

TERMS OF REFERENCE

END EVALUATION BODY TALK

1. Background information (MR)

Background information

In 2021, Liliane Fonds and Rutgers joined forces in the implementation of the Body Talk program (April 2021 – March 2024). The aim of the Body Talk program is that **‘more than 8,000 young people with a disability are in charge of their bodies and lives, and are standing up for their rights, wishes and limits’**. The program is implemented in three countries: Indonesia, the Philippines and Vietnam, where we closely collaborate with partner organizations Yayasan NLR Indonesia, Research Centre for Inclusion and NORFIL Foundation. These partners work closely with young people with disabilities and also have an extensive network, ranging from interest groups of people with disabilities to young advocates for equal rights to local authorities.

In the “Body Talk” alliance, the Liliane Foundation and Rutgers combine their expertise in the field of young people with disabilities and sexual and relational training, to share and discuss these sensitive topics. With our complementary expertise, we develop a **"guideline for comprehensive sexuality education"** and supporting resources and tools for parents and educators. By doing so, we aim to build a strong team of local trainers and advisors, with the partner organizations of the Liliane Foundation as the core, to guide young people and share their knowledge with anyone who can benefit.

Together we strive for our ultimate goal: **that young people with disabilities between the ages of 12 and 25 can access their own body and life.**

Implementation Model

Through the project, master trainers are trained and will be tasked to lead the implementation of trainings. At the organizational level, technical support and dissemination activities are targeted at teachers and health workers. At the interpersonal level, parents, caregivers, and other community members are targeted for trainings on sexual and reproductive health and rights and learn how to support SRHR of young people with disabilities. Moreover, advocacy and dissemination materials are developed to raise awareness and share knowledge on sexual and reproductive health and rights for young people with a disability. Policy advocacy initiatives will also be conducted to push for policy support on SRHR of children with disabilities.

Where are we at?

The program officially started its implementation in April 2021. However, due to the Covid-Pandemic not all activities could be implemented as planned. The following key activities have been implemented.

- SRHR value clarification workshops for the three local partner organisations were organized (online)
- A baseline was conducted in each of the countries in April-May 2022.
- Key implementation is:
 - Master trainings and trainings in context to develop a ToT network including teachers and health workers to support beneficiaries in project site.
 - Development of training manual and contextualization
 - Equip YWD and their caregivers with knowledge and skills on SRHR

- Capacity building of Project Ambassador as a role model for YWD.
- Awareness raising campaigns through public events and (social) media for targeted communities and government officials and the broader audience
- Collaboration with educators to include comprehensive sexuality education in school curriculum
- Collaboration with local health sector in setting up youth friendly services
- MTR was conducted in 2023 in each country with an overarching report¹

Details of achievements per country, will be shared with the selected consultants later on.

2. Purpose / Objectives / Rationale

The purpose of the End Evaluation is for capturing results, success, lessons learned, challenges and barriers of the Body Talk Programme and understanding the sustainability of the programme. In relation to the results we will focus on the outcomes defined in the project. We want to understand what elements worked well in which context and what elements were more challenging and which barriers were encountered. The results of the end evaluation will be used for future proposals and programming.

Regarding the sustainability we want to focus on the results of the model/strategy implemented. As well as to understand to what extent elements of the programme are being integrated within implementing organisations, as well as understanding the interest in the project/programme by others.

The MTR focused largely on improving the implementation of the programme. The purpose was formulated as: *“The purpose of the MTR will be for **internal learnings** regarding better implementation of the programme. With the results of this Mid-Term Review, we can identify whether we have to add, eliminate or change certain activities or approaches / methodologies, we can review priorities and make decisions about the next steps that are needed to reach the overall program objectives.”*

Therefore the End Evaluation needs to pay more attention to the outcomes defined in the projects and how implementation was successful and sustainable in the different context.

We envision there to be 1 (one) end evaluation that will incorporate context specific questions and elements. In terms of reporting a report per country will be required as well as an overarching report compiled by the lead coordinating evaluator.

If feasible, elements of the End Term will be used for lobby and advocacy or used for embedding in new and or existing projects and programs. We also aim to use elements for track record.

3. Intended user(s) and use(s)

The primary users will be the organization that are currently implementing the project. These are Liliane Foundation, Rutgers, Yayasan NLR Indonesia, Research Centre for Inclusion and NORFIL Foundation. There might be sections of the report that will be used for external usage, or for the purpose of lobby and advocacy, track record and application for future funds.

¹ Will be available for selected consultants

4. Key Evaluation questions

The End Evaluation should be guided by key evaluation questions.

Key Question 1: What are the (intended and unintended) outcomes achieved, and to what extent are they contributing to the intended objectives?

Key Question 2: Was the implementation model adequate to achieve the outcomes

Key Question 3: How sustainable is the Body Talk programme

Key Question 1: What are the (intended and unintended) outcomes achieved, and to what extent are they contributing to the intended objectives?

(Sub question 1a.) To what extent can these outcomes be linked or attributed to the Body Talk programme and its partners?

The outcomes are:

- YPWD are aware of their desires and boundaries & understand, recognize, express and respect boundaries and wishes – of their own and of others
- Parents / guardians or caregivers support their children with knowledge and understanding on relationships and sexuality
- Communities acknowledge and respect that YPWD are sexual beings with their own needs and desires
- Health care providers deliver quality and youth-friendly sexual and reproductive health services to YPWD
- CSE is an element in the formal school curricula
- Government authorities enable implementation of quality and youth friendly sexual and reproductive health and rights services for YPWD,
- LF, Rutgers and SPOs are acknowledged / visible as disability-inclusive SRHR experts

Evaluation Question	What do you need to know (information required) sub topics/questions	Who will give you the information? (target group)	How will you get it? (Method)	Generic or context specific
1. What are the differences per country (related to the outcomes)	Data on the indicators developed Separate data collection by evaluation team	Different stakeholders and key participants of the programme. (see outcomes and indicators)	Survey (when relevant make use of the baseline) Narrative interviews Reports	Generic for each context needed
2. What are the key success of the Body Talk Programme	From data collected, specific case studies	Different stakeholders and key participants of the programme. (see outcomes and indicators)	Case studies Outcome harvesting Mystery visits Focus Group Discussions	Per context different focus

<p>3. What were common challenges and barriers that each country experienced?</p> <p>a. How can the program anticipate on this in the future (eg. dealing with opposition and successful approaches for involving the government)</p> <p>b. How can the program secure that Body Talk elements are being used or integrated into the school curriculum?</p>	<p>Experience per context MTR data Results from the programme per context</p>	<p>Different stakeholders and key participants of the programme. (see outcomes and indicators)</p>	<p>Survey (when relevant make use of the baseline) Narrative interviews Reports</p>	<p>Generic for each context needed</p>
---	---	--	---	--

Key Question 2: To what extent was the implementation model adequate to achieve the outcomes?				
Evaluation Question	What do you need to know (information required) sub topics/questions	Who will give you the information? (target group)	How will you get it? (Method)	Generic or context specific
<p>1. Where there any differences in the implementation model in the different contexts and if so what?</p> <p>Good to also include what worked in what contexts (as there could be differences/learnings here).</p>	<p>MTR results on the implementation model to compare with results from the End Evaluation</p>	<p>Implementing partners</p>	<p>Interview/FDG Reports from the context</p>	<p>Both</p>
<p>2. What elements of the implementation model were supportive in achieving results?</p>	<p>MTR results on the implementation model to compare with results from the End Evaluation</p>	<p>Implementing partners</p>	<p>Interview/FDG Reports from the context</p>	<p>Both</p>
<p>3. What elements of the implementation model were inhibitive/limiting in achieving results?</p>	<p>MTR results on the implementation model to compare with results from the End Evaluation</p>	<p>Implementing partners</p>		<p>Both</p>
<p>4. Was the implementation adaptive enough to facilitate needed changes?</p>	<p>MTR and the changes</p>	<p>Implementing partners</p>	<p>Interview/FDG</p>	<p>Generic</p>

			Reports from the context	
5. How countries adapted to body talk to their own context. (specific methods, activities)	MTR and the changes	Implementing partners	Interview/FDG Reports from the context	Country specific
Key Question 3. How sustainable is the Body Talk programme?				
Evaluation Question	What do you need to know (information required) sub topics/questions	Who will give you the information? (target group)	How will you get it? (Method)	Generic or context specific
1. Is acquired knowledge still being used/implemented?	Trainings given, who were trained	Those trained	Survey/Interviews/FDG	Context specific
2. Are tools/manuals/games (elements of the tools/manual) being used or integrated?	Difference in tools/manuals/etc per context.	Trainers and those trained Implementing organizations.	Interviews Reports	Context specific
3. Is there evidence that the programme initiated initiatives are expected to continue and last after the end of the programme?	How elements are being integrated internally or new projects. Understand what organisations/stakeholders showed interest in the project and what they used/ still use.	Implementing organisations Other organisations/ stakeholders outside the project	Interview Reports (emails/phone) validation	Context specific
4. Adaptability and willingness of implementing partners to continue (elements) of the project?	Integration in systems/structures Integration in projects and programmes	Implementing organizations	Interview/FDG	Context specific, depends on their structure

The End Evaluation will be conducted in the different countries. Due to time and budget constraints the exact areas where the End Evaluation will be conducted will be defined in the inception report in close collaboration with the country teams.

5. End Evaluation Review Design

We expect the final design of the End Evaluation to be in line with the above-mentioned key questions. The questions are related to the teams implementing the programme and to those benefiting from the programme. Documents (plans/reports/baseline/MTR/training materials) will need to be reviewed and both staff, and the direct target group will be consulted. Also, stakeholder and documents from outside the programme (policy/official statistics/CSE etc) will be reviewed.

Sources of data and data collection methods

The data will be collected from plans, reports, baselines, MTR and any other available reports. Data will also be collected from groups and or individuals either through interviews, surveys or through (focus) group discussions. We expect the tools developed to be in line with the final End Evaluation questions. We anticipate there to be unexpected outcomes, for which we encourage innovative ideas.

Outcome harvesting is being suggested as a recommended means of verification / data collection tool. The method is considered strong for results of the policy advocacy initiatives, though from experience can be time-consuming when also taking into account substantiation of the outcomes. It is therefore important to balance (time and monetary) investment with the potential benefits when selecting the methods and also check whether it has been used during baseline and or MTR.

The complete M&E Framework including the definitions and the revised indicators from after the MTR has been attached to this ToR as Annex. The baseline questionnaire has not been developed based on this M&E framework as the M&E framework was developed at a later stage. The M&E framework attached is considered useful as reference on how to measure/count your indicators and will be used for reporting on the program progress in the last year of program implementation in 2024.

For all data collection, context specific ethical procedures and where relevant consent will be required. Given the nature of the End Evaluation, cultural sensitivity should be incorporated in the methodology of the End Evaluation

6. Practicalities, Deliverables

Roles and responsibilities

All partners, Yayasan NLR Indonesia, Research Centre for Inclusion and NORFIL Foundation , Liliane Foundation and Rutgers will be involved in the selection process of the consultant, methodology approval, and the approval of deliverables. A representative of each organization will be part of the selection team. Yayasan NLR Indonesia, Research Centre for Inclusion and NORFIL Foundation will coordinate the data collection for their respective context. They will be direct responsible for logistic arrangements and, if necessary, a translator for fieldwork.

Contact per organisation

Organisation	Country	Name/Position	Contact
Yayasan NLR Indonesia	Indonesia	Nela Sara Gratia/ M&E expert	nela@nlrindonesia.or.id
Research Centre for Inclusion	Vietnam	Le Thi Ha / Project Officer Body Talk	ha.le@nlrmekong.org
NORFIL Foundation	Philippines	Gamilla Gay Avena Program Manager PFID Norfil	gamillagay.avena@norfil.org

NORFIL Foundation	Philippines	Lucille Villar Project Officer, SRHR	lucilleauco.villar@norfil.org
Liliane Foundation	The Netherlands	Willie Houben/Organisational Development Adviser	whouben@lilianefonds.nl
Liliane Foundation	The Netherlands	Anneke Hofs/MEL Advisor	ahofs@lilianefonds.nl
Liliane Foundation	The Netherlands	Caroline Mol/MEL Advisor	cmol@lilianefonds.nl

Consultant Deliverables

- Provide a (technical) proposal, including the proposed (participatory) methodologies, tools, budget and timeframe for approval by SPO and LF staff
- An inception report
- 1 draft Synthesis report based on the 3 country reports and the coordination of feedback process
- 1 final synthesis report based on the 3 country reports
 - With same structure
 - Clear and concise English.
 - Adhere to page limits (max 20)
- Raw data (if requested)

7. How to apply?

Evaluator qualifications

We envision this End Evaluation to be managed and coordinated by a lead consultant coordinating three local consultants (one in each country) as part of the implementation team. The team that will be implementing (data collection etc.) will need to have good understanding of the local context in respective countries and speak the native language. It is expected that the main part of the analysis/report writing work will be led by the lead consultant and that they are responsible for the coordination and the management of the team with local consultants.

We expect the consultant team to have the following qualifications/experience

- ✓ Experience in the country
- ✓ Experience in the field of SRHR
- ✓ Experience in doing similar assignments
- ✓ Experience in developing trainings/modules is an added value
- ✓ Affinity with working with youth and youth with a disability
- ✓ Affinity with participatory methods for data collection
- ✓ Ability to speak the local language
- ✓ Ability to write/speak English

We expect the lead consultant to have the following qualifications/experience

- ✓ Experience in the context
- ✓ Experience in the field of SRHR
- ✓ Experience in doing similar assignments
- ✓ Strong analytical skills
- ✓ Strong coordination and planning skills
- ✓ Affinity with participatory methods for data collection
- ✓ Strong (to native) English writing and speaking skills

The application to the End Term Evaluation should include:

- The proposed methodology including tools
- Clear time frame and detailed budget
- Curriculum Vitae(s) or portfolio clearly presenting experience in conducting evaluations (if available a comparable report to share)
- Overview and Roles of the proposed teams/consultants per context including CVs
- References of two or three previous clients

Based on the proposals received, LF, Rutgers and the local organisations will come to a selection of max 3 best proposals per country. Through further online interviews, the final consultant will be selected. The selection criteria will be based on the presented methodology, affinity of the consultant with the type of evaluation and target group, available budget and fees charged by the consultant.

8. Planning and Budget

Week nr,	Months	Activities	Main Responsible
33	12 th Aug	ToR published	LF / SPO
34	19 th Aug	Submission of proposals (deadline 25th of August)	Consultants
35	30 Aug	Selection of proposals	LF and SPO
36-37	Sep	Contracting of consultant	LF
36-37	Sep	Finalise End Evaluation design and planning MTR	Consultant/ SPO /LF
38	Sep	Final plan/design	Consultant/ SPO /LF
36-43	Sep	Phase 1: Desk study, initial data collection	Consultant
36-43	Sep/Oct	Phase 2: Data collection , analysis, validation and exchange	Consultant
44-45	Nov	Report writing and feedback	Consultant/ SPO /LF
45-46	Nov	Feedback workshop- online	Consultant/ SPO /LF
47-48	21 st Nov	Final report	Consultant

Note: Fieldwork (timing) – availability of partners in the three different countries:

- Philippines: November
- Indonesia: Week 3, October
- Vietnam: October

Budget will be coordinated and authorized based on the financial proposals received.

9. Annexes

Annex 1: Code of Ethics for evaluation

- **Independent** — Management must not impose restrictions on the scope, content, comments and recommendations of evaluation reports. Evaluators must be free of conflict of interest.
- **Intentional** — The rationale for an evaluation and the decisions to be based on it should be clear from the outset.
- **Transparent** — Meaningful consultation with stakeholders is essential for the credibility and utility of the evaluation.
- **Ethical** — Evaluation should not reflect personal or sectoral interests. Evaluators must have professional integrity, respect the rights of institutions and individuals to provide information in confidence, and be sensitive to the beliefs and customs of local social and cultural environments.
- **Impartial** — Removing bias and maximizing objectivity are critical for the credibility of the evaluation and its contribution to knowledge.
- **Of high quality** — All evaluations should meet minimum quality standards defined by the Evaluation Office
- **Timely** — Evaluations must be designed and completed in a timely fashion so as to ensure the usefulness of the findings and recommendations
- **Used** — Evaluation is a management discipline that seeks to provide information to be used for evidence-based decision making. To enhance the usefulness of the findings and recommendations, key stakeholders should be engaged in various ways in the conduct of the evaluation.

Annex 2: 2024 ME Matrix Body Talk_complete (updated M&E Matrix)