Terms of Reference for SENANG Project Final Evaluation

September 2025

1. TABLE OF CONTENTS

2. PROJECT SUMMARY

Type of study	Final Evaluation
Name of the project	Supporting an Enabling Atmosphere for Children and Youth Network for peace building Goals (SENANG)
Project Start and End dates	1 January 2023 – 31 December 2025
Project duration	36 months
Project locations:	Deep South region of Thailand and Bangsamoro Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao, the Philippines
Thematic areas	Child Protection; Other supporting themes, and cross-cutting areas
Donor	EU Foreign Policy Instruments - Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument (NDICI) - Global Europe, EuropeAid/173665/DD/ACT/Multi « Support to in-country civil society actors in conflict prevention, peace-building and crisis preparedness in East and Southeast Asia ».
Estimated beneficiaries	**Target groups:** In the Deep South of Thailand (DST), the action targets at least 25 staffs, from 7 Civil society Organisations (CSOs); at least 40 youth leaders (20F, 20M) and 400 adults (250F, 1 SOM); at least 1,200 children, 600 girls (G) and 600 boys (B) from 10 conflict affected communities and 1200 community members (588M, 612F). In the Bangsamoro Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (BARMM) Philippines, the action targets at least 366 children (181 B, 185G); and 900 youth (449B, 451 G), including 35 youth leaders from conflict-affected communities or members of the Rawaten Children's Advisory council and; 523 adult community members (261 M, 262F (adult)), including 25 staff from 10 CSOs part of the Mindanao Emergency Response Network. **Final beneficiaries:** In DST the number of final beneficiaries will be 982,600 children, youth and adults (341, 858G, 361, 130B (0-1 7 years old); 133, 101 G, 142, 071 B (18-24 years old); 2, 300F, 2,200M (adult from 15 conflict affected communities). In BARMM 79, 711 children and youth, adults (25, 998B, 27,397G (0-17 years old); 6, 288B, 6,300G (18-24 years old); 6, 847M, 6,881 F(adult)).
Overall objective of the project	To contribute to prevent conflicts, respond to crises and build peace in Thailand's Deep South and Philippine's Mindanao by fostering children and youth inclusive of those with diverse SOGIESC-led inter-generational dialogue on social cohesion through the promotion of art: and culture.

3. INTRODUCTION

Save the Children is the leading global independent organisation for children. Save the Children believes every child deserves a future. Around the world, we work every day to give children a healthy start in life, the opportunity to learn and protection from harm. When crisis strikes and children are most vulnerable, we are always among the first to respond and the last to leave. We ensure children's unique needs are met, and their voices are heard. We deliver lasting results for millions of children, including those hardest to reach.

> *Our vision: A world in which every child attains the right to survival, protection, development and participation.*
>
> *Our mission: To inspire breakthroughs in the way the world treats children, and to achieve immediate and lasting change in their lives.*
>
> *Our values: Accountability, ambition, collaboration, creativity and integrity.*

This document provides the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the hiring of an external Evaluation Team (such as an individual, consultancy firm, organization, or institution – referred hereafter to as "consultant") for the Final Evaluation of the SENANG project. The primary purpose of this consultancy is to understand the extent to which the project has achieved the intended outcomes and generate evidence on programme impact and immerging changes.

The consultant will conduct the final evaluation study from the design stage, to drafting and finalizing the report, all the way to the communication. This consultancy includes field data collection in Thailand; analysis and consolidation of the data from both Thailand and the Phillippines, as well as providing recommendations for the programme and communities we work with in both countries. Field data collection in the Philippines is not included under this consultancy. Data will be collected in the Philippines by enumerators hired by Save the Children Philippines using and contextualizing the tools developed by the consultant hired under this ToR.

To ensure objectivity and credibility, the selected consultant must have no prior involvement in the Action. The evaluation is scheduled between October 2025 and January 2026.

More details on the project background, study scope, key questions, intended methodology, reporting and governance, key deliverables and timeframes for its implementation are provided in the following sections.

4. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Both Thailand and the Philippines have experienced protracted conflicts that have deeply affected children's lives and futures. The two locations have faced a resurgence of ethno-nationalist conflict, rooted in long-standing grievances of minority groups against the state. In Thailand's Deep South (*DST*), comprising the three southernmost provinces and four adjoining districts of Songkhla, the conflict is recognised as one of the oldest pre-modern conflicts that is still active in Southeast Asia (*The Contested Corners of Asia, 2013*). In the Philippines, the Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (*BARMM*) continues to face similar challenges. The conflicts in both the DST and BARMM are centred on issues of language, religion, and education, which serve both as drivers and products of culture. As a result, more than 7,000 lives have been lost, and over 10,000 children have been directly or indirectly affected by armed violence. Youth and children in these regions face psychosocial difficulties, fractured community relations, and

low educational outcomes. In response to the risk of renewed violence, BARMM has institutionalised Peace Education within school curricula.

Children and youth are often only seen as victims of conflict, without any agency for change. Culture is often seen as only a reflection of religion or language and has been used as a weapon in local communities, causing damage to multicultural and cross-community relations. However, children and youth have confirmed through community consultations that culture can be a platform for communities with different social norms and beliefs to speak openly about their needs and promote peace.

Project information:

The "Supporting an Enabling Atmosphere for Children and Youth Network for Peacebuilding Goals" (*SENANG*, meaning Serenity and Happiness in Malay), funded by the European Union's Foreign Policy Instrument, was developed by Save the Children Thailand (*SC Thailand*) and Save the Children Philippines (SC Philippines) with Peace Resource Collaborative Foundation (*PRCF*), in consultation with children, youth, artists, academics and Civil Society Organisations (*CSOs*). The project has been funded under the European Union instrument - Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument (NDICI) - Global Europe, under the call EuropeAid/173665/DD/ACT/Multi «Support to in-country civil society actors in conflict prevention, peace-building and crisis preparedness in East and Southeast Asia».

It has been implemented in Pattani, Yala, Narathiwat and Songkhla in Thailand's Deep South (*DST*), and in the Bangsamoro Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao (*BARMM*), of the Philippines – both regions affected by long-standing ethno-nationalist conflict. The action aimed to create safe and neutral platforms for children and youth to participate in peace negotiations at the local/provincial level in DST and BARMM. The action has included collaboration with local organizations to feed youth and children's voices into local/national plans and is building on previous EU-funded initiatives implemented by Save the Children such as Local Engagement to Advocate for Peace in DST and Spaces for Peace in BARMM. The action aligns with the 2021 Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) Regional Forum statement on promoting youth, peace, and security, recognizing the importance of meaningful youth engagement and empowerment for sustainable peace processes.

Overall objective: To contribute to prevent conflicts, respond to crises and build peace in Thailand's Deep South and Philippine's Mindanao by fostering children and youth inclusive of those withdiverse SOGIESC-led inter-generational dialogue on socialcohesion through the promotion of art: and culture

Specific objective: *Increase children and youth inclusive of those with diverse SOGIESC representation and capacity to fully and meaningfully participate in the prevention and resolution of conflicts and in peacebuilding within safe and neutral peace spaces within communities that promote a culture of peace, tolerance, intercultural and interreligious dialogue.*

Outputs:

1. *Children and youth inclusive of those with diverse SOGIESC use art as a medium to express their contextualised vision of social cohesion, drawing from the Deep South's and Mindanao's rich history and culture*
2. *Children and youth inclusive of those with diverse SOGIESC are supported to foster inter-generational dialogue on culture and social cohesion in conflict-affected areas targeting youth networks, influential community leaders and government representatives.*
   State and non-state accountability mechanisms at local and regional levels are strengthened and include children and youth inclusive of those with diverse SOGIESC perspectives of Peace and Culture.

Cross-cutting priorities: Child safeguarding, gender equality, disability and social inclusion (GEDSI), environmental sustainability and "do no harm" principles.

Timeframe: 36 months, recognizing that locally led, child-inclusive peacebuilding requires time to build trust and shift power.

5. SCOPE OF STUDY

5.1 Purpose, Objectives and Scope

This final evaluation is being conducted at the end of the SENANG project. It will build upon the baseline (2023) and midterm assessment (2024) that were previously conducted. This evaluation will be conducted by an external consultant.

The primary purpose of the study is to measure the project progress of SENANG regarding planned project results and indicators, to 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 and the Philippines government, partners, donors, and future strategies for Save the Children, 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.*
3) *Document lesson learned, mechanisms worked and can explain the achievement or non-achievement of the programme results.*
4) *Evaluate to what extent did the action support and empower civil society in conflict prevention and peacebuilding, contribute to inclusive policy-making and resilience building in line with the EU Strategy for the Indo-Pacific, and highlight the role and visibility of the EU as a peace actor.*

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

Scope: The final evaluation will evaluate the project's implementation and interventions in the target locations against the OECD/DAC criteria and designated evaluation questions, focusing on harvesting the endline values for log frame indicators, projects achievements and challenges, effectiveness, outcomes, and impact. The findings will generate lessons learned and evidence to inform future programme design and opportunities for scale-up or replication. Scheduled between October 2025 and January 2026, the evaluation will engage children and youth in the DST and BARMM, together with relevant adult stakeholders such as CSOs, community members, local authorities and government agencies, reflecting the project's total reach of 4,654 individuals (Thailand: 2,865; the Philippines: 1,789).

Key implementing partners and stakeholders in Thailand include:

1. *Peace Resource Collaboratives Foundation (PRCF)*

2. *The Looker*
3. *Yala Rajabhat University, Faculty of Design and Applied arts*
4. *Public Policy Institution, Prince of Songkhla University*
5. *The Royal Thai Government Peace Dialogue technical team*
6. *The Parliament Adhoc Committee on Deepsouth Peace Process*

Intended Audience and Use of the Study

Primary intended audience of the assessment are Save the Children project implementation team and technical advisor to use the finding to evaluate effectiveness of the project achievement against project objectives in all level (Impact, Outcomes and Outputs). Moreover, the evaluation result will also be shared with project donor as evidence of project progress and achievement.

Stakeholder	Further information
Project donor	*European Union Foreign Policy Instrument*
Primary implementing organisation	*Save the Children (Thailand and Philippines)*
Implementing partners	*Peace Resource Collaborative Foundation (PRCF)*
Government stakeholders	*SBPAC(Thailand) OPAPRU (The Philippines)*
Community groups	*N/A*
Beneficiaries	*Children and adults involved in the program/project/s and the study*
International development/humanitarian research community	*N/A*

The evaluation consultant 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.

5.2 Key Study Questions

Criteria	Key Study Questions
Accountability	▪ *How has the program/project approached accountability to children and the wider community?*
Child participation	▪ *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	▪ *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*	▪ *Did the program/project achieve its intended outcomes?* ▪ *Are there any differences in outcomes achieved by different groups?* ▪ *Were there any unintended outcomes, either positive or negative, direct or indirect?* ▪ *Are the objectives of the program/project being achieved?*
Efficiency*	▪ *Were objectives achieved on time? (and budget)* ▪ *Was the programme or project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?*
Impact*	▪ *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	▪ *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*	▪ *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*	▪ *Are the positive effects or impacts sustainable?*
Gender sensitivity	▪ *How has the program/project considered gender sensitivity both in the design and its implementation of activities?* ▪ *Has the program/project outcomes or results been equally represented?*
Civil Society Empowerment and Inclusive Policy Influence	▪ *To what extent has the project supported and empowered civil society organizations (CSOs), youth networks, and community groups to play an active and sustained role in conflict prevention and peacebuilding?* ▪ *How effectively has the project promoted inclusive and participatory dialogue among civil society, government, and other stakeholders (e.g., private sector, social partners)?*

- *In what ways has the project contributed to building the institutional or policy capacity of CSOs and community networks to influence peacebuilding and resilience agendas at local or national levels?*

*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. The consultant will ensure 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 (Baseline, Midline, and Conflict Sensitivity Analysis), 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 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*

6.3 Data Sources and Data Collection Methods / Tools

All primary data collected during the study must facilitate disaggregation by gender, age, disability, and location and other attributes required in the logframe. Existing baseline and midterm 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 and midterm 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:

[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.

- *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. The risk assessment will be utilized as part of risk mitigation plan in conducting the study.*
- *A referral mechanism will be in place in case any child safeguarding or protection issues arise. A suggested mechanism would be immediate report to Save the Children Child Protection focal person.*
- *Informed consent will be used where possible. Save the Children will provide consent form to the consultant and it should be prepared according to the Save the Children Safeguarding Policy.*

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

7. EXPECTED DELIVERABLES

The study deliverables and tentative timeline (subject to the commencement date of the study or unforeseen events) are outlined below. The Evaluation Consultant team lead and SC Thailand Project Coordinator will agree on final milestones and deadlines at the inception phase. The SC Thailand Project Coordinator will ensure alignment of deadlines and milestones with SC Philippines.

Deliverables and Tentative Timeline

Deliverable	Due Date
The Consultant is contracted and commences work	8 November 2025
Kick off meeting between consultant team, Save the children and partner to provide more information on the project and clarify the TOR and briefing on safeguarding policy.	10 November 2025
Phase 1: Inception Phase	
The Consultant will conduct **initial desk research and tool review** and develop and submit the **Inception report that** will include: ▪ *evaluation objectives and key evaluation questions* ▪ *description of the methodology, data sources, draft data collection tools (preferably against the key evaluation questions and selected indicators for baseline assessment) and sampling considerations* ▪ *caveats and limitations of evaluation* ▪ *key deliverables, milestones and timelines* ▪ *risk and issue management plan* ▪ *a stakeholder communication and engagement plan* ▪ *consultation protocols for consulting with children and other vulnerable groups (if applicable)* ▪ *Logistical or other support required from Save the Children* ▪ *Human Research Ethics Committee approval, if required* Once the report is finalised and accepted, the Consultant must submit a request for any change in strategy or approach to the Child Protection Technical Expert and SENANG Project Coordinator	17 November2025

Feedback by SC	22 November 2025
SC Approval of Inception Report and data collection tools	24 November 2025
Phase 2: Data Collection and Analysis	
• *Fieldwork plan and logistical arrangements* • *Translation of tools* • *Data collection in DST (Data for BARMM will be shared with the consultant by Save the Children after contextualization of tools and field data collection via SC Philippines)* • *Data analysis*	25 November - 8 December 2025
Conduct 2 days Project Reflection workshop that includes Preliminary findings presentation and **verification workshop** with partners ▪ *Prepare summary of interim findings for Thailand and the Philippines* ▪ *Prepare tools and facilitate SENANG project reflection workshop* ▪ *Prepare Reflection report as a result of the workshop* ▪ *Any emerging programme issues or risks (if applicable)* ▪ *Key tasks for the next stage of the evaluation and any proposed refinements or changes to methodology (if applicable)*	12-13 December 2025
Draft Evaluation Report* including the following elements: ▪ *Executive summary* ▪ *Background description of the Programme and context relevant to the evaluation* ▪ *Scope and focus of the evaluation* ▪ *Overview of the evaluation methodology and data collection methods, including an evaluation matrix* ▪ *Findings aligned to each of the key evaluation questions* ▪ *Consolidate and document good practices and lessons learned from intended impact and unintended consequences of the project interventions* ▪ *Specific caveats or methodological limitations of the evaluation* ▪ *Conclusions outlining implications of the findings or learnings* ▪ *Recommendations* ▪ *Annexes (Project log frame, Evaluation TOR, Inception Report, Study schedule, List of people involved)* The report should be approximately 30 pages with executive summary.	25 December 2025
Feedback by SC	28 December 2025
Final Draft Evaluation Report* with submission of **data and analysis** incorporating feedback from consultation on the Draft Evaluation Report	7 January 2026

Feedback by FPI	17 January 2026
Final Evaluation Report	25 January 2026
Approval by SC	30 January 2026
Knowledge translation materials: ▪ *PowerPoint presentation of evaluation findings* ▪ *Evidence to Action Brief***	25 January 2026

*All reports are to use the Save the Children Final Study Report template [unless another format is required by the project donor or used by partner who did the research/assessment/evaluation]. 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 MANAGEMENT

Study Tentative Timeline, with key deliverables in bold. The final timeline and deliverables will be agreed upon the inception phase.

What	Who is responsible	By when *(TBC)*	Who else is involved
Study tender submissions due [if external]	[Study proponents]		
Tender review and selection of study team [if external]	[SC tender review panel]		

Documentation review, desk research	[Evaluation consultant]		
Consultation	[Evaluation consultant]		[Refer to Key Stakeholders section]
Inception report	[Evaluation consultant]		
Review of inception report	[SCT Programme Coordinator]		[Project team, Technical advisor, MEAL]
Development of Data collection tools	[Evaluation consultant]		[Project team, Technical advisor, MEAL]
Ethics submission	[SCT Programme Coordinator]		MEAL
Logistical arrangements	[Evaluation consultant]		[SCT Supply Chains and Support Services]
Data collection	[Evaluation consultant]		
Data management and analysis (coding, transcriptions, data cleaning, integration and analysis)	[Evaluation consultant]		
First draft of the Final study report	[Evaluation consultant]		
Review of first draft report	[SCT Programme Coordinator]		[Project team, Technical advisor, MEAL]
Meeting with evaluation consultant to finalize the report	[SCT Programme Coordinator]		[Project team, Technical advisor, MEAL]
Validation of study findings and recommendations	[SCT Programme Coordinator]		[Project team, Technical advisor, MEAL, beneficiary representatives, and key stakeholders]
Final study report and submission of data and analyses	[Evaluation consultant]		
Knowledge translation materials	[Evaluation consultant]		

Project team meeting to develop Study Response Plan	[SCT Programme Coordinator]		[Project team, Technical advisor]
Study final report (together with response plan) posted on OneNet and reviewed (see page 1 above for platform links)	[SCT Programme Coordinator]		[SC Peer reviewers]

10.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.*

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.

11. SCHEDULE OF PAYMENT

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%]*

12. HOW TO APPLY

If interested in applying for this study, please contact arif.leh@savethechildren.org

13. ANNEXES

Annex 1: Project Logframe *(to be provided)*

Annex 2: List of project documents to be consulted *(to be provided)*

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?
	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)?
Communication and Use	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?

[please note, the evaluation quality criteria above is all the external consultants will need to be aware of. However, you can find more details and guidance via the SCI Evaluation Quality Scoring Tool (in English, French, Spanish and Arabic).

ToR prepared by:	fadel.hayeeyama@savethechildren.org Child Protection Programme Coordinator
ToR approved by:	mink.sritha@savethechildren.org

	MEAL Technical Expert
Date of sign off:	September 3, 2025

Who can I contact if I have a question or comment about this document?

Please contact the Evidence Quality and Innovation TWG at EQITWG@savethechildren.org. as well as SCI Centre Evidence and Learning Team at CentreEvidenceandLearning@savethechildren.org