will highlight in the draft and final version of the evaluation report what was done to face these concerns, how these constraints affected the evaluation process and what results were achieved.

As mentioned previously, the development of this summative evaluation must apply the ethical considerations promoted by UNEG and assumed by UNICEF. As some people will be treated as source of information, they must be referred carefully without any specification about their identity (Booth et al, 2016). When any stakeholder is approached to offer declarations, full information about the evaluation and its purposes must be provided (Kara, 2017).

The selected evaluation consulting firm will perform the assignment assuming an ethical conduct which in this context is crucial for the following reasons: the responsibility of the implications, the credibility of the findings, conclusions and recommendations, and the responsibility in terms of use of resources.

The selected evaluation consulting firm must act based on the following obligations: independence, impartiality, credibility, honesty, integrity and accountability. If the evaluation consulting firm identifies

⁶ As explained by Gerring (2017), it is expected that, in this kind of study, the proposed arguments are characterized by: truth, precision, generality, coherence, parsimony, relevance and commensurability.

any conflict of interest in any stage of the assignment, must advise ACO immediately. An Evaluation Reference Group to be established by ACO will assess, among other things, the compliance of the expected ethical commitments.

7. Evaluation workplan and management

8.1. Table of deliverables

The expected timeline of the summative evaluation of ACO Education Programme is a total of 60 working days. The following deliverables must be produced by the selected evaluation consulting firm and given to ACO for approval:

Deliverables	Duration (estimated # of days)	Timeline / Deadline	Percentage of payment
1- Inception report: written in Portuguese and no more than 15 pages (excluding annexes). Details about its structure are given below.	10 working days	To be negotiated with consultant	20% of agreed amount after approval of ACO.
2- Draft version of summative evaluation report: written in Portuguese and English and no more than 30 pages (excluding annexes). Details about its structure are given below.	30 working days	To be negotiated with consultant	30% of agreed amount after approval of ACO.
3- Presentation (PPT) of summative evaluation results to be presented in validation workshop: written in Portuguese and English and with no more than 15 slides.	5 working days	To be negotiated with consultant	20% of agreed amount after approval of ACO.
4- Last version of summative evaluation report: written in Portuguese and English, including validation workshop feedback and with no more than 45 pages (excluding annexes). Details about its structure are given below.	15 working days	To be negotiated with consultant	30% of agreed amount after approval of ACO.

8.1.1. Structure of inception report

The inception report is the first deliverable prepared and presented by the evaluation consulting firm. Its content (using a maximum of 15 pages) must reveal an understanding of conducting the summative evaluation and be aligned to the summative evaluation TORs. It must present a thorough summary of the documentary review. It must define clearly the focus and scope of the assignment. It must reconstruct the actual theory of change which supported the programme. It must provide a critical analysis of some components of the programme. It must describe the selected evaluation methodology. It must offer a judgement about the reviewed sources of information and provide some consideration about the identified limitations. It must identify how will be treated the quality assurance of the deliverables, specially about the last version of the evaluation report. It must describe the deliverables and timeline of the assignment. It must include functional annexes and evaluation matrix and tools.

The basic structure of the inception report is the following:⁷

- Introduction (rationale, context, object and scope of the summative evaluation).
- Purpose, objectives and evaluation criteria and questions.
- Main results of the documentary review.
- Reconstruction of the theory of change of ACO Education Programme.
- Analysis of horizontal and vertical logic of the programme and accuracy and functionality of indicators and sources of information.
- Evaluation methodology (approach and design, data collection and data analysis strategies, limitations and challenges).
- Proposed quality assurance of the summative evaluation report.
- Time frame and deliverables.
- Annexes (consulted literature, evaluation matrix, evaluation tools and TORs).

It is expected that the inception report must receive feedback or approval from ACO within the following three working days after its submission.

8.1.2. Structure of draft and last evaluation report

There is no substantive difference in terms of structure between the draft and final reports. The distinctiveness among them is their length and the accuracy of their content. It is expected that, through the (draft and final) evaluation report, the evaluation criteria and questions are gradually evidence-based answered. The content of the entire document and the level of precision, functionality and specificity of the findings, conclusions and recommendations are improved from one version to the other one.

⁷ The selected evaluation consulting firm could add more components to the inception report structure but using in total the expected 15 pages.

The following structure of the (draft and last) evaluation report is based on UNEG, UNICEF and GEROS standards for a good quality evaluation report:⁸

- Title.
- Acronyms.
- Executive summary.
- Introduction (including: background and reconstruction of theory of change of ACO Education Programme, evaluation purpose, evaluation objectives, evaluation matrix with two sets of criteria and questions).
- Description of the summative evaluation (including: evaluation focus, design, methodology – quantitative and qualitative strategies and triangulation -, identification of limitations of the methodology).
- Findings (organized by evaluation criteria and covering all the approved evaluation questions for the two set of criteria).
- Conclusions (based on evidences) and recommendations (straight forward and functional and defining who must do what and when).
- Annexes.

It is expected that the draft evaluation report must receive feedback and / or approval from ACO within the following ten working days after its submission. In the case of the last evaluation report, the feedback and / or approval from ACO must be done within the following fifteen working days after its submission due the circulation of the final report among the members of the Evaluation reference Group (ERG).

8.2. Management arrangements

The ACO M&E specialist will manage this summative evaluation, supported by the Chief of PM&E section and in frequent coordination with the Chief of Education section. The M&E specialist will be the authorized ACO focal point to coordinate and discuss on technical and logistical matters with the selected evaluation consulting firm. The selected evaluation consulting firm will submit to the M&E specialist all the deliverables according to the agreed timeline. The M&E specialist will circulate among the members of the ERG all the deliverables and compile their feedback, sending to the evaluation consulting firm a document with all the comments and suggestions, including his ones.

According to the technical note shared by Evaluation Unit – ESARO, the ACO M&E specialist will establish an ad hoc ERG. Its members will be key governmental, non-governmental and UNICEF staff experienced in the object of evaluation. This ERG will review and comment the content of the deliverables against these evaluation TORs and approved inception report (especially against evaluation matrix and

⁸ Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS) is a global UNICEF mechanism focused on the quality assessment of evaluation reports uploaded by any country office to the corporate Evaluation and Research Database (ERDB). Its public link (where its handbook is available) is the following: https://www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/index_GEROS.html

questions). At the same time, will propose questions and suggestions regarding the deliverables with the purpose to improve its quality.

The selected evaluation consulting firm will interact, with the support of ACO, with relevant governmental and non-governmental partners at national and sub national level, especially, the Ministry of Education, Provincial Cabinets / Delegations of Education, academy, local and international NGOs, civil society organizations and parents. As stated before, this summative evaluation will not include the direct participation of children at any stage.

8.3. Evaluation management response

When the final version of the summative evaluation report is approved by ACO, an evaluation management response (offline) will be drafted by Education section, supported by PM&E section, based on the evaluation recommendations. The draft version of the management response will be discussed and assessed with Management. Its final version will be disseminated among PMT members and uploaded in EISI.

The management response will specify at what extent each recommendation is doable and what specific actions will be done by ACO. At the same time, the management response will specify the staff responsible of each action and a realistic timeline for its delivery.

8.4. Evaluation results dissemination

Further dissemination of the evaluation results will be done based on the presentation (PPT) prepared by the evaluation consulting firm and used in the validation workshop. But its content will be adapted according to the nature of the audiences.

With the support of Communications section, a set of key evaluation findings and results will be published within ACO website. The Executive Summary of the evaluation report will be edited, printed and circulated among governmental, non-governmental, academia, media and international cooperation entities. In all the cases, the name of the evaluation consulting firm will be referenced.

8.5. Evaluation budget

The planned budget for this summative evaluation is USD 120,000. The evaluation consulting firms must adequate its financial proposals to this amount.

8.6. Payment Schedule

Please, see table of deliverables above.

8. Desired profile and experience of evaluation consulting firm

The expected evaluation team to be proposed by the evaluation consulting firm must have the following composition (culturally and gender mixed with a minimum of three members) and technical characteristics:

International evaluation team leader:

- a) Seasoned and updated specialist in evaluation technical details (evaluation approach, methodology, tools, reports, etc.).
- b) Experienced on intensive fieldwork at national and sub-national level and intercultural team management.
- c) Proven professional background on education, gender equality and human rights and holding an advance degree (PhD).
- d) A minimum of 10 years of experience on institutional capacity development research / evaluation.
- e) Proven previous experience in the context of Africa, in general, and Angola, specifically.
- f) Verified membership of an international / national evaluation network, association, voluntary organization for professional evaluation, etc.
- g) Analytical, negotiation and advocacy skills along with demonstrated experience in liaising with government agencies and non-governmental organizations.
- h) Excellent report writing and communication skills in Portuguese and English.

Evaluation team members (one international and one national)

- a) Academic background on education, sociology, anthropology, political science, social service, etc., holding, at least, an advance degree (Master).*
- b) Proven professional experience as a team member on educational, social, political and economic realities of Africa, in general, and Angola, specifically.
- c) A minimum of eight (8) years of experience in research and / or evaluation at national and international levels.
- d) Verified membership of an international / national evaluation network, association, voluntary organization for professional evaluation, etc.
- e) Proven professional experience on research / evaluation methodologies (qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods).
- f) Excellent report writing and communication skills in Portuguese and English.
- g) Excellent ability to communicate, facilitate and coordinate a participatory discussion process with different types of stakeholders.

*Bachelor degree with more than twelve years of working experience in evaluation will be considered in lieu of master degree.

9.1. Conditions

- The members of the evaluation consulting firm will not be provided by ACO with lodging and / or meals during their fieldwork in Angola.
- ACO will facilitate the contact between the selected evaluation consulting firm and key stakeholders / informants based on the specifications provided, at least, three weeks before the fieldwork.
- The selected evaluation consulting firm will assume the cost and responsibility to get local transportation (taxi or rented vehicle) during the fieldwork in Luanda and / or in provinces.
- All domestic travels of the members of the evaluation team during the fieldwork must be covered by the selected evaluation consulting firm.
- The members of the evaluation consulting firm will not be entitled to DSA provided by ACO during the fieldwork.
- The selected evaluation consulting firm will be paid according to the signed contract and after the approval of each deliverable by ACO.
- As per UNICEF DFAM policy, payment to the selected evaluation consulting firm will be made against approved deliverables as outlined in the Table of Outputs / Deliverable. Note that the selected consultant firm will receive its final payment only after submission and approval of the outputs / deliverables.
- The selected evaluation consulting firm will be governed by and subject to UNICEF’s General Terms and Conditions for institutional contracts or Long-Term Arrangements for Services (LTAS).
- When the last evaluation report is submitted, the selected evaluation consulting firm will provide to ACO all the information collected and data sets elaborated in the framework of the assignment.

The following conditions will be ensured by requesting Section

	Yes	No	
Office space:		X	please inform Administration
Computer:		X	please inform ICT
Visa Request:		X	please inform Travel Unit
Travel Arrangement		X	Please inform Travel Unit

As per UNICEF DFAM policy, payment is made against approved deliverables. No advance payment is allowed unless in exceptional circumstances against bank guarantee, subject to a maximum of 30 per cent of the total contract value in cases where advance purchases, for example for supplies or travel, may be necessary. The consulting firm selected will be governed by and subject to UNICEF’s General Terms and Conditions for individual contracts.

9.2. Risks and Mitigation Measures

There may occur delay in the submission of deliveries or in completion of consultancy due to local context (lack of diligence from local partners) or to consultant’s own inability to deliver the expected results.

Mitigation measures will include active monitoring of the progress of the consultancy to ensure full participation from all stakeholders; possibility replace the consultant firm should it become clear when the consultant firm cannot perform successfully the tasks of this assignment.

9. Annexes

The selected evaluation consulting firm will receive from ACO the content of the following annexes:

Annex A:

List of documents related to ACO Education Programme (2015 – 2019): Word file and folder with electronic version of documents.

Annex B:

List of ACO Education Programme (2015 – 2019) investments: Excel file with information about funded products / goods / consultancies / etc.

Annex C:

List of national and sub-national stakeholders (with specification of contact details) engaged with ACO Education Programme along the current CP (2015 – 2019): Word file with information of governmental / non-governmental / academia / etc. partners.

10. Bibliography:

The formulation of these evaluation TORs has implied the use of the following bibliography:

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| Booth et al
2016 | <i>The Craft of Research</i> . Fourth Edition. The University of Chicago Press. 316 pages. |
| Bryman, A.
2016 | <i>Social Research methods</i> . 5 th Edition. Oxford University Press. 747 pages. |
| Gerring, J.
2017 | <i>Social Science Methodology: a unified framework</i> . Second Edition. Cambridge University Press. |
| Kara, H.
2017 | <i>Research and Evaluation for busy Students and Practitioners. A time-saving guide</i> . Second edition. Policy Press, Chicago. 260 pages. |
| Mertens, D.
2018 | <i>Mixed Methods Design in Evaluation</i> . SAGE, California. 202 pages. |

- Patton, M,
2017 *Evaluation Flash Cards: Embedding Evaluative Thinking in Organizational Culture.* Otto Bremer Trust, Minnesota. 26 pages.
Available at: https://ottobremer.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/OBT_flashcards_201712.pdf
- Stockmann, R.
2011 *A practitioner Handbook on Evaluation.* Edgard Edward Publisher. 182 pages.
- UNEG
2017 *Norms and Standards for Evaluation.*
Available at: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>
- UNICEF
2015 *Education Outcome Statement (2015 – 2019).*
Available at: <https://insight.unicef.org/apps01/perfasmnt/Pages/Reporting.aspx>
- UNICEF
2017 *UNICEF GEROS Handbook - Global Evaluation Report Oversight System (GEROS).* New York.
Available at: https://www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/index_GEROS.html
- UNICEF
2018 *Revised evaluation policy of UNICEF.*
Available at: https://www.unicef.org/evaluation/files/Revised_Evaluation_Policy_Interactive.pdf
- UNICEF
2019a *Technical Note on Evaluation Reference Group (ERG).* Evaluation Unit – ESARO. 10 pages.
- UNICEF
2019b *2020 – 2022 Country programme document - Angola.* 15 pages.
- UNICEF
2019c *2019 – 2021 Regional Evaluation Framework and Action Plan.* Evaluation Unit – ESARO. 16 pages.