

**Terms of Reference for
HEARTS II Final Evaluation**
August 2025

1. TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Table of Contents.....	0
2. Project Summary.....	1
3. Introduction.....	2
4. Background and Context.....	2
5. Scope of Study.....	3
5.1 Purpose, Objectives and Scope.....	3
5.2 Intended Audience and Use of the Study.....	4
5.3 Key Study Questions.....	5
6. Study Methodology.....	6
6.1 Study Design.....	6
6.2 Sampling.....	6
6.3 Data Sources and Data Collection Methods / Tools.....	7
6.4 Ethical Considerations.....	7
6.5 Known limitations.....	8
7. Expected Deliverables.....	8
8. Reporting and Governance.....	10
9. Study Team and Selection Criteria.....	10
10. Schedule of Payment.....	11
11. HOW TO APPLY.....	12
12. Annexes.....	12

2. PROJECT SUMMARY

Type of study	Final Evaluation
Name of the project	HEARTS II Promoting the protection and inclusion of children discriminated due to their sexual orientation and gender identity/expression (SOGIE) in Thailand (Hearts II) 2023-2025
Project Start and End dates	1 January 2023 - 31 December 2025
Project duration	Three years
Project locations:	Bangkok, Thailand
Thematic areas	Child Protection; Other supporting themes, and cross-cutting areas
Donor	The Norwegian Organisation for Sexual and Gender Diversity (FRI)
Estimated beneficiaries	650 individuals including 400 children and youth; 250 adults (teachers, CSOs staff, SCT staff, and government stakeholders)
Overall objective of the project	HEARTS phase II demonstrate interventions to address the challenges and strengths of children and youth with diverse sexual orientation, gender identity, expression, and sex characteristics (SOGIESC) in Thailand. Challenges ranges from discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex, or queer (LGBTIQ+) youth in schools, exclusion of LGBTIQ+ children from existing child welfare i.e. mental health services, and children's capacity in monitoring the government's duties to fulfil their rights.

3. INTRODUCTION

This document provides Terms of Reference for HEARTS II endline evaluation. HEARTS II project is funded by FRI to implement from 1 January 2023 – 31 December 2025. The project aims to ensure the rights of LGBTIQ+ children and youth are protected and promoted in Thailand. The primary purpose of this consultation is to conduct a final evaluation of HEARTS II project to understand the extent of which the project has achieved the intended outcomes.

The project background, study scope, key questions, intended methodology, reporting and governance, key deliverables and timeframes for its implementation are provided in the sections that follow.

4. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Children and youth with diverse sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, and sex characteristics (SOGIESC) still face stigma and discrimination that hinder their development and well-being. At a national level, the progress is made through the legalisation of marriage equality. However, Thailand does not have a gender recognition law, which means that citizens, including children, cannot be legally recognized as the gender they identify as.

The project has generated significant momentum in advancing the rights, protection, and well-being of children and youth with diverse SOGIESC in Thailand. Through strategic engagement at multiple levels, the project has enabled young people to participate meaningfully in national dialogues, including direct engagement with government representatives during a youth camp co-hosted with the Ministry of Justice. These efforts contributed to Thailand's UPR and CRC submissions, resulting in government accountability and the national plan of action for SOGIESC inclusion in education. The project's influence extended to the education sector, where policy dialogues with the Ministry of Education (MOE) and consultations on the teachers' guidance for teaching SOGIESC in classroom laid the groundwork for more inclusive learning environments. A pilot whole-school approach at Chumchon Mooban Pattana School led to a 42% increase in teacher knowledge on SOGIESC inclusion, while student-led initiatives in four schools fostered peer awareness and reduced bullying. However, barriers persist in integrating SOGIESC friendly practices into the education system, highlighting the need for working closely with MOE and at national level to pilot curriculums and trainings with teachers and educators.

Education in Thailand is currently not SOGIESC-inclusive in several respects. A large comprehensive sexuality education (CSE) review (Ministry of Education et al., 2016) indicated that the coverage of sexual and gender diversity topics was patchy and many teachers' and students' attitudes on same-sex attraction were negative. A health education curriculum review (Wongwareethip, 2016) further revealed that gender and sexual diversity topics were being taught through the stigmatizing and outdated concept of "sexual deviation." Correspondingly, a secondary analysis of the CSE review dataset indicated that even among LGBT-identified students, 35% had negative attitudes toward homosexuality, and students were more likely to hold negative attitudes if they had attended lessons related to sexual diversity, suggesting that existing teaching increased self-stigmatization (Shrestha et al., 2020). Although a civil society complaint on the discriminatory curriculum in health studies led to a curriculum revision in 2019, the changes may have been superficial and many aspects of gender and sexual diversity are not taught about (Lekkla, 2021).

In addition, Thai schools rarely have explicit bullying prevention policies, let alone ones that would specifically refer to SOGIESC-based violence (Mahidol University et al., 2014). LGBTIQ+ children and youth face diverse forms of violence, 75% reported being ridiculed. It is also

important to note that over 70% of LGBTIQ+ children and youth have symptoms of depression or anxiety, and 50% contemplated suicide in the past one year. These high numbers of mental health adversity demonstrated the need to prevent and respond to SOGIESC-based violence while increase social support and resilience. Children and youth reported that having at least one person in the family who supports them can increase their wellbeing.

The Department of Mental Health's five-year strategic plan (2023-2027) includes LGBTQ population as the vulnerable group. As part of this strategic plan, the Department aims to build Public Mental Health Literacy and develop innovative Smart Psychosocial Care for the vulnerable group.

The Thai government has launched the **HERO OBEC Care** system to promote student mental health, integrating data systems for more effective, holistic support. In collaboration with the Department of Mental Health, OBEC is training educators nationwide to use the platform and respond to students' needs. This marks a major step toward improving student well-being, reducing inequality, and enhancing education quality through technology and cross-sector cooperation.

The expected outcomes of the project are:

1. *Governments are held accountable in the respect, protection, promotion, and fulfilment of the rights of children and youth with diverse SOGIESC*
2. *LGBTI/Child rights organisations mainstream child and youth rights regardless of SOGIESC within different programme areas (Education, Child Protection, Child Rights Governance)*
3. *Children and youth with diverse SOGIESC are better supported and protected within their local communities (peers, schools, friends, and family)*

HEARTS II project is a second phase of HEARTS 2020 – 2022. HEARTS II project is implemented by Save the Children Thailand and the Foundation of Transgender Alliance for Human Rights (January 2023 – May 2024).

5. SCOPE OF STUDY

5.1 Purpose, Objectives and Scope

This Final Evaluation study is being conducted at the end of HEARTS II project. It will build upon the baseline data collected in 2023.

The primary purpose of the study is to measure the project's achievements against the baseline and the expected outcomes and indicators, generate evidence-based insights by identifying and documenting good practices, lessons learned, and both its intended and unintended impacts. The evaluation will assess the extent of change in the lives of targeted children, the quality of services provided, and related policy developments. Findings from this evaluation will inform recommendations for the Thai Government, partners, donors, and future strategies for Save the Children Thailand, ensuring improved program effectiveness. Additionally, the evaluation will provide actionable recommendations for management and program teams to support the design and implementation of future projects with similar objectives.

Objective of the evaluation:

- 1) Evaluate the Action's achievement using OECD/DAC Criteria. Provide evidence-based insights to measure progress against baseline benchmarks, identify gaps, and inform future strategies for replicating and scaling the Action's approach.

- 2) Identify positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended that was attributed to the programme and advocacy efforts.
- 3) Document lesson learned, mechanisms worked and can explain the achievement or non-achievement of the programme results.

The Evaluation Consultant will be required to undertake consultation with the Save the Children's Project team, MEAL Technical Expert, REL Coordinator, SPQI Director at the commencement of the assignment in order to further refine the evaluation questions.

Scope: The final evaluation covers the all-project implementation and activities from 2023 to 2025 implementing at 4 schools in Bangkok. It aims to evaluate the overall project achievements, and capturing the changes, outcome, and impact emerging. Also, it tends to generate the evidence of lessons learned for the next phase of the project implementation. The target groups of this evaluation include teachers, students, and parents, SCT Staff, local authorities and duty bearers. The project activities were delivered by SCT and by its implementing partners: the Foundation of Transgender Alliance for Human Rights (January 2023 – May 2024). This final evaluation is expected to take place from October 2025 –of December 2025

5.2 Intended Audience and Use of the Study

Primary intended audience of the study are:

Stakeholder	Further information
Project donor	The Norwegian Organisation for Sexual and Gender Diversity (FRI)
Primary implementing organisation	Save the Children Thailand
Implementing partners	The Foundation of Transgender Alliance for Human Rights
Government stakeholders	The Rights and Liberty Protection Department, The Bangkok Metropolitan Administration, The Office of Basic Education
Community groups	Duangprateep Foundation, LGBTIQ+ organisations, Child Rights organisations
Beneficiaries	Students, youth advocates, teachers and school staff, parents

The study team will be required to propose how the primary audience will be involved throughout the evaluation process and how evaluation findings will be shared with each of the different stakeholders in the table above, particularly outlining how reporting back to communities, beneficiaries and children will be conducted in an accessible and child friendly manner.

5.3 Key Study Questions

Criteria	Key Study Questions
Accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How has the program/project approached accountability to children and the wider community?
Child participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How have the children, their needs, desires and suggested solutions, been consulted and accounted for in programme or project design and implementation? How were children supported to meaningfully participate across the programme/project cycle?
Safe programming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How has the program/project assessed the risks for children and do these risks still exist to date? Have they been reduced, controlled and managed by the minimising actions? Are there new risks? What further measures do we need to implement to reduce, remove and control these new emerging risks?
Effectiveness*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the program/project achieve its intended outcomes? Are there any differences in outcomes achieved by different groups? Were there any unintended outcomes? Are the objectives of the program/project being achieved?
Efficiency*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were objectives achieved on time? (and budget) Was the programme or project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?
Impact*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the program/project contribute to reaching higher level objectives (preferably, overall objective)? Why/ why not? What is the impact or effect of the programme or project in proportion to the overall situation of the target group or those effected? What are the intended or unintended effects of the programme, either positive or negative, direct or indirect?
Reach and uptake	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the program/project reach its intended target populations? Why/ why not? What were the barriers and facilitators to beneficiaries accessing/ completing the program?
Relevance*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How was learning and evidence was used throughout the program cycle to adapt and ensure the project remained relevant? How important is the relevance or significance of the intervention regarding local and national requirements and priorities?
Sustainability*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the positive effects or impacts sustainable?
Gender sensitivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How has the program/project considered gender sensitivity and SOGIESC inclusion both in the design and its implementation of activities?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Has the program/project incorporated different needs and accessibility of boys and girls, men and women, trans and non-binary individuals?</i> ▪ <i>What are the gender gaps that the program/project addressed and what remaining aspects need to be considered further?</i>
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

[*OECD DAC Criteria](#)

6. STUDY METHODOLOGY

6.1 Study Design

The evaluation consultant will propose the study design either the experimental, quasi-experimental or non-experimental design with mixed qualitative and quantitative methods, and appropriate sampling approaches during inception report. Ensuring Children and Youth participatory approaches in designing or developing in the study methodology.

The methodology will include a review of project documents such as proposals, logframe, annual reports, monitoring data, learning reports, and previous studies, as well as findings and lessons that reflect the perspectives of children and key stakeholders.

6.2 Sampling

The evaluation consultant is recommended to propose a sampling strategy that is appropriate to the study design, following the guidance below. While alignment with baseline studies is suggested, it is not mandatory; however, coherence will strengthen fair and accurate comparability across study phases. The sampling should also follow the disaggregation required by the logframe indicators to ensure comprehensive coverage of the data. Research in any discipline requires adherence to the principles of the Scientific Method, *verifiability, predictability, falsifiability, and fairness*. To meet these principles, applicants must describe the sampling process in sufficient detail, including the sampling method and sample size calculation (at a minimum the n and N values), to allow for peer review within Save the Children and to ensure the study can be replicated and its results verified. The sampling method to be used for qualitative and quantitative approaches will be:

Probability of sampling methods:

- *Simple random sampling*
- *Systematic sampling*
- *Stratified sampling*
- *Clustered sampling*

Non-probability sampling methods:

- *Voluntary sampling*
- *Convenience sampling*
- *Quota sampling*
- *Purposive sampling*
- *Snowball sampling*

An estimated of the project total population.

Stakeholders	Individuals
Students	400
Teachers	40
Parents	60
Youth advocates	30
LGBTIQ+ organisation staff	50
Save the Children Thailand staff	60
Government	20
Total	650

6.3 Data Sources and Data Collection Methods / Tools

All primary data collected during the study must facilitate disaggregation by gender and age. Existing baseline data collection tool will be consulted to develop final evaluation tools. Child-friendly data collection tool must be adapted for data collection with children and youth. Data collected during baseline will be used to compare finding from final evaluation.

Save the Children will not provide enumerators to assist with primary data collection. It will be a requirement of the study team to source additional external data sources to add value to the study, such as government administrative data. The team should also indicate how data triangulation will be realised.

A range of project documentation will be used to provides information about program implementation.

The study team is required to adhere to the [Save the Children Child Safeguarding; Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse; Anti-Harassment, Intimidation and Bullying](#); and Data Protection and Privacy policies throughout all project activities.

6.4 Ethical Considerations

It is expected that this study will be:

- **Child participatory.** *Where appropriate and safe, children should be supported to participate in the evaluation process beyond simply being respondents. Opportunities for collaborative participation could include involving children in determining success criteria against which the project could be evaluated, supporting children to collect some of the data required for the evaluation themselves, or involving children in the validation of findings. Any child participation, whether consultative, collaborative or child-led, must abide by the [9 Basic Requirements for meaningful and ethical child participation](#).*
- **Inclusive.** *Ensure that children from different ethnic, social and religious backgrounds have the chance to participate, as well as children with disabilities and children who may be excluded or discriminated against in their community.*
- **Ethical:** *The study must be guided by the following ethical considerations:*
 - *Safeguarding – demonstrating the highest standards of behaviour towards children and adults.*
 - *Sensitive – to child rights, gender, inclusion and cultural contexts.*
 - *Openness - of information given, to the highest possible degree to all involved parties.*

- Confidentiality and data protection - measures will be put in place to protect the identity of all participants and any other information that may put them or others at risk.¹
- Public access - to the results when there are not special considerations against this
- Broad participation - the relevant parties should be involved where possible.
- Reliability and independence - the study should be conducted so that findings and conclusions are correct and trustworthy.

It is expected that:

- Data collection methods will be age and gender appropriate.
- Study activities will provide a safe, creative space where children feel that their thoughts and ideas are important.
- A risk assessment will be conducted that includes any risks related to children, young people's, or adult's participation.
- A referral mechanism will be in place in case any child safeguarding or protection issues arise.
- Informed consent will be used where possible.

The study team will be required to obtain approval from a Human Research Ethics Committee. Save the Children will provide assistance with this process.

6.5 Known limitations

The timeline may clash with schools' mid-term break for the coordination period (October).

7. EXPECTED DELIVERABLES

The study deliverables and tentative timeline (subject to the commencement date of the study) are outlined below. The Evaluation Consultant team lead and SCT Programme Coordinator will agree on final milestones and deadlines at the inception phase.

Deliverable / Milestones	Timeline
The study Team is contracted and commences work	2 nd week of October
The study Team will facilitate a workshop with Save the Children Thailand at the commencement of the project to develop the inception report.	3 rd week of October
The study Team will submit an inception report * in line with the provided template , including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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 	4 th week of October

¹ If any Consultancy Service Provider, Freelancer or Contingent worker will have direct contact with children and/or vulnerable adults and/or beneficiaries and/or have access to any sensitive data on safeguarding and/or children and/or beneficiaries, it is the responsibility of the person receiving the consulting service to contact the local HR team and child safeguarding focal point to ensure vetting checks and on-boarding are conducted in line with statutory requirements, local policies and best practices guidance.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>ethical considerations including details on consent</i> ▪ <i>stakeholder and children communication and engagement plan</i> ▪ <i>key deliverables, responsibilities, and timelines</i> ▪ <i>resource requirements</i> ▪ <i>data collection tools (in line with the study matrix) [Indicate if there are any existing tools available or if there will be new ones developed, as well as include who is responsible for developing them]</i> <p>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.</p>	
<p>Ethics submission (if applicable):</p> <p>Should approval from a Human Research Ethics Committee be required, an ethics submission should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>study protocols (participant recruitment, data security and storage, consent and confidentiality etc.)</i> ▪ <i>considerations for consulting with children and other vulnerable groups (if applicable)</i> ▪ <i>participant information statement and consent forms</i> 	4 th week of October
<p>Final data collection tools (in the report language):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Survey instrument</i> ▪ <i>Data collection mechanism</i> 	4 th week of October
<p>A Power Point Presentation including a summary of formative findings from the study. The focus will be on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Summary of interim findings</i> ▪ <i>Any emerging program issues or risks (if applicable)</i> ▪ <i>Any changes that have had to be made to the study design (if applicable)</i> ▪ <i>Key tasks for the next stage of the study and any proposed refinements or changes to methodology (if applicable)</i> 	4 th week of November
<p>A Draft Study Report including below elements:</p> <p>All reports are to use the Save the Children Final Study Report template</p> <p>Executive summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Background description of the Program and context relevant to the Study</i> ▪ <i>Scope and focus of the study</i> ▪ <i>Overview of the study methodology and data collection methods, including a Study matrix</i> ▪ <i>Findings aligned to each of the key Study questions</i> ▪ <i>Specific caveats or methodological limitations of the evaluation</i> ▪ <i>Conclusions outlining implications of the findings or learnings</i> ▪ <i>Recommendations</i> ▪ <i>Annexes (Project logframe, study ToR, Inception Report, Study schedule, List of people involved)</i> 	1 st week of December

A consolidated set of feedback from key stakeholders will be provided by Save The Children within 2 weeks of the submission of the draft report.	
Data and analyses including all encrypted raw data, databases and analysis outputs	3 rd week of December
Final Study Report* incorporating feedback from consultation on the Draft Study Report	4th week of December
Knowledge translation materials: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ PowerPoint presentation of Study findings ▪ Evaluation Brief** 	4th week of December

*All reports are to use the Save the Children [Final Study Report template](#) . Please also refer to Save the Children technical writing guide.

** The Evaluation Brief is a 2-4 pages summary of the full report and will be created using the Save the Children [template](#).

All documents are to be produced in MS Word format and provided electronically by email to the SC Evaluation Project Manager. Copies of all PowerPoint presentations used to facilitate briefings for the project should also be provided to Save the Children in editable digital format.

8. REPORTING AND GOVERNANCE

The evaluation consultant is to provide reporting against the project plan. The following regular reporting and quality review processes will also be used:

- Verbal reporting each bi-weekly to the Save the Children Study team (Project team and its technical team) by outlining progress made over the past month.
- A written progress updates by email to the Save the Children Project Coordinator for each milestone task as agreed in the timeline, documenting progress, any emerging issues to be resolved and planned activities for the next month.

9. 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.

Understanding of Requirements and Experience

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

- Designing and conducting outcome or impact level evaluations, familiar with employing the various robust designs such as experimental, quasi-experimental or other designs
- Conducting the research/evaluation in the field of child protection, child participation, child and youth empowerment, particularly in relation to peace building and conflict management, multiculturalism /arts and culture in Deep South Thailand, conflict-affected impact.

- *Leading socio-economic research, evaluations or consultancy work in Thailand's Deep South region 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.*
- *The team has a strong background in SOGIESC inclusion work and LGBTIQ+ rights with children and youth.*

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.

10. SCHEDULE OF PAYMENT

The total budget available for this evaluation, including all professional fees, travel, accommodation, data collection, hiring and training for enumerators, applicable taxes is expected to fall within the range of THB 400,000 – 480,000. Proposals should provide a clear financial breakdown within this range.

The following payments will be made to the consultant using and agreed mode of payment

- *Upon approval of inception report and tools: [30%]*
- *Upon completion reflection workshop, submission of First Draft reflection report and study Report: [40%]*
- *Upon approval of final study report: [30%]*



11. HOW TO APPLY

If you are interested in applying for this study, please complete the [Consultant EOI Form](#). The contact person for this study is kittiphan.samana@savethechildren.org

When submitting, kindly also attach the following:

- *Proposal (including budget and timeline)*
- *Portfolio*

12. ANNEXES

Annex 1: Project Logframe

[to be provided]

Annex 2: 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?

	<p>12. Are unintended and unexpected changes (positive or negative) identified and explained?</p>
	<p>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.</p>
	<p>14. Are the findings disaggregated according to sex, disability and other relevant social differences?</p>
	<p>15. Is there a clear logical link between the data that was collected and analysed, and the conclusions and recommendations presented?</p>
	<p>16. Are conflicting findings and divergent perspectives presented and explained in the analysis and conclusions?</p>
	<p>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)?</p>
<p>Communication and Use</p>	<p>18. Is the analysis and interpretation of the data well communicated through accessible language and helpful visuals (diagrams, graphs, tables as needed)?</p>
	<p>19. Are references, annexes and links included that provide additional relevant data, analysis or references (including key documents and which individuals/stakeholders were involved)?</p>
	<p>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?</p>