

**TERMS OF REFERENCE**  
**INSTITUTIONAL CONSULTANCY/CONTRACT**

Section:	<b>Evaluation/Education</b>	Date:	<b>February 2024</b>
Title:	<b>Evaluation of Learning Recovery Initiative</b>	Duty station:	<b>Beirut, Lebanon</b>
Reporting to:	<b>Evaluation Officer</b>	Contract type:	<b>LTA</b>
Duration:	<b>90 days</b>	Start date:	<b>March 2024</b>

Section	Content
<b>Background</b>	<p><b>OVERALL SITUATION OF LEBANON</b></p> <p>Lebanon remains at the forefront of one of the worst humanitarian crises in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA), with children in Lebanon lagging behind their peers. The Human Capital Index measured by World Bank indicates that children born in Lebanon today will reach, on average, only 52 percent of their potential productivity when they grow up. This is lower than the average estimates for the MENA region (57%) and upper-middle-income countries (56%). Lebanon’s poor performance on the Human Capital Index is largely attributed to the education outcomes calculated for the index. If actual years of schooling, which average approximately 10.2 years in Lebanon, are adjusted for actual learning, effective years of schooling are 40 percent less on average, only 6.3 years of actual learning.<sup>1</sup></p> <p><b>IMPACT ON EDUCATION</b></p> <p>Repeated school closures due to the COVID-19 pandemic, exacerbated by the massive 2020 Beirut port explosion, the summer 2021 fuel crisis, the economic and political crisis, the depreciation of the Lebanese Pound and high inflation rates, and the most recent cholera outbreak in the country highlighted the deeply rooted unfolding crisis as well as multiplied the needs. The situation worsened in 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 due to unprecedented teacher strikes that resulted in most schools being partially or fully closed, leading to further and significant decrease in learning, as effectively students have been facing four years of lost learning.</p> <p>As a result of the multiple crises, both Lebanese and non-Lebanese families have been facing deprivations that have severely undermined the ability of the education system to provide sustained access to quality education, and parents’ and caregivers’ ability to keep their children in school. Over 1.2 million school-aged children enrolled in public, private, semi-private, and UNRWA schools and an additional 50,000 children attending non-formal education were affected by school closures mandated by the Ministry of Education and Higher Education (MEHE) and the Ministry of Public Health (MoPH), resulting in growing learning gaps and a de-prioritization of education, especially among the most vulnerable.</p> <p>Despite MEHE’s launch of a distance learning initiative in March 2021, participation rates were uneven across governorates, grade levels, and student populations. The digital gap has affected the most vulnerable among both Lebanese and non-Lebanese communities, as remote learning was inaccessible for children who lacked devices, internet connection, or reliable electricity<sup>2</sup> causing a major and detrimental increase in learning inequality and drop out among the poorest Lebanese and refugee children. Overall, the average number of schooling days since 2020 ranges approximately from 60 to 100 days per year, which is 25 to 55% less than the official 130 days. Aside from the disruptions to children enrolled in learning, the number of Syrian children out of school, as per UNICEF estimates, increased from 55% to 60% between 2020 and 2022 (approximately 430,000 children). The number of Lebanese children out of school is estimated to be 220,000 (20% of the Lebanese school-aged population), bringing the total to approximately 700,000 children (37% of the total school-aged population).</p> <p>The recent Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) (OECD 2019) and Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) (IEA 2020) show Lebanon as one of the lowest ranked countries in the region in terms of student learning outcomes. Time trends show that learning outcomes have consistently declined over</p>

<sup>1</sup> World Bank, 2021 Foundations for BUILDING FORWARD BETTER

<sup>2</sup> Human Rights Watch (October 2021). <https://www.thenationalnews.com/mena/2021/10/11/lebanese-education-system-at-risk-of-collapse-human-rights-group-warns/>

Section	Content
	<p>the last decade, pointing at systematic issues with quality of education. While quality of education is low overall, learning outcomes are highly unequal across the country. The differences in the quality of individual schools are very large—more than in other countries— and disproportionately affect students in public schools and those from lower socio-economic backgrounds. The prolonged school closures and interrupted education service delivery will have long lasting negative effects on learning for all children, exacerbating inequalities and impacting the most marginalized.</p> <p><b>OBJECT OF EVALUATION</b></p> <p><b>National Learning Recovery Initiative</b></p> <p><b>General context of the initiative</b></p> <p>In response to the extended school closures caused by the multiple crises mentioned previously, the Ministry of Education and Higher Education (MEHE) in close coordination with UNICEF, launched the <b>National Learning Recovery Initiative (LR)</b> in October 2021 that aimed to bring children back to school, recover their learning loss over more than 2 years, and keep them learning for longer. A national action plan for Learning Recovery for the SY 2021-2022 was developed with concerted efforts from key development partners (UNESCO, WB, QITABI, and EU) as well as the Centre for Educational Research and Development (CERD), which is the national entity mandated to develop and roll out trainings for education personnel, lead curriculum reform, and conduct statistical research. The LR action plan aligned with the MEHE 5-year strategic plan 2021-2025, focusing on building the capacity of public schools’ teachers in LR pedagogy, developing supplementary learning materials to support children’s individualized learning, and running a summer catch-up program for all children enrolled in formal education that provides a positive environment for psychosocial support and social emotional learning.</p> <p><b>Objective</b></p> <p>The main outcome of the Learning Recovery initiative is to “Recover the learning loss of girls and boys enrolled in public schools to bring them up to grade level.” It is aligned with UNICEF’s CPF 2023-2025 and contributes to fulfilling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Outcome 2 – “By 2025, the most marginalized boys and girls aged 3-18 have access to quality and inclusive learning, including foundational literacy, numeracy and transferable skills which prepare them for work, to start a business and for life”, and</li> <li>- Output 2.2 – “By the end of 2025, marginalized in- and out-of-school girls, boys and adolescents have increased access to quality education in a gender responsive and inclusive learning environment through teacher professional development, school improvement and safe formal and non-formal learning environment.”</li> </ul> <p>To Reach its objectives, Learning Recovery Initiative targets two main elements, one linked to teachers, ensuring that they have the skills and tools to differentiate instruction in the classroom based on regular formative assessments. The main activities that will support the achievement of this output include that CERD develops teacher training content and tool; and trains teachers on using them; and that DOPS conduct coaching visits to schools to provide guidance to teachers on implementing the learning recovery pedagogy in their practice inside the classroom.</p> <p>The second output is linked to the children, ensuring that they continue to learn in a safe and inclusive environment and receive targeted support that caters for their individual learning needs. The main activities to fulfill this output include scaling up the Call &amp; Learn Tutoring hotline; continue the implementation and roll-out of the summer catch-up program; developing and digitizing learning materials for children; and activating the learning continuity plan in case public schools are closed in SY 2023-2024.</p>

Section	Content
	<p><b>TOC of the initiative</b></p> <p>The Learning Recovery Initiative theory of change is based on the following hypothesis:  <b>IF</b> Teachers’ capacity is built on using the learning recovery pedagogy and tools in their teaching practice, and  <b>IF</b>, Students continue to learn in a safe and inclusive environment and receive targeted support that caters for their individual learning needs,  <b>THEN</b>, the learning loss of girls and boys enrolled in public schools is recovered, bringing them up to grade level and ensuring that they stay in school and complete basic education.</p> <p>The pathway to building teachers’ capacity in Learning Recovery is based on the following TOC:  <b>IF</b> tools and training materials are developed, and  <b>IF</b> teachers are well trained on them, and  <b>IF</b> continuous guidance is provided to teachers in the classroom,  <b>THEN</b> Teachers will acquire the skills to differentiate instruction in their teaching,  <b>AND</b> Teachers will be able to implement the learning recovery approach in the classrooms.</p> <p>The pathway to addressing children’s individual learning needs is based on the following TOC:  <b>IF</b> the Call &amp; Learn Tutoring hotline is scaled up, and  <b>IF</b>, Supplementary learning materials are developed and digitized, and  <b>IF</b> the Summer catch-up program is rolled out, and  <b>IF</b> the Learning Continuity contingency plan is activated,  <b>THEN</b>, Continuation of learning is assured during school closure,  <b>AND</b> Children’s individual learning gaps are closed.</p> <p>In order to achieve the above, UNICEF partnered with the main stakeholders in public education sector, namely MEHE-DGE, MEHE-DOPS and CERD. The project also closely coordinates with civil society organizations active in the education sector (QITABI; Teach for Lebanon), as well as other initiatives launched by UNICEF (Makani Centers, Dirassa schools, Learning Passport, Akelius).</p> <p>The below diagram represents the full theory of change:</p> <p>The diagram illustrates the theory of change, structured as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Alignment with CPD 2023-2025:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>CPD Outcome 2:</b> By 2025, the most marginalized boys and girls aged 3-18 have access to quality and inclusive learning, including foundational literacy, numeracy and transferable skills which prepare them for work, to start a business and for life.</li> <li><b>CPD Output 2.2:</b> By the end of 2025, marginalized in- and out-of-school girls, boys and adolescents have increased access to quality education in a gender responsive and inclusive learning environment through teacher professional development, school improvement and safe formal and non-formal learning environment.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Outcomes:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Top Outcome: The learning loss of girls and boys enrolled in public schools is recovered, bringing them up to grade level and ensuring that they stay in school and complete basic education.</li> <li>Left Path Outcome: Teachers’ capacity is built on using the learning recovery pedagogy and tools in their teaching practice.</li> <li>Right Path Outcome: Students continue to learn in a safe and inclusive environment and receive targeted support that caters for their individual learning needs.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Outputs:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Left Path: Teachers acquire the skills to differentiate instruction in their teaching; Teachers are able to implement the LR approach in the classrooms.</li> <li>Right Path: Children’s learning gaps are closed; Learning continuity is assured during school closure.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Interventions:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Left Path: CERD conduct training for teachers; CERD develop teachers training content and tools; DOPS conduct coaching visits to schools.</li> <li>Right Path: Scale-up the Call &amp; Learn Tutoring hotline; Develop and digitize supplementary learning materials; Roll out the Summer Catch-up program; Activate Learning Continuity Contingency Plan.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Main Assumptions:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Left Path: Teachers reporting to duty; CERD centers operational; DOPS coaches conducting schools’ visits.</li> <li>Right Path: Schools are open and students attending; MEHE supports the implementation of the summer catch-up program; Children and teachers are able to attend the summer program; Makani and other Learning hubs are operational and ready to support the learning continuity plan.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Main Actors:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Left Path: MEHE, CERD, DOPS, QITABI.</li> <li>Right Path: MEHE, CERD, QITABI, TFL, MFP (Makani &amp; Dirassa) NGOs.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Learning recovery Logical Framework is annexed to this ToR.

**Learning Recovery key achievements in SY21/22, SY22/23 and SY 23/24**

Despite the challenges faced during 2022 with the socio-economic crisis and financial collapse that led to continued disruptions in children’s learning, the national Learning Recovery action plan was implemented. The table below reflects progress related to the various components of the LR plan, which have been funded by EU and KfW:

	Activity	Target	Achieved	Funds Allocated	
1	Print and distribute <b>Learning Recovery supplementary materials</b> to public schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 382,000 print packages for children.</li> <li>▪ 65,000 print packages for teachers.</li> <li>▪ 1,300 LR guidelines for school directors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 382,000 print packages for children.</li> <li>▪ 65,000 print packages for teachers.</li> <li>▪ 1,300 LR guidelines for school directors</li> </ul>	\$2,100,195	
2	Conduct <b>Teacher Training</b> on learning recovery pedagogy: FLN, SEL, formative assessments	Target: 80% of all public-school teachers in basic education (40,000)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 22,831 teachers in phase 2 (65%)</li> <li>▪ 14,499 teachers in phase 3 (41%)</li> <li>▪ 6,625 teachers in phases 4 and 5 (another 6,000 planned)</li> </ul>	Total \$1,817,625 divided into 4 phases: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ \$655,876</li> <li>▪ \$824,076</li> <li>▪ \$179,575</li> <li>▪ \$157,998</li> </ul>	
3	Manage a <b>Tutoring hotline</b> service to support children's learning remotely	Target: 10,000 children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Piloted in summer school – ~2,000 children.</li> <li>▪ Scaled up in Jan.2023 - ~ 1,100 callers per week.</li> <li>▪ Total reached: 18,000 children</li> </ul>	\$314,660	
4	Conduct a <b>Summer catch-up program</b> to support FLN/PSS/SEL in 2022	a. Operational cost	Target: 93,000 children	98,400 children	\$271,634
		b. Teacher incentives support	Target: 8,000 teachers	8,859 teachers	\$328,128
		c. Insurance for children provided	Target: 93,000 children	98,400 children	\$178,673
		d. Student transportation	Target: 93,000 children	89,000 children	\$2,670,000
	Conduct a <b>Summer catch-up program</b> to support FLN/PSS/SEL in 2023	a. Operational cost	Target: 200,000 children	156,477 children	\$406,879
		b. Teacher incentives support	Target: 10,000 teachers	7,993 teachers + 4,025 school staff + 149 Admins	\$629,214
		c. Insurance for children provided	Target: 200,000 children	156,477 children	\$173,736
		d. Student transportation	Target: 100,000 children	130,677 children	\$3,700,000

Section	Content
<b>Purpose and Objectives</b>	<p><b>Purpose</b></p> <p>This evaluation serves the purposes of accountability and learning. It aims at providing an independent assessment of the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the learning recovery intervention’s design and implementation mechanisms, and to examine to whether quality education objectives were achieved in the programme in an inclusive and gender responsive way.</p> <p>This evaluation will inform future programming by identifying lessons, best practices and generating recommendations to inform the design and implementation of learning recovery interventions in Lebanon. In addition, the findings of the evaluation will be used for advocacy for continued donor support in enhancing education quality and access for the most vulnerable.</p> <p>The evaluation covers the last two school years of 2021-2022, 2022-2023, and 2023-2024, including summer schools 2022 and 2023.</p> <p><b>Objectives</b></p> <p>This evaluation is designed to provide evidence (1) whether the current LR initiative is achieving the needed results in the most efficient, coherent and sustainable way, and (2) whether corrections actions are needed to improve the outcome. More specifically, the evaluation aims at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Providing an independent assessment of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of Learning Recovery Intervention against design and objectives, its implementation, and results, collaboration processes with main partners, and results achievement with a particular emphasis on its contribution to enhance quality of education for all.</li> <li>- Assess the intervention selection criteria and <b>targeting processes</b> in order to examine to which extent inclusion, equity, gender and safe access objectives were achieved in the programme.</li> <li>- Validate the programme ToC, and explore to which extent the intervention, in its design and implementation, has been successful in facilitating better <b>inclusion of children with disabilities</b>.</li> <li>- Analyse the factors that affected progress towards results and the hindering and supporting effect of the country context, and capture <b>challenges, lessons learned, and success factors</b> during the three cycles of the intervention.</li> <li>- Provide strategic learning and recommendations aimed at informing the upcoming phase of the programme design and implementation by UNICEF Lebanon</li> </ul>
<b>Scope</b>	<p>This evaluation will focus on the Learning Recovery Intervention implemented by UNICEF for the school years 2021-2022, 2022-2023, and 2023-2024, in addition to the summer school of 2022 and 2023. The evaluation covers all the schools targeted by the intervention in the different geographic area of the country. Evaluation will assess the intervention’s relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence and sustainability. The budget of the intervention covered by this evaluation is approximately USD 12.5 million in addition to around USD 6 million to cover student transportation during summer schools.</p> <p>Evaluation will observe the ability of the intervention, in its current design and implementation mechanisms, to reach the most vulnerable children and achieve its planned outcomes in the most efficient and coherent manner. The evaluation will validate the theory of change logic and its causal linkage, and the extent to which it is succeeding in enhancing quality of education and closing the learning gap.</p> <p>The evaluation will identify the challenges and bottlenecks and/or flaws in the overall programme focus, design, and approaches, and also, ways in which these challenges were addressed during the past two rounds or how they would need to be addressed in view of the forthcoming phase of the project, and emerging new risks that it might entail.</p>

Section	Content
<b>Use of findings</b>	<p>The intended use of the evaluation is to provide inputs into improving the design, focus and implementation modalities of Learning Recovery interventions in Lebanon.</p> <p>The evaluation outcomes will be used by UNICEF Education section, MEHE, CERD, DOPS, other national stakeholders, EU and other donors in the sector. Evaluation findings and lessons will also be disseminated widely to implementers of similar interventions.</p>
<b>Evaluation criteria and key evaluation questions</b>	<p>This evaluation will be assessed using criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. These criteria are prioritized because they respond best to the evaluation purpose and objectives. 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 evaluation matrix as part of the Inception Report following desk review of key documents and interview of evaluation users. Below is what should be under each criterion as per <a href="#">OECD/DAC</a>.</p> <p><b>(1) Relevance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ To what extent is LR intervention designed and implemented to respond to needs of vulnerable children in Lebanon? Has beneficiary feedback been continuously incorporated to improved design and delivery of the IE interventions? And how?</li> <li>○ How aligned is the LR intervention with the UNICEF mandate, core commitments to children, children’s right to education, country context, and government priorities?</li> <li>○ How relevant is UNICEF’s LR intervention in addressing inherent equity gaps – taking into consideration any disparities?</li> <li>○ How well has accountability to affected populations, complaints and feedback mechanisms and safe programming provisions worked in the LR?</li> <li>○ To what extent has UNICEF been able to adapt this intervention to changes in needs and priorities caused by changing in country context, Covid-19, and socio economic and financial crisis?</li> </ul> <p><b>(2) Efficiency</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ To what extent were UNICEF activities delivered in a timely and organized manner, within the planned monetary resources allocated?</li> <li>○ How efficient was the intervention design in achieving its planned results?</li> <li>○ Did UNICEF put in place appropriate structures, and adequate resources (technical and financial) to deliver its intervention? If there were any lack/problem in resources/capacity, how was this addressed?</li> <li>○ To what extent was UNICEF able to effectively collaborate and coordinate externally with key stakeholders, and leverage existing partnerships, to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● be as efficient as possible for programme strengthening and improvement?</li> <li>● ensure efficient use of existing platforms (service, community, and media delivery platforms) and resources for its activities?</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Were there any inefficiencies because UNICEF did not work with certain or adopted different implementation modalities?</li> <li>○ Were appropriate monitoring and financial accountability mechanisms in place?</li> <li>○ How efficiently did UNICEF respond to equity-based challenges?</li> <li>○ To what extent are social and gender disaggregated data collected and monitored during the programming?</li> </ul> <p><b>(3) Effectiveness</b></p>

Section	Content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How valid is the project rational/theory of change pathway and linkages? Is there evidence that the design and planned activities can lead to the desired outputs and outcomes in the current implementation context? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● How effective was UNICEF support in building both teachers’ capacities and practices in learning recovery pedagogy?</li> <li>● To what extent was the intervention successful in providing targeting support to students and provide a safe and inclusive learning environment?</li> <li>● To what extent was UNICEF support effective in recovering learning loss of girls and boys and bringing them to grade level?</li> <li>● To what extent did the program contribute to CDP objective of increasing access to quality education in a gender responsive and inclusive learning environment?</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ What are factors that affected project implementation and progress toward results, and the hindering and supporting effect of the country context? What are the main challenges, lessons learned, and success factors during LR interventions implementation to date?</li> <li>○ How effective were project design and implementation approach in collaborating with government/national partners? What were the main challenges? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● To which extend was UNICEF interventions effective in enhance the partnership and capacity of main stakeholders (MEHE, CERD, DOPS), parents, communities and service providers?</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Has there been any unintended positive or negative consequences or effects of the LR?</li> <li>○ In what ways and to what extent has the UNICEF LR intervention integrated an equity-based approach into the design and implementation during the implementation? What are the entry points to ensure the intervention becomes gender responsive? And how adequate is this approach in addressing inherent equity gaps and taking into consideration the disparities?</li> <li>○ Are girls with disabilities facing specific barriers not allowing them or impeding their access to the intervention?</li> <li>○ Does the UNICEF LR program actively contribute to the promotion of the right to education and education outcomes, especially for the most vulnerable?</li> <li>○ In what ways and to what extent has the LR intervention been gender responsive or transformative?</li> </ul> <p><b>(4) Coherence</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How does the LR intervention fit with or complement the work of other donors and implementers, especially USAID QITABI 2 Project and other similar project?</li> <li>○ How aligned is UNICEF’s LR intervention with the Education Programme strategy and objectives, and other Quality Education and Inclusive Education interventions being carried out by UNICEF?</li> <li>○ How can the implementation arrangements of LR support be better coordinated at MEHE/CERD to ensure complementarity with MEHE/CERD regular activities and reduce duplication with other programs?</li> </ul> <p><b>(5) Sustainability</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ To what extent can the LR intervention achieved results be sustained after project closure? How?</li> <li>○ What are the key barriers and bottlenecks towards achieving sustainability of UNICEF LR interventions?</li> <li>○ What are the contributing factors constraints that require attention to improve prospects of sustainability of results?</li> <li>○ What are the longer-term implications for sustainability, especially in relation to the likelihood of the ability of the public sector to sustain the project results and after the end of UNICEF support, and to maintain the implementation of project activities?</li> <li>○ What are the critical lessons learned from the implementation of programme especially, related to system strengthening, strategic partnerships, evidence generation and advocacy?</li> </ul>

Section	Content
<b>Evaluation approach and Methods</b>	<p>(1) <b>Design:</b> Overall study design for the evaluation will be theory-based. A theory-based equity focused evaluation using process tracing and contribution analysis will enable: 1). analysis of results chain and change pathways of the theory of change, and 2) analysis to focus on whether LR project approach was designed and implemented in a way that is appropriate to context and effectively reaching the desired results. The evaluation team will elaborate on the design or propose a more appropriate design and methodology to conduct the evaluation during the inception phase.</p> <p>The programme theory will be empirically tested through the collection and review of quantitative and qualitative data to establish a logical model of cause-effect linkages and exploring the delivery of results.</p> <p>Process tracing and contribution analysis will in addition be employed to assess the achievement of higher-level outcomes. The evaluation team is expected to elaborate on the feasibility of using both approaches.</p> <p>(2) <b>Methodology:</b></p> <p>The Evaluation should use a mixed-methods approach to answer the evaluation questions. The qualitative methodology should include desk review, key informant interviews, and focus group discussions, while quantitative methodology should include analysis of monitoring and administrative data, as necessary. Girls with disabilities are to be interviewed alone and by facilitators with relevant expertise to ensure their active involvement and trust to share their feedback. Each of these methods is summarized below, and will be subject to an inception phase in which the final agreed approach will be described in the inception report:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Desk review: The evaluation team will conduct a desk review of UNICEF documents, such as strategic plans, policies, proposals, and reports.</li> <li>ii. Reconstruction and empirically testing of the programme theory with appropriate indicators, borrowing from the programme documents and interviews.</li> <li>iii. Key informant interviews: The evaluation team will interview UNICEF Lebanon staff from the Education team, government entities officials (MEHE, CERD, DOPS) and other partners involved in the implementation, and any other relevant partners, donors and stakeholders. Girls with disabilities will be asked questions relevant to their experiences, allowing them to express gendered related barriers.</li> <li>iv. Sensemaking session(s) with programme staff and partners to understand the context of a programme, the factors that contribute to its success or failure, and the implications of the evaluation findings for future programming.</li> <li>v. School visits and FGDs with, teachers, DOPS coaches, schools’ principals, parents/caregivers, students, interview with school directors and girls separately. Specific questions relating to gendered barriers are asked to all, with specific tailored questions to girls. FGD with girls to be facilitated by expert on girl facilitation to ensure quality of information provided from girls.</li> <li>vi. Data analysis, summarizing and display: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The bulk of the data collected will be qualitative, generated from the document review and key informant interviews. As such, the main data analysis approach will be extant data analysis.</li> <li>b. Standard qualitative data analysis techniques of thematizing, clustering and in some cases, comparing and contrasting responses to the same questions will be employed.</li> <li>c. Data from learners screening and testing will be available to the evaluation team as well. Depending on the type and quality of data available or collected, descriptive statistics may be generated where feasible.</li> <li>d. Monitoring data will be available.</li> <li>e. A gender analysis of the results will be included to ensure the specific experience of girls are showcased.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

Section	Content														
<b>Stakeholders</b>	UNICEF Interventions are implemented in close collaboration with government and partners in achieving results. The list of institutions and stakeholders is given below.														
	<b>Category</b>	<b>Institution</b>													
	Government	The Ministry of Education and Higher Education (MEHE): DGE, Primary and Secondary Directorates, REOs and DOPS The Center of Education Research and Development (CERD): PITB and JAD													
	Donors	KFW, EU, SDC and AFD													
	<b>Implementers</b>														
	UN Agencies	UNHCR and WFP (in Summer School)													
	Implementing Partners/ CSOs/NGOs	QITABI2, TFL													
<b>Others</b>															
<b>Specific tasks, deliverables and timelines</b>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Activity</th> <th>Deliverables</th> <th># of Days</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Inception phase</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft inception report</li> <li>Presentation to reference group</li> <li>Final inception report. 20% payment</li> </ul> </td> <td>20 days</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Data collection Phase</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Post data collection debrief; validation workshop with stakeholders for presentation of main findings and recommendations (30% Payment)</li> </ul> </td> <td>40 days</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Analysis, triangulation, and report writing</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft evaluation report</li> <li>Final report meeting UNICEF quality standards and completed comments matrix (50% Payment)</li> <li>Dissemination workshop to share conclusions and recommendation with relevant stakeholders and external audience.</li> </ul> </td> <td>30 days</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Activity	Deliverables	# of Days	Inception phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft inception report</li> <li>Presentation to reference group</li> <li>Final inception report. 20% payment</li> </ul>	20 days	Data collection Phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Post data collection debrief; validation workshop with stakeholders for presentation of main findings and recommendations (30% Payment)</li> </ul>	40 days	Analysis, triangulation, and report writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft evaluation report</li> <li>Final report meeting UNICEF quality standards and completed comments matrix (50% Payment)</li> <li>Dissemination workshop to share conclusions and recommendation with relevant stakeholders and external audience.</li> </ul>	30 days
	Activity	Deliverables	# of Days												
	Inception phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft inception report</li> <li>Presentation to reference group</li> <li>Final inception report. 20% payment</li> </ul>	20 days												
	Data collection Phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Post data collection debrief; validation workshop with stakeholders for presentation of main findings and recommendations (30% Payment)</li> </ul>	40 days												
Analysis, triangulation, and report writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft evaluation report</li> <li>Final report meeting UNICEF quality standards and completed comments matrix (50% Payment)</li> <li>Dissemination workshop to share conclusions and recommendation with relevant stakeholders and external audience.</li> </ul>	30 days													
Total duration is <b>90 days</b> .															
The evaluation team must provide the following products electronically (details and duration will be specified at the inception meeting):															
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Inception report</b> which will describe the detailed intervention methodology, articulated around the following points (maximum 20 pages + annexes): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reflection on the Terms of Reference including a clear commitment to be able to answer the evaluation questions within the time and budget mentioned.</li> <li>A comprehensive background on the Cash for Education programming in Lebanon, including applicable context information.</li> <li>A finalized purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation</li> <li>Finalized evaluation questions, an evaluation matrix (including indicators (measures) through which the criteria will be assessed), a final list of data sources to be used, the methodology, finalized sampling strategy, data analysis plan and final data collection instruments. and.</li> <li>Limitations of the evaluation and mitigation measures</li> <li>Indicative timelines for deliverables</li> <li>Proposed structure for the final report in line with UNEG and UNICEF standards</li> <li>Appendices: list of key documents reviewed, set of proposed tools for data collection, list of key informants and sites to visit</li> </ul> </li> </ol>															

Section	Content
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. <b>PPT presentation of the main preliminary findings and conclusions</b> to the Key Stakeholders; this presentation will be discussed during the mini workshop to report the results of the evaluation towards the end of the field mission. The PPT presentation will also be updated and submitted at the same time as the final report.</li> <li>3. <b>Draft report</b> presenting all the findings of the evaluation. 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.</li> <li>4. <b>Final report</b>, the report should contain an executive summary of maximum five pages, a description of the CFE intervention evaluated, the evaluation’s objectives, the design and methodology used and the evaluation’s findings, conclusions and recommendations. Excluding annexes and the executive summary, the report should not be longer than 60 pages. The evaluation report must comply with the UNICEF standards for evaluation reports. The report will be subject to a detailed and in-depth quality review by the UNICEF country office and the regional office.</li> <li>5. <b>Completed Comments matrix</b> either accepting or rejecting with a valid rationale all comments made on the draft report.</li> <li>6. <b>Raw data</b>, including data collection instruments, electronic transcripts, complete data sets, etc.</li> <li>7. <b>Dissemination materials for external audience, that include an infographic poster</b>, a policy brief or any other tool for disseminating main conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.</li> </ol>
<b>Management arrangements</b>	<p><b>(1) Evaluation Manager</b></p> <p>UNICEF Lebanon Evaluation Specialist will manage and oversee the evaluation and ensure that it upholds the UNICEF /UN Evaluation Group norms and standards for evaluations. The evaluation manager will provide quality assurance, with support from the Regional Evaluation Advisor for Middle East and North Africa Region (MENARO).</p> <p><b>(2) Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)</b></p> <p>A reference group will be formed to review, guide, and endorse the deliverables and ensure that the evaluation answers all questions. The reference group will be entrusted to guide the evaluation process, including by providing strategic inputs across the whole process, from the design phase to the delivery and comment on the final report. It will also be involved in the recommendation co-creation workshops and in the dissemination.</p>
<b>Payment schedule</b>	<p>Payment 1: 30% after completion of 1<sup>st</sup> deliverable (submission of inception report)</p> <p>Payment 2: 30% after completion of 2<sup>nd</sup> deliverable (draft report and presentation of preliminary findings to the reference group)</p> <p>Payment 3: 40% after completion of 3<sup>rd</sup> deliverable (final study report and presentation)</p>
<b>Principles and Ethical Conduct of Evaluation</b>	<p>The evaluation shall be carried out in accordance with the ethical principles and standards defined by the United Nations Evaluation Group:</p> <p><b>Confidentiality:</b> The assessment must respect the rights of the persons providing information, guaranteeing their anonymity and confidentiality.</p> <p><b>Accountability:</b> The report should identify any conflicts or differences of opinion that may have arisen between the consultants and/or between the consultant and those responsible for the programme component regarding the findings and/or recommendations of the evaluation. The entire team must confirm the results presented, with any disagreements to be indicated.</p> <p><b>Integrity:</b> The evaluator will need to highlight issues not specifically identified in the Terms of Reference, in order to obtain a more complete analysis of the program component.</p> <p><b>Independence:</b> The evaluation team must ensure that it remains independent of the program under evaluation, and should not be associated with its management, implementation or any other element of it.</p>

Section	Content
	<p><b>Incidents:</b> If problems arise during fieldwork, or at any other time during the evaluation, they should be reported immediately to the Evaluation Manager. If this is not done, the existence of such problems can in no way be used to justify the impossibility of achieving the results foreseen by UNICEF in these terms of reference.</p> <p><b>Validity of information:</b> The consultant must ensure the accuracy of the information collected during the preparation of the reports and will be responsible for the information presented in the final report.</p> <p><b>Intellectual property:</b> Using the different sources of information, the consultant must respect the intellectual property rights of the institutions and communities consulted.</p> <p><b>Submission of reports:</b> If the submission of reports is postponed, or in the event that the quality of the reports submitted is significantly lower than what has been agreed, the sanctions provided for in these terms of reference will apply.</p> <p>The evaluation consulting firm should adhere to the following UN and UNICEF norms and standards and is expected to 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. Copies of all these documents will be provided upon request:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Standards for Evaluation in the UN System</li> <li>• United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms for Evaluation in the UN System, including impartiality, independence, quality, transparency, consultative process.</li> <li>• Ethical Guidelines for UN Evaluations and the UNICEF procedure for ethical standards in research, evaluation, data collection and analysis will guide the overall process.</li> <li>• UNICEF adapted evaluation report standards and GEROS.</li> <li>• The evaluation should incorporate the human rights-based and gender perspective and be based on results-based management principles and logical framework analysis, in compliance with UNEG guidelines on gender and human rights.</li> </ul> <p>The evaluation team is required to 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. Owing to the envisaged participation of human subjects in the evaluation, the evaluation team should seek ethical review board approval either from a recognized Institutional Review Board in Lebanon or via UNICEF’s LTA for ethical approval.</p>

Section	Content																														
<b>Profile Requirements</b>	<p>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 Lebanon context and the sector. Team members will work closely together to co-produce 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.</p> <p>Required <b>qualifications and areas of expertise:</b> The evaluation will have to be conducted by a gender-balanced team comprising enough qualifying international and national evaluators covering the below requirements (expertise could be combined):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Team-leader with documented extensive experience (at least 10 years) in conducting complex development evaluations and leading evaluation teams. Must have advanced degree in public policy, economics or related fields.</li> <li>• Team member with specialized experience and technical knowledge and understanding of education in emergencies programming, education sector analysis and planning, and learning recovery related interventions.</li> <li>• A team member specialized experience and technical knowledge of literacy, numeracy and learning recovery programs in emergency context.</li> <li>• At least one team member with documented experience (at least 5 full years) in conducting evaluations and application of theory-based evaluation design.</li> <li>• At least one team member with proven extensive experience in quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis.</li> <li>• Team members with solid knowledge of human rights-based approaches to programming, gender, results-based management (RBM) principles, participatory approaches</li> <li>• Team members with experience of working in Middle East and North Africa region (previous work in Lebanon is an asset).</li> <li>• The evaluation team should include a mix of local and international experts able to conduct interviews in Arabic and English or French.</li> </ul> <p>Mixed teams of national and international consultants involving women are strongly encouraged. The evaluation team will be responsible for all technical aspects of the evaluation, under the guidance of the reference group and the evaluation manager. The Team Leader will lead the team and be responsible for carrying out evaluation activities at all stages, from methodological design to the presentation of results to the course of workshops through data collection, report writing. He/she will have to report periodically on the progress of the work to the evaluation manager. He/she will guarantee the quality of the expected products. None of the team members should be a current staff or contractor with any of the implementing partners indicated in program description above.</p>																														
<b>Tasks and estimated duration</b>	<p>This is estimated level of effort. Evaluation teams are expected to propose a more realistic schedule based on the methods and approach suggested.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Activities. (Detailed in Annex 1)</th> <th>Duration (Days)</th> <th>Team Leader, Evaluation</th> <th>Team member 1</th> <th>Team member 2</th> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="5" style="text-align: center;">Working days</td> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>I. Inception Phase</td> <td>24 days</td> <td>25 days</td> <td>15 days</td> <td>10 days</td> </tr> <tr> <td>II. Data collection phase</td> <td>40 days</td> <td>40 days</td> <td>33 days</td> <td>30 days</td> </tr> <tr> <td>III. Report Writing Phase</td> <td>25 days</td> <td>25 days</td> <td>14 days</td> <td>12 days</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Total</b></td> <td><b>90 days</b></td> <td><b>90 days</b></td> <td><b>62 days</b></td> <td><b>52 days</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Activities. (Detailed in Annex 1)	Duration (Days)	Team Leader, Evaluation	Team member 1	Team member 2	Working days					I. Inception Phase	24 days	25 days	15 days	10 days	II. Data collection phase	40 days	40 days	33 days	30 days	III. Report Writing Phase	25 days	25 days	14 days	12 days	<b>Total</b>	<b>90 days</b>	<b>90 days</b>	<b>62 days</b>	<b>52 days</b>
Activities. (Detailed in Annex 1)	Duration (Days)	Team Leader, Evaluation	Team member 1	Team member 2																											
Working days																															
I. Inception Phase	24 days	25 days	15 days	10 days																											
II. Data collection phase	40 days	40 days	33 days	30 days																											
III. Report Writing Phase	25 days	25 days	14 days	12 days																											
<b>Total</b>	<b>90 days</b>	<b>90 days</b>	<b>62 days</b>	<b>52 days</b>																											
Budget	\$150,000																														

Section	Content
Funding source	WBS: 302/002/008 Grants: SC190744, SC230479, SC230442, SC 230692

**PREPARED BY:**

**Tamara Nassereddine** ·  
Evaluation Manager  
Feb 28, 2024



**REVIEWED BY:**

*Sibylle Selwan* 04.03.2024  
Sibylle Selwan, Supply & Logistics Manager OIC  
(For Institutional contract)

**REVIEWED BY:**

*Linkin* OIC Chief of Education 1 Mar 2024  
Education Section Chief

**REVIEWED BY:**

\_\_\_\_\_

**APPROVED BY:**

*Edouard Beigbeder*  
Edouard Beigbeder  
Representative  
Representative 05-03-2024

### Annex1. Detailed estimated team members level of effort

Activities	Duration (Days)	Team Leader, Evaluation	Team member 1	Team member 2
		Working days		
<b>I. Inception Phase</b>	<b>25 days</b>	<b>25 days</b>	<b>15 days</b>	<b>10 days</b>
Signature of the contract		-	-	-
Initial meeting with evaluation manager		1 day	1 day	1 day
Meeting with Program Team		1 day	1 day	1 day
Review of the literature, and preliminary interviews		7 days	5 days	2 day
Evaluation matrix validation workshop and formalization of headings		1 day	1 day	1 day
Development of data collection tools		5 days	3 days	3 days
Submission of the draft inception report		7 days	3 days	2 days
Revision of the inception report based on the comments		3 days	2 days	1 day
<b>II. Data collection phase</b>	<b>40 days</b>	<b>40 days</b>	<b>33 days</b>	<b>30 days</b>
Meeting with UNICEF staff, major Donors, and other stakeholders		5 days	5 days	5 days
Field visits (and updating the evaluation manager regularly on the progress of work by WhatsApp, Tel, email, etc.)		20 days	20 days	20 days
Post data collection debrief		1 day	1 day	
Data processing and analysis		10 days	5 days	4 days
Meeting + PPT presentation of preliminary conclusions		4 days	2 days	1 days
<b>III. Report Writing Phase</b>	<b>25 days</b>	<b>25 days</b>	<b>14 days</b>	<b>12 days</b>
Drafting of the interim evaluation report		15 days	7 days	7 days
Submission of the Interim Evaluation Report (Draft 0)		-	-	-
Submission of the revised version of the report (Draft 1) incorporating the comments of the ERG.		5 days	3 days	3 days
Submission of the final version of the report incorporating comments Reference group and key stakeholders		3 days	2 days	1 day
Workshop to disseminate results		2 days	2 days	1 day
<b>Total number of days</b>	<b>90 days</b>	<b>90 days</b>	<b>62 days</b>	<b>52 days</b>

## Annex 2: Required Report Structures

<p><b>Inception Report Outline</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Reflection on the Terms of Reference including a clear commitment to be able to answer the evaluation questions within the time and budget mentioned.</li> <li>2) Confirmation of the purpose of the evaluation, as well as the scope, and the objectives of the evaluation</li> <li>3) Additional context to the one mentioned in the ToR if applicable.</li> <li>4) Confirmation of the evaluation criteria and questions refined from the literature review and preliminary interviews.</li> <li>5) Methods of data collection, including sampling and consideration of ethical considerations</li> <li>6) Data analysis methods</li> <li>7) Evaluation matrix showing for each evaluation criterion and question, the data collection methods and corresponding data sources. Including a clear statement on how success will be judged in the sub questions.</li> <li>8) Limitations of the evaluation and mitigation measures</li> <li>9) Indicative work plan</li> <li>10) Proposed structure for the final report in line with UNEG and UNICEF standards</li> <li>11) Appendices: list of key documents reviewed, set of proposed tools for data collection, list of key informants and sites to visit</li> </ol>
<p><b>Report Structure</b></p>	<p>The report should be written in a style accessible by the general audience and within a 60-pages limit. The executive summary should not exceed 5 pages, while including a summary on each section of the report and being aligned with the structure of the full report. The report should be both in English and submitted electronically in Word MS format. The structure of the report should be logical and succinct (e.g., background and objectives before the findings and findings are presented before the conclusion). The research team is expected to submit two reports, one in English and another one in Arabic. The following order could be adopted for the report:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Table of contents, list of annexes/figures/tables, etc.</li> <li>II. List of Acronyms</li> <li>III. Executive Summary (Max 5 pages)</li> <li>IV. Introduction &amp; Background</li> <li>V. Methodology</li> <li>VI. Limitations</li> <li>VII. Ethical Considerations</li> <li>VIII. Results, Discussion, &amp; Recommendations</li> <li>IX. Conclusion</li> <li>X. Annexes</li> </ol> <p>The report should be written in a style accessible by the general audience and within an 80-pages limit. The executive summary should not exceed 5 pages, while including a summary on each section of the report and being aligned with the structure of the full report. The report should be both in English and submitted electronically in Word MS format.</p>
<p><b>Dissemination materials</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Slide deck of key findings, conclusions, and recommendations</li> <li>II. Infographic poster,</li> <li>III. A policy brief.</li> </ol>

### Annex 3 - Learning recovery Logical Framework

Outcome: The learning loss of girls and boys enrolled in public schools is recovered, bringing them up to grade level and ensuring that they stay in school and complete basic education.			
Description	Indicator	Baseline & Target	MOV
a. Teachers' capacity is built on using the learning recovery pedagogy and tools in their teaching practice	% of unique teachers trained on learning recovery (inclusive of newly contracted teachers)	Total # teachers: 35,000 Baseline: 65% Target: 80%	CERD TMS report, UNICEF field monitoring, TPM reports
	% of unique teachers implementing the learning recovery pedagogy in their classroom practice	Total # teachers: 35,000 Baseline: NA Target: 50%	VIMS Data, MEHE reports
b. Students continue to learn in a safe and inclusive environment and receive targeted support that caters for their individual learning needs	% of students completing the school year	Total # children in basic education: 450,000 Baseline: NA Target: 80%	SIMS Data, Data from MEHE, MEHE reports
Intervention	Indicator	Baseline & Target	MOV
Output 1: Teachers acquire the skills to differentiate instruction in their teaching			
CERD conduct training for teachers	# of teacher training slots in Learning Recovery including FLN and SEL	Baseline: 75,766 slots in 2022 Target: 100,000 training slots	CERD TMS report, UNICEF field monitoring, TPM reports
CERD develop teachers training content and tools	# of training modules developed in FLN and SEL	Baseline: 20 modules Target: 25 modules	CERD reports, Available modules
Output 2: Teachers are able to implement the LR approach in the classrooms			
DOPS conduct coaching visits to schools	# of schools visits conducted by DOPS counsellors	Baseline: 0 Target: 3,000 visits in 2023 7,000 visits in 2024	VIMS Data, MEHE reports, TPM reports
	# of teachers supported by the DOPS coaches	Baseline: 0 Target: 9,000 teachers in 2023 21,000 teachers in 2024	VIMS Data, MEHE reports, TPM reports
Output 3: Children's learning gaps are closed			
Scale-up the Call & Learn Tutoring hotline	# of students using the Call & Learn tutoring hotline	Baseline: 18,000 children in SY 2022-23 Target:	Partner reports

		25,000 children in 2023 50,000 children in 2024	
Develop and digitize supplementary learning materials	# of supplementary LR materials printed and distributed to schools	Baseline: 0 Target: 382,000 print packages for children; 65,000 print packages for teachers; 1,300 LR guidelines for school directors	Delivery notes, Distribution plan
	% of materials in FLN and SEL digitized	Baseline: 0 Target: 80%	Partner reports, Available materials
Roll out the Summer Catch-up program	# of students attending the summer catch-up program	Baseline: 98,400 students in 2022 Target: 200,000 students in 2023 200,000 students in 2024	SIMS Data, MEHE reports, TPM reports
	# of schools running the summer catch-up program	Baseline: 455 schools in 2022 Target: 800 schools in 2023 800 schools in 2024	SIMS Data, MEHE reports, TPM reports
	# of teachers receiving incentives for summer catch-up program	Baseline: 8,000 teachers in 2022 Target: 16,000 teachers in 2023 16,000 teachers in 2024	SIMS Data, MEHE reports, TPM reports
<b>Output 4: Learning continuity is assured Learning during school closure</b>			
Activate Learning Continuity Contingency Plan	Learning continuity plan activated	Baseline: 0 Target: 1	SIMS Data, MEHE reports, Partner reports, TPM reports