

UNITED NATIONS CHILDREN'S FUND in KAZAKHSTAN

TERMS OF REFERENCE

FOR NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONAL CONSULTANCIES

Evaluation Title: Formative Evaluation of the State Programmes for Development of Education with the Focus on Inclusivity

Region: Europe and Central Asia

Commissioning Office: United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) in Kazakhstan

Evaluation Object: State Programmes for Development of Education implemented between 2011 and 2021

Type of evaluation: Formative

Anticipated start date of the assignment: September 2022

End date: March 2023.

Funding information: Inclusive Education sector evaluation - 2390/A0/06/882/002/008 - \$100,000 RR (GC); Evaluation - 2390/A0/06/880/006 - \$20,000 RR (BMO)

1. Introduction

UNICEF in Kazakhstan in collaboration with the Ministry of Enlightenment of the Republic of Kazakhstan (former Ministry of Education and Science) is commissioning a formative evaluation to assess to what extent the state education programmes in Kazakhstan implemented within the period of 2011-2021 have been contributing to inclusion of children of different levels of ability.

The evaluation aims to produce evidence-based recommendations for strengthening the education system, to contribute to increased knowledge on the national inclusive education agenda, and to improve national capacity to advance attainment of the Sustainable Development Goal 4 targets.

This document outlines the scope of the evaluation including research questions, the envisaged methodology, and implementation framework for the selected institutional contractor.

The evaluation will start in September 2022 and is expected to be completed in 2023. UNICEF is looking for an institution with deep commitment and strong background in evaluation and relevant subject matter to undertake this exercise.

2. Background and Context of evaluation

One of the top priorities of the long-term "Kazakhstan-2050" Strategy is education. The general aim of educational reforms in the country is the adaptation of the system of education to new social and economic environment and create modern and efficient education. The Government set the objective of joining the top 30 most competitive countries of the world. Although Kazakhstan's economy displayed impressive performance since gaining independence in 1991, it still has weaknesses and uneven development. Slow productivity growth, wealth disparity, sharp growth of living costs, a lack of job prospects, and weak institutions are some of the major issues. The COVID-19 pandemic intensified these issues. The January events, which were marred by violence and attempts at destabilization, clearly pointed to the need for faster progress on reforms to achieve sustainable growth and shared national prosperity.

In this context, the authorities intend to promote the rule of law, take a tougher stance against corruption, and announce initiatives to boost private sector growth and competitiveness as well as solve government inefficiency. Reforms are also required to improve human capital quality and

living standards, reverse productivity stagnation, and accelerate the transition to a low-carbon economy.

The improvement of the system of education plays an important role in achieving these objectives and responding to new realities the country is facing.

Over the past decade four state educational programmes have been implemented in Kazakhstan:

	<i>State Educational Projects</i>	<i>Objectives aimed at promoting inclusion in education</i>	<i>Target indicators aimed at inclusion in education</i>
1.	The State Program for the Development of Education in the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2011–2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to improve inclusive education system in schools; • to create conditions for life-long education, education for all; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • percentage of schools that created favorable conditions for inclusive education - 70% (out of their total number);
2.	The State Program for the Development of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2016–2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to provide equal access to quality pre-school education and training; • to provide equal access to high-quality secondary education, to educate intellectually, physically, spiritually developed, and successful citizens; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • percentage of children aged 3-6 years attending preschool education and learning according to the new curriculum, in 2017 - 87.5%, in 2019 - 100%; • percentage of schools that transitioned to the new curriculum, in 2016 - 100%, in 2019 - 100%;
3.	The State Program for the Development of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2020–2025 (in 2021 transitioned to The national project "Educated Nation").	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to address the gap between urban and rural schools, between regions, educational institutions, and among students in terms of inclusive education; • to provide a safe and comfortable inclusive learning environment; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • percentage of 1-6 y.o. children attending preschool education - 85.3%, 3-6 y.o. children - 100%; • child wellbeing index in Kazakhstan - 0.73;
4.	The national project "Educated Nation" 2021-2025	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to provide access and to ensure equity in education; • to create favorable conditions and environment for learning; • to improve the quality of education. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • percentage of children with disabilities receiving special psychological and pedagogical support and early intervention - 2022 – 50 - 2023 – 65 - 2024 – 80 - 2025 – 100

In June 2021, Kazakhstan adopted a new Law on Inclusive Education that establishes a universal approach to children with disabilities by including them in the educational environment through the implementation of programs of psychological, medical, and pedagogical assessment and consultation. In 2015, Kazakhstan, among other UN Member States, committed itself to achieving the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) until 2030, including SDG 4 - ensuring inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all.

However, as of today, there is no single or integrated approach or procedure for implementation of inclusivity at all levels of education (starting from pre-school to post university). There are no clear

ways to monitor inclusive education or the methods of calculation¹. Furthermore, in the country context children with disabilities are over-represented among the population who are not in education.

Understanding of inclusive education in Kazakhstan is rather limited focusing mainly on inclusion of children with disabilities, while in an international context the concept is interpreted more broadly. It refers to a quality, flexible, individual, and non-discriminatory approach in education. According to UNESCO it is defined as “a process of reinforcing the capacity of education systems to welcome and reach out to all learners²”.

A situational analysis about access to quality education by children from socially vulnerable groups, carried out in 2011, defined 10 groups which have difficulties accessing secondary education³:

- children from vulnerable families;
- children from incomplete families;
- children from families with low income;
- children with risk behavior;
- children from remote rural areas;
- children with disabilities in development (including disabled children);
- children from language and ethnical minorities;
- children from migrant families (expats);
- children from refugee families;
- orphans and children deprived of parental care;

One of the main aims of conducting this evaluation is to broaden the government’s perspective on inclusion, widening the perception of inclusive education beyond disability. In terms of inclusive education, access to education should be available to all students, regardless of individual capabilities. Kazakhstan ratified the International Convention for the Protection of Persons with Disabilities in 2008, the Convention on Combating Education Discrimination in 2016.

In Kazakhstan there are more than 160 000 children with special needs and each year this number is growing. Every year the network of special educational organizations increases in the country, providing educational services and correctional support for children with special educational needs, including children with disabilities. As of the beginning of the 2020-2021 academic year, 403 special educational organizations were operational.

According to the Ministry of Enlightenment of the Republic of Kazakhstan, in 2020 there were 42 special kindergartens in the country with a total of 4,229 children, 335 groups. 534 special groups have been created in 217 preschool organizations covering 8,229 children. At the beginning of the 2020-2021 academic year, the share of schools that claims to have created conditions for inclusive education was 74.9% (2016-2017 academic year - 44.7). The number of school-age children with disabilities was 107,348, of which 41,581 (38.7%) are attending mainstream schools or studying online (25.95% in the 2016-2017 academic year)⁴. A significant change in 2020 was the introduction of teachers-assistants at all levels of education to provide pedagogical support for a child with disability.

¹ Prevention of School Drop Outs: School Support Plans (2021)

² <https://www.unicef.org/education/inclusive-education>

³ Prevention of School Drop Outs: School Support Plans (2021)⁴ The 2020 annual report of the Child Protection Committee on the situation of children in Kazakhstan

⁴ The 2020 annual report of the Child Protection Committee on the situation of children in Kazakhstan

In addition, in 2020, there were 2,214 children from migrant families, 625,000 children in low-income families, 5,714 children in residential care, 23 410 orphans and children deprived of parental care, and 114 children in detention⁵.

The knowledge generated by the evaluation will be used by the Government to address existing gaps and adjust reforms if needed so. The evaluation of the Programme will feed into the next education policy framework and will further contribute to the implementation of the national project "Educated Nation" 2021-2025.

The evaluation is part of the Costed Evaluation Plan, approved by UNICEF Executive Board, in September 2020 and in line with Outcome II of Country Programme Document "All children and adolescents, especially the most marginalized, benefit from inclusive, quality education that responds to twenty-first century needs, and have the skills to be healthy, resilient and ready for adult life.

3. Purpose and objectives of evaluation

The purpose of this formative evaluation is to examine to what extent the state education programmes in Kazakhstan implemented within the period of 2011-2021 have been contributing to inclusion of children of different levels of ability in the education system in the country as well as to examine the enabling conditions and bottlenecks which will require further improvement. The evaluation is to provide the Government of Kazakhstan and UNICEF with sound evidence and conclusions to inform planning the future strategies and work in this area.

Within this framework, the evaluation will have the following specific objectives:

- examine relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the state education programmes with a focus on inclusivity;
- document the evolution of government work on inclusion by analyzing previous and current laws, policies, programmatic documents that guide the development of the inclusive education and construct the theory of change;
- examine the extent to which the education sector priorities on inclusion have been appropriately designed, efficiently, and effectively managed in relation to global priorities, including the incorporation of equity, gender equality, and human rights considerations;
- assess some of the immediate results and good practices of what is working, for whom, and what is not working;
- identify existing challenges, barriers and gaps in the education system and provide strategic recommendations aimed at creating an inclusive and resilient learning environment for every child;
- develop recommendations for future strategies in sustaining results and good practices and addressing existing challenges and barriers.

The evaluation aims to promote evidence-based policy recommendations on inclusive education policies, and to contribute to increased knowledge on inclusive education issues in the country.

This is highly relevant at this time as the country had undergone COVID-19 crisis and January events that highlighted the need for more improvements in the education system targeting at the full inclusion of vulnerable groups.

Stakeholders:

This evaluation will consider different stakeholders, including:

⁵ Bureau of National Statistics, TransMonEE 2020, National report on Education - 2020

a. UNICEF Country Office (CO), by whom the evaluation is commissioned. UNICEF CO will regularly communicate with the contractor and provide feedback on performance and other necessary support to achieve objectives of the evaluation.

b. The Ministry of Enlightenment, the Government representative, as well as the counterpart of the joint evaluation. The Ministry will participate in the evaluation through facilitation of data collection, consultations, provision of comments on draft documents, address the recommendations made by the evaluation in collaboration with UNICEF.

c. Local stakeholders – teachers of rural and urban schools, respective staff of local government authorities (akimats); inclusion support rooms, regional, urban and district Psychological, Medical and Pedagogical Commissions (PMPCs), psychological and pedagogical correction rooms, rehabilitation centers, special schools, special kindergartens will be involved in the evaluation process through participation in discussions, provision of information for analysis.

d. Beneficiaries and other stakeholders – parents/caregivers and children, including NEET, academia, business, NGOs, international partners are planned to be engaged in interviews and focus groups during the data collection process.

Intended audience of the evaluation are Parliament, Government, Child Rights Ombudsperson, Ministry of Enlightenment, local akimats, and CSOs.

Use of findings: This evaluation seeks to capture lessons learned and develop recommendations for the Ministry of Enlightenment of the Republic of Kazakhstan in further implementation of the national project "Educated Nation" and other reforms in the education system to strengthen the inclusion agenda. The evaluation will help in understanding the focus, approaches, strategies, and effectiveness of current modalities of the inclusive education and identify barriers, bottlenecks and challenges in implementing it. The findings will also point to examples of good strategies/practices that can be further replicated or scaled up in the next national education project, policy or reforms.

It is planned to widely disseminate the findings and recommendations of the evaluation by sharing the policy brief, infographics and other communication materials with a wide range of stakeholders, including central and local government and other partners, NGOs, academia, mass media through bilateral technical meetings, official channels, and UNICEF social media, including the website, Instagram, facebook and other ways.

4. Scope of evaluation

Programmatic Scope: The object of this evaluation will be four state education programmes:

- 1) The State Programme of Education Development in the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2011-2020;
- 2) The State Programme for Education and Science Development in the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2016-2019;
- 3) The State Program for the Development of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan for 2020–2025 (in 2021 transitioned to The national project "Educated Nation");
- 4) The national project "Educated Nation" for 2020–2025 which have the following general objectives to promote inclusive education in the country (see details in Table 1):
 - to improve inclusive education system in schools (pre-school, primary and secondary);
 - to address the gap between urban and rural schools, between regions, educational institutions, and among students in terms of inclusive quality of education;
 - to provide a safe and comfortable inclusive learning environment.

Further, it will examine the challenges and barriers encountered during the implementation of these programmes' activities and understand the partnerships and collaborations/actors employed in achieving the targets related to inclusion in education.

Geographic Scope: As part of the assignment, travel from Nur-Sultan to five regions of the country is planned to conduct the field work. The regions will be selected by the contractor in consultation with UNICEF and national stakeholders to reflect the diverse realities in the country. In the meanwhile, COVID-19 restrictions shall be considered prior to planning the routes.

Period: This evaluation will examine state education programmes implemented between 2011-2021 with the focus on inclusivity, covering pre-COVID-19 (2011-2019) and COVID-19 (March 2020-2021) contexts.

Contractors may take into consideration children at risk of exclusion from quality and adapted education, due to family, social, economic, and/or individual conditions – such as those living in vulnerable families, in families with low income, in institutions, in remote areas, deprived of parental care (including orphans), with disabilities in development, with risk behaviors, in conflict with the law, from linguistic and ethnical minorities, in migration (including as refugees).

What is not within the scope of this evaluation: The evaluation will not assess the 'impact' of the state educational programmes and is not expected to make causal attribution claims as (a) the state programs support is only one of the contributors to achieving the intended education outcomes and (b) the national project "Educated Nation" is under way and will be completed in 2025.

5. Limitation of evaluation

Programmatic risks, challenges, and limitations: Internal programmatic understanding anticipates that the following risks and limitations may affect the evaluation or its outcomes:

- Due to the dynamic nature of the pandemic, it is difficult for UNICEF to predict at this point if face-to-face interactions will be feasible during data collection.
- The evaluation object is quite complex, it includes four different state education programmes through which the inclusive education development in the country shall be examined. Therefore, the applicants need to identify intended goals, aims, objectives and desired results to be achieved from each intervention.
- Access to quality data with higher level of disaggregation (including gender dimension) on children with special educational needs is another potential limitation.

6. Evaluation questions and criteria

Evaluation criteria and key evaluation questions: This evaluation will be assessed using criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. These criteria are prioritized because they capture the key evaluation questions presented below. In addition, the evaluation will incorporate equity and gender equality considerations as cross-cutting issues. Key evaluation questions (and sub-questions) are clustered according to the evaluation criteria provided. This initial list of questions will be further refined and unfolded by the evaluators and included in the Inception Report following desk review of key documents and interview of evaluation users. Below is what should be under each criterion as per OECD/DAC.

1. Relevance.

- How well are the state education programmes aligned with global priorities (The World Declaration on Education for All, Policy and Guidelines on Inclusion in Education (UNESCO), Inclusive Education Initiatives for Children with Disabilities (UNICEF), The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals) in terms of inclusivity?

- How are the state education programmes aligned to government priorities in Kazakhstan ("Kazakhstan-2050", Digital Kazakhstan, National Development Plan of Kazakhstan - 2025, etc.) and commitments on human rights, including child rights, equality, non-discrimination, and inclusion?
- To what extent and how well have the state education programmes adapted to the changing context within the education sector?
- How relevant are the state education programmes in addressing inherent equity gaps, taking into consideration any disparities?
- To what extent the education system was able to adapt its strategies to changes in needs and priorities caused by COVID-19?

2. *Effectiveness.*

- To what extent were state education programmes activities delivered in a timely and organized manner for the benefit of children at risk of exclusion?
- To what extent were the state education programmes effective in achieving its intended results, both at national and regional levels, in terms of inclusivity?
- To what extent have the state education programmes achieved the overall expected outcomes or are likely to achieve?
- To what extent have the state education programmes contributed to broader education goals?
- How effective have the state education programmes been in addressing inherent equity gaps or taking into consideration the disparities?
- Did the state education programmes actively contribute to the fulfillment of the right to education, especially for the most vulnerable?
- In what ways and to what extent have the state education programmes been gender responsive or transformative?

3. *Efficiency.*

- To what extent have the activities and measures planned/implemented through the State programmes enabled optimized use of resources?
- How efficiently did the State programs respond to equity-based challenges?
- To what extent, and in what ways, did the Implementing Agencies proactively leverage key partners to ensure efficient use of existing platforms (service, community, and media delivery platforms) and resources for educational activities?
- Were there any inefficiencies because Implementing Agencies did not work with certain partners (or if the Implementing Agencies only worked with the same set of partners)?
- How efficiently did the Implementing Agencies respond to equity-based challenges?

4. *Coherence.*

- To what extent the state programmes as planned/implemented enabled coordinated interventions/measures?
- How did the Implementing Agencies' work fit with the work of external partners (global partners, regional partners, other government bodies, partner programmes /interventions)?
- Were the state education programmes priorities chosen based on comparative strengths, capacities, and stakeholders' expectations?
- To what extent did the Implementing Agencies leverage their comparative advantage vis-à-vis, other partners, efficiently?
- To what extent were the Implementing Agencies able to effectively collaborate and coordinate with one another and externally with key stakeholders, and leverage existing partnerships, to be as efficient as possible for strengthening and improving service delivery?

- How did the state education programmes align with/fit with other interventions being carried out in the country?
- Were the state Programmes interventions coherent with the Implementing Agencies' approach that is likely to have positive results, or are there critical gaps?

5. Sustainability.

- To what extent the Implementing Agencies are committed to further support inclusion in education and able to sustain?
- Are legal, institutional and financial mechanisms established to ensure sustainability of programmes results?
- Are there conditions to ensure quality of the services (curriculum, teacher training, supervision mechanisms, etc.)?
- What are the key barriers and bottlenecks toward achieving sustainability in the education sector?

Issues related to Gender Equality, Human Rights-Based Approach to Programming and Results-Based Management will be addressed across the evaluation questions or, if required, developed as specific points as per United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) [Guidance on Integrating human-rights and gender equality in evaluation](#).

7. Evaluation process and methods

Design: Overall study design for the evaluation will be theory-based contribution analysis. A theory-based equity focused evaluation using contribution analysis will assess (i) inputs leading to outputs and outcomes, and (ii) analysis to focus on whether the state programmes' approach is appropriate to ensure inclusion in education and effectively reaching the most marginalized. The evaluation team will elaborate on the design or propose a more appropriate design and methodology to conduct the evaluation during the inception phase. The evaluation design will be primarily based on a review of the existing documents, monitoring data, field work and reconstruction of the programme theory with appropriate indicators, borrowing from the programme documents.

The programme theory will be empirically tested through the collection and review of quantitative and qualitative data. The programme theory will establish a logical model of cause-effect linkages by exploring the delivery of results. Reconstructing the programme theory will be a critical first part of the evaluation prior to conducting review of data and fieldwork and will be done through a combination of documentary review and interviews with relevant right holders (parents/caregivers and children including NEET), stakeholders (HR Ombudsperson, CR Ombudsperson, Implementing Agencies, schools, academia, business, NGOs, international partners, etc.) and professionals (schoolteachers, staff of the Psychological, Medical and Pedagogical Commissions (PMPC), Psychological and Pedagogical Correction Rooms (PPCR), Rehabilitation Centers (RC), teachers, health professionals etc.) at national and local levels, Implementing Agencies', beneficiaries (parents/caregivers and school children and adolescents (14-17 y.o.) including NEET).

Methodology The evaluation will employ a mixed-methodological approach to ensure that data can be sufficiently triangulated to deliver aggregate quantitative and qualitative judgments. The methodology should apply a human right based approach, with the use of child rights and a gender-response evaluation lenses.

Quantitative

Secondary data analysis: using administrative data from the National Educational Database (NEDB), and available raw datasets from studies, reports, and evaluations to be disaggregated by sex, ethnicity, age, disability, etc, where possible. UNICEF country office in collaboration with the Ministry will facilitate access to these datasets.

Qualitative

- Key informant interviews (KIIs) with representatives from the Enlightenment Ministry and its technical agencies, municipal level officials and other relevant government institutions, NGOs and representatives from key partners;
- Interview/discussions with UNICEF programme specialists/offices, and implementing partners;
- Focus group discussions (FGDs) with programme partners and beneficiaries;
- Observations during field visits.

Desk review

- Desk review of background documents related to the government programmes;
- Review of good practices or case studies of inclusion in education;
- Review and analysis of documentation on key lesson learning or areas /strategies not working well in terms of inclusion in education.

Theory of Change

In Kazakhstan, the government included some specific results into the state programmes and action plans, however, a document setting out the Theory of Change (hereinafter ToC) with respective indicators/targets has not been developed. The evaluation team jointly with UNICEF and national stakeholders is expected to retrospectively construct a ToC for the evaluation and further for strengthening the national education system's inclusivity for the period following the evaluation (2022-2030 given the SDG targets and duration of the key national policy documents).

UNEG evaluation principles

The Evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the [Norms and Standards for Evaluation](#) (UNEG) and standards using the [Evaluation criteria](#) (OECD).

UNICEF brings a human rights perspective and strives to mainstream gender issues in all its work for children, with the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) as a principal reference, and recognizes the mutually supportive relationship between the CRC, the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disability.

The evaluation is a part of an organizational focus on equity and a process of strengthening reforms that target inequities affecting the most disadvantaged children in Kazakhstan. According to UNICEF, equity means that all children have an opportunity to survive, develop, and reach their full potential, without discrimination, bias, or favoritism. This interpretation is consistent with the CRC, which guarantees the fundamental rights of every child, regardless of gender, race, religious beliefs, income, physical attributes, geographical location, or other status.

An equity-based approach to UNICEF's evaluation seeks to understand whether the undertaken interventions managed to address the needs and uphold the rights of the specific groups of the most vulnerable children in Kazakhstan. Equity-based evaluations should also generate knowledge and recommendations for UNICEF's further focus in protecting the rights of poor and vulnerable children. To ensure comprehensiveness of the evaluation and taking into account the multi-dimensional essence of equity the evaluation should use a mixed-methods approach.

The contractor will work closely with UNICEF staff at key phases of the evaluation process to ensure that equity focus, and ethical requirements are fully met in the final Evaluation Report.

Ethical considerations

The contractor should follow UNEG ethical guidance to evaluation as guiding principle to ensure quality of evaluation process and clearly identify any potential ethical issues and approaches, as well as the processes for ethical review and oversight of the evaluation process in their proposal.

UNICEF will be responsible for arranging a review of the agreed with UNICEF methodology by an independent Ethical Review Board based on the "Criteria for Ethical Review Checklist", specified in the *Annex 3* of the TOR. The selected contractor will be responsible for addressing the comments by Ethical Review Board.

The approval letter from the Ethical review board should be included in the annex of the final report.

8. Deliverables

The evaluation team must provide the following products electronically in English (details and duration will be specified at the inception meeting):

1. Inception report which will describe the detailed evaluation methodology, that includes an evaluation design, an evaluation matrix and the theory of change. It should follow outline in *Annex 1*. The evaluation report must comply with the [UNICEF standards for evaluation reports](#) and to the [GEROS Quality Assessment System](#) according to the quality assurance checklist.
2. PPT presentation of the main preliminary findings and conclusions to the Evaluation Reference Group; this presentation will be discussed during the mini workshop to report the results of the evaluation and the theory of change towards the end of the field mission. The PPT presentation will also be updated and submitted at the same time as the final report.
3. Draft report presenting all the findings of the evaluation and the theory of change. This report will be the subject of several iterations between the evaluation team and UNICEF until the content of the interim report is in line with UNICEF evaluation report standards and GEROS. Each finding, conclusion and recommendation should be numbered and the link between them should be clearly explicit in the conclusions and recommendations section.
4. Completed comment matrix for the draft report.
5. Presentation at a Workshop or extended meeting that will include reference group, programme staff and external stakeholders. This will include validation or rebuttal of the recommendations by the stakeholders.
6. Final report, integrating all the comments and final version of the theory of change, including Executive summary. The evaluation report shall be in line with the UNICEF standards for evaluation reports indicated in *Annex 2* and to the GEROS Quality Assessment System according to the quality assurance checklist. The report will be subject to a detailed and in-depth quality review by the UNICEF country office and the regional office.
7. Raw data, including data collection instruments, electronic transcripts, complete data sets, etc.
8. Dissemination materials for external audience (for those who are not experts and do not possess deep-level knowledge in this field), that include an infographic poster (requirements to format to be provided by UNICEF CO), a policy brief (when applicable) or any other tool for disseminating main conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.

9. Project Management/Contract Supervisor and other stakeholders

To ensure independence of the evaluation, the Child Rights Monitoring Specialist of UNICEF Kazakhstan will be the overall manager of the evaluation. The manager will ensure compliance with UNICEF norms and standards as well as compliance with quality standards. He/she will be the UNICEF focal point for the evaluation team and will be responsible for document validation. He/she will also ensure that the evaluation reference group is informed of the status of the evaluation.

Evaluation Quality Control will be conducted through a review of terms of reference, methodology and draft and final reports and will be carried out by the Child Rights Monitoring Specialist in coordination with the Evaluation Reference Group and the UNICEF Regional Evaluation Specialist.

The Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) has been established, and includes UNICEF programme staff, implementing partners, government, and representatives of right holders. ERG contributes to the relevance, impartiality and credibility of the evaluation being carried out, providing a variety of points of view, and ensuring a transparent process.

The participation of key stakeholders in the ERG also contributes to increased cooperation with the Government, state bodies, other institutions, and donors, as well as to increase the culture and capacity of the evaluation approach among national partners.

Objectives of the ERG:

- Facilitate regular exchange of information and feedback during the evaluation process
- Ensure access to key informants during data collection
- Take part in interviews with the research team
- Review and comment on the draft and the final version of the report
- Develop an Evaluation Management Response (EMR) to the recommendations

UNICEF Education Section will ensure that all documents needed for the evaluation are available and provide timely feedback to the evaluation manager.

10. Qualifications or Specialized Knowledge/Experience Required

The evaluation will be carried out by a team of external consultants with solid expertise and experience in the field. The team should have a good knowledge of the Kazakhstan context and the education system. Team members will work closely together to coproduce and implement an appropriate methodology and approach for answering evaluation questions and achieving results expected. To carry out this evaluation, the evaluation firm will be contracted to provide required expertise.

Required qualifications and areas of expertise. The evaluation will have to be conducted by a gender-balanced, diverse team comprising sufficient number of qualified international and national evaluators covering the below requirements (expertise could be combined):

- Team-leader with documented extensive experience (at least eight years) in designing and implementing theory-based evaluations, especially in Central Asia. Master's degree in a related field required, higher degree preferred.
- Team member with specialized experience (at least five years) and technical knowledge and understanding of education programming, including early learning, quality education, education sector analysis and planning. Master's degree in a related field required, higher degree preferred.
- Other evaluator(s) with documented experience (at least 5 years) in conducting development evaluations in education sector. Bachelor's degree in a related field required, higher degree preferred.
- At least one team member with proven experience (at least five years) in quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis. Bachelor's degree in a related field required, higher degree preferred.
- Team members with solid knowledge of human rights-based approaches to programming, including child-rights, gender, equity, results-based management (RBM) principles, participatory approaches. Master's degree in a related field required, higher degree preferred.

- At least one member with solid knowledge of inclusive education. Master’s degree in Education or other related field required, higher degree preferred.
- Team members with experience of working in Central Asia and CISs (previous work in Kazakhstan is an asset).

11. Assignments and Payment Schedule

Activity	Deliverables	Duration	Payment terms
Inception phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft inception report • Ethical review • Presentation to reference group • Theory of change • Final inception report and completed comments matrix. 	20 days	30%
Data collection Phase	Post data collection debrief.	32 days	40%
Analysis, triangulation, and report writing	Presentation of preliminary findings and recommendations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft evaluation report and theory of change • Facilitating a recommendations co-creation meeting/workshop • ERG review and UNICEF quality assurance facility. • Final report meeting UNICEF quality standards and management response plan 	40 days	

Important note: Fees shall be calculated based on the days offered to complete the assignment and shall be considered the maximum compensation as part of a lump sum contract. No additional fees shall be paid to complete the assignment. Payment will be made upon submission and approval of deliverables and full and satisfactory completion of the assignment

12. Administrative Issues

All the travel-related costs should be included in the total project budget. The Contract holder is responsible for travel arrangements. Travel cost shall be calculated based on economy class travel, regardless of the length of travel and costs for accommodation, meals and incidentals shall not exceed applicable subsistence allowance (DSA) rates, as promulgated by the UN office in Kazakhstan.

13. Format of Technical and Financial Proposals

As part of the application package, complete and submit the technical and financial proposals as they are described below:

a. Technical proposals should be written in English and submitted in the following format:

1. Cover Page
2. Table of Contents
3. Abbreviations Used (if any)
4. UNICEF Application Form (signed by the institution)
5. The copy of Certificate on the state registration of the Legal Entity to be attached
6. Reference on the account availability in the servicing bank of the Legal Entity to be attached

7. Introduction Profile of the Institution (not more than 15 pages)
8. Technical Proposal (see details in Section 14)
9. Appendices (if any)

b. Financial proposal should include all possible costs related to implementation of the tasks under the present TOR. UNICEF does not provide or arrange health insurance coverage.

Financial proposal must be submitted in a **separate file** of non-editable format (e.g. PDF). In case the bidder is a resident of Kazakhstan, please indicate VAT amount separately in your Financial Offer or clearly state if you are non-VAT payer.

14. Technical evaluation criteria

Proposals submitted in response to this call will be evaluated in terms of technical quality and financial cost.

The Technical Proposal should include but not limited to the following:

- 1) Corporate Profile highlighting the bidder's qualifications and experience in implementing the assignment, please include details of specific experience with similar assignments in the past five years (the list shall contain the name of the assignment, client name, country and contact details; the cost of the assignment – if possible);
- 2) Confirmation of the experience in the form of references from previous clients (at least 3 references on the client's letterhead with data indication, properly signed);
- 3) Samples of similar previous works, e.g. final reports from similar evaluations (minimum 2);
- 4) Details of the Proposed Team for the assignment including the following information:
 - Separate table with the Name, Title and the Role assigned to each team member within the implementation of the assignment;
 - CVs of the proposed team, containing details on the relevant education and professional experience, including copies of diplomas, certificates obtained in the relevant field;
 - Past experience of proposed experts in working on similar projects: List all similar projects they worked on and their roles on those projects.
- 5) Project implementation timeline and work plan showing the detailed sequence and timeline for each activity and days necessary for each proposed team member.
- 6) Methodology;
- 7) Description of approach to ensure quality of services, absence of conflict of interest and respect of ethical standards;
- 8) Quality assurance mechanism and risk mitigation measures put in place.

Cumulative Analysis

The evaluation and award criteria that will be used for this RFP is composed of a Cumulative Analysis evaluation (point system with weight attribution). The weighting ratio between the technical and financial proposals will be 70:30. The respective importance between technical and financial scores will be weighted as 70% and 30%.

An offer is considered technically acceptable (and therefore eligible for opening of financial offers) when it obtains a minimum of 70 Points out of 120 during the course of the technical evaluation. The final selection of the contractor will be based on a combination of the technical and financial proposals with a weighting of 70% for the technical proposal and 30% for the financial proposal. In the case of cumulative analysis, the proposals scoring below 70% of the available technical points will be considered as non-compliant and will be rejected and not further considered.

Technical quality will be evaluated using the criteria outlined below.

Item	Technical Evaluation Criteria	Max. Points Obtainable
1	Overall Response	30
1.1.	Completeness of response and relevance of the technical proposal with terms of reference	10
1.2	Understanding of objectives and how they propose to perform the tasks in order to meet the objectives and requirements of the ToR	20
2	Institution & Key Personnel	50
2.1	Range and depth of contractor's experience with similar projects	15
2.2	Previous experience of work	10
2.3	Samples of previous work	10
2.4	Key personnel: relevant experience and qualifications for the assignment	15
3	Proposed Methodology and Approach	40
3.1	Proposal approach and methodology/timeline	25
3.2	Description of approach to ensure quality of services, absence of conflict of interest and respect of ethical standards	15
TOTAL TECHNICAL SCORES		120

15. Any other information

The UNICEF General Terms and Conditions will apply to the contract entered into with the selected contractor. Please note that when evaluating the technical requirements of each proposal, UNICEF will take into account any proposed amendments to the UNICEF General Terms and Conditions. The proposed amendments to the UNICEF General Terms and Conditions may negatively affect the assessment of the technical merits of the proposal.

UNICEF reserves the right to withdraw all or part of the payment if the results are unsatisfactory, if the work / results are incomplete and not delivered in a timely manner, as indicated in the individual work plan of the contractor. This Terms of Reference is an integral part of the contract to be signed with the national company.

UNICEF reserves the right to patent any intellectual property rights, as well as copyright and other similar intellectual property rights in any discoveries, inventions, products or works arising from the implementation of a project in cooperation with UNICEF. The right to reproduce or use the materials is transferred with the written consent of UNICEF on a case-by-case basis. The contractor selected should always refer to UNICEF Kazakhstan support when distributing products on social media and websites.

Prepared by – Umit Kassimova, OIC CRM Specialist

Umit Kassimova

Date:

Reviewed by – Aigul Kadirova, OIC Education Specialist

Aigul Kadirova

Date:

Cleared by – Assel Kaliyeva, Procurement Officer

Assel Kaliyeva

Date:

Authorised by Aislu Bekmussa, OIC Deputy Representative

Aislu Bekmussa

Date:

Endorsed by – Arthur van Diesen, Representative

Arthur van Diesen

Date:

Annex 1. Inception Report Outline

- i. Introduction presenting the purpose of the evaluation, the purpose, the scope, and the objectives of the evaluation, conceptual framework
- ii. Context of the evaluation including preliminary results of the literature review
- iii. Evaluation criteria and questions refined from the literature review and preliminary interviews
- iv. Methods of data collection, including sampling and consideration of ethical considerations
- v. Data analysis methods
- vi. Evaluation matrix showing for each evaluation criterion and question, the collection methods and corresponding data sources
- vii. Theory of change
- viii. Limitations of the evaluation and mitigation measures
- ix. Indicative work plan
- x. Proposed structure for the final report in line with UNEG and UNICEF standards
- xi. Appendices: list of key documents reviewed, set of proposed tools for data collection, list of key informants and sites to visit

Annex 2. UNICEF Adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standard

The title page and opening pages provide key basic information

1. Name of the evaluation object
2. Timeframe of the evaluation and date of the report
3. Locations (country, region, etc.) of the evaluation object
4. Names and/or organizations of evaluators
5. Name of the organization commissioning the evaluation
6. Table of contents which also lists Tables, Graphs, Figures and Annexes
7. List of acronyms

Executive Summary is a stand-alone section of 5-6 pages that includes:

1. Overview of the evaluation object
2. Evaluation objectives and intended audience
3. Evaluation methodology
4. Theory of change
5. Most important findings and conclusions
6. Main recommendations

Annexes increase the credibility of the evaluation report. They may include, inter alia:

1. ToRs
2. List of persons interviewed and sites visited
3. List of documents consulted
4. More details on methodology, such as data collection instruments, including details of their reliability and validity
5. Evaluators biodata and/or justification of team composition
6. Evaluation matrix
7. Results framework

1. Object of Evaluation

The report presents a clear and full description of the ‘object’ of the evaluation

1 The **logical model and/or the expected results chain** (inputs, outputs, and outcomes) of the object is clearly described

2 The **context of key social, political, economic, demographic, and institutional factors** that have a direct bearing on the object is described. For example, the partner government’s strategies and priorities, international, regional or country development goals, strategies and frameworks, the concerned agency’s corporate goals and priorities, as appropriate.

Scale and complexity of the object of the evaluation are clearly described, for example:

3 **The number of components**, if more than one, and the size of the population each component is intended to serve, either directly or indirectly

- **The geographic context and boundaries** (such as the region, country, and/or landscape and challenges where relevant).
- **The purpose and goal, and organization/management of the object**
- **The total resources** from all sources, including human resources and budget (s) (e.g. concerned agency, partner).

4 The **key stakeholders involved** in the object implementation, including the implementing agency (s) and partners, other key stakeholders and their roles

5 The report identifies **the implementation status of the object**, including its phase of implementation and any significant changes (e.g. plans, strategies, logical frameworks) that have occurred over time and explains the implications of those changes for the evaluation

2. Evaluation Purpose, Objective(s) and Scope

The evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope are fully explained

- 1 The purpose of the evaluation is clearly defined, including why the evaluation was needed at that point in time, who needed the information, what information is needed, how the information will be used by different intended audiences.
- 2 The report should provide a clear explanation of the evaluation objectives and scope including main evaluation questions and describes and justifies what the evaluation did and did not cover
- 3 The report describes and provides an explanation of the chosen evaluation criteria, performance standards, or other criteria used by the evaluators
- 4 Theory of change
- 5 As appropriate, evaluation objectives and scope include questions that address issues of gender and human rights

3. Evaluation Methodology

The report presents transparent description of the methodology applied to the evaluation that clearly explains how the evaluation was specifically designed to address the evaluation criteria, yield answers to the evaluation questions and achieve evaluation purposes.

- 1 The report describes the data collection methods and analysis, the rationale for selecting them, and their limitations. Reference indicators and benchmarks are included where relevant.
- 2 The report describes the data sources, the rationale for their selection, and their limitations. The report includes discussion of how the mix of data sources was used to obtain a diversity of perspectives, ensure data accuracy and overcome data limits.
- 3 The report describes the sampling frame – area and population to be represented, rationale for selection, mechanics of selection, numbers selected out of potential subjects, and limitations of the sample
- 4 The evaluation report gives me complete description of stakeholder's consultation process in the evaluation including the rationale for selecting the particular level and activities of consultation
- 5 The methods employed are appropriate for the evaluation and to answer its questions.
- 6 The methods employed are appropriate for analysing gender and human rights issues including child rights issues identified in the evaluation scope.
- 7 The theory of change prospectively defining the pathways of change, propose a package of evidence-based strategies and articulate a chain of results to sustaining of results and addressing the gaps for inclusivity in education to achieve SDGs.
- 8 The report presents evidence that adequate measures were taken to ensure data quality, including evidence supporting the reliability and validity of data collection tools (e.g. interview protocols, observation tools etc.)
- 8 The evaluation design was ethical and included ethical safeguards where appropriate, including protection of confidentiality, dignity, rights and welfare of human subjects particularly children, and respect of the values of the beneficiary community.

4. Findings

4.0 Findings respond directly to the evaluation criteria and questions detailed in the scope and objectives section of the report are based on evidence derived from data collection and analysis methods described in the methodology section of the report

- 1 Reported findings reflect systematic and appropriate analysis and interpretation of the data.
- 2 Reported findings address the evaluation criteria (such as efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, impact and relevance) and questions defined in the evaluation scope.
- 3 Findings are objectively reported on the evidence.

- 4 Gaps and limitations in the data and/or unanticipated findings are reported and discussed.
- 5 Reasons for accomplishments and failures, especially continuing constraints, were identified as much as possible.
- 6 Overall findings are presented with clarity, logic and coherence.

5. Conclusions and Lessons Learned

Conclusions present reasonable judgements based on findings and substantiated by evidence and provide insights pertinent to the object and purpose of the evaluation

- 1 The conclusions reflect reasonable evaluative judgements relating to key evaluation questions.
- 2 Conclusions are well substantiated by the evidence presented and are logically connected to evaluation findings.
- 3 Stated conclusions provide insights into the identification and/or solutions of important problems issues pertinent to the prospective decisions and actions of evaluation users.
- 4 Conclusions present strengths and weaknesses of the object (policy, programmes, projects or other intervention) being evaluated, based on the evidence presented in taking due account of the views of a diverse cross-section of stakeholders.
- 5 Lessons learned, when presented, were generalized beyond the immediate intervention being evaluated to indicate what wider relevance there might be.

6. Recommendations

Recommendations are relevant to the object and purpose of the evaluation, are supported by evidence and conclusions, and were developed with involvement of relevant stakeholders

- 1 The report describes the process followed in developing the recommendation including consultation with stakeholders
- 2 Recommendations are firmly based on evidence and conclusions
- 3 Recommendations are relevant to the object and purpose of the evaluation

Annex 3. Ethics Review Checklist

	Ethics Review Board Criteria of Interest	Additional Information Needed → Investigators: Please respond to ERB info requests in another color directly below the request	X or NA equal PASS (for ERB use)
Section 1	ERB Submission: Are all requested project information, materials, and final documents provided separately or incorporated in text? This includes:		
1.1	Inception Report or Research Protocol, containing, e.g.,: specific aims or objectives, research questions, study design, analysis & dissemination plans		
1.2	Informed Consent documents		
1.3	Surveys and data collection instruments		
1.4	Written protocols to ensure subjects' safety		
1.5	Written protocols for protection of subjects' identities		
1.6	Written protocols for protection of data		
1.7	Other relevant documents		
1.8	Do protocols include a section identifying ethical issues and measures to mitigate ethical problems as required by UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards?		
1.9	Have informed consent and data collection instruments been pre-tested?		
1.10	Are all submitted documents final versions?		
1.11	May the final protocol and instruments be included in an internal UNICEF searchable database for colleagues to learn from your work?		
1.12	Additional comments or suggestions		
Section 2	Research Design: Do submitted materials describe the proposed research? This includes:		
2.1	Is the study's background, rationale, and study design scientifically sound?		
2.2	Does study involve intervention, treatment, comparison, or control groups?		
2.3	Type of data collection: survey questionnaire..... subject interview..... key informant interview (KII)..... focus group discussion (FGD)..... document (desk) review..... on-site observation..... case study..... analysis of secondary data..... physical measurements biological specimen other.....		

2.4	Number of Data Collections: one-time (no follow-up) two or more (follow-up)		
2.5	Sample size: Approximate total n =		
2.6	Are any subjects children (<18 years old)?		
2.7	Additional comments or suggestions		
Section 3	Subject Risks: Are risks reasonable in relation to any benefits to subjects and to the importance of knowledge that may be expected to result from the research?		
3.1	Is the research Minimal Risk Only?: This means the probability and magnitude of anticipated harm or discomfort is no greater than ordinarily encountered in daily life or during performance of routine physical or psychological exams or tests.		
3.2	Does the research involve greater than minimal risk, but where risks are justified by anticipated benefits; where the relation of the anticipated benefits to risks is at least as favorable as available alternative approaches; and where the intervention or procedure is likely to yield generalizable knowledge? If so, are mitigating procedures described?		
3.3	Do study objectives show that risks are reasonable in relationship to expected gains and benefits are clearly articulated?		
3.4	By their participation, are subjects vulnerable to any of the following?: physical risk psychological risk social risk economic risk legal risk political risk employment risk..... academic risk..... religious risk..... other.....		
3.5	In event of any of the above risks, do protocols describe clear strategies to mitigate risks?		
3.6	Does the study request information or opinions where public disclosure may result in danger, limitations to future freedoms, or access to services?		
3.7	Do gender, ethnicity, or other demographic characteristics -- or grouping of subjects by any of these characteristics, especially in FGDs -- increase subject risk?		
3.8	If a subject discloses or is suspected to be at risk outside the study, are procedures in place to address or report risk and refer subject for relevant support?		

3.9	Is reporting abuse of minors mandatory? If yes, has consideration been given to the impacts and consequences of mandatory reporting?		
3.10	Additional comments or suggestions		
Section 4	High Risk: When subjects are vulnerable to heightened risk have additional safeguards been included to protect their rights and welfare?		
4.1	Can subjects be perceived as vulnerable, including: children, especially unaccompanied or separated (UASC); lacking WASH, food, shelter, or medical care; refugees in conflict or post conflict; those in natural, ecological, or disaster settings; mothers & pregnant women; forced migrants and illegal or undocumented immigrants; prisoners or persons in institutions including orphanages or juvenile justice systems; gang members; those with mental or physical illness or disability; those with HIV/AIDS; those at economic or educational disadvantage; persecuted minority groups, or under high familial, peer, or social pressure? If yes, are study-specific protection protocols provided?		
4.2	Does the sampling strategy target people at risk for issues such as: violence, torture, abuse, kidnapping; sexual exploitation, harassment, violence or abuse; prostitution or pornography, female genital mutilation, reproductive or sexual issues; sexual orientation; child, early or forced marriage; suicide? If yes, are study-specific protection protocols provided?		
4.3	Are subjects involved in any of the following: slavery, including the sale and trafficking of children; forced labour, servitude, forced recruitment to armed groups; war or armed conflict; illegal activities, production or trafficking of drugs; economic exploitation; work that could damage health or safety; removal of organs for exploitation? If yes, are study-specific protection protocols provided?		
4.4	Does the study request information relating to illegal activities? If yes, is an MOU in place with government to ensure that no participant is prosecuted? Have participants been notified of this agreement?		
4.5	Additional comments or suggestions		
Section 5	Recruitment: Do submitted materials describe subjects and the recruitment process?		
5.1	To what extent are subjects identified: names are recorded with responses..... names recorded separate from responses..... no names are recorded other personally identifiable information (PII) is recorded..... no PII is recorded subjects are given a unique identifier..... other.....		

5.2	If subject name or any other PII is recorded, are procedures included for how this info will be kept separate from responses?		
5.3	Are subject recruitment procedures & sampling strategy adequately described?		
5.4	Do recruitment procedures clearly describe ways and means to ensure privacy of subjects throughout the recruitment process?		
5.5	If subjects are children or other vulnerable groups, are materials (e.g.: survey instruments, focus group topics, etc.) age appropriate?		
5.6	If subjects are children or other vulnerable groups, or if subject matter is sensitive, is recruitment sensitive to subjects' potential vulnerabilities (real or perceived) and does it ensure privacy throughout recruitment?		
5.7	Do recruitment procedures show indication of bribery, coercion, intimidation, compulsion, pressure, or force?		
5.8	Is recruitment of some members of the population and not others likely to result in resentment for either inclusion or exclusion? Have strategies to address this been adequately described?		
5.9	Are potential subjects likely to conflate participation with potential or actual goods or service provision? Have strategies to address this been adequately described?		
5.10	If subjects are paid, compensated, provided a gift, or provided other benefits or services for participation, is the incentive described and justified as non-coercive?		
5.11	Additional comments or suggestions		
Section 6	Informed Consent: IC is a negotiation whereby subjects are informed about the study and their rights, and they agree to participate voluntarily. IC must be sought from each subject or the subject's authorized representative confirming this process.		
6.1	Type of Informed Consent: written & signed written not signed written & signed by authorized representative.. written with online checkbox..... verbal & signed or recorded..... verbal & signed by authorized representative.... verbal not signed or recorded..... active..... passive..... other		
6.2	Are the processes for obtaining each IC adequately described?		
6.3	Does the IC include a clear and simple invitation to participate, an explanation of what the subject will be expected to do, and why they are being recruited?		

6.4	Does IC include the purpose of the research presented in simple, age, education, and culturally appropriate local language?		
6.5	Does IC state that participation is voluntary, and subject may choose to not respond to any or all questions, or may withdraw anytime without consequences?		
6.6	Does IC include the expected duration of the subject's participation (hours/minutes)?		
6.7	Are subjects given a clear indication of who will have access to their responses and in what form?		
6.8	Are subjects given a clear description of potential re-use or sharing of data, with whom, and in what form?		
6.9	Does IC include a description of any risks or benefits to subjects?		
6.10	Does IC include a statement describing how confidentiality (or anonymity) will be maintained, and if there are any limitations to confidentiality?		
6.11	Does IC provide identity and contact info of investigators? Is the form of contact useful and appropriate given power dynamics and access to resources like phones and/ or transport?		
6.12	For child subjects, is IC being obtained from parent, guardian, caregiver, or authorized representative? If not, is a justification provided for why this is unnecessary?		
6.13	For child subjects, is their role in the study described adequately and in an age and culturally appropriate manner for them to provide written or verbal assent?		
6.14	Do IC materials advise subjects to keep focus group discussions (FGD) confidential from anyone outside the group?		
6.15	Where subjects differ by type (e.g.: age, sex, risk, status, etc.), are IC documents specific for each type?		
6.16	Where data collection differs by method (e.g.: survey, FGD, interview, audio recording), do ICs cover each method?		
6.17	If IC is written, is a copy left with subjects or there is explanation for not doing so?		
6.18	Additional comments or suggestions		
Section 7	Subject Protections: Do submitted materials clearly identify protection against risk?		
7.1	Do materials describe protocols for subjects' safety throughout data collection, analysis, storage, and dissemination?		
7.2	Are all data collected necessary for the purposes of evidence generation?		
7.3	Do data analysis and reporting procedures ensure subject confidentiality (or anonymity) and security?		
7.4	If future contact with subjects is planned, does it provide for confidentiality and data security through the research period and beyond?		

7.5	If children or other vulnerable groups are subjects, have personnel had experience working with these groups? If not, what specialized instruction will they receive?		
7.6	Have personnel collecting data from subjects had ethical training specific to the target group?		
7.7	Are personnel collecting data aware of ethical issues that may arise and provided mitigation strategies?		
7.8	Additional comments or suggestions		
Section 8	Data Protections: Do data collection and storage protocols adequately ensure subject & data safety?		
8.1	Are data collection tools appropriate and constructed to assure subject confidentiality or anonymity?		
8.2	Do data collection procedures and environment ensure data security?		
8.3	Do procedures cover all data types (e.g., written, audio, video, observation), and are protections described for each type?		
8.4	If data will be shared with partners, is there a clear agreement or NDA?		
8.5	Do protocols describe chain of custody of data and protections for data transfer or transmission, storage, de-identification, and destruction?		
8.6	Additional comments or suggestions		