**Terms of Reference**

**Evaluation of a project “Prevention of child disability and social inclusion of children with disabilities and special needs in the Republic of Belarus”**

1. **Context**

As in other Europe and Central Asia (ECA) countries, children with special educational needs and disabilities (CWSEND) in the Republic of Belarus constitute one of the most vulnerable and socially excluded groups of children who face multiple discrimination and stigma. Since Belarus’ ratification of the Convention of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) in 2016, National Action Plan for “Implementation in the Republic of Belarus of the Provisions of the Convention on the Rights of the Persons with Disabilities for 2017-2025” (NAP CRPD) has been implemented. A draft law “On Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Integration” of 2019 creates a momentum for reviewing and amending policies with the aim to fulfil rights, tackle discrimination and eliminate disparities that CWSEND face. In the beginning of 2018, over 31,000 or 1.7% of child population lived with registered disabilities (children with disabilities (CWD)) which together with children with special education needs (SEN) amounted to 176,000 or 9.4% of all children (an increase of over 39,000 children to 2010).

Despite significant efforts of the Government of Belarus (GoB) in providing social assistance to CWSEND and setting-up a support system at the local level interlinking health, social protection and education sectors, CWSEND and their families continue to face multiple institutional, attitudinal and structural barriers to fulfilling their human rights, such as lack of complex integrated assistance and quality of access to services. From 27 to 61 % of children with disabilities experience challenges with accessibility of services; they experience stigma and discrimination (34% of CWD do not attend educational institutions because of medical contraindications); and they belong to the poorest category of the population (both parents work only in 34 % of families with CWD, in 20% families parents do not work at all).

CWSEND programming is largely present in the UNICEF’s Country Programme Document (CPD 2016-2020) under the following outcomes: Outcome 1: By 2020 families’ resilience and coping mechanisms are strengthened and parents know about the importance of the early years; Outcome 2. By 2020 all children with disabilities and special needs and their families receive adequate quality integrated services.

UNICEF and the GoB have partnered in the deinstitutionalization of CWSEND, launching respite care and palliative services, ratification of UNCRPD, enhancement of Early Childhood Intervention (ECI) system, development of Inclusive Education (IE) and evidence and data generation. The overall goal of the interventions has been to improve social services and care for CWSEND, focusing on enabling them to live with their families or in alternative family environments and advancing opportunities for social inclusion of these children and their families. A Theory of Change of key CWSEND -related UNICEF programme is presented in the Annex 1.

Since 2011 UNICEF has made financial investment in amount over $3 million in CWSEND programming. The key donor is the Government of Russian Federation with a funding in the amount of $2.2 million within UNICEF and the Ministry of Health (MoH) project for 2017-2020 “Prevention of child disability and social inclusion of children with disability and special needs”.

1. **Background of the project**

The overall objective of the project “Prevention of child disability and social inclusion of children with disability and special needs” is to foster equal access to quality family-centered health and rehabilitation services for children with disabilities and their families in rural and urban areas that in turn enable children with disabilities to fully enjoy their human rights of social inclusion and participation.

Financial contributions provided by the Government of Russian Federation and technical expertise provided by individual professionals and institutions of MoH, Ministry of Education (MoE), Ministry of Labour and Social Protection (MoLSP), NGOs (Help Children Together, RANO, BALAPDIMI) and UNICEF staff. The list of national implementing partners providing technical contribution is presented in Annex 2. Especially important has been the contribution from MoH professionals providing on-going scientific and methodological support. The MoH has demonstrated strong ownership of the project results as all newly established 28 interregional ECI centres are regulated and budgeted under a dedicated MOH Order (November 29, 2018).

The specific project objectives are as follows:

• Increase capacity to collect and analyze disaggregated data on the number of children identified during the early years and receiving services required to maximize their potential.

• Raise society’s awareness of child disability issues and foster greater knowledge among children and parents of their rights and how to exercise them.

• Promote accessible quality early childhood intervention (ECI) services for children with disabilities at the place of their residence.

• Establish system of system of safeguarding families with children born prematurely and families in need of support at the local level to prevent institutionalisation in early years.

Ministry of Health in Belarus and UNICEF agreed upon main strategies and programme interventions fostering the ECI system strengthening. Specifically, the following results were achieved in 2017-2019:

Within objective 1. Increase capacity to collect and analyze disaggregated data on the number of children identified during the early years and receiving services required to maximize their potential:

• Cutting-edge household survey on disability of children conducted over 12,000 households (exceeding 28,000 respondents), revealing critical issues of child functioning;

• Contribution to MICS 6 survey with the modules on child and adult functioning based on a module of the Washington Group on Disability;

• Development in partnership with Belstat, a national platform for reporting on the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG platform);

• Contribution to the development of the Child data-portal containing over 240 child indicators including special section on disability under health indicators domain;

• Providing technical expertise in developing the MOH order on the national system of quality monitoring of the provision of ECI services and track the statistical data on children under three years old using the ECI services.

Within objective 2. Raise society’s awareness of child disability issues and foster greater knowledge among children and parents of their rights and how to exercise them.

• Preparation and launch of the Disability campaign specifically identifying and targeting negative social norms towards the children with disabilities through the conducting of an informational and educational campaign on sigma and discrimination prevention.

• Developing a set of methodological and information materials for teachers on stigma and discrimination against children with disabilities.

Within objective 3. Promote accessible quality early childhood intervention (ECI) services for children with disabilities at the place of their residence:

* Establishment of 28 multidistrict ECI centres, regulated and budgeted under a MOH Order (November 29, 2018);
* Establishment of 7 ECI resource centers and supplied with office equipment;
* Development of the national ECI standards, quality monitoring indicators and manual on ECI service provision;
* Development of the national manual on Early identification and purchase of the screening scales and diagnostic materials for early child development followed by the training of specialists;
* Development of sustainable and on-going methodological support and training for all ECI specialists through in-service training programme for paediatricians and child neurologists;
* Training for professionals on TEACCH and ADOS to use this knowledge and skills for universal methods of ASDs early identification;
* Training of professional on early rehabilitation of children with low and extremely low birth weight;
* Provision of modern rehabilitation, play and didactical materials, and screening instruments to all 28 multi-district ECI centres with development of manual to guide specialists in use of new resources;
* Implementation of new home visiting training programme for medical professionals working with young children and focusing on identification for early childhood interventions, with more than 200 pediatricians and general practitioners from Minsk and Minsk Oblast participating in the planned national roll-out of the programme increase capacity of professionals and will allow them to move home visitation practice beyond regular sick-day visiting;
* Provision of specific recommendations for Belarus’ pre-school curriculum revisions regarding inclusive approaches which will be piloted in the 2019-2020 academic year;
* Integration of ICF principles into training programme for medical professionals.

Within objective 4. Establish system of system of safeguarding families with children born prematurely and families in need of support at the local level to prevent institutionalisation in early years:

• Families of born prematurely receive tailor made services of multidisciplinary ECI teams at the place of their residence to reduce the likelihood of lifelong sequelae;

• Three supporting exclusive and regular breastfeeding centers opened in Minsk and equipped;

• 130 specialists (neonatologists and paediatricians) trained in modern approaches in newborn care and family support.

In addition, UNICEF in Belarus continues investing in evidence generation. Currently the following studies are being launched: secondary data analysis of Disability Survey and ‘Study of needs and opportunities of girls and women with disabilities in the Republic of Belarus”. Besides, in 2020 in partnership with the MoH a multi-sectoral unified administrative database on CWSEND will be developed.

Gender focus of the project

UNICEF’s programming in ECI supports young girls and boys in reaching their full potential while also working to transform unequal gender relations at home, challenging “traditional” gender socialization processes. ECI services also improve the social position of fragile families and reduce divorces and separations in families with a child with disability. The involvement of both mothers and fathers in ECI programmes is widely promoted to address low fathers’ engagement in responsive caregiving and early development of their children.

The invisibility of women and girls with disabilities (WGD) perpetuates the situation with multiple and intersectorial forms of discrimination, were they are discriminated against on the basis of gender and / or disability or for other possible reasons related to unmet needs. Therefore, the planned study on girls and women with disabilities will help to establish a baseline and increase knowledge and awareness about the situation and rights of WGD. The study will be conducted in partnership with UNFPA and MOLSP.

Equity and HRBA focus of the project

The human rights-based approach (HRBA) was applied within the framework of the design, development and implementation of all project activities. Education activities were tailored to the needs and demands of the most vulnerable groups of children and implemented with the active engagement of parents. The round tables were organized with the participation of all stakeholders.

The project activities directly contributed to the realization of the children’s rights by the project beneficiaries. In particular, the training and roundtable participants were encouraged to exercise their right to express their views and to be heard (CRC Article 12 on Respect for the Views of the Child); the children with disabilities and their able-bodied peers participated together in the events and discussed their access to healthcare, education and employment (CRPD Article 7 - Children with disabilities) and such issues as barrier free environment (CRPD Article 9 - Accessibility).

Information on the project expenditures is available in Annex 3.

1. **Purpose of the Evaluation**

With the achieved results, the GoB (MoH, MoE and MoLSP) and UNICEF have agreed that the time is right to take stock of the results achieved to date within this major project. It will ensure UNICEF’s accountability for achieving results and will support planning for the new cycle of 2021-2025. The evaluation will inform the forward-looking national agenda and support monitoring of UNCRPD implementation (including through NAP review) as well as support planning of relevant state interventions for 2021-2025. A final evaluation of the project “Prevention of child disability and social inclusion of children with disability and special needs” is thus scheduled for 2020. The evaluation findings will support a large Multi Country Evaluation on Inclusion of Children with Disabilities in Europe and Central Asia Region (ECAR) managed by the UNICEF ECA regional office.

The purpose of the final evaluation is, in part, to provide a summary account of UNICEF’s results assessing whether the project has achieved or is likely to achieve its main objectives and the project’s performance against the evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.

The evaluation will provide accountability of UNICEF to its donor and partners as well as communities with respect to results that are measurable to-date. The evaluation will also be an important learning opportunity, deriving lessons from the experience and existing evidence and developing recommendations for UNICEF, the Donor, the Government and other project stakeholders and partners that would inform the subsequent scale up of good practices considering their sustainability for increasing contribution to sustainable results and further impact.

The specific objectives of this final project evaluation are to:

* Assess the project performance against the following evaluation criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability;
* Identify lessons learned and good practices supported by UNICEF, GoB and other partners within the project and make recommendations for interventions’ adjustments and/or scale up in the new 2021-2025 cycle of state programmes and UNICEF country programme;
* Assess the enabling environment and identify the bottlenecks in realization of rights of CWSEND and review NAP CRPD implementation to inform the 2nd UNCRPD monitoring report due in 2020.

All specific objectives of the evaluation should address child rights, gender and equity dimensions. The audience for evaluation findings and its intended use are described in the section six.

1. Scope of the evaluation

The project final evaluation will cover the whole duration of the project from its starting date up to the date of the evaluation (the period 2017-mid 2020). The major project results within all four project programmatic objectives should be covered, with a specific focus on child rights, gender and equity dimensions. The evaluation will cover the implementation and results of the project all seven regions of Belarus and 28 cities where ECI centers locate. The focus population (final beneficiaries) of the project under evaluation are 380,000 young children; 500,000 parents; 28 regional clusters and its local authorities; 15,000 young children with disabilities and developmental difficulties.

The NAP CRPD review will be conducted but will not constitute a part of the evaluation. Hence the evaluation criteria and requirements presented below do not apply for this specific review. The key NAP CRPD interventions for review will be defined in the inception report in consultation with UNICEF.

1. Evaluation Questions/Framework

The evaluation will respond to the following evaluation questions. These are not exhaustive and should be clarified at the start of the work when developing the evaluation framework:

* **Relevance:**
1. To what extent are the project’s models and approaches are aligned with and supportive of the international commitments under UNCRPD and the national priorities?
2. Were programmes and model services (ECI) design are aligned with the Convention on the Rights of the child principles? Did the project adopt gender mainstreaming and Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA) to programming? Did it pursue gender mainstreaming?
3. Does the national system of monitoring the provision of ECI services introduced by the MOH order provides sufficient disaggregated data to monitor family resilience and severe child disability and the system’s performance?
4. Were the most important barriers to realizing the rights of CWSEND addressed?
5. To what extent is the model to deliver ECI services relevant to the identified needs of CWSEND and their families and the barriers they face? Are the programme and interventions customized enough to address the needs of specific sub-groups of CWSEND by age, gender, type of disability, place of residence and other factors?
6. Were relevant partners involved in the programme design, implementation and evaluation, including CWSEND, their families and organisation of people with disabilities?
7. Was the project responsive to changing needs and circumstances of CWSEND? Was it adjusted through the course of its implementation?
* **Effectiveness:**
1. To what extent have the project results and objectives been realized?
2. Have the project activities contributed to eliminating bottlenecks in ensuring effective inclusion of CWSEND?
3. Are the models and approaches to delivery address the actual needs of children with disabilities and their families and reduce/eliminate barriers they face? Are the needs of different groups (based on age, gender, socio-economic profile, urban-rural residence, and type of disability) properly addressed?
4. What factors (e.g. political, social, gender and cultural, social norms, systemic, or related to the programme and service design and implementation, professional practices) influenced the project effectiveness?
5. How effective were the capacity building activities? At which levels (national/municipal/local)? What is the evidence that the knowledge/skills acquired are used by the beneficiaries?
6. Was the inter-sectoral cooperation between the key project partners effective? Did it contribute to planned results?
7. What is UNICEF comparative advantage and the synergies with other actors, programmes and interventions? What synergies have been created (including with private sector)?
* **Efficiency:**
1. Did the GoB and UNICEF allocate sufficient resources to achieve project objectives?
2. Have UNICEF and government programme budgets and resources (human, financial and technical) been properly used to address priority bottlenecks? Could the same programme results be achieved with less resources (economic and technical efficiency)?
3. What strategies did UNICEF use to improve efficiency of its project operations?
4. Are ECI services developed and supported by UNICEF efficient and affordable for governments to sustain and scale up? How significant are estimated efficiency gains from budget allocation to fully fund ECI system?
5. Were the programmes implemented according to initial timeline? Were there any delays in implementation and what were the reasons for that?
6. Was the project implementation appropriately monitored and evaluated? How were the results of monitoring and evaluation used? Was the project reviewed/adjusted over the course of its implementation?
* **Sustainability:**
1. What are the strategies used by the project to promote sustainability of its interventions?
2. Are legal, institutional and financial mechanisms established to ensure sustainability of programme results (policies, strategies services)? Are conditions established to ensure continuity in quality of services (service standards, training, supervision mechanisms, etc.)?
3. What is the extent of the central and local Government commitment to support and scale up the Project interventions?
4. What are the key factors that can positively or negatively influence the long-term programmatic and financial sustainability of the key project results, including ECI services established?

Was scaling up options of good models considered in the programme design and which of those are incorporated into national policies and/or systems and are viable? How feasible is the ECI services scale up?

1. Has the participation and/or support of other partners enhanced project sustainability?
2. Which lessons learned have external validity?

**Forward looking analysis**. Relying on findings, lessons learned and recommendations of the project evaluation, the consultants will be asked to answer the following questions:

1. Would the development of legislation on comprehensive system of early identification, intervention and assistance to young children from birth until school entry be relevant to CWSEND population in Belarus?
2. What are the main barriers to CWSEND rights realization in Belarus?
3. What are the main legislative and policy changes that should be made to address these gaps and promote rights of CWSEND?
4. What are the main capacity building and programmatic interventions that should be made to address these gaps and promote rights of CWSEND?
5. What should be the UNICEF priorities in supporting inclusion of CWSEND and reducing stigma against them?

Since the final evaluation takes place while the project is not fully completed it is challenging to assess the full scope of the project’s impacts. Thus, evaluation questions do not address impact as an evaluation criterion.

Evaluation questions will be refined by the evaluation team on the basis of the evaluability assessment during in consultation with the Reference Group comprised of the project’s partners and stakeholders. The final questions, when answered, will have the greatest potential to be used for future programming, strategies and policies by the evaluation’s intended users.

1. Expected audience, dissemination and uses

The evaluation will provide UNICEF accountability to its donor and partners as well as communities with respect to results that are measurable. The evaluation will also be an important learning opportunity, deriving lessons from the experience and existing evidence that would inform the subsequent scale up of identified good practices budgeted within the new 2021-2025 cycle of state programmes. Ultimately, the evaluation results will inform the necessary adjustments in government policies and programs and UNICEF programming helping to reinforce realization of the rights of CWSEND and achieve international obligations under the UNCRPD. As a result, GoB and partners will be more effective in their responses aimed at reducing deprivations and equity gaps through strengthening integrated assistance and services for CWSEND and their families.

The main audiences for the evaluation are:

(1) National level (line ministries) to influence state policy and programme responses informing decision-making on policies and inform GoB’s report on UNCRPD due in 2020. The findings and the lessons learned will be used for advocacy and policy advice with authorities to ensure that policies include an adequate focus on CWSEND in health, education and social protection and are incorporated in the state programmes for 2021-2025.

(2) Local level authorities and CSOs partners to inform their work on strengthening social care services provided to families with CWSEND and improve coordination of service provision at local level. The evaluation results will also be used to mobilize resources from the national and local budgets.

(3) Private companies and donors for leveraging funds to ensure the sustainability of current ECI and other interventions at the local level and its further scaling up.

(4) Parliamentarians to inform development of legislation, including the Code on Education, law “On Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Integration”, law “On Health system” as well as monitor the country’s progress toward national goals, SDGs and international commitments as guided by the CRC, CRPD and other international documents, such as the UN Guidelines on Alternative Care.

(5) Professionals to enhance their knowledge in the areas of effective social services, EI and ECI practices and their potential impact in Belarus.

The evaluation will also provide opportunities for the CO knowledge mobilization and dissemination with other UNICEF offices and with the Evaluation Team for Multi Country Evaluation on Inclusion of Children with Disabilities in Europe and Central Asia Region.

The results of the evaluation will be validated internally with the donor, government partners and key stakeholders through the ERG. The evaluation report will be placed in the public domain – together with a management response to follow up on recommendations. The evaluation brief will be publicly available and widely disseminated among the key audiences.

1. Methodology and Technical Approach

The evaluative framework will be based on the reconstruction of the project’s Theory of Change (ToC)based on the existing ToC of CWSEND programme provided in the Annex 1. The preliminary **evaluability assessment** will be carried out by the team leader. The gaps will be identified, and the evaluation methodology may be adjusted to address them. As one of project’s goals was to improve availability and quality of disaggregated data, it is expected that the evaluation will rely on reliable disaggregated data. The project supported nation-wide Disability Survey (2018) and MICS6 (2019) with a Child Functioning module. These sources of survey disaggregated data will allow Evaluation Team to assess reliability of disaggregated administrative data collected through the national system of monitoring the provision of ECI services introduced by the MOH order in 2019.

At the initial stage the team leader is expected to prepare a **Desk Review** of all relevant UNICEF project documents, donor reports, financial data, researches and studies generated within the project and from other sources, NAP CRPD and other government strategies and policy documents, primary and secondary data reports and perform initial validation of resources and final definition of the scope for the evaluation. It is expected that a Desk Review will identify additional sources of secondary data as well specific methodological difficulties that may be encountered through the evaluation process. The desk review may uncover sources of usable secondary data, thus lessening the need to collect primary data.

Based on the desk review, the Team Leader will develop the Inception Report, with evaluation matrix, a recommended methodological approach to this assignment, including data collection instruments.

The evaluation design will be non-experimental and include such core data collection instruments as a desk review, reconstruction of the project’s ToC, semi-structured interviews with beneficiaries (children and their parents) and national and international partners advancing rights of CWSEND in Belarus, round tables with parents and national partners and observations of project activities. The Team Leader will exercise his/her professional judgement to determine if additional evaluation tools should be used to meet the ToRs requirements.

The Inception Report will include also the sampling methods for selecting interviewees’ and participants in round tables and project sites for visits. The sampling methods should ensure balanced geographic coverage, gender and urban/rural balance, and representation of various disabilities sub-groups.

The methodology that will be used by the evaluators should be presented in the inception report and the Final Report in detail. The methodology must be agreed upon between UNICEF, the evaluators and project partners, with consultation of Government counterparts and the donor, prior to the start of the evaluation. It should:

* Employ relevant internationally agreed evaluation criteria including those of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability, giving special consideration to gender and equity dimensions;
* Use applicable international and corporate norms and standards for evaluation;
* Demonstrate impartiality and lack of biases by relying on a cross-section of information sources (e.g. stakeholder groups, including beneficiaries, etc.) and using mixed methods (e.g. quantitative, qualitative, participatory) to ensure triangulation of information through a variety of means. Participatory methods will be emphasized with CWSEND, parents and all partners, including the CO. The selection of field visit sites will need to demonstrate impartiality;
* Based on the CWSEND programme ToC reconstruct the project’s ToC to enable the development of targeted and focused evaluation questions;
* Be geared towards addressing the key evaluation questions considering the evaluability challenges, the budget and timing constraints;
* Be based on an analysis of the logic model of the operation and on a thorough stakeholder analysis;
* Using mixed methods and appropriate sampling ensure that women, girls, men and boys from different stakeholder groups, including the most marginalised, participate and that their voices are heard and considered;
* Be synthesized in an evaluation matrix, which should be used as the key organizing tool for the evaluation.

The Evaluation team will be expected to follow the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children. Based on the "Criteria for Ethical Review Checklist" as the interviews and focus groups will involve children protocols for the protection of human subjects such as written protocols to ensure human subjects’ safety and identities, protection of data protocols and consent forms and other relevant instruments will be reviewed and approved by the ethics board. The official ethical approvals will be received using the regional IRB LTA holder.

To facilitate the evaluation process, UNICEF will ensure that government and other counterparts are consulted throughout the process. The CO will assist with the organization of meetings with the relevant government authorities, development partners, institutions, key stakeholders and beneficiaries. UNICEF will be responsible for preparing and coordinating the full agenda of the evaluation in consultation and based on recommendations/request from the TL and relevant national and international stakeholders.

The CO will support the establishment of an Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) comprising key stakeholders to the evaluation (UNICEF, Russian Federation Embassy, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Labour and Social Protection, Representatives of NGOs) who will have the role to review and provide feedback in the course of the implementation of the evaluation and its specific outputs. The objective of the ERG is to support a credible, transparent, impartial and quality evaluation process in through reviewing evaluation deliverables.

The following limitations to the project evaluation are anticipated:

1. Since MOH order on the national system of quality monitoring of the provision of ECI services is launched in 2019 not all ECI centers could be able to provide data to Evaluation Team by the same time;
2. Staff turnover in the involved partner institutions during the implementation of the project may lead to lose of relevant information.
3. Multisectorality of the project interventions for CWSEND requires complex sectoral validation of findings.

To address the first two limitations, the evaluation team may use information provided by representative sample of ECI centers and adjust the evaluation instruments as necessary. The risks associated with project multisectorality will be addressed through ensuring a multidisciplinary composition of the ERG and evaluation team with experienced national consultant able to comprehensively assess the interventions across sectors.

The evaluation team will identify additional limitations that may hinder an impartial evaluation process and will develop the appropriate mitigation strategies.

The evaluation should follow UN Evaluation Group Norms and Standards – including ensuring that the planned evaluation fully addresses any ethical issues. The consultants should also adhere to UNICEF’s Evaluation Policy, to UNEG’s ethical guidelines for UN evaluations, UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation, Data Collection and Analysis, and to UNICEF Reporting Standards. The structure of the evaluation report should follow the UNICEF-adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards and the GEROS Quality Assessment System described in the UNICEF GEROS Handbook (https://www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/index\_GEROS.html). Evaluation team members will sign a no conflict of interest attestation.

UNICEF relies on an external company who reviews TORs, Inception Reports and Final Reports using a quality matrix based on UNEG Standards. The evaluation report will not be cleared by UNICEF until the report is assessed as “green” or satisfactory by the external facility.

The Evaluation Team members are required to clearly identify any potential ethical issues and approaches, as well as the processes for ethical review and oversight of the evaluation process and take the primary responsibility for the Quality Assurance process, ensuring a rigorous process of data collection, analysis and synthesis to minimise errors. The process of on-going triangulation and verification, validation of the evaluation design and its instruments during two in-country mission will help to ensure this.

1. Expected Deliverables, Timeframe and Reporting requirements

The Team Leader will report to the UNICEF M&E Specialist and be the main focal point within the evaluation team for all communications. Once the documents are prepared and delivered, UNICEF shall hold the Intellectual property right of the documents and the related materials.

**Evaluation main deliverables and deadlines**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverables by evaluation phases** | **Completion dates** | **# of days****Team Leader** | **# of days per Team Member** |
| Inception  |  |  |  |
| Introductory skype call with TL organized by the UNICEF Belarus M&E Specialist.  | 1 week after signing the contracts (beginning of the Inception Phase) | 1 | 1 |
| Preliminary desk review including of NAP CRPD. The review of NAP CRPD implementation (10 pages excluding annexes) should be structured following NAP CRPD sections and address child rights, gender and equity dimensions | 5 weeks after the beginning of the Inception Phase | 5 | 10 |
| **Preparation of the Inception Report** (30 pages excluding annexes), including the **Desk Review**, outlining the main evaluation issues that will be addressed, the relevant evaluation questions and the proposed and final methodology, data collection and analytical tools that has been agreed upon between UNICEF Belarus before the evaluation is set to begin.  | 10-12 weeks after the beginning of the Inception Phase | 10 | 10 |
| Implementation |  |  |  |
| Fieldwork in BelarusEnd of the first in-country mission Debriefing | 12-14 weeks after the beginning of the Inception Phase | 12 | 12 |
| Analysis and Reporting |  |  |  |
| Data analysis and processing | 12-22 weeks after the beginning of the Inception Phase | 5 | 15 |
| Preparation and submission of draft evaluation report with an Executive Summary (40-50 pages excluding executive summary and annexes) | 22-26 weeks after the beginning of the Inception Phase | 16 | 16 |
| Presentation by TL of final draft report in Belarus and discussion/validation meeting during the second in-country mission | 30-32 weeks after the beginning of the Inception Phase | 4 | 4 |
| Submission of the final report and Evaluation Brief by TL | 1-2 weeks after the validation meeting | 4 | 4 |
| Preparation of Management Response and Dissemination of the report and Evaluation Brief | 1-5 weeks after the approval of the final report. | 3 | 3 |
| Total |  | 60 | 75 |

**The Inception Report (IR)**, including the **Desk Review** should outline the main evaluation issues that will be addressed, the relevant evaluation questions and the proposed and final methodology that has been agreed upon between UNICEF before the evaluation is set to begin. The IR will be reviewed by the Evaluation Reference Group. The draft IR will be subject to an external quality review.

**Draft Evaluation Report with an Executive Summary** will be shared with ERG to ensure that the evaluation meets UNICEF expectations as stipulated in the Evaluation Terms of Reference. The draft report will be subject to an external quality assurance review.

**Power point presentation** should aim to communicate the main findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation. It is anticipated that the Team Leader will present the final report at a date to be agreed between UNICEF and the consultant.

Report writing, terminology, publication and citation guidelines of UNICEF should be followed. Necessary guidelines will be provided by UNICEF. All documents produced should be child-sensitive, and in line with the Convention on the Rights of the Child and other legal documents on human rights. All deliverables will be submitted in English, the content of which should be well structured, coherent and evidence-based.

Interaction and debriefing will take place at various points e.g.: with UNICEF at the end of the field mission; and if desired, through a face-to-face or remote presentation (video conferencing) once the final draft report has been drafted. Further interactions will be conducted as deemed necessary throughout the evaluation period.

Draft deliverables should be submitted in Word format, with final deliverables delivered in both word and pdf. All objects/graphics in the ER must be editable to allow for eventual translation and/or reformatting. Presentations may use PowerPoint or other formats, as appropriate.

1. **Location, Duration and Budget**

The evaluation will take place over a period of mid-December 2019 - August 2020 and will be remunerated against the deliverables to be indicated in the TOR.

International Team leader will be home based with travels to Belarus. National consultants will only be required to do in-country travels, if need be.

Proposed Workplan

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | ACTIVITY | 2019 | 2020 |
| 12 | 01 | 02 | 03 | 04 | 05 | 06 | 07 | 08 |
| 1 | Evaluation Team identified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Evaluation Team contracted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Evaluation Reference Group established |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Draft and Final Inception report produced |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Ethical review and quality assurance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Evaluation design and instruments validated during first in-country mission |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Data gathered and analysed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Draft evaluation report submitted end reviewed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Presentation and validation of Findings and Conclusions during second in-country mission |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10  | Final report and Evaluation brief submitted  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Estimated Cost

Estimated cost of the evaluation is USD 50,000.

Travel Requirements for the Assignment

The Evaluation team will be required to complete two country missions. The total duration of the first country mission should be 12 working days. Second country mission aimed at presenting and validating the findings and lessons learned should be of two days duration.

1. **Required qualifications and areas of expertise**

The evaluation will have to be conducted by a team comprising a sufficient number of qualifying international and national evaluators covering the below requirements:

* International Team Leader with documented extensive experience (at least 8 full years) in conducting complex development evaluations (having conducted evaluations for UNICEF is an asset, having evaluations positively rated by UNICEF’s quality assurance system is an additional asset);
* National Evaluation Team Member(s) with documented experience (at least 5 full years) in conducting development evaluations (having conducted evaluations or assessments for UN in area of disability is an asset);
* At least one team member with professional experience in area of inclusion of CWSEND;
* At least one team member with proven experience in quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis;
* All team members with experience of working in developing countries, at least one team member with experience in Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) (previous work in Belarus is an asset);
* At least one team member with solid knowledge on child rights, HRBA and gender equality;
* Excellent report writing skills in English;
* Good communication skills;
* Fluency in English, fluency in Russian and/or Belarusian is an asset.

The team may be an international institution or a group of international evaluators and it may be complemented by one or more national consultants for support in translation, organization of the in country agenda, review of NAP CRPD and interpretation of findings from a country-specific stand point if needed.

The team is responsible to ensure that the process is in line with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Ethical Guidelines (http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ETHICAL+GUIDELINES). The evaluator(s) should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relationships with all stakeholders. Furthermore, they should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual information. All participants should be informed of the context and purpose of the evaluation, as well as of the confidentiality of the information shared.

1. Roles and responsibilities

Roles and responsibilities for all team members

* All team members are requested to refer attentively to the documentation made available in the evaluation shared folder, including the ToR, context information and information on and preparatory analysis of UNICEF’s interventions.
* All team members are requested to familiarize themselves with UNICEF’s global normative products in the substantive areas for which they are responsible. These are available on the UNICEF website [www.unicef.org](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5CEri%5CDocuments%5C2016%20Ukraine%20Evaluation%5CAdmin%5CTORs%5CTL%20TOR%5Cwww.unicef.org).
* Complementary to the evaluation ToR, the evaluation team leader will prepare a number of orienting documents and tools (including an evaluation matrix) in discussion with the evaluation team. These documents should be read by all team members and will be used as a framework for guiding the questions to be asked and data to be gathered during the evaluation.
* All team members will contribute to concise written reports a) at the end of the desk review phase and prior to the start of the field mission (3-5 pages), b) at the end of the field work as contribution to the preliminary debriefing session, and c) for the draft evaluation report (10-15 pages). Team members will also contribute to the revision of the final draft evaluation report, reviewing the report in its entirety and making suggestions.
* The Inception Report will identify an initial list of the key stakeholders to be met by the Evaluation team; nevertheless, team members should feel free to contact and interview additional stakeholders and informants, within available resources and time. The detailed plan of meetings and agenda will be finalized at the beginning of the mission.
* At the end of the evaluation process, all team members will be asked to fill in a questionnaire aimed at the improvement of the management of future evaluations in UNICEF.

Roles and responsibilities for Team Leader

The Team Leader (TL) has the overall responsibility for evaluating the project looking at the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of key project interventions. Specifically, the tasks of the TL include:

* Conduct a thorough desk review of existing information on the context, NAP CRPD, national policies and priorities and UNICEF’s work, including all relevant programme and project documents and reports, previous studies, research and evaluations
* Develop and provide detailed methodological guidance for the team and coaching them in the tools and approach to be used for data gathering and analysis. The guidance will be shaped by UNICEF’s Monitoring Results for Equity Systems framework and inquiries into UNICEF performance organized around core roles;
* Facilitate meetings/interviews with national counterparts and development partners;
* Provide guidance in preparing Evaluation deliverables;
* Follow the methodology described in the ToR, prepare check-lists as appropriate and consult with the Team Members as necessary on methodological issues;
* Coordinate with the Evaluation team to consolidate inputs from Evaluation team and ensure
timely delivery of Evaluation products;
* Manage the evaluation work plan, respecting deadlines for specific activities and inputs described in the work plan;
* Maintain a high level of communication with the other team members;
* Review all relevant documentation related to the UNICEF support in Belarus, including inter alia secondary information available in-country such as statistics, studies and surveys related to children and programmatic areas as well as project documents and progress reports, baseline studies, other technical reports, etc;
* Take part in two evaluation mission to Belarus in contributing specifically to information collection and analysis of UNICEF Belarus’s programmes and interventions in targeting adolescents;
* Conduct interviews with a range of key stakeholders and informants;
* Visit accessible field programmes sites and interview field staff and ultimate beneficiaries, as appropriate and feasible;
* Assess UNICEF’s work and comparative advantage in the context of existing policies, plans and emerging issues;
* Contribute to the team’s analysis and discussion of evaluation questions and issues common to the whole team;
* Lead the consolidation of the teams inputs for the debriefing session(s) and in the presentation of the draft findings to stakeholders prior to departure from Belarus;
* Submit the Inception Report upon completion of the Desk Review, the mission (field visit) an aide memoire upon completion of the Field Mission, the Draft and Final reports, and the power point presentation on the main findings and recommendations emerging from the evaluation.

Evaluation Manager

* Support the drafting of ToR (with support from the RO).
* Recruiting Evaluation team/company.
* Organizing evaluation missions and meetings.
* Establishing a DropBox with a well-organized library of materials for the Evaluation team.
* Managing the field work phase.
* Ensuring external quality assurance reviews are undertaken.
* Submission of final draft report to the Representative for approval.
* Facilitating the preparation of a management response.
* Uploading evaluation report IESI and tracking implementation of recommendations.
* Ensuring wide dissemination and discussion of the evaluation.
1. Process of application

Proposal from candidates should include:

Cover letter indicating a position (Team Leader or Team Member), CV and P11 UNICEF Form should be provided. The consultant is to indicate their daily fee for the services to be provided. The fees payable to a consultant shall follow the “best value for money” principle, i.e., achieving the desired outcome at the lowest possible fee.

Criteria for the selection of proposals: Selection of the consultant will be on competitive basis.

Applicants should submit their applications in English through UNICEF in Belarus web page <https://www.unicef.by/rabota-s-nami/vakansii/> and <https://www.unicef.org/about/employ/?job> by closing date specified to be eligible for consideration.

Applications received after the closing date will not be considered. Only short-listed candidates will be contacted.

1. Administrative issues

The bidders are requested to provide an all-inclusive cost in the financial proposal. In all cost implications bidders, should factor the cost of the required service/assignment. Estimated cost for travel should be included in the financial proposal. Travel cost shall be calculated based on economy class travel, regardless of the length of travel. Costs for accommodation, meals and incidentals shall not exceed applicable daily subsistence allowance (DSA) rates, as promulgated by the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC). Unexpected travels shall also be treated as above.

1. Management of the Evaluation

The evaluation will be managed by the UNICEF Belarus Office as an independent evaluation under the leadership and technical guidance of the M&E Specialist. Support and QA will be provided from the ECA Regional Office. They will have the responsibility of overseeing the evaluation as well as ensuring it adheres to UNICEF standards and is of good quality. The day to day administrative arrangements will be the responsibility of the Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist.

Representatives of partners involved in the planning and delivery of programmes in support of integration of children with disabilities will be involved in designing the evaluation and will participate in elaboration of recommendations through active contribution during debriefing meetings and by providing feedback to the draft Inception and Final Reports.

1. Payment Schedule

Taking into account the tasks and timeframe mentioned above, fees will be paid in three instalments after submission of deliverables and upon approval by the supervisor, as follows:

* 30% of the contract total will be released upon acceptance by UNICEF of the inception report;
* 30% of the contract total will be paid after approval by UNICEF of the draft report;
* 40% of the contract will be paid after submission and approval by UNICEF of final evaluation report and all requested deliverables.

Inception report and final evaluation report will be considered final after satisfactory review by the external review facility and the approval of the Reference Group.

**Nature of Penalty Clause in Contract**

UNICEF reserves the right to withhold all or a portion of payment if performance is unsatisfactory, if work/outputs is incomplete, not delivered or for failure to meet deadlines (fees reduced due to late submission: 20 days - 10%; 1 month -20%; 2 months -30%; more 2 months – payment withhold). All materials developed will remain the copyright of UNICEF and UNICEF will be free to reference them and use in its publications.

**Annexes**

Annex 1 UNICEF in Belarus Theory of Change on Realizing the rights of children with special educational needs and disabilities
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**ToR developed by:**

Uladzimir Valetka,

Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Date\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ToR approved by:**

Dr. Rashed Mustafa Sarwar,

UNICEF Representative \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Date\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Annex 1. UNICEF in Belarus Theory of Change on Realizing the rights of children with special educational needs and disabilities



Annex 2. List of key project partners

* State Institution "Republican Scientific and Practical Center “Mother and Child" of the Ministry of Health of the Republic of Belarus;
* State Institution "Republican Scientific and Practical Center for Medical Examination and Rehabilitation" of the Ministry of Health of the Republic of Belarus;
* State Educational Establishment "Belarusian Medical Academy of Postgraduate Education"
* State Institution "Brest Regional Center for Medical Rehabilitation of Children with Psychoneurological Diseases "Tonus";
* Healthcare Institution "Minsk City Center for Medical Rehabilitation of Children with Psychoneurological Diseases";
* Interregional Early Intervention Center of the Health Care Institution 19th City Children's Polyclinic.

Annex 3. Project expenditures in 2017-2019

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of activity** | **Total programmable amount** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Expenditures in 2017** | **Expenditures in 2018** | **Expenditures in 2019** | **Cumulative expenditures** | **Funding balance** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Supplies & Equipment | 381417.99 | 0 | 174224.64 | 234 700.75 | 408925.39 | 0 |
| Personnel (consultants, travel) | 549350 | 12356.41 | 85645.74 | 408 130.34 | 506132.49 | 43217.51 |
| Training of counterparts | 492050 | 8677.25 | 306103.1 | 137 681.28 | 452461.63 | 39588.37 |
| Information and communication materials | 586550 | 0 | 78054.55 | 44119.65 | 122174.2 | 464375.8 |
| Operational expenses (miscellaneous services & supplies) | 235632 | 37575.98 | 70760.73 | 48 969.57 | 156656.05 | 78975.95 |
|
| ***Total Direct cost*** | ***2244999.99*** | **58609.64** | **714788.76** | **873601.59** | **1646349.76** | **598650.23** |

**Annex 4. Relevant information resources for the project evaluation**

1. Law of the Republic of Belarus “On Governmental Allowances for Families Rearing Children”;

2. Law of the Republic of Belarus “On Social Services”;

3. Edict of the President of the Republic of Belarus dated 19.01.2012 no. 41 “On Public Targeted Social Support”;

4. The State Programme “Health of the People and Demographic Security of the Republic of Belarus for 2016-2020”, approved by Resolution of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Belarus dated 14.03.2016 no. 200;

5. The State Programme “Education and Youth Policy” for 2016–2020, approved by Resolution of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Belarus dated 28.03.2016 no. 250;

6. The National Action Plan for Implementation in the Republic of Belarus of the Provisions of the Convention on the Rights of the Persons with Disabilities for 2017-2025, approved by Resolution of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Belarus dated 13.06.2017 no. 451;

7. The National Action Plan for Improving the Status of Children and Protecting Their Rights for 2017-2021, approved by Resolution of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Belarus dated 22 September 2017, no. 710;

8. Resolution of the Ministry of Health of the Republic of Belarus dated 12.08.2016 no. 96 “On Approving the Instructions on the Procedure of Screening”;

9. Belarus Progress Report “Prevention of child disability and social inclusion of children with disabilities and special needs in the Republic of Belarus”, 2017;

10. Belarus Progress Report “Prevention of child disability and social inclusion of children with disabilities and special needs in the Republic of Belarus”, 2018;

11. Belarus Progress Report “Prevention of child disability and social inclusion of children with disabilities and special needs in the Republic of Belarus”, 2019;

12. Disability Survey - Household survey for a comprehensive assessment of the situation of persons with disabilities in Belarus, 2018, http://www.belstat.gov.by/ofitsialnaya-statistika/makroekonomika-i-okruzhayushchaya-sreda/gendernaya-statistika-i-statistika-otdelnykh-grupp-naseleniya/statistika-otdelnykh-grupp-naseleniya/vyborochnoe-obsledovanie-domashnikh-khozyaystv-v-tselyakh-kompleksnoy-otsenki-polozheniya-lits-s-ogr/

13. Launch of disability campaign https://www.unicef.by/press-centr/274.html

14. Annual work plans for project result areas with the project indicators;

15. Draft law “On Rights of Persons with Disabilities and their Social Integration”;

16. MICS6 (2019) data, including from a Child Functioning module;

17. Indicators based on administrative data collected through the national system of monitoring the provision of ECI services (introduced by the MOH order in 2019).