

Terms of Reference (TOR)
Support to Encamped Myanmar Refugees – Lot 4
Protection Project Endline Assessment



1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Thailand has hosted refugees from Myanmar for over four decades, providing shelter to individuals fleeing prolonged armed conflict and political instability. Without legal status, the majority of these refugees reside in one of nine camps situated along the Thailand–Myanmar border, spanning four provinces. For over four decades, Myanmar nationals have crossed the border and sought refuge in Thailand, fleeing recurrent political conflict and armed violence and seeking safer and more lucrative economic opportunities. The number of Myanmar nationals in Thailand constantly fluctuates both in and outside the refugee camps. As of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) November 2024 record, 81,039 verified refugees (40,034 males, 41,005 females) are currently residing in nine camps along the Thailand–Myanmar border. Approximately 37.8% of this refugee population are children, totaling an estimated 30,633 individuals (15,641 boys, 14,992 girls).

As of March 2025, there were 108,377 verified and unverified refugees (52,128 males, 56,249 females) residing in the nine camps (TBC, March 2025). Compared to the previous academic year, student enrollment increased by 14%. In the reporting period, the project ensured that 27,041 children (12,318 boys, 14,723 girls), including 66 children with disabilities (43 boys, 23 girls). These children, like all children, deserve access to an inclusive, gender-sensitive, and self-reliant education. This right is intrinsic to their dignity and is necessary for them to be able to live harmoniously and positively contribute to their host communities.

KRCEE conducted a child safeguarding risk assessment in 2020. The findings highlighted multiple gaps in the safety and inclusiveness of school environments, including limited understanding of safeguarding principles among teachers, a lack of child-friendly reporting mechanisms, and inadequate responses to protection concerns. Further consultations with key protection agencies in 2021—including UNHCR, COERR, IRC, and JRS—reinforced these concerns, identifying systemic issues within the camp-wide child protection system. A culture of silence, minimal follow-up on reported incidents, and prevailing patriarchal attitudes were all cited as barriers to effective safeguarding. Mental health concerns among children have also been documented, with children reporting anxiety, low self-esteem, and a lack of hope for the future. Teenage pregnancy and exposure to violence are key reasons for school dropout. Gender-based risks differ, with girls more vulnerable to sexual abuse and discrimination, and boys more affected by substance abuse and risky behaviours. Consultations with the Karen Student Network group also revealed challenges faced by children with disabilities and those at risk of exclusion due to bullying or discrimination.

To address these issues, Save the Children, in partnership with KRCEE and OCEE, has implemented a series of child safeguarding interventions in three target camps—Mae La, Um Phiem, and Nu Po. These efforts aim to strengthen the camp-wide safeguarding system and ensure its alignment with existing child protection structures, such as the Child Protection Referral System (CPRS), Child Protection Committees (CPCs), and SGBV Committees. (please see project logframe in Annex 1)

Key activities have included the establishment of child safeguarding focal points within schools, capacity-building for teachers and refugee teacher trainers (RTTs), and the development of school-based safeguarding policies that address risks such as SGBV and harmful social norms.

Policies and incident reporting mechanisms have been launched in collaboration with children and community stakeholders, with strong emphasis on accessibility and child participation. Particular focus has been given to vulnerable groups, including children with disabilities and LGBTQI+ youth, through targeted training on child rights, protection, and gender equality. Child-friendly reporting mechanisms have been co-designed with children and are regularly promoted and monitored. Safeguarding materials and messages have also been created and shared by children's groups to raise awareness among their peers.

This endline assessment aims to measure progress against the project's baseline values, evaluating the outputs, outcomes and impact of child safeguarding interventions across the three target camps. It will assess the effectiveness of the project's implementation and reflect on the sustainability and integration of CSG mechanisms within existing protection systems. The assessment will also review the project's responsiveness to key findings and recommendations from Results-Oriented Monitoring (ROM) reviews and other previous learning exercises. Beyond measuring performance, the assessment seeks to capture good practices, identify challenges, and generate lessons learned for potential adaptation, replication, or scale-up within other camp-based protection programmes in Thailand.

2. SCOPE OF STUDY: PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

This study is being conducted at the year 3 of the project. The primary purpose of the study is: to measure progress against the project's baseline values, evaluating the outputs, outcomes and impact of child safeguarding interventions across the three target camps. It will assess the effectiveness of the project's implementation and reflect on the sustainability and integration of CSG mechanisms within existing protection systems. The assessment will also review the project's responsiveness to key findings and recommendations from Results-Oriented Monitoring (ROM) reviews in 2024 and other previous learning exercises. Beyond measuring performance, the assessment seeks to capture good practices, identify challenges, and generate lessons learned for potential adaptation, replication, or scale-up for the future camp-based protection programmes.

The study main objectives are

Type of Evaluation	Overarching objectives/questions
Implementation/ Process	- How well was the program/project implemented? (<i>see key study questions regarding fidelity and process</i>) - How did the project response to the recommendations for ROM reviews? (<i>see key study questions regarding relevance and process</i>)
Outcome	Did the program/project achieve its intended outcomes? (<i>see key study questions regarding impact, effectiveness and sustainability</i>)
Impact	What positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended can be attributed to the programme? [DAC definition]

	To what extent did the project intervention strengthen the child safeguarding system in the three target camps, and what mechanisms facilitated or hindered this? What explains the limited case reporting by focal points?
--	---

The study team will be required to undertake consultation with the SC Refugee Education and Protection Programme Coordinator and the study Working Group at the commencement of the project in order to further refine the study questions.

Scope: The endline assessment will focus on all indicators under Outcome 2, covering all related project interventions in the three target refugee camps: Mae La, Um Phiem, and Nu Po. This assessment does not cover Outcome 1. The findings from this endline study will be shared with Humanity & Inclusion (HI) and used as part of the final evaluation of the overall project. The study will primarily engage school-based informants, including children, teachers, head teachers, resident teacher trainers (RTTs), education personnel, and implementing partners such as KRCEE and OCEE. It will also explore the wider impact of the interventions on safeguarding and child well-being within the camp communities. The assessment is expected to span approximately 3 months, from [October- December 2025]. The target camps are located in remote areas along the Thai-Myanmar border in Tak province, which require prior access approval from the Ministry of Interior. Careful planning around logistics, travel time, and road conditions will be necessary to facilitate data collection.

3. EXPECTED DELIVERABLES

The study deliverables and tentative timeline (subject to the commencement date of the study) are outlined below. The study team lead and Save the Children's Refugee Education and Protection Programme Coordinator will agree on final milestones and deadlines at the inception phase.

Deliverables and Tentative Timeline

Deliverable / Milestones	Timeline
The study Team is contracted and commences work	2 nd week of November 2025
The study Team will facilitate a workshop with the relevant stakeholders at the commencement of the project to develop the inception report.	2 nd week of November 2025
The study Team will submit an inception report* in line with the provided template , including: - Study objectives, scope and key study questions - description of the methodology, including design, data collection methods, sampling strategy, data sources, and study matrix against the key study questions - data analysis and reporting plan - caveats and limitations of study - risks and mitigation plan - ethical considerations including details on consent	3 rd week of November 2025

▪ stakeholder and children communication and engagement plan ▪ key deliverables, responsibilities, and timelines ▪ resource requirements ▪ data collection tools (in line with the study matrix) [tools from Baseline to be recommended] Once the report is finalised and accepted, the evaluator/researcher study team must submit a request for any change in strategy or approach to the study manager or the steering committee.	
Ethics submission (if applicable): Should approval from a Human Research Ethics Committee be required, an ethics submission should include: ▪ study protocols (participant recruitment, data security and storage, consent and confidentiality etc.) ▪ considerations for consulting with children and other vulnerable groups (if applicable) ▪ participant information statement and consent forms	4 th week of November 2025
Final data collection tools (in the report language): ▪ Survey instrument ▪ Data collection mechanism	1 st and 2 nd week of December 2025
An [Initial finding Report / Power Point Presentation] including a summary of formative findings from the study. The focus will be on: ▪ Summary of interim findings ▪ Any emerging program issues or risks (if applicable) ▪ Any changes that have had to be made to the study design (if applicable) ▪ Key tasks for the next stage of the study and any proposed refinements or changes to methodology (if applicable)	3 rd and 4 th week of December 2025
A Draft Study Report including below elements: All reports are to use the Save the Children Final Study Report template ▪ Executive summary ▪ Background description of the Program and context relevant to the Study ▪ Scope and focus of the study ▪ Overview of the study methodology and data collection methods, including a Study matrix ▪ Findings aligned to each of the key Study questions ▪ Specific caveats or methodological limitations of the evaluation ▪ Conclusions outlining implications of the findings or learnings ▪ Recommendations ▪ Annexes (Project logframe, study ToR, Inception Report, Study schedule, List of people involved) A consolidated set of feedback from key stakeholders will be provided by Save The Children within [2nd] weeks of the submission of the draft report.	3 rd and 4 th week of December 2025
Data and analyses including all encrypted raw data, databases and analysis outputs	3 rd and 4 th week of December 2025

Final Study Report* incorporating feedback from consultation on the Draft Study Report	3 rd and 4 th week of December 2025
Knowledge translation materials: ▪ PowerPoint presentation of Study findings ▪ Evaluation Brief**	3 rd and 4 th week of December 2025

4. STUDY MANAGEMENT

The study team will report directly to the Refugee Education and Protection Programme Coordinator. Additional technical support will be provided by the Child Protection Technical Expert, MEAL Technical Advisor and technical team from should approve all plans and documents developed by the study team.

5. STUDY TEAM AND SELECTION CRITERIA

Interested consultants will be required to submit an Expression of Interest in line with the provided template, which should demonstrate adherence to the following requirements. Criteria are provided in Annex 3

Requirements and Experience

To be considered, the study team members together must have demonstrated skills, expertise and experience in:

- Designing and conducting outcome and impact evaluations using non-experimental design
- Conducting studies in the field of refugee along Thai-Myanmar border, particularly in relation to Child Protection in Emergencies or Education in Emergencies.
- Leading socio-economic research, evaluations or consultancy work in Thailand that is sensitive to the local context and culture, particularly [child rights, gender equality, ethnicity, religion and minority groups and/or other factors.
- Conducting ethical and inclusive studies involving children and child participatory techniques
- Conducting ethical and inclusive studies involving marginalised, deprived and/or vulnerable groups in culturally appropriate and sensitive ways
- Managing and coordinating a range of government, non-government, community groups and academic stakeholders
- Experience conducting study in humanitarian contexts
- Sound and proven experience in conducting evaluations based on OECD-DAC evaluation criteria, particularly utilisation and learning focused evaluations
- Extensive experience of theories of change and how they can be used to carry out evaluations

- Strong written and verbal skills in communicating technical and/ or complex findings to non-specialist audiences (especially report writing and presentation skills)
- A track record of open, collaborative working with clients

There is a high expectation that:

- Members (or a proportion) of the study team have a track record of previously working together.
- A team leader will be appointed who has the seniority and experience in leading complex study projects, and who has the ability and standing to lead a team toward a common goal.
- The team has the ability to commit to the terms of the project and have adequate and available skilled resources to dedicate to this study over the period.
- The team has a strong track record of working flexibly to accommodate changes as the project is implemented.

Financial Proposal

Save the Children seeks value for money in its work. This does not necessarily mean "lowest cost", but quality of the service and reasonableness of the proposed costs. Proposals shall include personnel allocation (role / number of days / daily rates / taxes), as well as any other applicable costs.

6. PAYMENT

The fee for this service is 4,000 - 6,000 EUR, inclusive of all taxes and charges.

Payment condition:

No. Payment	Condition of payment	Amount
1	Upon signing the contract	40%
2	Upon submission of the first draft	30%
3	Upon approval of the final report	30%
	Total	100%

7. HOW TO APPLY

If interested in applying for this study, please refer to the [Consultant EOI Form](#). Contact person for this study porntip.sarnsuwan@savethechildren.org

8. ANNEXES

Annex 1: Project Logframe

	Results chain	Indicators
Overall objective (Impact)	I. To promote refugees inclusion and safeguarding in the target camps with a focus on children and persons with disabilities	1. % of refugees participating to the intervention with the perceptions of improved protection measures (Disaggregation by sex, age & disability status)
Specific objectives (Outcomes)	Oc 2. Enhanced camp-wide child safeguarding system in the three target camps selected	2.1 % of children (b, g, cwd) who receive appropriate child protection support which meet SC's Safe School quality standards (Disaggregation by sex)
		2.2 # of educational staff are reported active in CSG prevention and survivor-centered protection (Disaggregation by sex and school)
		2.3 # of CSG cases reported by CSG focal points
Outputs	Op.2.1: Enhanced functionality, inclusiveness and gender sensitiveness of Child safeguarding systems in the camps schools, linked to the camp-wide child protection system (Child Protection Referral System (CPRS), Child Protection Committee (CPC), Sexual Gender Based Violence (SGBV) committee)	2.1.1 # of teachers, school staff, and RTTs who have increased knowledge on child safeguarding risks, and harmful gender norms affecting the children. (Disaggregation by sex, disability status)
		2.1.2 # of school adopted CSG policy linked to CPRS, CPC and SGBV mechanisms developed based on SC's CSG standards with implementing measures and monitoring mechanism to protect children from violence
		2.1.3 # of Child Safeguarding (CSG) focal points, teachers and school staff who have increased their knowledge in handling CSG cases and ensuring the safety and welfare of the children. (Disaggregation by sex and role)
	Op.2.2 Improved access to and participation in reporting mechanisms for children in and around schools SCT	2.2.1 # of children participating in the child resilience training that have increased knowledge on protection of children from violence. (Disaggregation by sex, disability status)
		2.2.2 # of children reached through awareness raising on CSG in and around the schools in the three camps (Disaggregation by sex, disability status)
		2.2.3 % of children who have increased their perception of safety in and around school, and understanding on CSG risks in relation to SGBV, social and gender norms (Disaggregation by sex, disability status)

Annex 2: List of project documents to be consulted

(To be provided)

- Save the Children Child Safeguarding; Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse; Anti-Harassment, Intimidation and Bullying.
- Data Protection Guidance and Ethical considerations checklist
- Project documents include proposals, annual reports, activity reports, monitoring reports, and learning reports.
- ROM reviews findings and recommendations by the EU external monitoring team.
- Save the Children Safe School Common Approach Framework
- Gender and Power Analysis and Baseline Assessment inception reports and data collection tools.

Annex 3: SCI Evaluation Scoring for perspective consultants

Category	Evaluation Quality Criteria (used for internal scoring after completion)
Purpose, Design and Methods	1. Does the evaluation report clearly identify the evaluation's purpose (including its key objectives, questions and criteria) as set out in the evaluation's Terms of Reference (ToR)?
	2. Are the data collection and analysis methods a clearly justified approach to addressing the evaluation's purpose and questions? (Do they provide valid, reliable and ethical data?)
	3. Is the methodology suitably tailored to the context and population groups to which the evaluation questions relate (e.g. re gender, disability, socio-economic status, geographic location, cultural context, ethnicity)?
	4. Is the size and composition of the sample in proportion to the conclusions sought by the evaluation?
	5. Does the evaluation build on what is already known, for example existing tried and tested frameworks and tools, existing data/evidence, and previous lessons learned?
	6. Are the methods used to collect and analyse data and any limitations of the quality of the data and collection methodology explained and justified?
	7. Has any personal and professional influence or potential bias among those collecting or analysing data been recorded and addressed or mitigated ethically?
Analysis and Findings	8. If evaluating impact, is a point of comparison used to show that change has happened (eg. a baseline, a counterfactual, comparison with a similar group)?
	9. Is the explanation of how (e.g. theory of change, logframe, activities) the intervention contributes to change explored?
	10. Is the data well triangulated, such as by using different data collection methods, types of data and stakeholder perspectives?
	11. Are alternative factors (eg. the contribution of other actors) considered to explain the observed result alongside an intervention's contribution?
	12. Are unintended and unexpected changes (positive or negative) identified and explained?
	13. Are the perspectives of children & communities included in the evidence, including the most deprived and marginalised? Note: For evaluations focused on young children, caregiver perspectives are adequate instead.
	14. Are the findings disaggregated according to sex, disability and other relevant social differences?
	15. Is there a clear logical link between the data that was collected and analysed, and the conclusions and recommendations presented?

Communication and Use	16. Are conflicting findings and divergent perspectives presented and explained in the analysis and conclusions?
	17. Are the findings and conclusions of the assessment shared with and validated by a range of key stakeholders (eg. communities, partners, Save the Children staff)?
	18. Is the analysis and interpretation of the data well communicated through accessible language and helpful visuals (diagrams, graphs, tables as needed)?
	19. Are references, annexes and links included that provide additional relevant data, analysis or references (including key documents and which individuals/stakeholders were involved)?
	20. Is there a clear plan for how to use the results, including recommendations that are 'SMART' (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Timebound) and directed toward the appropriate 'end users', a dissemination plan, and specific actions for implementing these recommendations?