

Terms of Reference
for
Volvo Education in Emergencies Project
Participatory Risk and Capacity Assessment
January 2026



I. TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Table of Contents.....	0
2. Project Summary.....	1
3. Introduction.....	2
4. Background and Context.....	2
5. Scope of ASSESSMENT.....	4
5.1 Purpose, Objectives and Scope.....	4
5.2 Intended Audience and Use of the Evaluation.....	5
5.3 Key Assessment Questions.....	5
6. ASSESSMENT Methodology.....	6
6.1 Assessment 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.....	9
8. Timeline.....	11
9. Reporting and Governance.....	12
10. Assessment Team and Selection Criteria.....	13
11. Schedule of Payment.....	13
12. HOW TO APPLY.....	14
13. Annexes.....	14



2. PROJECT SUMMARY

Type of study	Assessment
Name of the project	Emergency Preparedness and School Safety
Project Start and End dates	15 April 2025 – 14 April 2028
Project duration	36 months
Project locations:	Yala and Chiang Mai Provinces in Thailand
Thematic areas	Education
Sub themes	Preparedness, Prevention and Risks Reduction
Donor	Volvo for Life Fund
Estimated beneficiaries	The intervention will directly reach a total of 8,060 beneficiaries, including 560 adults (280 men and 280 women) comprising community leaders, parents and caregivers, schoolteachers and education staff, and government authorities, as well as 7,500 children (3,200 boys and 4,300 girls). In addition, the intervention is expected to indirectly benefit 625,000 people, including 600,000 adults (292,140 men and 307,860 women) and 25,000 children (12,172 boys and 12,828 girls). Activities will be implemented across 10 targeted schools, with 5 schools in Chiang Mai and 5 schools in Yala.
Overall objective of the project	Build the capacities of local institutions and individuals by empowering school staff and children to develop, own, and independently sustain effective Emergency Preparedness Plans that will safeguard children in these high-risk areas

3. INTRODUCTION

This document sets out the Terms of Reference (ToR) for commissioning a School Participatory Risk and Capacity Assessment under the Emergency Preparedness and School Safety (Volvo EiE) project.

to examine progress to date, identify key risks and challenges, and assess alignment with the project's intended objectives. The findings will generate evidence-based insights to inform project adjustments, strengthen implementation quality, and support decision-making, while upholding accountability to children, schools, and local communities.

The Emergency Preparedness and School Safety, funded by Volvo Cars – Volvo for Life fund, is implemented over a three-year period from 15 April 2025 – 14 April 2028 to strengthen education preparedness, resilience, and child safeguarding in climate-vulnerable areas of Thailand. The project is designed as a phased, integrated intervention, combining Save the Children Thailand's technical EiE expertise with deep community-level experience to support sustainable change. Through continuous technical guidance, the project aims to build institutional and individual capacities, enabling schools, staff, and children to develop, own, and sustain effective Education Preparedness Plans (EPPs), contributing to both immediate risk mitigation and long-term community resilience. The project directly targets 10 primary schools (5 in Chiang Mai and 5 in Yala), reaching 7,500 children and 560 adults (including teachers, caregivers, community leaders, and government authorities), and indirectly benefits approximately 625,000 individuals across target communities.

Implementation of Outcome 2 commenced in Year 2 of the project, building on foundational activities delivered in Year 1. Key activities to date include the review and development of advanced education preparedness plans, training of teachers on Safe Schools topics (including child protection, psychological first aid, positive discipline, disaster risk reduction, and contextual integration), and the introduction of anticipatory actions ahead of forecasted hazards. Several key lessons emerged from implementation, particularly in flood-prone areas of Yala Province. The EiE Day 1 Workshop demonstrated that preparedness is most effective when both programmatic and operational teams are engaged, fostering shared understanding of emergency roles and stronger institutional ownership. The experience highlighted the importance of embedding education in emergencies principles within existing systems rather than treating them as standalone interventions.

Additional learning highlighted the need for context-sensitive and participatory approaches, including adapting safeguarding discussions to local cultural norms and strengthening cross-departmental collaboration. The project also demonstrated the value of linking preparedness planning with anticipatory action and flexible funding, enabling schools to take timely, preventive measures. Overall, implementation to date confirms that education preparedness and safeguarding initiatives are most impactful when they are inclusive, culturally grounded, and integrated across institutional and community systems.

This external assessment consultant is scheduled to take place from January 2026 to April 2026. The following sections outline the background of the project, scope of the study, key evaluation questions, intended methodology, reporting and governance structures, key deliverables, and the timeframe for implementation.

4. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Ranked 9th in the world for long-term climate risk by German Watch's Climate Risk Index, Thailand faces mounting climate-related challenges that significantly impact children's access to quality education, with environmental hazards creating complex barriers to learning, significant education disruptions, and school safety risks.

During the annual haze season from January to April, severe air pollution from agricultural burning, forest fires, and urban emissions regularly forces school closures around the country. Chiang Mai regularly tops

the list of the world's worst cities for air pollution during this period and PM2.5 levels frequently exceed WHO safety standards. Thailand's Disease Control Department reported that between October 1, 2023 and December 31, 2024, more than one million people in Thailand suffered health issues linked to PM2.5 pollution. In January 2025, 350 schools in the country were closed due to pollution concerns. These conditions particularly affect children with respiratory conditions and disabilities, who may be unable to attend school for extended periods even when facilities remain open. The situation is exacerbated by inadequate air filtration systems in most public schools, leaving students and staff exposed to harmful pollutants.

In Thailand's northern and Deep South regions, increasingly unpredictable monsoon patterns have led to more frequent and severe flooding. From August to November 2024, Northern Thailand experienced severe flooding due to monsoon rains exacerbated by Typhoon Yagi's residual effects. The situation was particularly critical in Chiang Mai, Chiang Rai, Phayao, and Lampang, with over 213,442 people affected in total, including 51,002 children. Major infrastructure, including roads and schools, was submerged or damaged. UNICEF reported over 555 schools in northern Thailand were affected, and the schools were temporarily closed for 7-14 days or longer in some districts where the damage were severe. Most schools shifted to online learning and delivered study materials to students' homes during that period. Save the Children Thailand (SCT) acted quickly, facilitating the reopening of 30 severely affected schools by providing micro-grants for urgent infrastructure repairs and replacing lost educational materials. Additionally, 5,000 students received back-to-school kits to ensure they had the necessary school supplies to resume their education.

Southern Thailand started experiencing severe flooding in late November 2024, continuing into December, the worst seen in decades for some provinces. This region regularly experiences major flood disasters in December and January, but this event came more than a month earlier than usual, taking the population by surprise and revealing emergency preparedness weaknesses. During this time, the flooding caused extensive damage to schools and other infrastructure. At least 136 schools were used as shelters, delaying the reopening of classes and raising concerns about the safety of students. As part of SCT's Education in Emergency (EiE) response, 5,000 children and teachers were supported through activities meant to increase awareness and access to anticipatory actions in education and 1,800 children received back-to-school kits. Flood-specific EiE kits were distributed to schools in advance of the flooding and participatory risk assessments were conducted. Additionally, SCT provided micro-grants to schools to help repair damage and replace educational materials and distributed information materials in schools and villages on recommended behaviours for children during and before flood disasters.

In both regions, schools in flood-prone areas often lack proper elevation or drainage infrastructure, leading to extended closures and damage to educational materials and facilities. The economic burden of repeated flood damage strains already limited school resources, creating a cycle of deteriorating infrastructure that disproportionately affects schools serving marginalised communities. Gender dimensions add another layer of complexity to these environmental challenges. During flood events, girls often face increased domestic responsibilities, caring for younger siblings or helping with household recovery, leading to higher rates of absenteeism in school. Cultural considerations in Yala (Deep South region), with its significant Muslim population, require additional planning for gender-appropriate emergency shelters and facilities when schools are used as evacuation centres. Children with disabilities face compounded challenges, as emergency facilities rarely account for inclusive accessibility requirements. The situation is particularly concerning in rural and under-resourced areas, where schools may lack basic infrastructure to withstand even minor environmental stresses. In Chiang Mai's highland areas (northern region) and Yala's remote districts (Deep South region), many school buildings were not constructed to withstand intense weather events or provide adequate protection from air pollution.

Climate change projections suggest these challenges will intensify in coming years, with models predicting more frequent extreme weather events and prolonged periods of poor air quality. Thailand's current EIE frameworks and emergency preparedness protocols remain inadequate to address these mounting challenges. While the nation has made strides in disaster risk reduction (DRR), many schools lack comprehensive emergency preparedness plans that account for the full spectrum of environmental

hazards they face and needs of specific groups. Training for teachers and school administrators in emergency response remains limited, particularly in addressing the needs of girls and students with disabilities during crises. Many schools operate without proper early warning systems or evacuation protocols, and emergency communication systems often fail to reach parents and caregivers effectively.

The project aims to achieve the three following outcomes:

Outcome 1: SC country offices are better prepared to respond to education in emergencies needs from the onset of a crisis

Outcome 2: Girls and boys of school-going age are safe and protected from all hazards in and around schools.

Outcome 3: Strengthened resilience of local and national education systems for education continuity and risk reduction

5. SCOPE OF ASSESSMENT

5.1 Purpose, Objectives and Scope

This assessment is conducted in Year 2 of the Volvo-EiE project, at the outset of Outcome 2 implementation, to support schools and communities in strengthening preparedness, resilience, and child safeguarding in disaster-prone areas. It aims to generate evidence-based insights into the risks, hazards, and preparedness capacities affecting children in project-supported locations, with a particular focus on informing school-based preparedness planning and stakeholder engagement.

The primary purpose of the study is:

- *Identify and analyse key hazards, risks and needs of children in target schools and surrounding communities, reflecting children's needs, perceptions, and concerns.*
- *Examine school-level risks and hazards through a school assessment aligned with the Comprehensive School Safety Framework¹; to understand how broader multi-risks affect school environments, and to assess existing school-level capacities in delivering Education in Emergencies and preparedness practices in disaster management as baseline for measuring changes at the end of project.*
- *Map the stakeholder ecosystem related to Education in Emergencies, risk reduction and preparedness, to inform Save the Children Thailand's advocacy, coordination, and partnership strategies at provincial and district levels.*

The consultant will be required to undertake consultation with the SCT's project team and technical experts at the commencement of the project in order to further refine the assessment design and methodology.

Scope:

The assessment will apply a multi-risk and child-centered approach across Chiang Mai and Yala, covering 5 target primary schools in Chiang Mai through primary data collection and 5 schools in Yala through secondary data review. Within this multi-risk assessment, a school-level assessment aligned with the

¹ *The Comprehensive Safe School Framework (2023–2030) is a global framework coordinated by the Global Alliance for Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience in the Education Sector (GADRRRES) through its multi-stakeholder working group. It aims to protect learners and education systems from disaster and conflict risks through three pillars: safe learning facilities, school disaster management, and risk reduction and resilience education, while promoting child participation, community engagement, and alignment with national systems.*

Comprehensive School Safety Framework will be conducted to examine how localized hazards – both rapid- and slow-onset ones, as well as other environmental and climate-related threats, affect school environments, and to assess existing school-level preparedness practices and capacities to mitigate the risks and ensuring education continuity during emergency. Participatory tools such as risk mapping, hazard matrices, institutional relationship diagrams, and historical timelines are suggested to be used at school level, alongside child-participatory methods to identify key hazards affecting children and to understand children’s needs, concerns, and perceptions of safety.

In addition, the consultant will conduct stakeholder mapping to identify key actors involved in risk reduction and preparedness, including education authorities and relevant stakeholders at district and provincial levels, to inform Save the Children Thailand’s advocacy and partnership strategies. The assessment will actively engage children, parents and caregivers, teachers, school management, and community leaders throughout the process.

5.2 Intended Audience and Use of the Evaluation

Primary intended audience of the evaluation are:

Stakeholder	Further information
Project donor	Volvo Cars – Volvo for Life Fund
Primary implementing organisation	Save the Children Thailand
Implementing partners	N/A
Government stakeholders	10 Schools and local education entities
Community groups	Local communities
Beneficiaries	Children, school personals, parents and government entities
International development/humanitarian research community	N/A

5.3 Key Assessment Questions

- What environmental, and climate-related risks and hazards affect the target schools in Chiang Mai and Yala, and how do these risks affect school environments and affect children over time?
 1. What specific hazards do children face in each target school, and what are children’s needs, concerns, and perceptions of safety in relation to these risks?
 2. How do schools currently identify, manage, and respond to risks and hazards affecting children, and what preparedness capacities and gaps exist in relation to the Save the Children Safe School Framework?
- % of teachers demonstrate knowledge on identified safe schools modules
 - % of children perceiving a high level of safety in their school environment, in Save the Children or partner-supported schools

- Who are the key stakeholders linked to school-level risk reduction, and Education in Emergencies, and how can Save the Children Thailand strengthen advocacy, coordination, and partnerships to support preparedness and project impact?

The above key assessment questions are intended to serve as a guiding framework for the assessment. They are not exhaustive and may be refined, prioritized, or adapted to better reflect the local context, emerging findings, data availability, and stakeholder inputs in Chiang Mai and Yala. At the inception phase, the Consultant will work closely with Save the Children Thailand to review and adjust the assessment questions and data collection focus as necessary, ensuring alignment with the project's objectives.

6. ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

6.1 Assessment Design

The consultant will propose an assessment design that addresses the assessment objectives and generates robust, practical learning to inform school-level preparedness and risk reduction under the Volvo EiE project.

The assessment is expected to adopt a mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative and quantitative data, and will include:

- *A desk review of relevant project documents (including project proposals, logframe, monitoring data, and reports) to inform the assessment design, tool development, and analysis, including a review of existing risk and hazard analysis reports from 5 schools in Yala, under ECHO HIP II project, to be incorporated as secondary data.*
- *School-level data collection, using tools aligned with the Save the Children Safe School Framework and participatory risk assessment methods.*
- *Stratified random sampling for the quantitative component, with strata defined by gender and age groups. However, the purposive or quota sampling may be proposed ensure inclusion of diversity such as disability and ethnics.*

The assessment design should be feasible within the school-level scope and ensure meaningful participation of children and school stakeholders.

6.2 Sampling

It is recommended that the applicants propose a sampling strategy that ensures methodological rigour, and alignment with the assessment objectives. The sampling process must be described in sufficient detail to meet the principles of the scientific method which presents verifiability, predictability, replicability, and fairness.

Key expectations include:

- *The consultant should provide a clear explanation of the sampling method, including sample size calculation values (population size N and proposed sample size n at a minimum), as well as the assumed confidence level and margin of error.*
- *Quantitative Component: Stratified random sampling is encouraged, with strata defined by gender and age groups, subject to feasibility within the school-level scope.*

- *Qualitative Component: For focus group discussions, key informant interviews, and case studies, non-probability methods such as purposive or quota sampling may be used to ensure inclusion of diverse perspectives, particularly marginalized group such as children with diverse SOGIESCS, disabilities, ethnics.*
- *The sampling strategy should be feasible, transparent, and clearly justified, enabling independent review of the methodological choices.*

The sampling strategy will be agreed and finalised with Save the Children's Technical Team during the inception phase.

6.3 Data Sources and Data Collection Methods / Tools

All primary data collected during the assessment must facilitate disaggregation by gender, age, location and other characteristics suggested during the inception phases. Save the Children will provide guidance on tools and classification schemes for this minimum dataset.

Existing Save the Children data sources that can be drawn on in the assessment include:

- *ECHO HIPs II school risk assessment reports (5 schools in Yala)*
- *Save the Children Save School Common Approaches.*
- *The Climate Crisis: Save the Children's Internal Child-Centred Framework for Action (2025)*
- *Save the Children's Programming in a Context of Increasing Climate-related Risk and Change: A climate risk-informed guide for all sectors (2024)*

Save the Children recommends mixed method of data collection methods on in the study that includes, for example, structural survey, questionnaire, key informant and group interview. Save the Children will not provide enumerators to assist with primary data collection. It will be a requirement of the evaluation 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 made available to the evaluation team that provides information about the design and implementation of the Volvo-EiE project. Documents include:

- *Project Proposal*
- *Project Logframe*
- *Project monitoring report/ progress report/ annual report*
- *List of project stakeholders, particularly implementing partners and sub-grantees*

The evaluation 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 evaluation 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 evaluation must be guided by the following ethical considerations:*
 - *Safeguarding – demonstrating the highest standards of behavior 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.²*
 - *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 evaluation 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.*
- *Assessment 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. The consultant is required to ensure that the evaluation information, inception report, data collection tools, and all relevant documents are well prepared and aligned with the submission checklist provided by Save the Children.

6.5 Known limitations

- The analysis is not intended to be statistically generalisable at provincial level. Findings are derived from a limited number of schools (5 schools per province) and therefore reflect a project-focused, school-based analysis, rather than a comprehensive representation of all schools within Chiang Mai and Yala. The results are intended to inform project learning, planning, and implementation, rather than province-wide policy conclusions.
- Age-, ability-, disability-, and ethnicity-related appropriateness of data collection may affect the depth and consistency of findings. Data collection tools and facilitation approaches must be adapted to suit children of different ages and abilities, which may limit comparability across age groups and require simplified or participatory methods rather than standardised questioning.
- The data collection timeline presents operational constraints. Fieldwork is planned during a period when schools may be affected by final examinations (February) and school holidays (March–April). These factors may restrict access to students and teachers, reduce available time for data collection, and require flexibility in scheduling and sampling.

² 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.



7. EXPECTED DELIVERABLES

The midterm evaluation deliverables and tentative timeline (subject to the commencement date of the study) are outlined below. The evaluation team lead and the project coordinator will agree on final milestones and deadlines at the inception phase.

Deliverables
The evaluation Team is contracted and commences work
The evaluation Team will facilitate a Kick-off meeting with the relevant stakeholders at the commencement of the project to develop the inception report.
<p>The evaluation Team will submit an inception report* in line with the provided template, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Evaluation objectives, scope and key evaluation questions</i> ▪ <i>description of the methodology, including design, data collection methods, sampling strategy, data sources, and study matrix against the key evaluation questions</i> ▪ <i>data analysis and reporting plan</i> ▪ <i>caveats and limitations of evaluation</i> ▪ <i>risks and mitigation plan</i> ▪ <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 evaluation 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 evaluation team team must submit a request for any change in strategy or approach CINTALAM project coordinator</p>
<p>Ethics submission:</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>evaluation 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>
<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>
Evaluation team conduct the field data collection
Data and analyses including all encrypted raw data, databases and analysis outputs

An Interim Report including a summary of formative findings from the evaluation. 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 evaluation design (if applicable)*
- *Key tasks for the next stage of the evaluation and any proposed refinements or changes to methodology (if applicable)*

A **Draft Study Report** including below elements:

All reports are to use the Save the Children [Final Evaluation Report template](#)

- *Executive summary*
- *Background description of the Program 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*
- *Specific caveats or methodological limitations of the evaluation*
- *Conclusions outlining implications of the findings or learnings*
- *Recommendations*
- *Annexes (Project log frame, study ToR, Inception Report, evaluation schedule, List of people involved)*

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.

INTPA review

Final Midterm Evaluation Report* incorporating feedback from consultation on the Draft Study Report

Knowledge translation materials:

- *PowerPoint presentation of evaluation findings*
- *Evaluation Brief***

*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. TIMELINE

Deliverables/week	February				March				April			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
The study team is contracted and commences work	■											
Submit Inception report and tools		■										
Review of the Inception and tool			■									
Ethics Submission (to SC IRB)			■									
Field data collection				■	■	■						
Data analysis							■	■				
Report writing								■	■			
Validation workshop								■				
Submit the first draft report										■		
Review of the draft report											■	
Submit the final report												■
Submit the Evidence to Actions brief												■

9. REPORTING AND GOVERNANCE

The study team lead will report to the Humanitarian Coordinator. Save the Children through Volvo-EiE Project should approve all plans and documents developed by the study team, in suggestions of the Technical Experts where relevant.

The study team lead is to provide reporting against the assessment plan. A weekly email to Humanitarian Coordinator detailing the progress, any emerging issues to be resolved and planned activities for the following week should be made by the evaluation team lead.

A draft report should be submitted for feedback and comments. The report should be written in English. The final evaluation report will comprise the following contents:

- *Table of Contents*
- *List of Acronyms*
- *List of Tables*
- *Executive Summary*
- *Background and context*
- *Introduction*
- *Scope of Evaluation*
- *Design and Methodology Evaluation*
- *Data analysis*
- *Key Findings*
- *Conclusions and Recommendations*
- *Annexes*
- *The final TOR*
- *Inception report including workplan and budget*
- *Project Logical framework*
- *Evaluation matrix and tools*
- *List of people involved in the evaluation*
- *Raw data*

The study team will revise the report according to the agreed feedback and comments from Save the Children. The final report will be assessed against Save the Children's Evaluation Report Scoring Checklist. The MEAL Technical Expert and the Climate Change and Green Skills Technical Expert at Save the Children Thailand will review the report and provide sign-off of the evaluation.

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

- *Verbal reporting bi-weekly to the project coordinator and the technical team by outlining progress made over the past month.*

10. ASSESSMENT TEAM AND SELECTION CRITERIA

Understanding of Requirements and Experience

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

- *Designing and conducting research or assessment using quasi-experimental or non-experimental design.*
- *Conducting studies in the field of climate change, climate education, environment, disaster risk reduction, particularly in relation to child participation, youth empowerment, climate and environment education, the social innovation.*
- *Leading socio-economic research, assessment or consultancy work in the Chiang Mai, 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 studies and evaluations in humanitarian contexts*
- *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 evaluations 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 midterm evaluation 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 signing the contract: 30%*
- *Upon submission of inception report: 40%*
- *Upon approval of final midterm evaluation report: 30%*

12. HOW TO APPLY

Interested applicants are invited to submit the application via email to kittiphan.samana@savethechildren.org, with the subject line in the subject : **Volvo-EiE Consultancy – Application Submission**]. The following documents are required:

- A technical proposal outlining the applicant’s understanding of the assignment, proposed approach, and relevant experience.
- A financial proposal detailing the costs associated with assessment management.
- Curricula vitae (CVs) of the team leader and proposed team members.

13. ANNEXES

Annex 1: Project Logframe

[To be provided]

Annex 2: List of project documents to be consulted

[To be provided]

Annex 3: SC Steering Committee Roles and Responsibilities

[To be provided]

Annex 4: 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?

	<p>10. Is the data well triangulated, such as by using different data collection methods, types of data and stakeholder perspectives?</p> <p>11. Are alternative factors (eg. the contribution of other actors) considered to explain the observed result alongside an intervention's contribution?</p> <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>
Communication and Use	<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>