**Terms of Reference for Individual Contract**

**Title:** Evaluation of capacity development and its impact on institutionalization of emergency preparedness and response (EPR) and Conflict/Disaster Risk Reduction (C/DRR) in the education sector in the West and Central Africa region (WCAR).

**Position**: Individual Contract

**Location**: Involves travel to the West and Central Africa Regional Office (WCARO), Dakar and to up to 6 countries in West and Central Africa

**Duration**: 01 November 2011 to 29 February 2012 (consultants will work equivalent to 3 months within this time period)

**Start date**: 01 November 2011

**Reporting to**: Education Specialist(s)/Emergencies

Introduction

The UNICEF West and Central Africa Regional Office (WCARO) is looking for technical expertise from individual consultants to conduct a multi-country evaluation study of its emergency preparedness and response (EPR) and conflict/disaster risk reduction (C/DRR) capacity development and institutionalization efforts in the education sector.

Ateam of two consultants will be required to undertake the work in up to 6 countries that have agreed to take part in this exercise. This is, therefore, an invitation to individual consultants with adequate expertise and capacities in evaluation, particularly of capacity development initiatives in EPR and C/DRR, to submit applications to conduct this evaluation study between November 2011 to end of February 2012. Consultants will work the equivalent of 3 working months during this time period.

Background

The UNICEF West and Central Africa Regional Office (WCARO) based in Dakar (Senegal) covers 24 countries: Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroun, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Democratic Republic of Congo, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guinea-Equatorial, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Sao Tome & Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo.

The West and Central Africa region is becoming increasingly vulnerable to disasters triggered by both natural and man-made hazards: Floods, droughts, storms, environmental degradation, diseases such as HIV and AIDS, meningitis, cholera, malaria, as well as conflict, political instability, poverty, food and livelihood insecurity.

In 2009, as part of the Education in Emergencies and Post-crisis Transition Programme (EEPCT) funded by the Government of the Netherlands and the European Commission, UNICEF WCARO launched a strategy for national capacity development in partnership with Save the Children under the aegis of the IASC Education Cluster. The objective was to build and strengthen sustainable national emergency preparedness and response (EPR) capacity in the education sector in WCAR holistically and strategically, by supporting national authorities at all levels as well as enhancing capacity of NGO and UN staff.

Since June 2009, over 1,300 people have participated in capacity development trainings at regional, national and sub-national levels with the majority of participants coming from government partners (mainly Ministry of Education, national and sub-national levels).The remaining participants included representatives of local and international NGOs, community-based organizations, and UN agencies.

A first step in WCARO’s capacity development initiative was the training of *frontline responders* from Ministries of Education and other authorities from national and sub-national levels, and other key education actors. A training package was developed which centers on practical and technical components of education in emergencies, including contingency planning and preparedness processes, to mitigate the impact of disasters on schools and learners. A key focus on disaster risk reduction (DRR) in countries and localities experiencing recurrent emergencies such as floods, and drought has also been incorporated.

Two regional training of trainers (ToT) workshops were held in Dakar and Accra in June-July 2009. Country teams comprising Ministry of Education (MoE), UNICEF and NGO staff from 20 out of 24 WCAR countries have since been rolling-out the initiative at national and decentralized levels within their countries to different degrees (see table in Annex to review activities undertaken in the various countries). National and sub-national capacity development workshops incorporate the WCAR training package adapted to local contexts and needs. Through a detailed planning process, training materials were contextualized according to the target audiences and specific objectives and workshop outputs were determined. In addition, UNICEF WCARO facilitated the participation of Education actors (MoE, UNICEF and NGO) from 14 countries in global, regional or in-country cluster coordinator trainings. Furthermore, two Regional Needs Assessment Training Workshops for Franco- and Anglophone countries, targeting NGOs and UNICEF staff working in the field of Education in Emergencies have taken place during the months of August/September this year. Noteworthy is also the extended support given to Ivory Coast, Chad and Burkina Faso in their efforts to institutionalize C/DRR through inclusion into their Education Sector Plans. Countries participating in capacity development activities have benefited from in-country and/or long-distance support from UNICEF WCARO since 2009.

The Education in Emergencies and Post-crisis Transition Programme (EEPCT) four goals are:

***Designated Goal 1***– Improved quality of education response in emergencies and post-crisis transition countries;

***Designated Goal 2***– Increased resilience of education sector service delivery in chronic crises, arrested development and deteriorating contexts;

***Designated Goal 3***– Increased education sector contribution to better Prediction, Prevention and Preparedness for emergencies due to natural disasters and conflict;

***Designated Goal 4***– Evidence-based policies, efficient operational strategies and fit-for-purpose financing instruments for education in emergencies and post-crisis situations.

The proposed evaluation study is expected to analyze how the various capacity development interventions have contributed to Goal 3 and will contribute to building a solid evidence base upon which to guide future capacity development and institutionalization efforts in accordance with Goal 4. In terms of a results hierarchy Goals 3 and 4 are seen as contributing to Goals 1 and 2.

This study is expected to be a key advocacy and fund-raising tool at a time when Dutch funding for education in emergencies is likely to significantly reduce, but also at a time when other donors are increasingly interested in ensuring more stability in countries, not least in fragile states, linked to growing commitments to supporting climate change mitigation strategies and peace and conflict resolution.

The proposed study is in line with UNICEF global priorities and also contributes to the implementation of the Education Cluster Strategic Plan 2011-2013 and Annual Work Plan 2011 Outcome 1: *Education Cluster and national actors have appropriate technical capacities*.

It will play a key role in establishing a baseline and robust monitoring and evaluation framework for future interventions in the area of EPR and DRR.

**Challenges** that are likely to affect the study include:

* Absence of a baseline: Baseline data were not collected before the start of the capacity development/institutionalization strategy, but are now essential to identify the gaps and ensure that strategic responses are developed;
* Lack of reports/documentation
* Difficulty to qualitatively assess the level of EPR/DRR institutionalization, preparedness and resilience;
* Availability of key MoE Officials;
* Staff turnover in UNICEF, NGO and other partners including Ministries;
* Country Offices evaluation fatigue after a number of previous M&E exercises;
* Country Offices capacity to have effectively implemented elaborated action plans
* Short time scale required for the completion of the study.

Scope and Focus

The study will look at both individual and institutional capacity development bearing in mind that as a result of the workshops and other capacity development activities, participants representing the national and decentralized levels were expected to have learned the following competencies/be able to perform the following tasks:

1. Be aware of and learn the key technical components, approaches and quality standards of effective emergency *response* in education through interactive and participatory approaches, from conducting rapid assessments and establishing temporary learning spaces to developing emergency education curricula and devising psychosocial support strategies;
2. Have the knowledge and skills to apply these technical components for strengthened *preparedness* at national and decentralized levels. Participants develop action plans for capacity development activities for improved preparedness and disaster risk reduction in the most emergency-prone localities;
3. Indicate priority advocacy and policy action to inform national education sector policy, planning and budgeting for strengthened preparedness, response and risk reduction so that education in emergencies is addressed in a more systematic and sustainable manner;
4. Map capacity of education actors at national and local levels for emergency education and identify roles and responsibilities for effective coordination through new or existing mechanisms including education clusters;
5. Initiate the process of contingency planning for the education sector at local levels in coordination with the relevant disaster management authorities;
6. Plan for the roll-out of further capacity development at local levels, as required.

The capacity development strategy adopted addresses both emergency *preparedness* and *response* (EPR) by improving UNICEF and its partners’ capacities to respond, but also by mitigating the damage resulting from future crises through the *institutionalization* of emergency preparedness and disaster risk reduction (DRR) in the education sector’s policy and planning. EPR and DRR institutionalization - meaning the vertical (centralized/decentralized) but also horizontal (all MoE’s departments/sections) mainstreaming of emergency awareness throughout the MoE’s structure, policy and planning and its linkage with overall disaster management structures - was suggested as the best strategy to ensure the overall capacity development intervention was effective and sustainable. For emergency preparedness and DRR to become embedded in ministries’ actions at all levels, a multi-step approach is required. This involves sensitization, awareness raising, mentality change, training, institutionalization (roles, responsibilities, structures, etc.), behavioral change and ultimately emergency risk informed programming. Key indicators of impact of the above should be reflected in: MoE contingency planning; integration of EPR/DRR into education sector policy, plans and budgets curricula, EMIS, Medium-Term Expenditure Frameworks at national and district levels, school and community plans; MoE participation in national disaster management; co-ordination mechanisms and identification of roles and responsibilities for EPR/DRR at the national and sub-national levels; sector review documents; MoE participation in education clusters; meeting minutes; utilization of the training in the event of actual emergencies.

The study will analyze the contribution of capacity development on institutionalization with the understanding that institutionalization should contribute to building resilience but this study will not actually measure resilience.

The evaluation is both summative to assess the outcome as donor funding is coming to an end and formative since support for EPR and DRR will continue in the future.

The EEPCT Programme has already been reviewed/evaluated twice but this new proposed study focuses on the Program’s capacity development and institutionalization components, responding to recommendations made in the two previous studies (see Annex for details). The proposed study will expand the evidence base by incorporating other countries that were not covered in the two previous studies.

The **geographical scope** of the evaluation and the selection of countries to be evaluated will be done in cooperation with UNICEF WCARO and Country Offices, taking into account the following criteria:

* Balanced inclusion of countries according to potential emergency scenarios (man-made and natural disaster, chronic emergency, complex emergencies);
* Preference for countries with high levels of vulnerability;
* Stratification of sample according to phases of emergencies and transitions (mid-crisis, early recovery, or transitional);
* Stage/progress of the institutionalization efforts as reported by the UNICEF Country Offices;
* Ability of the country to facilitate or absorb an additional external mission at relatively short notice.

Based on the above mentioned criteria, countries would need to be chosen from the 24 countries covered through the UNICEF West and Central Africa Regional Office.

The validity of the evaluation is premised on its being conducted by a completely independent source, although UNICEF will provide logistical support and access to government and other partners at the country level.

Purpose of the study

The study will systematically and objectively assess the effectiveness and sustainability of the EPR/DRR capacity development strategy and its contribution to institutionalization in the education sector in the West and Central Africa Region and draw lessons for future programming including the development of a robust monitoring and evaluation framework.

The study is both necessary and timely as it is expected to:

* Help country offices identify and understand achievements and challenges arising from capacity development/institutionalization efforts, including the perspectives of participants and duty bearers;
* Provide the country and regional offices with recommendations to inform decision-making at a critical time i.e. the end of the current EEPCT grant;
* Provide evidence for future advocacy and fund raising efforts;
* Identify a way forward for enhancing the future quality of EPR and DRR capacity development and institutionalization in the education sector, including the development of robust planning and M&E frameworks.

Objectives

The proposed evaluation study has 4 **objectives**:

1. **To assess the adequacy, effectiveness and sustainability of the regional (ToT) and national (Roll-out) EPR/DRR capacity development activities (with a focus on outcomes and impact).**
* What did participants actually learn and how is it applied?
* How did trained staff react to an emergency compared to untrained staff (where applicable)?
* What were the achievements and the challenges in terms of the competencies that those who were trained developed and were they sustained?
* How far has the *cascade* training approach gone and what has the impact been at each level, including the community/school level (where applicable)?
* What mechanisms have been put in place to ensure the sustainability of the activities and how effective are they?
* How are the activities monitored and evaluated at the regional and national levels and how can this be enhanced?
1. **To assess how the capacity development strategy has contributed to the institutionalization of EPR and DRR at national/education sector level (national policy and planning) and at sub-national level (as applicable).**
* How have trainings and other capacity development activities helped to build effective institutional capacities?
* How have capacity development activities been translated into a process towards EPR/DRR integration into the education sector’s policy and programming at the national and sub-national levels?
* What are determining factors that made that process happen?
* What is the role of the education cluster or sector coordination group in this integration?
* To what extent are roles and responsibilities clear and institutionalized at all levels of the system?

Additional questions raised by the *EEPCT Programme Review and Evaluability Study or PRES:*

* + *‘Are issues of conflict vulnerability and disaster risk reduction accounted for within the design and implementation of [MoE] programme activities?*
	+ *Are the contextual features of areas affected by chronic crises also appropriately considered?’*
1. **To identify and analyze any other initiatives at the CO level which have contributed to enhanced EPR and DRR in the education sector.**
* What other capacity development activities (such as cluster coordinator trainings, needs assessment training, awareness raising and sensitization on Education in Emergencies, longer-term support to integrate C/DRR into Education Sector Plans etc.) if any, have taken place that have impacted on EPR and DRR at the country level and what impact have they had both in terms of capacity development and institutionalization?
* What are the linkages with other sectors (WASH, Protection, Health, Nutrition, Communication for Development etc.)?
1. **To identify and recommend measures to address capacity gaps and institutionalization failures to inform future EPR/DRR capacity in WCAR and develop a clear road map and logical framework for the way forward.**
* Where are the existing capacity gaps and what are the potential strategic responses including key actions required for effective EPR/DRR institutionalization?
* What are the principal lessons learned – both positive and negative?
* What key elements need to be incorporated into future planning and M&E?

Methodology

The evaluation study will take place in 4 steps:

1. ***Inception Phase (Home base)***

The consultant team will produce an overall roadmap of the consultancy which shows in a work plan the tasks, the deliverables and deadlines against the TOR. This road map will be known as the Inception Report.

The Inception Report will include a thorough description of the scope of the exercise and the methodological approach for data collection and analysis. For the data collection, a combination of tools will be expected, and will include, *inter alia*, interviews, written or oral tests of trainees, on line surveys, focus groups and multi-stakeholder consultations, using an appreciative inquiry approach. For the analysis, an evaluation framework will be developed that lists and defines each evaluation criteria to be used by the evaluators. Quantitative but also qualitative indicators will have to be developed to measure the EPR/DRR institutionalization by the MoE and its partners. The framework will explicitly analyze if the capacity development/institutionalization strategy adequately insured the inclusion of Human Rights, Gender (including gender-based violence), Equity and Results Based Management, and the extent to which the integration of EPR/DRR into education sector planning was inclusive of these issues. The Inception Report will be the subject of discussion in a meeting with the Reference Group.

The study design will take the following recommendation into account from the *EEPCT Programme Review and Evaluability Study*: “*future evaluative work may attempt to undertake standardized approaches (such as knowledge, attitude and practice (KAP) surveys) to measure the effectiveness of previous or ongoing capacity development activities (including trainings and workshops)”.*[[1]](#footnote-1)

1. ***Orientation and Desk Review Phase (Home base + Dakar)***

An initial distance briefing meeting (through Webex or teleconference) or through initial mission of consultant team to Dakar will take place with the Regional Education Adviser, the Regional Chief, Monitoring and Evaluation, the Education Specialist (Emergencies) who will comprise the Reference Group for the study.

For the Desk Review, core documents and contacts will be made available by the Education Specialist (Emergencies). These documents will include previous EEPCT Studies, training materials, list of participants, training evaluations, national capacity development roll-out plans, national sectorial policy documents and documentation relevant linked to other capacity development activities (beyond training).

1. ***Implementation Phase/Country Visits***

The consultants will organize country missions depending on availability of the country. The logistics of data collection will be supported by the UNICEF Education Specialist (Emergencies) and the country offices.

Data collection will include the following steps:

* Initial consultation with UNICEF Country Office staff;
* Structured interviews with key stakeholders (see also list of informants below): programme managers at UNICEF and NGO, project managers from (implementing) partners, officials from the MoE and other relevant ministries at the national and sub-national level (where applicable), co-lead and members of education clusters (where cluster approach is activated) or sector coordination groups;
* Participant profile analysis to define the level of institutional change that the capacity development initiative could have influenced and that which it could not;
* Review of key documents – policies, plans and budgets, monitoring and evaluation reports, etc. at national, sub-national and school levels (if applicable);
* Group discussions on draft findings with UNICEF and partners in country.

Consultants are expected to spend up to a maximum 10 days in each selected country to ensure an in-depth study of capacity development activities at national, but also at the sub-national level. UNICEF will provide logistical support and access to government and other partners at the country level.

1. ***Reporting Phase***

A draft mid-term report will be delivered to a Reference Group for feedback. Final approved Report will be due latest on 29 February 2012.

The report, written in English (translation into French through WCARO), is expected to contain, as a minimum, the following features:

* Executive summary
* Context
* Literature and desk review (including facts of all targeted countries in the region, including the ones where field visits will take place under this study)
* Methodology including indicators, evaluation tools and framework
* Findings
* Recommended measures to address identified capacity gaps
* Lessons Learned to inform future capacity development/institutionalization work
* Road map and logical framework for the way forward
* Annexes including ToRs
* The final report should not exceed 50 pages (excluding annexes)

**Who should be the key informants?**

It will be essential that the views of all stakeholders are taken into account:

* **Direct beneficiaries** of the capacity development interventions themselves at the various levels of the interventions (national, sub-national and community if applicable):
* **UNICEF and partner (Save the Children where applicable and other key NGO) staff** on the degree to which trainings/other capacity development activities have reinforced individual EPR skills and influenced the operating procedures and institutional responsiveness within their respective organizations;
* **Ministry of Education officials** on the degree to which trainings/other capacity development activities have strengthened individual EPR skills and influenced national policy and planning for EiE (including at school and community level where applicable);
* **Disaster Management (DM) bodies and other sectors officials (where applicable)** on the degree to which the education sector has been integrated in national DM policies/ planning or linked to other sectors priorities and strategies.
* **Colleagues involved in EPR/DRR who were not direct beneficiaries of the training** to measure the level of institutionalization within the organizations and ministries.

**WCARO** will take the following responsibilities:

* Identifying and recruiting the consultant-team to carry out the proposed study;
* Briefing the consultants;
* Reviewing the inception paper;
* Coordinating field visits with Country Offices;
* Reviewing and validating the Final Report in coordination with the consultants;
* Disseminating the Study’s findings;
* Coordinating the actual implementation of the Study’s recommendations;
* Designing the new phase of the capacity development/institutionalization strategy.

**Participant Country Offices** will be responsible for:

* Availing key relevant staff members for interview;
* Providing logistical and administrative support (WCARO to make all efforts to limit required CO support to a minimum);
* Facilitating interaction with the Ministry of Education, Disaster Management agencies where applicable and other stakeholders involved in EPRP and DRR, including access to appropriate coordinating mechanisms (e.g. Education Clusters and Ministry Working Groups).
* Following-up on the study’s recommendations.

**Benchmarks and Performance Standards**

The study will refer to the following benchmarks:

* Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action (CCCs)
* Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies (INEE) Minimum Standards for Education: Preparedness, Response, Recovery
* UNICEF Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) Programme Guidance Note
* Guidance Notes for Educational Planners: Integration of C/DRR into education sector planning

The UN Ethical Guidelines for UN Evaluators in the UN System and the UNICEF technical note #2 on ethics in evaluations (children’s involvement in evaluations) are to be followed.

Organization and Management

The evaluation team will consist of 2 consultants working under the supervision of one Team Leader (one of the 2 consultants). The consultants will report to, and receive guidance and supervision from, the Education Specialist (Emergencies), UNICEF WCARO.

Reference Group for the study will comprise of the Regional Education Adviser, the Regional Chief, Monitoring and Evaluation, the Education Specialist (Emergencies).

Consultants are encouraged to either apply individually or in a team of two.

Application Procedures

**Required Skills/Competencies**

The consultant should combine the following competencies:

* Strong expertise in education sector policy and planning;
* Demonstrated experience in evaluation, particularly of capacity development approaches and of institutional change programs;
* Understanding of conflict/disaster education programming;
* Some exposure to/knowledge of UNICEF work in education in the humanitarian/post-conflict sector;
* Demonstrated understanding of EPR/DRR capacity mapping and capacity development approaches in the education sector;
* Knowledge of global emergency education issues and how these “translate” in the West and Central Africa Region;
* Demonstrated technical skills in the field of conflict/disasters, particularly the social and human dimensions of disaster impact, and understanding of the concepts of ‘risk’, ‘exposure’ and ‘vulnerability’ and of how disaster impacts are mediated by different factors;
* Analytical and conceptual ability; good communication skills;
* Effective written and verbal communication skills in French and English required;
* Good inter-personal skills with cultural sensitivity;
* Experience in working for UNICEF and/or other UN or humanitarian organizations an advantage;
* Personal and professional integrity;

Written applications should be submitted electronically to Aissatou N’gom (angom@unicef.org), copied to Andrea Berther (aberther@unicef.org) and Helena Murseli (hmurseli@unicef.org) by **Tuesday, 18 October 2011.**

Submissions should include the following:

* Updated CV of consultant
* Cover letter highlighting experience and expertise in evaluations and methodologies used on similar topics.
* Updated P11 (form to be downloaded from [www.unicef.org](http://www.unicef.org))
* For consultants applying as a team: Outline of division of responsibilities and roles

Deliverables/End products

1. Inception report including the evaluation framework + Powerpoint
2. Report on initial findings
3. Draft report
4. Final Report

Follow up to Evaluation

The systematic follow-up on the implementation of the study will include:

* Dissemination and distillation of findings, lessons learned and recommendations within WCARO, other regional UNICEF offices, UNICEF Headquarters/Geneva Education/EMOPS/EPR/DRR, Save the Children, Plan International and other NGOs, EEPCT donors, members of the Education Cluster Working Group Task Team on Capacity Development, co-lead and members of national education clusters, members of national education coordination groups, UNICEF (implementing) partners, Regional Dakar Based Education in Emergencies Working Group and through the EEPCT website <http://www.educationandtransition.org/>.
* Revision of the strategy for national capacity development in coordination with other UNICEF regional offices, Save the Children, Plan International, members of the Education Cluster Working Group, WCAR COs based on the study’s findings and recommendations.
* Revision of institutionalization efforts in coordination with WCAR COs, Ministries of Education, Disaster Management bodies where applicable and other sectors, particularly Protection, Health, Nutrition, WASH and Communication for Development, national and international NGOs, community-based organizations and UN agencies.

**ANNEX**

The following table shows the activities undertaken per country in the West and Central Africa region (countries marked in bold are officially IASC adopted cluster countries):

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Country** | **Global and Regional Trainings\*** | **National and Sub-national Capacity Development Roll-out\*\*** | **Institutionalization C/DRR** |
| 1 | **Benin** | ✓ | FLR/EiE, NA  | ✓ | FLR/EiE, CC, NA |  |  |
| 2 | Burkina Faso | ✓ | FLR/EiE, NA | ✓ | FLR/EiE | ✓ | Integration into ESP, EiE Focal Point/WG (official) |
| 3 | Cameroun | ✓ | FLR/EiE, CC, NA |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Cape Verde | ✓ | NA | ✓ | FLR/EiE | ✓ | Integration into ESP, EiE Focal Point |
| 5 | **Central African Republic** | ✓ | FLR/EiE, CC, NA | ✓ | FLR/EiE, CC | ✓ | Integration into ESP, EiE Focal point/WG (official) |
| 6 | **Chad** | ✓ | FLR/EiE, CC, NA | ✓ | FLR/EiE, CC | ✓ | Integration into ESP, EiE WG (official) |
| 7 | Congo (Brazzaville) | ✓ | FLR/EiE, CC, NA | ✓ | FLR/EiE | ✓ | Integration into ESP, EiE Focal Point (official) |
| 8 | **Democratic Republic of Congo** | ✓ | FLR/EiE, CC | ✓ | FLR/EiE, CC | ✓ | Integration into ESP, EiE Focal Point |
| 9 | Gabon | ✓ | FLR/EiE |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Gambia | ✓ | FLR/EiE, (NA) | ✓ | FLR/EiE | ✓ | EiE Focal Point, DRR Team |
| 11 | Ghana | ✓ | FLR/EiE, CC, NA | ✓ | FLR/EiE | ✓ | EiE Focal Point |
| 12 | **Guinea** | ✓ | FLR/EiE, CC, NA | ✓ | FLR/EiE, CC | ✓ | EiE Focal Point |
| 13 | Guinea-Bissau | ✓ | FLR/EiE | ✓ | FLR/EiE |  | EiE Focal Point |
| 14 | Guinea-Equatorial | ✓ | FLR/EiE | ✓ | FLR/EiE |  |  |
| 15 | **Ivory Coast** | ✓ | FLR/EiE, CC, NA | ✓ | FLR/EiE, CC | ✓ | Integration into ESP, EiE Focal Point/WG (prior crisis) |
| 16 | Liberia | ✓ | FLR/EiE, CC, (NA) | ✓ | FLR/EiE, CC, NA | ✓ | EiE Focal Point (official) |
| 17 | Mali | ✓ | FLR/EiE, NA | ✓ | FLR/EiE, Sim | ✓ | EiE Focal Point |
| 18 | Mauritania | ✓ | FLR/EiE, CC, NA | ✓ | FLR/EiE | ✓ | Integration into ESP, EiE Focal Point/WG (official) |
| 19 | Niger | ✓ | FLR/EiE, NA  | ✓ | FLR/EiE | ✓ | Integration into ESP, EiE Focal Point |
| 20 | Nigeria | ✓ | FLR/EiE, CC, (NA)  | ✓ | FLR/EiE | ✓ | Integration into ESP, EiE Focal Point |
| 21 | Sao Tome & Principe | ✓ | FLR/EiE |  |  |  | EiE Focal Point |
| 22 | Senegal | ✓ | NA | ✓ | FLR/EiE | ✓ | EiE Focal Point |
| 23 | Sierra Leone | ✓ | CC, (NA) | ✓ | FLR/EiE |  |  |
| 24 | Togo | ✓ | FLR/EiE, NA  | ✓ | FLR/EiE |  |  |

\*FLR/EiE = Frontline Responders/Education in Emergencies Training, CC = Cluster Coordination Training, NA = Needs Assessment Training, Sim = Emergency Preparedness Simulation (organized through Emergency section WCARO)

\*\* Depending on context, roll-out comprised traditional training activities or a mixed approach of indicated components in table above (ranging from training, advocacy to development of action plans and their implementation etc.)

**Global and regional support for the study**

This multi-country study is reflected in, and funded by, the UNICEF WCARO Basic Education and Gender in Education (BEGE) 2011 Annual Work Plan’s KRA4, Activity 3.2 *High Quality Evaluations: Evaluation EiE Roll-Out (WCAR): EiE Capacity Development Roll-out (Phase I) Evaluation undertaken and recommendations disseminated within and outside the WCA region”.*

The EEPCT Programme has already been reviewed/evaluated twice but this new proposed study focuses on the Program’s capacity development and institutionalization components, responding to recommendations made in the two previous studies: The *EEPCT Programme Review and Evaluability Study* was commissioned in October 2009 to provide an ‘objective assessment of, and preliminary recommendations for, improvements and adjustments’ in the EEPCT Programme and ‘to contribute to programme accountability’. The Study makes a number of important observations, findings and recommendations that the new study will have to take into account. **It also called for a strengthened evidence base**:

* *What remains unclear is the degree to which the Program’s commitment to governmental partnerships and capacity development has led to more effective service provision and improved responses to future crises.[[2]](#footnote-2)*
* *While the PRES, given the limited numbers of case studies included and Programme-specific focus, was unable to gather evidence regarding broad-based changes in UNICEF’s institutional capacities or operating procedures, it did elucidate operation and managerial issues related specifically to the EEPCT Programme.[[3]](#footnote-3)*
* *The development of capacities among relevant governmental agencies was also widely noted to have been an achievement which would not have been possible on such a scale without the EEPCT Programme.[[4]](#footnote-4)*
* *Education ministry personnel in case study countries, for instance, credited the EEPCT Programme with building capacities but were not able to point to confirmatory data and tended to rely strictly upon anecdotes.* ***As such, education system development must be featured within future evaluative work****.[[5]](#footnote-5)*
* *Unlike the measurement of access to quality education, for which indicators and standardized methods of data collection exist, measuring institutional growth and processes must focus upon both quantifiable indicators such as their relevant share of governmental budgets and decentralization of funds as well as more qualitative analyses of improvements in managerial processes, standard operating procedures and human capacities (encapsulating both knowledge and skills). While measuring such improvements is challenging and must account for the numerous internal and external sources of institutional development within education systems,* ***the complexity of the task should not be taken as justification for overlooking evaluations in this area****. The appropriate level and scope of such institutionally-focused evaluations must be developed in the light of the types of assistance provided in each context.[[6]](#footnote-6)*
* *There remains a need to understand not only whether DRR has been implemented – and in what forms – but also, in the mid- to long-term,* ***to what tangible effect****.[[7]](#footnote-7)*
* *Education system development: With the extensive emphasis placed on education system development, this topic is of particular relevance to the EEPCT Programme. Education system development should be approached both quantitatively, as concerning education officials’ budgets, as well as management processes, the ability to generate and utilize evidence effectively and the ability to consider issues such as conflict and disasters within education service delivery.[[8]](#footnote-8)*
* *Disaster risk reduction: The contribution of the EEPCT Programme to education service delivery must also be considered. The impact of DRR activities often becomes apparent in the aftermath of a crisis but can be assessed beforehand by monitoring, for instance, the occurrence of disaster preparedness drills and the attainment of knowledge concerning disasters (and DRR) through its incorporation into curricula.[[9]](#footnote-9)*
* *In many ways, for an area of intervention which has been attempting to gain full acceptance as the “fourth pillar” of humanitarian intervention,* ***developing a solid evidence base and strengthening accountability is crucial*** *in winning over detractors and in mobilizing evidence to demonstrate conclusively the important role played by education during and in the aftermath of crises.[[10]](#footnote-10)*
* ***Efforts pertaining to evaluation of the EEPCT Programme*** *– and its use as a vehicle for gathering and analyzing evidence – should be redoubled during the remainder of implementation and involve, where necessary, external support from research centers and others.[[11]](#footnote-11)*

The *Progress Evaluation (PREV) of the UNICEF EEPCT programme*, completed in December 2010, whose objective was to identify and assess progress against the strategic goals of the Programme and to enable systematic reflection that results in concrete programme improvements, also provides a number of important observations that informed this capacity development study:

* Regional Education Officers, in particular, have played vital roles in promoting new training, capacity building and policy initiatives that otherwise would not have taken place. However, the evaluation identified inconsistent technical support to country programs as contributing to the inconsistent quality of programming and results-based reporting.[[12]](#footnote-12)
* **Research is required to define and better understand the core components of a resilient education system** in the context of complex emergencies, chronic crises and arrested development.[[13]](#footnote-13)
* Traditional examples of Disaster Risk Reduction focus on natural disasters. EEPCT is forward-thinking in including post-conflict countries that remain vulnerable to a re-occurrence of violence many years after the cessation of the conflict.[[14]](#footnote-14)
* The results of the UNICEF staff survey suggest that agency-wide understanding of country-level achievements towards prediction, prevention and preparedness for emergencies is lagging behind.[[15]](#footnote-15)
* When discussing why they believed improvement had taken place, stakeholders mentioned improved policy and emergency-response plans, establishment and integration of curriculum on DRR and awareness campaigns.[[16]](#footnote-16)
* It is quite challenging to measure the level of preparedness or risk reduction in an objective way, since there is rarely a good counterfactual: what would have happened without it?[[17]](#footnote-17)
* INEE has for some years advocated for the incorporation of DRR into emergency education programming and EEPCT is enabling these efforts to be mainstreamed.[[18]](#footnote-18)
* The inclusion of the concept of resilience in the EEPCT framework represented an innovative and important initiative to institutionalize a concept that has significant potential to build understanding of the linkages between crisis, recovery and transition to reconstruction and development. In the short term, clear guidance needs to be provided to country offices on which activities to report under this goal in order to maintain consistency in reporting.[[19]](#footnote-19)

The proposed study will expand the evidence base by incorporating other countries that were not covered in the Evaluability and Evaluation studies. This study is more focused on the capacity development and institutionalization components of the EEPCT programme in order to measure the outcomes and impact of the intervention, and to share and disseminate lessons learned and to enhance the strategy.

**Evaluation criteria definition**

The following criteria, coherent with the OECD DAC standards, will be used:

* **EFFECTIVENESS:** The extent to which the training has achieved its objectives (see above mentioned six training objectives).
* **ADEQUACY:** The extent to which the training was sufficient to meet the capacity development need.
* **SUSTAINABILITY:** The extent to which taught skills have been durably learned and systematically applied.

Additional criteria for possible consideration:

* **INSTITUTIONALISATION:** The extent to which emergency preparedness and response (EPR) and disaster risk reduction (DRR) measures have been mainstreamed into education policy, planning and programming.
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