16. Annexes

Annex 1. Evaluation Matrix

Annex 2. Evaluation Tools

- Key Informant Interviews Protocol 1: Managers of Implementing Partners
- Key Informant Interview Protocol 2: Representatives of local governmental agencies/municipality
- Key Informant Interview Protocol 3: Focus Group Discussion (General)
- Key Informant Interview Protocol 3: Focus Group Discussion (Children)
- Protocol 4: Observation

Annex 3. Informed Consent Process

Annex 4. Consent Form and Introductory Letter for the Child and for the Legal Representative

Annex 5. Mix of Evaluation Approaches

Annex 6. Roles and Responsibilities

Annex 7. Typology of Respondents Based on Evaluation Matrix

Annex 8. List of Literature Consulted

Annex 9. Ethical Considerations

Annex 10. Dissemination Plan

Annex 11. ToR

Annex 12. Translation of Consent Forms
## Annex 1. Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
<th>Sub questions</th>
<th>Performance indicators</th>
<th>Data Collection Methods</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How are the response purpose and overall objectives consistent with and supportive of child protection related Core Commitments for Children in humanitarian Action, No Lost Generation Strategy, IASC Guidelines on MHPSS, the Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Response, UNICEF strategic plans and UNICEF Ukraine’s Country Programme Documents?</td>
<td>What government programmes have the CP programme interventions been aligned to? What has been the intervention logic (Theory of Change)? How has UNICEF Country Programme 2012-2016 been revised and adapted to respond to the emergency situation in 2014? What objectives relevant to CP/PSS have been identified in the new Country Programme? Have PCAs/SSFAs with NGOs been aligned to indicators, benchmarks and minimum standards as identified in: Core Commitments for Children in humanitarian Action, No Lost Generation Strategy, IASC Guidelines on MHPSS, the Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Response, UNICEF strategic plans and UNICEF Ukraine’s Country Programme Documents?</td>
<td>Extent to which PSS Programme was aligned to national and international strategic policy documents Evidence of staged programming related to emergency relief, early recovery and recovery, contributing to a process of transition from relief to recovery programming. Indications of coordinated programming by CP sub-cluster</td>
<td>Desk review Interviews</td>
<td>UNICEF Country programmes 2012-2016, 2017-2021 Core Commitments for Children in humanitarian Action, No Lost Generation Strategy, IASC Guidelines on MHPSS, the Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Response UNICEF current/former relevant staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Were the interventions under the PSS response appropriately framed to the age and gendered needs of the targeted children?</td>
<td>Were target groups and their needs relevantly identified and reached? Was the PSS response age- and gender appropriate? Was there a plan in place for preventing and responding to major child protection risks, building on existing systems; safe environments established for the most vulnerable children?</td>
<td>Extent to which PSS response targets most relevant needs?</td>
<td>Desk review Interviews Observation Focus group</td>
<td>programme documents of UNICEF and implementing partners programme officers implementing partners programme officers mainstream social service system managers beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what degree were the PSS response interventions culturally and socially appropriate?</td>
<td>What cultural and social norms were considered when planning PSS response? Were they specifically considered in tailoring the interventions?</td>
<td>Extent to which PSS response was tailored to cultural and social norms?</td>
<td>Desk review Interviews Observation Focus group</td>
<td>programme documents of UNICEF and implementing partners programme officers implementing partners programme officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent the CP/PSS programme articulated the objectives related to changes in children’s well-being and lives, and that of their family and community?</td>
<td>Have the objectives of the CP/PSS programme been set in terms of changes in children’s well-being and lives, and that of their family and community? Have the objectives been formulated SMART?</td>
<td>Desk review programme documents of UNICEF and implementing partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The PSS response was equipped with SMART objectives and relevant outcomes/indicators framework</td>
<td>Desk review programme documents of UNICEF and implementing partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the objectives of the CP/PSS programme been set in terms of changes in children’s well-being and lives, and that of their family and community?</td>
<td>Desk review programme documents of UNICEF and implementing partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were clear needs defined with respect to required ‘levels’ of PSS?</td>
<td>Were periodic reports on grave violations and other serious protection concerns for children and women available and utilized at the time of planning the response? What were sources of the reports? What was data triangulation process?</td>
<td>Desk review interviews programme documents of UNICEF and implementing partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence that programme development involved beneficiaries at every level (conception, implementation and M&amp;E)</td>
<td>Desk review interviews programme documents of UNICEF and implementing partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent were potential beneficiaries involved in the development of the CP programme?</td>
<td>How did UNICEF and its implementing partners involve people at risk to identify priorities and develop capacities and strategies for protection and security? Were NGOs involved in design? Were children consulted on their needs? Were parents consulted on children’s needs?</td>
<td>Desk review interviews Focus group programme documents of UNICEF and implementing partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence that programme development involved beneficiaries at every level (conception, implementation and M&amp;E)</td>
<td>Desk review interviews Focus group programme documents of UNICEF and implementing partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have potentially vulnerable or marginalized children and communities been reached?</td>
<td>Have interventions been aligned with the needs of most vulnerable children and their families as identified in UNICEF guides? (e.g. children with disabilities, children deprived of parental care and children victims of violence) Do interventions designs allow for individualised approach to children’s needs and their families?</td>
<td>Desk review observation programme documents of UNICEF and implementing partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence that most vulnerable groups (CWD, children victims of violence, children in contact conflict with the law)</td>
<td>Desk review observation programme documents of UNICEF and implementing partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the needs and capacities of different age groups been appropriately addressed?</td>
<td>Have interventions been adapted to reflect age-specific needs of children and their families? Do interventions designs allow for individualised approach to children’s needs and their families?</td>
<td>Desk review observation programme documents of UNICEF and implementing partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence that interventions have appropriately addressed all age groups and were tailored to the age specific needs of children</td>
<td>Desk review observation programme documents of UNICEF and implementing partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>To what extent have the stated CP programme outcomes been achieved? What were the achievements in terms of improving psychosocial well-being of Ukrainian children, both planned and unplanned? How were local definitions of wellbeing understood (children and caregivers) and incorporated into program: design, indicators and overall objectives?</td>
<td>What outcomes relating to child protection and psychosocial support have been set? Are they SMART? Do indicators have proper baseline and are they adequately set? What data is available to demonstrate achievement of outcomes?</td>
<td>Targeted changes in the lives of conflict-affected children and their families are clearly and measurably stated in programme documents. Indications of post-emergency institutional development efforts related to cross-sectors i.e. child protection, health, education and social policy. Evidence of mainstreaming practices related to better protection of children.</td>
<td>Desk review</td>
<td>Secondary data on national indicators implementing partners programme officers mainstream social service system managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent has the program M&amp;E framework and processes been able to measure response outputs, outcomes, and impact? Were expected results clearly stated and measurable through identifiable indicators?</td>
<td>Have performance benchmarks for child protection, GBV and child protection components of MHPSS been identified?</td>
<td>Identification of performance indicators related to quality of MHPSS.</td>
<td>Desk review</td>
<td>Secondary data on national indicators implementing partners programme officers mainstream social service system managers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What factors contributed to programming(?) success or failure with regard to targeted changes?</td>
<td>Has the programme been affected in any external or internal factors?</td>
<td>Identification of factors that have affected the programme implementation and that have been taken or not taken into consideration.</td>
<td>Desk review</td>
<td>programme documents of UNICEF and implementing partners programme officers beneficiaries (children and families)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What difference has come</td>
<td>Has the quality of life of children and their family For children:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
about for beneficiaries in terms of skills and knowledge, emotional well-being, and social well-being? changed? How?

- Improved knowledge and skills of children to protect themselves (recognise risk situations, know whom to address for help, etc.)
- Increase of children who developed coping mechanisms to deal with the crisis situation
- Increased sense of security and self-confidence, no use of violence
- Increased engagement of children in school and communal activities

For families:
- Improved capacity of parents to help their children deal with stress
- Improved capacity of children and families to restore normality in their lives e.g. finding a job, peer support
- Improved capacity of parents to address conflicts non-violently

Focus group officers mainstream social service system managers beneficiaries (children and families)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For communities:</th>
<th>NGO partners have improved capacity to provide quality support services</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Increased acceptance of local people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved access to psychological and social services for marginalised/vulnerable groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How extensive, effective and efficient is the transfer of knowledge and intervention approaches to NGOs and government actors?</th>
<th>Have changes in capacity of NGOs and government happened? What changes in capacity of NGOs and government actors have occurred to better support children in need?</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>implementing partners programme officers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mainstream social service system managers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other agencies – government and NGOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have agencies developed common strategies and approaches, based on existing minimum standards and Guidelines?</th>
<th>Are there documented mechanisms of shared planning, implementation and resources among UNICEF, UNICEF implementing partners and other governmental and non-governmental agencies?</th>
<th>Identification of common strategies, memoranda or procedures for sharing resources</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>implementing partners programme officers</td>
<td>mainstream social service system managers</td>
<td>other agencies – government and NGOs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have agencies effectively and jointly identified and addressed gaps in geographic or vulnerable/at risk group coverage?</th>
<th>What similar programmes co-existed during implementation? Were they developed in a coordinated manner to reach all geographical areas and all vulnerable groups of children and their families?</th>
<th>Evidence of improved coverage1 as a result of joint planning or coordination among agencies</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>implementing partners programme officers</td>
<td>mainstream social service system managers</td>
<td>other agencies – government and NGOs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have agencies developed effective referral mechanism to other relevant sectors and services, both in child protection/PSS and beyond?</th>
<th>Have there been established, activated and supported coordination mechanisms for child protection, GBV and MHPSS in consultation with the government and other partners to coordinate rapid assessment, mapping, funding, strategy development and involvement of affected populations? Have any changes in referral and communication</th>
<th>Improved appropriate referral of children requiring specific support</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>implementing partners programme officers</td>
<td>mainstream social service system managers</td>
<td>other agencies – government and NGOs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Proportion of affected children that have been reached by the interventions focusing both on geographical coverage and subgroups of a population who may be particularly vulnerable e.g. children with disabilities, children separated from their families)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent has the NGO collaboration promoted effective working relationships with the government local administration to collaborate on community development issues?</th>
<th>How effective have the government local administration been in supporting the children in need and their families? Have they been supported to strengthen their capacity in doing so?</th>
<th>Improved collaboration, working relationship and partnerships between NGOs, government, including local administration to collaborate on community development issues</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>implementing partners programme officers mainstream social service system managers other agencies – government and NGOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>To what extent the CP/PSS Programme’s governance and coordination was efficient to the results attained?</td>
<td>What has CP/PSS Programme’s governance and coordination mechanism been? Has it affected the attainment of outcomes? How?</td>
<td>Identification of factors that demonstrate efficiency of the CP/PSS programme’s governance in terms of attaining results</td>
<td>Desk review Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did the actual or expected outcomes justify the costs incurred?</td>
<td>Does the budget adequately reflect the balance of project components? What are the indicative costs per outcomes?</td>
<td>Understanding of the cost cost-efficiency principles by the programme staff at different levels and identification of the proof that these principles were applied throughout the programming and implementation process Ratio of emergency response/development budget</td>
<td>Desk review Interviews</td>
<td>programme documents of UNICEF and implementing partners programme officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did the PSS response activities overlap and duplicate with other similar interventions, either nationally funded or donor-funded?</td>
<td>What other agencies worked towards improvement of psychosocial well being amongst children? Did these efforts happen in coordination with UNICEF response and towards a common goal?</td>
<td>Identification of practices that demonstrate practical and real effort to avoid duplication and ensure synergies</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>implementing partners programme officers mainstream social service system managers other agencies – government and NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Did the response result in any lasting impact in strengthening child protection mechanisms and systematic responses such as community based child protection structures, provision of services, or addressing harmful social norms or traditional practices, etc.?</td>
<td>Has the existing child protection services (formal care) changed in terms of number, capacity and family-based vs institution ratio? How has the ratio children in formal vs. informal care changed over the evaluated period?</td>
<td>Identification of factors that demonstrate real change in existing child protection mechanisms as well as change of family based v. institution and formal v informal care ratio</td>
<td>Interviews Secondary national indicators data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacted</td>
<td>What lasting changes – attributable to programming — can be identified in the lives of individuals, families, communities and the broader environment?</td>
<td>What changes in the lives of the affected children and their families would have not happened or happened differently without UNICEF response?</td>
<td>Evidence of children’s lives (skills and knowledge, emotional well-being, and social well-being) being fundamentally affected after the end of the interventions</td>
<td>Interviews Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacted</td>
<td>What has been the impact of placing community based child protection structures in the catchment area of each child and adolescent friendly</td>
<td>What community-based child protection structures have been installed and where? How have these improved access and quality of care for the children served and their families?</td>
<td>Identification of factors that demonstrate real and perceived changes in the quality of care provided to children and</td>
<td>Interviews Secondary national indicators data focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funded?</td>
<td>How the PSS objectives were realized in terms of adequacy of human and material resources? (based on assessment of human and material resources required to achieve expected outcomes).</td>
<td>What human and material resources were invested in the interventions? What is the balance between human resources and direct activities costs? Was it justified?</td>
<td>Identification of existing practices, both at programming and implementations levels, that were aimed to ensure adequacy of human and material resources</td>
<td>Desk review Interviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| funded? | How the PSS objectives were realized in terms of adequacy of human and material resources? (based on assessment of human and material resources required to achieve expected outcomes). | What human and material resources were invested in the interventions? What is the balance between human resources and direct activities costs? Was it justified? | Identification of existing practices, both at programming and implementations levels, that were aimed to ensure adequacy of human and material resources | Desk review Interviews | programme documents of UNICEF and implementing partners implementing partners programme officers |

| funded? | How the PSS objectives were realized in terms of adequacy of human and material resources? (based on assessment of human and material resources required to achieve expected outcomes). | What human and material resources were invested in the interventions? What is the balance between human resources and direct activities costs? Was it justified? | Identification of existing practices, both at programming and implementations levels, that were aimed to ensure adequacy of human and material resources | Desk review Interviews | programme documents of UNICEF and implementing partners implementing partners programme officers |

<p>| funded? | How the PSS objectives were realized in terms of adequacy of human and material resources? (based on assessment of human and material resources required to achieve expected outcomes). | What human and material resources were invested in the interventions? What is the balance between human resources and direct activities costs? Was it justified? | Identification of existing practices, both at programming and implementations levels, that were aimed to ensure adequacy of human and material resources | Desk review Interviews | programme documents of UNICEF and implementing partners implementing partners programme officers |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th>To what extent did the PSS response identify and build on existing national, local, civil society, government capacities and positive coping mechanisms?</th>
<th>What existing national, local, civil society, government capacities was UNICEF response built on? Were these existing capacities sufficient? If not, what has been done to strengthen them?</th>
<th>Identification of the practice/processes that demonstrate how and to what extent did the PSS response identify/built on existing national/local CSO/government capacities and positive coping mechanisms and how these mechanisms have been reinforced/strengthened as a result of the UNICEF intervention</th>
<th>Interviews Secondary national indicators data focus groups</th>
<th>implementing partners programme officers mainstream social service system managers other agencies – government and NGOs beneficiaries – children and their families (vs. control group)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent the PSS response achievements are/will be sustained after the withdrawal of external support?</td>
<td>What partnerships/allies have been formed towards a common goal? What commitments have been made by local actors – state and non-state?</td>
<td>Identification of concrete plans at national/local government and CSO levels to continue/sustain PSS response achievements</td>
<td>Interviews Secondary national indicators data</td>
<td>implementing partners programme officers mainstream social service system managers other agencies – government and NGOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How best to sustain the achievement of the PSS response?</td>
<td>Are there factors hindering or fostering the sustainability of achievement of the PSS response?</td>
<td>Objectively identifiable or perceived factors that might hinder sustaining the achievements of the PSS response</td>
<td>Interviews Secondary national indicators data</td>
<td>implementing partners programme officers mainstream social service system managers other agencies – government and NGOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What new capacities within services or communities have been established or restored?</td>
<td>What added value has there been in terms for local child protection capacity?</td>
<td>Objectively identifiable capacities within the services/communities that demonstrate increased child protection capacities</td>
<td>Interviews Secondary national indicators data</td>
<td>implementing partners programme officers mainstream social service system managers other agencies – government and NGOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent these capacities and skills are being actively used in the</td>
<td>How much of the effects are owned by the impacted communities?</td>
<td>Proof of practical deployment of the capacities and skills in the</td>
<td>Interviews Secondary national</td>
<td>implementing partners programme officers mainstream social service system managers other agencies – government and NGOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS and development of children?</td>
<td>PSS with a high degree of local ownership</td>
<td>indicators data</td>
<td>managers other agencies – government and NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent have the PSS response decision making bodies (government, civil society, development agencies) and implementing partners undertaken the necessary decisions and course of actions to ensure the sustainability of the PSS? To what extent have the systems been strengthened?</td>
<td>Identifiable evidence of existing partnerships between the CSOs and the government (national/local) and the long term strategic vision in terms of ensuring the sustainability of the PSS</td>
<td>Interviews Secondary national indicators data</td>
<td>implementing partners programme officers mainstream social service system managers other agencies – government and NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What partnerships/allies have been formed towards a common goal? What commitments have been made by local actors – state and non-state?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanitarian-development nexus</th>
<th>Evidence of staged programming related to emergency relief, early recovery and recovery, contributing to a process of transition from relief to recovery programming. • Indications of coordinated programming by CP sub-cluster Indications of post-emergency institutional development efforts related to cross-sectors i.e. child protection, health, education or social policy</th>
<th>Interviews Secondary national indicators data</th>
<th>UNICEF programme staff implementing partners programme officers mainstream social service system managers other agencies – government and NGOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How was the HDN experience in the case of UNICEF Ukraine PSS Programme?</td>
<td>Were there links between the development and humanitarian context; What was the capacity of national authorities in HDN context; What was UNICEF’s added value in HDN context; What was the capacity of UNICEF as an organization in HDN context; What was the contribution of other HDN related partners?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What lessons learned and recommendations can be drawn for the future programming and realization of child’s rights in HDN</td>
<td>Has a gap analysis of local and national capacities in protecting children and women, and ensure integration of capacity strengthening in early recovery and transition plans, with a focus on risk reduction been initiated?</td>
<td>Ratio of emergency response/development budget • Evidence of mainstreaming practices</td>
<td>UNICEF programme staff implementing partners programme officers mainstream social service system managers other agencies – government and NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>context?</td>
<td>What could have been done differently to better link PSS with mainstream social welfare system?</td>
<td>related to better protection of children</td>
<td>other agencies – government and NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can this HDN related experience contribute to identifying ways to collaborate and move forward strengthening the humanitarian/development linkages: (i) improved capacity of service providers and quality of services (CP/PSS); (ii) enhanced system of child rights protection and child rights monitoring, (iii) strengthening reform related to CP/PSS processes and etc.?</td>
<td>Has data been reviewed and gaps addressed in services for children with specific needs (at-risk groups)? Has the capacity of service providers and quality of service been improved? Has training on protection for workers across all sectors, including armed forces and the justice system been institutionalized? Has accountability for human rights violations been strengthened? Has adoption and implementation of national legislation that supports human rights/humanitarian standards been promoted?</td>
<td>Extent to which programming has contributed to the capacity of the state/local institutions to: Strengthen service providers capacity Provide more quality child services to monitor child rights</td>
<td>Interviews Secondary national indicators data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2. Evaluation Tools

Key Informant Interviews Protocol 1: Managers of Implementing Partners

I. Introduction (10 min)
- Greetings and introduction of the moderator
- Explaining about the project and method of work
- Explaining about confidentiality approach
- Participant introduction

II. General (10 – 15 min.)
- What is the background of your NGO? Tell us about your organisation’s work? Which target groups does your organisation work with?

III. Relevance (15-20 min.)
- How long have you been working with UNICEF? How were you approached by UNICEF?
- How did your organisation and UNICEF decide on the specific interventions? What were those interventions?
- Which major child protection risks were you targeting? Which target groups were you targeting? Why? What analyses were these decisions based on?
- How did your beneficiaries (children and parents) perceive your interventions? What were they happy about most? What were they unhappy about most?
- Were there any particular grave violations and other serious protection concerns for children and women that your planned interventions had to address?
- Did you identify any particular grave violations and other serious protection concerns for children and women during the work? Give an example? Was there a plan what to do? Did any correction of project plans occur?
- When you planned your interventions, were children and their families involved in that planning in some way?
- Was your organisation involved? Other NGOs? Government?
- Did you target any specific most vulnerable groups of children? Which ones? Why?
- Did you sometimes have to change the planned interventions because of very specific needs of a child or family? (probe for individualised approach to children’s needs and their families)
- How did you approach differently very young children vs older children?

IV. Effectiveness (30-40 min.)
- What was the outcome for the child and family that your programme was trying to achieve? Were these outcomes set up and documented beforehand?
- How did you know if you were successful?
- How did you know what activities needed to be done with each child/family?
- How were the needs of each child/family assessed?
- Who did the assessment? What methodology was used? Did you feel you were equipped with sufficient knowledge on how to do MHPSS at the time?
- How did you proceed with cases of very severe psychological stress? GBV against children? Children separated from their parents? Children with disabilities?
- What made things most difficult for the project to achieve even better results at the time?
- Were there any major unplanned changes in the project?
- What was most helpful for the project to run successfully and without which it might have stopped or worsened?
- What changes in the lives of the affected children and their families would have not happened or happened differently without UNICEF response?
o Do you think the quality of life of the children and their life has changed? How?

o Upon exiting your programme what were the best outcomes for the children and families? Describe your most significant achievement with your beneficiaries.

o Sometimes even at our best efforts programmes cannot help as much as we wish? Did you face such situations, too? With what type of children or family situations?

o How did you identify different risks for children and their families? Plan individually for each child and family?

o Did you refer to external organisations e.g. government or service providers? Please describe the mechanism of referral. (probe for case management approach)

o How effective have the government local administration been in supporting the children in need and their families?

o Did your organisation change as a result of your interaction with UNICEF? (probe for lasting organisational capacity, qualification and skills, etc.?)

o How did you have to collaborate with UNICEF? Other implementing partners of UNICEF? Other NGOs? Governmental agencies? (probe for shared planning, shared implementation and shared resources)

o Were there any other programmes similar to UNICEF that existed at the time?

V. Efficiency (10-15 min.)

• What was UNICEF coordination of your project like?
• How was reporting of achievements organised?
• Did you have sufficient resources to best provide the service – material resources, human, funding?

VI. Impact (10-15 min.)

• What community-based child protection structures have been installed and where?
• How have these improved access and quality of care for the children served and their families?
• What would happen if UNICEF discontinued its programme here?
• How would this impact the lives of the children and their families?
• Are there any services available for children’s needs and their families?
• Will your organisation be able to continue its work in the same way without UNICEF support?
• Did anything change in the existing child protection system here because of UNICEF? (probe for any system changes in service delivery e.g. new services, improved services, better knowledge of professionals, etc.)

VII. HDN (10-15 min.)

• What risks remain for children and families now?
• What continue to be the most pressing needs of children and families now?
• What is the capacity of the local system for address those risks?
• In what area the changes in the practice of your organisation are most significant after UNICEF project:
  - In the organisation of the work
  - In the direct work with clients
  - In the planning process
  - In the structure of the services

VIII. Wrap up (10 min)

• What are the main problems, obstacles?
Any solutions/recommendations?

**Key Informant Interview Protocol 2: Representatives of local governmental agencies/municipality**

### I. Introduction (10 min)
- Greetings and introduction of the moderator
- Explaining about the project and method of work
- Explaining about confidentiality approach
- Participant introduction

### II. General (10 – 15 min.)
- Tell us about your organisation’s work? Which target groups does your organisation work with?

### III. Relevance (15-20 min.)
- How long have you been working with UNICEF? How were you approached by UNICEF?
- How did your organisation and UNICEF decide on the specific interventions? What were those interventions?
- Was your organisation involved in UNICEF planning response for this region?
- Which major child protection risks were you targeting? Which target groups were you targeting? Why? What analyses were these decisions based on?
- Were there any particular grave violations and other serious protection concerns for children and women that your planned interventions had to address?
- Did you identify any particular grave violations and other serious protection concerns for children and women during the work? Give an example? Was there a plan what to do? Did any correction of project plans occur?
- Did you target any specific most vulnerable groups of children? Which ones? Why?
- Did you sometimes have to change the planned interventions because of very specific needs of a child or family? (probe for individualised approach to children’s needs and their families)
- How did you approach differently very young children vs older children?

### IV. Effectiveness (30-40 min.)
- How did you know what activities needed to be done with each child/family?
- How were the needs of each child/family assessed?
- Who did the assessment? What methodology was used? Did you feel you were equipped with sufficient knowledge on how to do MHPSS at the time?
- How did you proceed with cases of very severe psychological stress? GBV against children? Children separated from their parents? Children with disabilities?
- What changes in the lives of the affected children and their families would have not happened or happened differently without UNICEF response?
- Do you think the quality of life of the children and their life has changed? How?
- Describe your most significant achievement with your beneficiaries.
- Sometimes even at our best efforts programmes cannot help as much as we wish? Did you face such situations, too? With what type of children or family situations?
- How did you identify different risks for children and their families? Plan individually for each child and family?
- Did you refer to external organisations e.g. service providers? Please describe the mechanism of referral. (probe for case management approach)
- Did your organisation change as a result of your interaction with UNICEF? (probe for lasting organisational capacity, qualification and skills, etc.?)
Were there any other programmes similar to UNICEF that existed at the time? How did you collaborate with them?

V. Efficiency (10-15 min.)
- Did you have sufficient resources to best provide the service – material resources, human, funding?

VI. Impact (10-15 min.)
- What community-based child protection structures have been installed and where?
- How have these improved access and quality of care for the children served and their families?
- What would happen if UNICEF discontinued its programme here?
- How would this impact the lives of the children and their families?
- Are there any services available for children’s needs and their families?
- Will your organisation be able to continue its work in the same way without UNICEF support?
- Did anything change in the existing child protection system here because of UNICEF? (probe for any system changes in service delivery e.g. new services, improved services, better knowledge of professionals, etc.)

VII. HDN (10-15 min.)
- What risks remain for children and families now?
- What continue to be the most pressing needs of children and families now?
- What is the capacity of the local system for address those risks?
- In what area the changes in the practice of your organisation are most significant because of UNICEF, if any?:
  - In the organisation of the work
  - In the direct work with clients
  - In the planning process
  - In the structure of the services

VIII. Wrap up (10 min)
- What are the main problems, obstacles?
- Any solutions/recommendations?
Key Informant Interview Protocol 3: Focus Group Discussion with Beneficiaries / non-users (control group)

I. Introduction

- Greetings and introduction of the moderator
- Explaining about the project and method of work
- Explaining about confidentiality approach
- Participant introduction

II. Background information

- Tell us something about your families – how many family members? Children?
- How long have you been here?
- How did you end up here?

III. Family needs

The respondents are asked to describe their main needs as parents

- What are your main issues and questions as a parent – i.e. in regard to the health, education, social services etc.?
- What are the hardest moments you have?
- Who do you count on for advice/answer/help?

IV. Evaluation of the service/the child needs

For parents who use services

- What are the services for your children you use? Would you please, tell me more about medical, educational and social services?
- How did you choose them? Who was helping you in the choice?
- How do you understand about the center here? What do you know about them? Where did you find information about them?
- How do you feel about the center? What about your child?
- What do you find helpful for you and your child there? Let’s talk about some aspects:
  - Activities with the children
  - Coping with stress
  - Education
  - Medical needs
  - Integration – involvement in the local community
- Activities with the family
  - Support with dealing with children’s issues and be better helping your children with getting back to normal
  - Support with employment
  - Support with housing
  - Social support
  - Integration – involvement in the local community

- What do you think was not helpful and needs to change? Let’s talk about some aspects:
  - Activities with the children
  - Coping with stress
- Education
- Medical needs
- Integration – involvement in the local community
  - Activities with the family
  - Support with dealing with children’s issues and be better helping your children with getting back to normal
  - Support with employment
  - Support with housing
  - Social support
  - Integration – involvement in the local community
  - Have you seen any changes in your child since he/she is using the service?

For parents who don’t use services
  - Are there moments or situations you need help about the rearing of your children? What moments? From whom do you seek help?
  - Do you know about any service providing help for children in your town? What do you know about it – positives and negatives?
  - Why do you not use the service/services?
  - Do you consider using it in the future? Why?
  - Are there any other services/activities you would expect from the services with children who left their homes?

V. Expectations
  - What could be supportive for your child in the future? Do you expect some challenges?
  - Have you received support from the state? What else would be useful for you and your children as a support from the state?
  - What do you wish for your child for the future?
  - What problems/challenges could your child face in the future? What could help him/her avoid/overcome them?
# Focus Group Discussion

*Children using PSS services*

## I. Introduction and warm-up (5 min)

- Greetings and introduction of the moderator
- Explanation about the project and method of work
- Giving information on taking notes
- Creating a relaxed and safe atmosphere
- General data: What’s your name? How old are you? Tell me something about yourself?

## II. Life story (20 min)

- Could you tell me your story briefly; since you were born until the moment you got here?
- Tell me a little bit about your mother. Could you describe her with few words?
  - Supportive questions: What was her life before she had you? What did she do? How did her life go afterwards? Where is she now? What does she do? Etc.
- What about your father? Tell me a bit about him.
  - Supportive questions: What is he like? What was his life before you were born? And after? What does he do now? Etc.
- Tell me a little bit about your other family members (brothers, sisters, grand-parents, uncles and aunts). How are your relationships with them?

## III. Services (25 min)

### USE OF SERVICE

- We talked a lot about your life. Could you now tell me how did you get here? What happened? And then? How did you feel about it?
- What did you parents do then? How did they react, what did they say? How did you feel about that?
- How do you feel here in the center/service?
- Where were you before? Please, tell me about your experience there: How did you get there? How did you feel there? What happened after?

### EVALUATION OF SERVICE

- Tell me something about your life here, anything that comes up to your mind?
- Tell me a bit about your everyday life in the service (specific PSS service e.g. Centre, etc.)?
  - Support questions: How does a typical day go? What are your favorite and least favorite moments of the day? What do you like and dislike here?
- If you were to describe the service (specific PSS service e.g. Centre, etc.) to someone who has no idea what is it, how would you describe it? What else?
- Is there something from your everyday routine that you find very well working for you – enjoyable, helpful? What does it gives you? How does it make you feel? How is it helpful?
- Tell a story about the best thing that has happened to you since you use the service (specific PSS service e.g. Centre, etc.). Another possibility is to give the child paper and pens and ask him/her to draw a picture of someone who helped him/her out of a difficulty or a place where he/she got help. When the child has finished drawing, ask him/her to tell the story of the drawing
  - And what is not helpful or enjoyable?
- What do you think of the people that work here? (if not spontaneous, specify social workers, caregivers, or other). How is your relationship with them?
  - Supportive questions: What is their attitude towards the children here? Do they have favorites or children they like less? Etc.
• If you had three wishes to change social workers/caregivers/others so that they always helped you like the people in your stories; what would they be?
• What would be the smallest change that would make you think you were on the way to having your wishes granted?

REFERENCE FIGURES
• Who do you trust most here? Who do you respect? Can you give me an example?
• And who is or are your friend(s) here? Could you describe them to me with few words? What do you appreciate in them and what do they appreciate in you?
• Do you go school in this city? Tell me more about your school?

IDEAL SERVICE
• What do you think will be a positive thing for you from your stay here?
• What about some negative things; would there be something negative for you from your stay?
• If you had a magic wand and you could make with it the service (specific PSS service e.g. Centre, etc.) now you are in the ideal place for yourself and for kids like you, what would you make it to be like? Please, describe in detail.

IV. The future (10 min)

FUTURE PERSPECTIVES
Let’s talk a little bit about the future.
• What are your hopes and dreams for the future? What else?
• What are your concerns, anxieties, and fears for the future? What else?
• How do you see yourself in 10 years? What doing? Where living… with whom…?

OUT-OF-RESIDENCE HELPFUL RESOURCES (COORDINATE WITH SELF-RESOURCES FOR ANALYSIS)
• Can you think of something that will be really helpful for you to manage better your life after you go out from here? What else?
• What would you tell a new kid/youth that comes into the service (specific PSS service e.g. Centre, etc.)? What advice would you give him/her.

Thank you!
Key Informant Interview Protocol 4: Observation

Date of observation:

Locality:

Moderator: Time Start: Time End:

1. Observed topics covered:

2. Approximate number of people in the observed CPC/CFS/FSC: ______

3. Approximate number of boys _____ and girls ______

4. IDP status: yes/no

4. Quality of Support Provided by NGO
   - Is the facility adapted to the needs of the PSS Programme (boys; girls; age group; disability status; carer who is elderly)?
   - Ratio of moderator to beneficiary
   - If appropriate: are handout materials adapted to the audience?
   - Are the follow up/referral opportunities sufficiently explained?

5. Comments made or questions asked (on which topics, by beneficiary with which background).
Annex 3. Informed Consent Process

Good morning/afternoon, thank you for meeting with us. Our names are ____________, We are evaluators from OAG, an international consulting firm, and we are conducting an evaluation of UNICEF’s PSS.

We have received your contact information from ____________ and would like to inquire if you are interested in participating our evaluation. We have prepared some questions to ask you about your experience with ____________ organization.

We anticipate the interview to last approximately 1 hour. We will not record your name, and the information you provide us will be kept confidential. You have no obligation to participate in this study. Your participation (or refusal) will not affect your ability to access services. If you agree to be interviewed, you can skip questions that you do not want to answer or stop the interview at any time. Unfortunately, we cannot offer you anything in exchange for your participation, except to listen to your experience and concerns. We will provide you with our contact information should you have any questions about this study.

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us today. Do you have any questions for us before we begin
Informed Consent Process for FGD

[DATE]

Dear Madam / Dear Sir,

OAG is a company which was selected by UNICEF Ukraine to conduct an Evaluation of the Provision of Psychosocial Support and Protective Services through Child and Youth Friendly Spaces and Community Protection Centers in Eastern Ukraine (an introductory letter from UNICEF Regional Office is attached).

The evaluation will assess the work of these centres, trying to identify the changes happened in family’s and children’s lives. Another objective of the evaluation is to offer a better understanding on how results were made possible and which strategies were most effective. The evaluation will also assess UNICEF’s contribution to these changes. More importantly, this is a learning process for UNICEF and also for your country.

Children will have a voice in this evaluation by participating in interviews and sharing their experiences and their views. We are interested to discuss with children who are directly experiencing the effects of support services: community centres, family centres etc. Therefore, we ask for your support in involving your child in such discussion called focus group discussion.

We are attaching a short letter for children explaining the process and their rights. While discussing with children about their participation, please provide them with this introductory letter.

**The focus group discussion process**

The discussion will be carried out in the facilities of the centre you have visited or a public place you or your child is familiar with. If children feel safer to be accompanied by a trusting adult, they have the right to do so. The discussion will last approximately 60 minutes.

**Privacy and confidentiality**

The information will be treated anonymously and verbatim quotes will only be qualified by the respondent’s role i.e. “child”.

Documentation and data such as consent forms, interview notes or reporting templates will be collected by OAG which will retain them for a maximum period of 10 months from the date of receipt. If requested by UNICEF, interview notes will be forwarded to UNICEF Office in Ukraine.

If the child you represent is willing to participate in the evaluation and if you are willing for the child to participate, please complete the ‘Legal Guardian/Legal representatives Informed Consent Form’.

If you have any further questions regarding this evaluation, please do not hesitate to contact me, [NAME OF...].

Respectfully yours,

[NAME OF , Team Leader...]

Telephone

Email
Legal Guardian/Legal Representative Consent Form

I (legal guardian/legal representative) _______________________________ give my consent for the child ______________________________ to participate in the interview carried out by ……………………. OAG for the purpose of conducting Evaluation of the Provision of Psychosocial Support and Protective Services through Child and Youth Friendly Spaces and Community Protection Centers in Eastern Ukraine.

I hereby confirm that:

1. I have read the information provided through the introductory letter.
2. Details of procedures have been explained to my satisfaction.
3. I understand that:
   - The child I represent will not directly benefit from taking part in this evaluation.
   - The child is free to withdraw from the interview at any time and is free to decline to answer particular questions.
   - While the information gained in this evaluation will be published as explained, the child I represent will not be identified, and individual information will remain confidential.
4. I understand that the information the child provides in this interview will only be used by OAG for the evaluation purpose. I also understand that OAG will transmit information to UNICEF Office in Ukraine confidentially and will not copy, store or transmit it for any other purpose than this.

First name: _____________________ Last name: _______________________
Date: __________________________
Contact telephone number: ______________________________________

N.B. This form should be filled and signed in two copies, one to be retained by consultant and one by legal guardian/legal representative
Explanation for the Child

Hello,

My name is Mariia. My colleagues Simon and Dessislava and I would like to present to you a study we are carrying out and you might like to take part.

Children are sometimes in situations when they or their parents need support and help to handle difficult life situations like war or leaving home. In these cases, there are services which aim to provide the care necessary for children to grow up healthy and safe. These services change overtime.

Our study aims to identify how you feel about these changes. Children are part of this study and will have the chance to express their views and share their experiences along with the adults taking care of them.

We will make a report with all these opinions and send it to UNICEF, an international organization working for children’s rights. UNICEF will work with authorities to improve services in order to ensure that all children live well with their families wherever they are so that children feel like home.

1. We would like to invite you to a group discussion with other children like you, if you agree. When we talk to you we may take notes but your name will not be recorded, therefore people reading the notes from the interview will not know your name.

2. If you agree to take part in this study, a person you trust can be present, if you want, during the group discussion.

3. Your name and other information about you will not be mentioned in our report.

4. The interview will take no more than 60 minutes.

5. You can stop the interview at any time without having to give a reason.

6. If there are questions you don’t want to answer you can just leave them out.

7. You can ask me (the interviewer) about anything that is not clear.

If you would like to participate, you have to tell the adult who gave you this letter that you agree to be interviewed.

If you have any further questions regarding this study, please contact any of me, [NAME OF THE Mariia].

Thank you very much,

[NAME OF Mariia]

Telephone

Email
Annex 4. Mix of Evaluation Approaches

The below approaches will enrich and guide the evaluation process:

Following UNEG Guidelines and UNICEF Evaluation Policy, the evaluation team suggest to conduct the evaluation following a **Gender and Equity-focused approach** (‘Integrating Gender and Equity in Evaluations’) paying special attention to Human Rights issues, and how the differences between groups (disaggregating the beneficiaries by variables such as sex, origin, location, wealth groups, religion, age, among others) may determine specific situations of vulnerability, specifically for girls and boys. The evaluation will look into how the design of the services and its provision are adapted to these groups’ needs, specifically age-appropriate information.

**Systematic analyses of qualitative data** will be critical to ensure transparency and that the evaluation team’s interpretations of the data are based in participants’ views. This evaluation will apply a form of thematic analysis developed by Attride-Stirling (2001), which involved six steps to go from the spoken text of participants (i.e. the data) to our interpretation. Basic themes (at the lowest level, which were often derived from participants’ direct language) would be organised into mid-level categories, or organising themes. Relationships between these organising themes would be identified in order to finally group them into global themes.

**Qualitative analysis** will begin concurrently with data collection for the evaluation team to consider the early themes emerging from interviews and FGDs and to be able to modify future interviews to probe more deeply, and to clarify, confirm and explore participants’ views. As saturation will foreseeably begin to set in during primary data collection, in which issues may be repeated across participants, the evaluation team will have the confidence that a comprehensive set of themes has been gathered, data collection could stop, and post-data collection analysis could begin. Member checking, or the process of re-contacting participants to request clarification or additional information will be used to confirm understanding. The last phase of data analysis will involve synthesizing the evidence from different data sources (including **quantitative data**) to develop key findings and conclusions for each of evaluation criteria. Carefully drawing together findings from the document review, the KIs and FGDs, and the review of quantitative outcome data, the evaluation team will examine the evidence collected to assess whether the theory operated as assumed and contributed to the desired intermediate outcomes.

The team leader will lead the process with a **facilitation approach**: taking the initiative and final responsibility, but always from an inclusive and participatory approach, allowing all parts involved to be considered during the decisions made for the evaluation. Beyond seeing the evaluation as a process for obtaining a product (the evaluation report), the team understands the evaluation process as rich as the result, and will make sure the involvement and buy-in of all the parts.

The evaluation will follow a **participatory** and **consultative approach** ensuring maximum involvement of direct beneficiaries of PSS Programme funded by UNICEF in Ukraine and other stakeholders, NGO-service providers among others. Stakeholder participation will play an important role in this evaluation: The evaluation team will consider the involvement and participation of stakeholders from the start, including direct, indirect and ultimate beneficiaries (the target groups) as important in enhancing the transparency, validity, reliability and usability of the evaluation results and essential to its success. It will also help translating research into action, as the team will be able to respond to the
evaluation questions, enabling their ownership of the evaluation results.
## Annex 5. Roles and Responsibilities

The PSS Programme Evaluation will be managed by a structure with roles as per below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Evaluation Manager                        | Child Rights Monitoring Specialist                                  | ● Lead the management of the evaluation process throughout the evaluation (design, implementation and dissemination and coordination of its follow up);  
                                              |                                                                                                                   | ● Establish ERG; Convene the ERG meetings; Facilitate the participation of those involved in the evaluation design;  
                                              |                                                                                                                   | ● Coordinate the selection of the Evaluation Team;  
                                              |                                                                                                                   | ● Safeguard the independence of the exercise and ensure the evaluation products meet quality standards;  
                                              |                                                                                                                   | ● Connect the Evaluation Team with the wider programme units, senior management and key evaluation stakeholders, and ensure a fully inclusive and transparent approach to the evaluation;  
                                              |                                                                                                                   | ● Facilitate the Evaluation Team’s access to all information and documentation relevant to the intervention, as well as to key actors and informants who should participate in interviews, focus groups or other information-gathering methods;  
                                              |                                                                                                                   | ● Provide the evaluators with overall guidance as well as with administrative support; Oversee progress and conduct of the evaluation, the quality of the process and the products;  
                                              |                                                                                                                   | ● Approve the deliverables and evaluate the team’s work in consultation with ERG and RSE Steering Committee;  
                                              |                                                                                                                   | ● Take responsibility for disseminating and learning across evaluations on the various programme areas as well as the liaison with the RSE Steering Committee;  
                                              |                                                                                                                   | ● Ensure that the TOR, IR and Evaluation Report are submitted to external QA review conducted by external institution;  
                                              |                                                                                                                   | ● Disseminate the results of the evaluation.                                                                                                                                |
| Evaluation Reference Group                | Evaluation Manager Deputy Representative (or OIC), Chief of Social Policy Section, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, Child Protection in Emergencies Officer, two designated representatives from implementing partners, Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor. | ● Provide clear specific advice and support to the Evaluation Manager and the Evaluation Team throughout the whole evaluation process;  
                                              |                                                                                                                   | ● Review the Inception Report and all drafts of Evaluation Report and ensure Final draft meets the UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Evaluation Reports Standards;  
                                              |                                                                                                                   | ● Review and provide comments and feedback on the quality of the evaluation process as well as on the evaluation products (comments and suggestions on the TOR, draft reports, final report of the evaluation). |
| Evaluation Consultants contracted         | The Evaluation Team will report to Evaluation Manager and conduct the evaluation by fulfilling the contractual arrangements in |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| Team | by UNICEF via institutional contract | line with the TOR, UNEG/OECD norms and standards and Ethical Guidelines; this includes developing of an evaluation (implementation) plan as part of the inception report, drafting and finalizing the final report and other deliverables, and briefing the commissioner on the progress and key findings and recommendations, as needed.  

The **Evaluation Team** will also adhere to UNICEF's Evaluation Policy, to UNEG's ethical guidelines for UN evaluations and to UNICEF Reporting Standards. Evaluation team members will sign a no conflict of interest attestation.  

The **Evaluation Team** will demonstrate personal and professional integrity during the whole process of the evaluation. The Evaluation Team will respect the right of institutions and individuals to provide information in confidence and ensure that sensitive data cannot be traced to its source. Further, the team must respect ethics of research while working with children including using age appropriate consent forms, age appropriate data collection, and principle of do no harm. Furthermore, the team and its members must take care that those involved in the evaluation have an opportunity to examine the statements attributed to them. The evaluation process must be sensitive to beliefs, manners, and customs of the social and cultural environment in which they will work. Especially, the team must be sensitive to and address issues of protection, discrimination and gender inequality. Furthermore, the team members are not expected to assess the personal performance of individuals, and must balance an assessment of management functions with due consideration of this principle. Finally, if the team uncover evidence of wrongdoing, such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. |
### Annex 6. Typology of Respondents Based on Evaluation Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF RESPONDENT</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>DATA COLLECTION METHOD</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programme officers</td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Evaluation Manager, Child Rights Monitoring Specialist</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview (SMI)</td>
<td>Kyiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Child Protection Section</td>
<td>SMI</td>
<td>Kyiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>Social Policy Section</td>
<td>SMI</td>
<td>Kyiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing partners</td>
<td>NaUKMA (National University Of Kyiv Mohyla Academy)</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
<td>SMI</td>
<td>Kyiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian Red Cross Society</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
<td>SMI</td>
<td>Kyiv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian frontiers</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
<td>SMI</td>
<td>Kyiv Head Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Support Center</td>
<td>SMI</td>
<td>Kharkiv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Support Center</td>
<td>SMI</td>
<td>Kharkiv (Ternova village)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Station Kharkiv</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
<td>SMI</td>
<td>Kharkiv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proliska</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
<td>SMI</td>
<td>Kharkiv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promir</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
<td>SMI</td>
<td>Slavyansk (close to Kramatorsk)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centers of Psychological Assistance</td>
<td>SMI</td>
<td>Bahmut (close to Kramatorsk)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ya Volnovakha</td>
<td>Youth Center or CPC</td>
<td>SMI</td>
<td>Volnovakha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariupol Youth union</td>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>SMI</td>
<td>Mariupol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TdH</td>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>SMI</td>
<td>Mariupol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Beneficiaries (IDP parents of children)</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
<td>Kharkiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Children beneficiaries of PSS services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mariupol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Non-users (IDP parents of children)</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
<td>Severnodonetsk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>Regional Administration</td>
<td>Focal point for decentralisation</td>
<td>SMI</td>
<td>Kharkiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focal point in Dpt for Families, Youth and Children Mayor (Mariupol)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mariupol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Centre for social services</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>SMI</td>
<td>Mariupol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal care institutions for children</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>SMI</td>
<td>Kharkiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other agencies</td>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
<td>SMI</td>
<td>Kyiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daneska Refugee Council</td>
<td>Programme Manager</td>
<td>SMI</td>
<td>Mariupol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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27. UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation, Data Collection and Analysis CF/PD/DRP/2015-001(UPES)
The evaluation will be carried out according to the ethical principles and standards defined by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG):

Anonymity and confidentiality. The evaluation will respect the rights of the people who provide information, guaranteeing their anonymity and confidentiality.

Responsibility. The report will include any conflicts or differences of opinion that may have arisen between the consultants or between the consultant and the radio managers regarding the conclusions and/or recommendations of the evaluation. The entire team must confirm the results presented, any disagreements to be indicated.

Integrity. The evaluation team will highlight issues that are not specifically mentioned in the ToR, to obtain a more complete analysis of the partnership.

Independence. The team leader will ensure that he/she remains independent of the program under review, and he/she should not be involved in its management or any part of it.

Incidents. If problems arise during fieldwork, or at any other point in the evaluation, they should be reported immediately to the UNICEF Evaluation Manager. If this is not done, the existence of such problems can in no way be used to justify the failure to achieve the results expected by UNICEF in the ToR.

Validation of information. The evaluation team must ensure the accuracy of the information gathered during the preparation of the reports and will be responsible for the information presented in the final report.

Intellectual property. Using the different sources of information, the evaluation team must respect the intellectual property rights of the institutions and communities examined.

Submission of reports. If the submission of reports is postponed, or if the quality of the submitted reports is significantly worse than agreed, the sanctions provided for in these terms of reference will apply. The evaluation team will ensure the timely submission of deliverables as well as the conformity of the draft and final report with the UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports.[1]

[1] In addition to that, all Evaluation Team members will respect and comply with the ethical principles for evaluation, which includes the obligations to behave ethically in terms of: intentionality; bearing in mind the purpose, usefulness and necessity of the evaluation at all its stages; Avoiding conflict of interest; upholding the principles of independence, impartiality, credibility, honesty, integrity and accountability; Interactions with participants: engaging appropriately and respectfully with participants in all evaluation processes, upholding the principles of confidentiality and anonymity and their limitations, dignity and diversity, human rights, gender equality, avoidance of harm, especially with regard to sensitivities connected with GBV and domestic violence; Evaluation processes and products: ensuring accuracy, completeness and reliability, inclusion and non-discrimination, transparency, fair and balanced reporting that acknowledges different perspectives; Discovery of wrongdoing: discreetly reporting the discovery of any apparent misconduct to UNICEF.
Annex 9. Dissemination Plan

If agreed with UNICEF Evaluation Reference Group during the in-brief meeting, the Dissemination Plan will be based on the evaluation users as per below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Users</th>
<th>Evaluation planned use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| UNICEF Ukraine    | **Accountability**: having evidence of the performance and results in PSS Programme among beneficiaries.  
**Learning**: to identify or confirm improvement areas of response that need reinforcement during transition from humanitarian to development nexus. |
| NGOs              | **Accountability**: having evidence of the performance and results among beneficiaries.  
**Learning**: to identify or confirm improvement areas of the Programme. |
| MoES              | For better understanding the PSS Programme and its strengths and areas of improvement in the process of humanitarian-development transition.¹ |
| MoH               | For better understanding the PSS Programme as part of referral chain and its strengths and areas of improvement.² |
| MoSP              | **Leadership and Knowledge Management**: For knowledge management of standards in the area of psychosocial assistance and respective coordination. |
| Local authorities | **Capacity Building**: uniform interpretation of standards in the area of PSS to children. |
| UNICEF HQ         | **Knowledge Management**: to have evidence about this PSS Programme implemented in Ukraine, including through identification of good practices of PSS Programme via HDN lenses. |

¹ More specifically, what knowledge has been especially useful by teachers and school psychologists, and what knowledge is still missing, what are the gaps in service provision by schools in the area of PSS Programme

² Mental health referrals

The above users would be grouped into several audiences, each of which would consider separate dissemination outlet.

a) When it comes to **UNICEF**, UNICEF CO would share the evaluation with other COs, HQ and RO, to make sure knowledge management is ensured, proper recommendations are documented, and management responses are prepared. UNICEF CO will use the corporate evaluation management database for that.

b) When it comes to **NGOs** who were primary implementing partners of the Child Protection Section, UNICEF can opt for an informal NGO-gathering alongside other important events like capacity building, UNICEF corporate standards in M&E/reporting, JPR etc, HACT, during which UNICEF would present evaluation findings to the NGOs that were specifically within the scope of the present evaluation. Other NGOs that were not part of the Programme could be invited, if no confidential/sensitive information is included in the presentation. Alternatively, a separate presentation in the framework of the Ukrainian Evaluation Association or Ukrainian Child Rights Coalition could take place.

c) **National and local authorities**, custodians of the standards in PSS subsequent to training as organised by UNICEF, could receive evaluation findings in the fora of an Inter-Ministerial Commission on Child Rights, as all Ministries and top-level representatives of different institutions would be present there. In the alternative, UNICEF could do a one-off event specifically for authorities, presenting evaluation finding, and taking this meeting as an entry point with some of the interlocutors.
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## ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCCs</td>
<td>Core Commitment for Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFS</td>
<td>Child Friendly Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Country Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Child Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>Community Protection Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPWG</td>
<td>Child Protection Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>Convention of the Right of Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOs</td>
<td>Civil Society Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERB</td>
<td>Ethic Review Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>Evaluation Reference Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDN</td>
<td>Humanitarian-Development Nexus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNO</td>
<td>Humanitarian Needs Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRBA</td>
<td>Human Rights Based Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRP</td>
<td>Humanitarian Response Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCA</td>
<td>Government Controlled Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IASC</td>
<td>Interagency Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Internally Displaced Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>International Non Government Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Implementing Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Inception Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBV</td>
<td>Gender Based Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRBA</td>
<td>Human Rights Based Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDH</td>
<td>Linking Development Humanitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHPSS</td>
<td>Mental Health and PSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non Government Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGCA</td>
<td>Non Government Controlled Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD-DAC</td>
<td>Development Assistance Committee of the Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>Psychosocial Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA</td>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBM</td>
<td>Result based management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>Regional Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPA</td>
<td>Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSE</td>
<td>Research, Study and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToC</td>
<td>Theory of Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEG</td>
<td>United Nations Evaluation Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. CONTEXT

Since 2014 the armed conflict in the Eastern Ukraine has affected 4.4 million people. After four years of conflict, 3.4 million people in Ukraine are struggling to cope with the impact of the humanitarian crisis and urgently require humanitarian assistance and protection (HNO-2018). Active military action resulted in internal displacement. As of 13 September 2018 there were 1,518 thousands internally displaced persons (IDPs), among them 238 thousands children. More than one half of the IDPs settled in Donets and Luhansk regions nearby the line of contact. A large number of IDPs were received in Kharkiv, Dnipropetrovsk and Zaporizhzhya regions (oblasts). Every day, the armed conflict in the Eastern Ukraine forces millions of civilians to make impossible choices whether they eat, have medicine, or their children go to school. Critical civilian infrastructure is severely impacted, as ceasefire agreements are consistently disregarded. There were on average 40,000 violations per month in 2017. Today, water supplies to over 345,000 civilians hang in the balance. In 2017 over 130 incidents affected critical water infrastructure. Over 600,000 people, including 100,000 children, bear the brunt of the continued armed clashes along the 457-km ‘contact line’. Every month, over 1 million people are forced to cross the “no-man’s land” through checkpoints, many to simply access basic humanitarian and social services. More than 2,500 civilian men, women and children have been killed, and over 9,000 injured, since hostilities began four years ago. Explosive hazard contamination in Eastern Ukraine is impacting 1.9 million people, including around 200,000 children.3

The impact of conflict on communities in economic, social and psychosocial terms has been significant. According to the Directive of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine No. 797 dated August 5, 2015 “On Endorsement of the Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessment (RPA) Report by the joint mission of the European Union, United Nations, and the World Bank”, the estimated total amount of financial resources required for recovery of Donbass region was USD 1,520 million. The Targeted State Program for Recovery and Peacebuilding in the Eastern Regions of Ukraine till 2020 consolidates efforts by the following directions: (i) infrastructure and social needs, (ii) economic recovery, (iii) social stability, peacebuilding, and public safety.

Simultaneously the Government has striven to advance in various reform initiatives of the social sector that started in 2014, such as the decentralization, institutional reforms of social protection services, health and education sector, to safeguard the child rights. Recently adopted reforms creates additional challenges for the Eastern Ukraine (Donbass region). It is further envisaged that the implementation of the reform in the region will take time, therefore a step wise process is foreseen. The most crucial action is to gather all relevant resources, public and private, national and international, thus, technical support to health, education and decentralization reforms and its promotion at the local level is essential.

At the onset of the conflict, the Government of Ukraine has mobilised response to humanitarian situation in Eastern Ukraine through its own programmes and through the technical assistance of international community. Based on the principle of the Core Commitment for Children (CCCs) and the Convention of the Right of Child (CRC), UNICEF has been one of the first UN agencies in Ukraine to step up and respond to the humanitarian needs of children, women and their families in the conflict affected regions in the areas of Water sanitation and hygiene, education, health and nutrition, including HIV/AIDS and Child protection.

Since the beginning of the conflict, irrespective of where families are living in Eastern Ukraine, their lives, especially those of children, are being shaped by violence, displacement, and a persistent lack of opportunities. The conflict has impacted and is continuing impacting children physically, psychologically, and socially.

Children are showing symptoms of distress, including withdrawal, anxiousness, fear, denial, anger, sadness, restlessness. They often experience sleeplessness, sadness, grief, shock, nightmares, and hyperactivity. The prolonged displacement is also severely impacting their psychosocial well-being, education, development and health. Over the years, the number of children requiring support is increasing whilst parents and other caregivers who are also affected by the conflict are finding it difficult to support their children and seek the support they themselves need.

While children throughout the conflict affected oblasts of Ukraine have been exposed to difficult situations, the level of psychosocial distress in the areas along the contact line are particularly alarming. According to the estimates, the disturbing majority of children have seen tanks and military machines (86.1%), people who were beating or shooting others (37%), shooting and people who intimidated others with weapons (43%), beaten strangers (33.2%), or saw

---

beaten acquaintances (12.1%). The respondents often mentioned feeling sad (34.5%) or scared (36.5%), having difficulties concentrating (23.8%), problems with going to sleep (19.3%) or nightmares (26%). These reactions resemble the symptoms of post-traumatic stress. A significant number of the children surveyed experience the critical level of stress (26%). High levels of stress were more common among females than among males (28.3% to 22.8%, respectively). A significant number of children (both genders) scored significantly above average on peer problems (32.9%), hyperactivity (28%) and prosocial (25.3%) scales. Male children are 2.5 times more likely than female children to experience difficulties in prosocial behaviour (24% of males compared to 9.3% of females) and almost twice as likely to be hyperactive as were female children (26.2% of males compared to 16.1% of females).

UNICEF Ukraine has been working through its implementing partners to put in place age appropriate psychosocial support (PSS) response targeting children and their families in host communities in order to strengthen their resilience. UNICEF Strategic Plan 2014–2017 recognised linking development-humanitarian (LDH) as a key component of resilience. According to the plan, there is a need for “[..] more explicit integration of humanitarian and development programming to promote resilience [..]” and “to improve the links between humanitarian response and development programmes and to promote human security”. The strengthening of the coherence and complementarity between humanitarian and development programming of PSS to conflict affected children in Ukraine will benefit to better prepare for, respond to and recover from shocks and stresses.

2. OBJECT OF EVALUATION

The object of the evaluation is the UNICEF psychosocial support to conflict affected children and youth in the Eastern Ukraine with focus on humanitarian-development nexus.

The key directions of UNICEF PSS related interventions for children and their families living in the Eastern Ukraine are:
- Providing PSS to children and their family members;
- Strengthening key child protection capacities (PSS, identification and referral of child protection (CP) and gender based violence (GBV) in emergency-affected areas);
- Establishing and enhancing well-functioning and effective coordination and referral mechanisms among national and international protection partners in emergency affected areas;
- Building on and encouraging children’s and community’s innate resilience to crisis;
- Fostering community connections and interactions.

The key stakeholders are: UNICEF, UNICEF Implementing Partners (IPs), UN agencies, INGOs, NGOs, local authorities, donor community (through international technical assistance programmes/projects provided services through a network of child and adolescent youth friendly spaces).

Time period: 2014-2018

Geo scope: five conflict affected oblasts of Eastern Ukraine: Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts (Government Controlled Areas) and Kharkiv, Dnipropetrovsk and Zaporizhzhya oblasts.

The logic model of Theory of change (ToC) should be recreated in case there is no relevant ToC created in the PSS related programme documents.

In general, the purpose of the PSS response is to address distress faced by conflict affected girls and boys and their caregivers. The overall PSS response is based on the Interagency Steering Committee (IASC) Guidelines on Mental Health and PSS (MHPSS), UNICEF’s Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action and CPWG Minimum Standards of Child Protection in Humanitarian Action. The IASC Guidelines recognize that almost all conflict affected and displaced children will need some sort of PSS. The overall PSS interventions cover preparedness, response and early recovery phases of the emergency. While the majority of the children in such situations require non-specialised PSS, experience shows that a small number of children (5 to 10 per cent) require more focused, specialized support and approximately 3% of the children may suffer from severe mental disorders and require clinical intervention. The IASC Guidelines recommends that these different support needs be provided in the context of the different, complementary layers of support. This approach considers children as active agents who engage with challenges related to their psychosocial well-being and make an effort to cope and adapt to manage those challenges. The response based on IASC Guidelines reinforces social and environmental factors that help children regain healthy psychosocial development and resilience in the face of challenging circumstances. UNICEF is ensuring PSS response

---

targeting children and their families through a variety of partners who provide a layered response based on the IASC Guidelines. The response includes building capacities of the communities and frontline workers, provision of age appropriate services, integrating PSS in child protection intervention, and ensuring/supporting effective coordination in the sector.

In Ukraine UNICEF PSS support to conflict affected children (boys and girls who remained in the conflict affected areas, displaced, living in the host communities) addressed daily stressors as well as protection risks from abuse, violence, exploitation and neglect, through community supported child and youth friendly spaces and community based child protection mechanisms and structures. UNICEF PSS support to conflict affected children addressed the priority problems of children through services provided by partners at the different levels of the IASC MHPSS intervention pyramid.

Since 2014, UNICEF and partners in Ukraine have been implementing structured activities that are carried out in a safe, child-friendly, inclusive and stimulating environment. Most of the current child protection interventions in conflict affected areas of Ukraine are integrating a PSS response.

3. RATIONALE

The main purpose of the evaluation is to generate substantive evidence based knowledge by identifying good practices and lessons learned from intended and unintended impact of PSS response. This evaluation is intended to unveil the nature of the change that has taken place in the lives of children, and to determine its significance on the psychosocial well-being of those children. The results of this evaluation will be highly useful to enable any adjustment/redirection that may be necessary for future UNICEF interventions in the context of humanitarian-development nexus, relevant state programmes on national and local levels and PSS activity of UNICEF implementing partners.

The knowledge generated by the evaluation will be used by:

- UNICEF in Ukraine to further expand and improve its programmatic activities in this field;
- Line Ministries for planning and implementation purposes of the relevant state programmes;
- Local authorities, NGOs and other stakeholders for improving their PSS related activity.

Evaluation findings and recommendations will contribute to strengthening capacity for PSS as well as to improving intersectoral coordination for realization and protection of children’s rights at national and community level. The evaluation will promote further cross-sectoral aspects of the PSS through joint working sessions and meetings that are planned to take place during the evaluation mission.
At the first year of the five-year Ukraine’s Country Programme (2018-2022), the evaluation results will inform the UNICEF how to improve its humanitarian and development programming in Ukraine, seamlessly covering from the humanitarian onset, so that UNICEF can effectively assist Government’s efforts for ongoing social reforms. Hence, the evaluation results will contribute to the UNICEF’s programming aimed at strengthening the Government’s systemic and institutional capacity for providing basic social services, to improve individual and community resilience, and to reduce the vulnerability among conflict-affected population.

4. OBJECTIVE

The overall objective of this equity-focused evaluation is to determine the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability of the PSS interventions on well-being of children in Eastern Ukraine with focus on reducing the inequity among the most vulnerable families and children (including IDPs) and HDN aspects.

The specific objectives of the exercise are:

A. To assess the impact of equity-focused PSS in Eastern Ukraine.
B. To assess relevance of PSS response from the point of view of children/families/communities etc.
C. To assess the efficiency of the implementation process of the UNICEF’s PSS response in Ukraine, and to assess the cost of the response;
D. To assess the effectiveness of the implementation process of the UNICEF’s PSS response and to see if the programme achieved planned outcomes and outputs with regard to children’s psychosocial well-being; to assess intended and unintended changes on the psychosocial well-being of children, to determine how well the response addressed the priority problems of children, and also to assess the quality of the various services provided by all partners at the different levels of the IASC MHPSS pyramid.
E. To assess the sustainability of the results of the response in the absence of ongoing UNICEF support, by identifying the degree to which the PSS response has built on existing local capacities and coping mechanism, and a potential exit strategy that builds on local resources and capacities. What has been the impact of the programme on local networks and community based groups? How many volunteers/community members have been mobilized and trained?
F. To assess the extent of coverage of PSS interventions in relations to the presence of IDP children in different areas of Ukraine.
G. To assess the effectiveness of the coordination of all partners providing PSS interventions for children in Ukraine in host communities.
I. To assess the coherence of PSS intervention with the UNICEF Core Commitments for Children in Humanitarian Action, CPWG Minimum Standards for Child Protection in Humanitarian Response.
J. To determine the extent to which UNICEF/partners are providing an entry point to overall protection interventions to address CP&GBV issues, as well as entry points for education and youth interventions. To determine the extent to which the programme built on existing resources and capacities of communities.
K. To assess the appropriateness and social acceptability of the approach as implemented in Ukraine and to determine beneficiary and stakeholder perceptions of the overall response, especially children, parents and communities.
L. To document main lessons learnt and propose recommendations to deliver PSS services in a more effective and efficient way, in particular suggesting options for more integrated programming (e.g. increased referrals to other CP response as needed to address vulnerabilities and risks of violence, abuse, exploitation) and for further harmonization and capacity development of partners.
M. To suggest PSS knowledge management based on retrospective Theory of Changes.
N. To draft recommendations related to humanitarian-development nexus to inform the future programming, contribute relevant experience to the national and UNICEF’s global engagement on these issues.

5. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation will cover the period of 2014 to 2018 with the geographical coverage of 8 settlements: in Donetsk (3) and Luhansk (2) oblasts (GCA), Kharkiv (1), Dnipropetrovsk (1), Zaporizhzhya (1) oblasts of Ukraine.

The assessment will focus mainly on the interventions being directly implemented by UNICEF or by its IPs in five conflict affected regions (oblasts) of Ukraine: Donetsk, Luhansk, Kharkiv, Dnipropetrovsk and Zaporizhzhya oblasts.
The overall PSS response for Ukrainian children and youth is being implemented through 18 child- and youth-friendly spaces, 11 community protection centers (child and family protection places), 15 Youth clubs and 24 mediation rooms in host communities. On average some 100,000 children, including IDPs children, attend these safe spaces (including mobile outreach).

The interventions by all partners of the UNICEF supported PSS response will be the target of this assessment. The Evaluation Team will be provided with a mapping of all UNICEF supported safe spaces for children and families. Additionally, the team will also receive copies of all the agreements, field visit reports, training manuals, results from pre and post questionnaires etc. While all stakeholders are important, special emphasis will be placed on ensuring that children (both boys and girls) who are direct beneficiaries of the interventions are heard, enabled to communicate their priorities and needs, and participate in the evaluation process. Other stakeholders whose participation will be important to assess the impact of the response include parents (both mothers and fathers) of those children who are participating on response activities. Local community leaders, frontline workers, volunteers working with the response, members of child protection committees, youth and social workers will also be consulted in assessing the impact of the response.

Further to assessing the real impact of the PSS, an identical control group of villages/area in host communities not benefiting from PSS support services will also be identified. The specific criteria of the control villages/area will be discussed at a later stage once villages/areas have been identified to serve this purpose. These control villages/areas should not be target villages/area of any other identical programme being supported by either UNICEF or any other international and national organizations.

6. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation criteria to be used are based on the OECD-DAC standards, covering relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. Additionally, specific gender equality, HRBA, and humanitarian response standards and evaluation criteria which address coverage, coordination, coherence, appropriateness, quality and protection will also be used. The assessment should address some of the fundamental questions provided in the "Inter-agency Guide to the Evaluation of the Psychosocial Programming in Humanitarian Crises"5 some of the key questions under each objective are below.6 These are just the broad questions and a more detailed sub set of questions would be discussed at a later stage.

5.1 RELEVANCE

- How appropriate and aligned the CP programme interventions are with regards to the overall needs as expressed in the RPA, and in relevant Government programmes?
- Were the interventions under the PSS response age and gender appropriate?
- To what degree were the PSS response intervention culturally and socially appropriate?
- What are the socio-cultural barriers to the approach adopted by UNICEF and its partner in delivering PSS, and how has UNICEF and partners worked to identify and address these barriers?
- To what extent have UNICEF and its partners integrated broader child protection and GBV issues into the design and implementation of its interventions?
- To what extent the CP/PSS programme articulated the objectives related to changes in children’s well-being and lives, and that of their family and community?
- Were clear needs defined with respect to required ‘levels’ of PSS?
- To what extent were potential beneficiaries involved in the development of the CP programme?
- To what extent the CP programme has reached all targeted geographical areas?
- Have potentially vulnerable or marginalized children and communities been reached?
- Have the needs and capacities of different age groups been appropriately addressed?
- What areas of stronger integration of CP, GBV, education and youth programming can be identified for future programming?

5 UNICEF. 2011. Inter-agency Guide to the Evaluation of the Psychosocial Programming in Humanitarian Crises
6 The questions provided below are for guidance only and are not intended to be exhaustive. The questions could be replaced by the Evaluation Team while submitting the proposal to UNICEF.
5.2. EFFECTIVENESS

- To what extent the stated CP programme outcomes have been achieved? What were the achievements in terms of improving psychosocial well-being of Ukrainian children, both planned and unplanned?
- To what extent the response M&E framework and processes were adequate to measure response outputs, outcomes, and impact? Were expected results clearly stated and measurable through identifiable indicators?
- What factors contributed to success or failure with regard to targeted changes?
- What lasting changes – attributable to programming — can be identified in the lives of individuals, families, communities and the broader environment?
- What difference has come about for beneficiaries in terms of skills and knowledge, emotional well-being, and social well-being?
- How extensive, effective, and efficient is the transfer of knowledge and intervention approaches to NGOs and government actors?
- Extent to which the agencies worked together towards the common goal of improved psychosocial well-being amongst children? What were the coordination mechanisms and did they help?
- Have agencies developed common strategies and approaches, based on existing minimum standards and Guidelines?
- Have agencies effectively and jointly identified and addressed gaps in geographic or vulnerable/at risk group coverage?
- Have agencies developed effective referral mechanism to other relevant sectors and services, both in child protection/PSS and beyond?
- To what extent has the NGO collaboration promoted good working relationships with the government local administration to collaborate on community development issues?

5.3. EFFICIENCY

- To what extent the CP/PSS Programme’s governance and coordination was efficient to the results attained?
- To what extent did the actual or expected outcomes justify the costs incurred?
- To what extent did the PSS response activities overlap and duplicate with other similar interventions, either nationally-funded or donor-funded?
- How the PSS objectives were realized in terms of adequacy of human and material resources? (based on assessment of human and material resources required to achieve expected outcomes).
- How to improve the human and material resources management for further PSS interventions?

5.4. IMPACT

- Did the response have impact on protecting children, boys and girls of different ages, by strengthening the child protection mechanisms such as community based child protection structures, provision of services, community/social norms etc?
- To what extent and how have UNICEF and partners contributed directly or indirectly towards identifying, highlighting and addressing other forms of violence, abuse and exploitation against children?
- How and to what extent have UNICEF and partners’ interventions contributed to prevention and response to gender based violence and violence against children?
- What has been the impact of placing community based child protection structures in the catchment area of each child and adolescent friendly spaces?

5.5. SUSTAINABILITY

- To what extent did the PSS response identify and build on existing national, local, civil society, government capacities and positive coping mechanisms?
- To what extent the PSS response achievements are/will be sustained after the withdrawal of external support?
- How best to sustain the achievement of the PSS response?
- What new capacities within services or communities have been established or restored?
- To what extent these capacities and skills are being actively used in the PSS and development of children?
To what extent have the PSS response decision making bodies (government, civil society, development agencies) and implementing partners undertaken the necessary decisions and course of actions to ensure the sustainability of the PSS? To what extent have the systems been strengthened?

Extent to which the partners have sufficient financial capacity and resources to keep up the benefits produced by the programme

How have UNICEF and partners ensured community ownership of the PSS response?

5.6. HUMANITARIAN-DEVELOPMENT NEXUS

How relevant, timely, effective and efficient was the humanitarian response in this specific programme area (CP/PSS), specifically regarding (i) the links between the development and humanitarian context; (ii) the capacity of national authorities in HDN context; (iii) UNICEF’s added value; (iv) the capacity of UNICEF as an organization in HDN context; (v) the contribution of other HDN related partners?

What lessons learned and recommendations can be drawn for the future programming and realization of child’s rights in HDN context?

What are the key lessons learned from PSS activity through HDN lenses?

How can this HDN related experience contribute to identifying ways to collaborate and move forward strengthening the humanitarian/development linkages: (i) improved capacity of service providers and quality of services (CP/PSS); (ii) enhanced system of child rights protection and child rights monitoring, (iii) strengthen reform related to CP/PSS processes and etc.?

7. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The evaluation methodology will be guided by the Norms and Standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), as well as UNICEF Evaluation Policy. The evaluation will be conducted in a participatory manner: key stakeholders will be involved in all phases of the evaluation, including the planning, inception, fact-finding and reporting phases via Reference Group and other mechanisms.

Mixed method approach is suggested for this evaluation, combining qualitative and quantitative components to ensure complementary strengths and non-overlapping weaknesses with the following anticipated activities:

- Desk review of reference materials, including monitoring reports and other sources providing secondary data, project documentation, official and administrative statistics, regulatory framework and other related documents;
- Target groups identification in 8 selected settlements, including the families having children, community authorities and decision makers, services providers, concerned UNICEF staff and other relevant stakeholders in settlements and at the regional and national levels;
- Revising and reducing the evaluation questions reflecting the most relevant questions for the evaluation objective;
- Design of detailed methodology and tools for the evaluation and analysis based on the required indicators;
- Data collection through field visits, particularly administering standardized face-to-face interviews, semi-structured interviews, focus-group discussions and observations;
- Preparation of the evaluation report, which will include a detailed description of the evaluation design, descriptive analyses of the required indicators and key recommendations for replication of the PSS model in the context of HDN.

The list above is for reference only. However, the Evaluation Team is not supposed to create new tools and methods to access psychosocial well-being of children. Methodologies and Tools for Measuring Psychosocial Wellbeing of Children in Humanitarian Contexts (February 2014: Sarah Robinson, Janna Metzler and Alastair Ager) and Interagency Psychosocial Evaluation Project (UNICEF: 2011) from Palestine covered psychosocial well-being indicators which could easily be adjusted to the context.

During the Planning phase the Evaluation Team should start with a review of UNICEF and its partners’ relevant internal documents on the response, including but not limited to HNOs, HRPs, project proposal documents, quarterly reports submitted by partners to UNICEF, UNICEF weekly/bi-weekly sitreps, partners’ own internal evaluation reports, and NGO partner and international literature related to PSS interventions and assessment, other reference documents.

During the Inception phase Evaluation Team has to elaborate Inception Report which should outline detailed scope, evaluation framework; methodology; sampling, field visit timing, data collection methods, timeline for activities and
submission of deliverables, dissemination plan etc. The Inception phase will be used an evaluability phase and the Evaluation Team should collect and review all available evidence. The evaluability phase should include assessment of objectives, logic and activities of the PSS programme with an aim to investigate its credibility, feasibility, sustainability and acceptability. The Evaluation Team also should conduct an assessment of reliability of the data with focus on disaggregated data for evidence generation to be in line with “leave no one behind” approach.

During the Fact-finding phase (field work) the Evaluation Team will be responsible for collecting data in the field with minimum involvement of partners or UNICEF’s staff. However, UNICEF will facilitate the data collection and field work required for this exercise. While the assessment criteria have been set above, UNICEF would like the Evaluation Team to use the most significant change technique during all the methods adopted for the assessment.

The analysis will be built on triangulating information collected from different stakeholders through different methods including secondary data analysis and documentation review. It should critically examine the information gathered from the various sources, and synthesize the information in an objective manner. If contradictory information is obtained from different stakeholders, an effort should be made to understand the reasons for such information, including any gender-based differences.

During the Reporting phase the Evaluation Team should draft Evaluation Report and pay close attention to formulating good recommendations on HDN, clearly prioritizing 5-10 recommendations for concrete actions.

During the Dissemination phase, the Evaluation Team should pay close attention to involving all HDN related stakeholders. The Evaluation Report will be disseminated to the UNICEF senior management, programme specialists/officers, including Field Offices. Findings and recommendations will inform the work planning process, as well as the CO’s fundraising approach from 2019. The findings/recommendations will contribute to the Government’s social reforms implementation (decentralization, health reform, education reform).

The evaluation approach and data collection and analysis methods should also focus on equity, gender and human rights aspects, be responsive and appropriate for analyzing the gender equality, human rights issues including child rights issues identified in the scope. Gender equality, equity and human rights considerations will be further elaborated by the Evaluation Team during the inception phase and addressed across the final report.

Children, community members and professionals working in the field should be extensively consulted during the evaluation using different appropriate methods. Given the size of evaluation, a multi-disciplinary team of consultants will be best placed to conduct this exercise.

In light of UNICEF’s strategic agenda to harness innovation and deepen and widen the evidence base to drive and sustain global progress towards the realization of children's rights, ensuring ethical conduct in evidence generation is imperative. This is necessary both in its own right and as a significant contributor to ensuring quality and accountability in the evidence generation process, especially when it involves children.

The Evaluation Team should propose a design based tools and methods already available, while ensuring that this design suits the specific objectives of the HDN context. Evaluation methodology should be based on UNEG Ethical considerations and respond to UNEG ethical guidance to evaluation as guiding principle to ensure quality of evaluation process (http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ETHICAL+GUIDELINES) as well as on Standard Operations Procedures (SOP) for Quality Assurance and Ethical Standards in UNICEF-supported Research, Studies and Evaluations (RSEs) towards Measurable Results for Children in the CEE/CIS Region and UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation, Data Collection and Analysis.

The following limitations to the evaluation are anticipated:

- UNICEF CP/PSS programmes are at different stage of implementation since 2014 (beginning of the conflict);
- UNICEF CP/PSS programmes are at different phases of UNICEF response to conflict in Eastern Ukraine (2014-2015 mostly humanitarian response, 2016-2018 linking development-humanitarian response) which may negatively impact comparability between PSS interventions provided;
- unavailability and poor quality of data and evidence, for impact and outcome level (due to emergency challenges in 2014-2015).

To address some of these limitations, the evaluation will use information provided through the Evaluability assessment on availability, scope and quality of data and validate key determinants of inequity and trends at impact.
and outcome level. At a next stage the evaluation approach will be further narrowed down, examining all and country specific CP/PSS programme interventions and their impact, including UNICEF’s specific role. Detailed evaluation framework should be developed to allow comparability of programme approaches across the phases of conflict (2014-2015, 2016-2018) and the regions/cities in Eastern Ukraine.

8. WORKPLAN

A tentative time frame for the evaluation is provided below. The evaluation is expected to be completed within seven months. This might be subject to change depending on the prevailing situation on ground at the time of the evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature of contract</td>
<td>One – five days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producing a detailed Inception Report (IR) describing initial findings based on the preliminary desk review, the evaluation methodology, questionnaires, detailed implementation plan, the outline of the Evaluation Report, dissemination plan</td>
<td>Two months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External and Internal quality assurance (QA) review process of Inception Report; ethical review process</td>
<td>Two weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporation of received feedback</td>
<td>One week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary discussions with the ERG on approach, CP activities, ToC, HDN etc</td>
<td>One week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting tools and questionnaires for field work</td>
<td>One week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical review/approval processes</td>
<td>One week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field work including FGDs, interviews etc</td>
<td>One month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis and writing of the First draft of the report in English</td>
<td>One month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal QA review process: ethical review process (the First draft)</td>
<td>One week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert discussions (internal and external) of the First draft</td>
<td>One week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producing the Second draft</td>
<td>Two weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal and External QA review process of the Second draft</td>
<td>Two weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation of the Second draft, incorporation of validation comments and feedback from QA review process</td>
<td>Two weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of the Final draft both in English and Ukrainian</td>
<td>Two weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of the PowerPoint Presentation with graphs both in English and Ukrainian</td>
<td>Two days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of the Evaluation Report with PowerPoint Presentation both in English and Ukrainian to UNICEF</td>
<td>One day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of the Evaluation Report findings at UNICEF organized events (internal and public)</td>
<td>Two days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evaluation process at all stages should follow UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation, Data Collection and Analysis.

9. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS

UNICEF as commissioner takes the accountability of the evaluation and Head of CO RSE Steering Committee designated as supervisor for this evaluation. Managerial function for this evaluation will be done by Child Rights Monitoring Specialist (Evaluation Manager). Support for this evaluation will be provided jointly by Chief of Social Policy Section, Chief of Child Protection Section and the Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist.

The UNICEF CO RSE Steering Committee will have the following responsibilities:

- to review TOR and make recommendations;
- to ensure that evaluation process meets the standards of quality and apply the procedures outlined in the SOPs for Quality Assurance and Ethical Standards in UNICEF-supported RSEs towards results for children in the CEE/CIS Region, Procedure for Quality Assurance in UNICEF Research, UNICEF Evaluation and Research policies and other relevant guiding documents;

Interested companies/institutions should indicate the expected time to complete the assessment in their proposals.
• to identify appropriate ethics review mechanisms (including establishing Ethical Review Board and ethical approval process);
• to review inception report, draft and final reports to ensure they meet UNICEF’s quality assurance and ethical standards;
• to provide technical advice and support to the evaluation process.

The Ethical Review Board (ERB) will be established given the participation of children in the evaluation. The ERB shall be multidisciplinary and multi-sectoral in composition; comprising 3 members. The ERB will be chaired by the most senior member in terms of relevant professional experience in conducting or reviewing evaluation/researches/studies involving primary data collection and preferably experience undertaking programmes involving children.

The ERG will have the following responsibilities:
• to apply approach consistent with The UNICEF Procedure for Ethical Standards;
• to provide technical advice and support to the evaluation process;
• to review methodology, inception report, draft and final reports to ensure they meet UNICEF’s ethical standards;
• to provide ethical approvals based on the “Criteria for Ethical Review Checklist”.

The Evaluation Manager will have the following responsibilities:
• Lead the management of the evaluation process throughout the evaluation (design, implementation and dissemination and coordination of its follow up);
• Establish ERG; Convene the ERG meetings; Facilitate the participation of those involved in the evaluation design;
• Coordinate the selection of the Evaluation Team;
• Safeguard the independence of the exercise and ensure the evaluation products meet quality standards;
• Connect the Evaluation Team with the wider programme units, senior management and key evaluation stakeholders, and ensure a fully inclusive and transparent approach to the evaluation;
• Facilitate the Evaluation Team’s access to all information and documentation relevant to the intervention, as well as to key actors and informants who should participate in interviews, focus groups or other information-gathering methods;
• Provide the evaluators with overall guidance as well as with administrative support; Oversee progress and conduct of the evaluation, the quality of the process and the products;
• Approve the deliverables and evaluate the team’s work in consultation with ERG and RSE Steering Committee;
• Take responsibility for disseminating and learning across evaluations on the various programme areas as well as the liaison with the RSE Steering Committee;
• Ensure that the TOR, IR and Evaluation Report are submitted to external QA review conducted by external institution;
• Disseminate the results of the evaluation.

The Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) will comprise of the representatives of the major stakeholders including Evaluation Manager, Deputy Representative (or OIC), Chief of Social Policy Section, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, Child Protection in Emergencies Officer, two designated representatives from implementing partners, Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor.

The ERG will:
• Provide clear specific advice and support to the Evaluation Manager and the Evaluation Team throughout the whole evaluation process;
• Review the Inception Report and all drafts of Evaluation Report and ensure Final draft meets the UNICEF-Adapted UNEG Evaluation Reports Standards;
• Review and provide comments and feedback on the quality of the evaluation process as well as on the evaluation products (comments and suggestions on the TOR, draft reports, final report of the evaluation).

The Evaluation Team will report to Evaluation Manager and conduct the evaluation by fulfilling the contractual arrangements in line with the TOR, UNEG/OECD norms and standards and Ethical Guidelines; this includes developing of an evaluation (implementation) plan as part of the inception report, drafting and finalizing the final report and other deliverables, and briefing the commissioner on the progress and key findings and recommendations, as needed.
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The Evaluation Team should also adhere to UNICEF’s Evaluation Policy, to UNEG’s ethical guidelines for UN evaluations and to UNICEF Reporting Standards. Evaluation team members will sign a no conflict of interest attestation.

The Evaluation Team must demonstrate personal and professional integrity during the whole process of the evaluation. The Evaluation Team must respect the right of institutions and individuals to provide information in confidence and ensure that sensitive data cannot be traced to its source. Further, the team must respect ethics of research while working with children including using age appropriate consent forms, age appropriate data collection, and principle of do no harm. Furthermore, the team and its members must take care that those involved in the evaluation have an opportunity to examine the statements attributed to them. The evaluation process must be sensitive to beliefs, manners, and customs of the social and cultural environment in which they will work. Especially, the team must be sensitive to and address issues of protection, discrimination and gender inequality. Furthermore, the team members are not expected to assess the personal performance of individuals, and must balance an assessment of management functions with due consideration of this principle. Finally, if the team uncover evidence of wrongdoing, such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body.

The evaluation should follow UN Evaluation Group Norms and Standards – including ensuring that the planned evaluation fully addresses any ethical issues.

10. STRUCTURE OF THE EVALUATION REPORT

The Evaluation Report is proposed to have the following structure, to be reviewed once the Evaluation Team is selected:

Opening pages
Executive Summary
Introduction
Chapter 1: Background, Objectives and Methodology
  1.1. Object of the Evaluation
  1.2. Purpose, Objectives and Scope of the Evaluation
  1.3. Evaluation Methodology
  1.4. Major Limitations
  1.5. Ethical considerations, Human Rights and Gender
Chapter 2: Overview of the Actions and Context
  2.1. Main areas of PSS intervention
  2.2. Logic of intervention (ToC)
  2.3. Management and Governance Structure
  2.4. Partnerships
Chapter 3: Analysis and Findings
  3.1. Overall context
  3.2. Baseline and end-survey results
  3.3. Relevance
  3.4. Effectiveness
  3.5. Efficiency
  3.6. Sustainability
  3.7. Impact
  3.8. Cross-cutting topics
Chapter 4: Humanitarian-Development Nexus
  4.1. Humanitarian context
  4.2. Development context
  4.3. Promoting resilience through linking development-humanitarian
Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations
  5.1. Conclusions and Lessons Learned
  5.2. Recommendations

ANNEXES
  • Terms of Reference
  • Desk Review and Background Documents
The evaluation report to be produced must be compliant with the UNICEF Evaluation standards and GEROS Quality Assessment System.

The evaluation report not will be used for academic publishing.

**11. DELIVERABLES**

The Evaluation Team is responsible to submit the following **Deliverables**:

1. **Detailed Inception Report (IR) in English and Ukrainian** (Electronic version to be submitted within two months after signing a contract and initial briefing with the Evaluation Manager, ERB and ERG). This report should be 10 to 15 pages in length and should be in line with UN standards for IRs. The IR should outline detailed scope, evaluation framework; methodology; sampling, field visit timing, data collection methods, timeline for activities and submission of deliverables, dissemination plan). The IR should also include initial data and findings based on the documentary review and final evaluation design/plan. The Inception Phase will be used as an evaluability phase and phase to collect and review all available evidence.

   This report will be used as an initial point of agreement and understanding between the Evaluation Team and Evaluation Manager. A draft will be shared in advance for comments, and approved by the ERG. Final inception report will be presented by the Evaluation Team to the ERB and ERG and quality assured by RSE Steering Committee, Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor and external QA institution.

2. **Drafts of Evaluation Report (the First and the Second) in English** (Electronic version of the first draft should be submitted after completion of the data collection field visits). The draft report should be in line with UNICEF adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standards and contain the same sections as the final report (described in the p. 10) and will be at least 40 pages in length (excluding annexes). It will also contain an executive summary of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the UNICEF PSS programmes, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its main findings, conclusions and recommendations. The drafts will be shared with the ERG to seek their comments. The drafts report will be quality assured by RSE Steering Committee and Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor. The final draft will be quality assured by external QA institution.

3. **Evaluation Report (Final draft) in English and Ukrainian** (Electronic and hard copy versions to be submitted after receiving consolidated comments and feedback from UNICEF). The final report will be 50 to 60 pages in length. It will also contain an executive summary of no more than 5 pages that includes a brief description of the programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its major findings, conclusions and recommendations. The final report should include all received comments and suggestions provided by QA review providers. The Evaluation Report should systematically answer the key evaluation questions posed. It should fairly and clearly represent the views of the different actors/stakeholders. It should clearly give the conclusions and recommends in a way that is substantiated by evidence.

4. **Power point presentation in English and Ukrainian** (electronic version)

   Presentation based on the finalized evaluation report summarizing the entire process, purpose, objectives, methodology, findings and recommendations and conclusions. Dissemination plan and advocacy approaches should be developed respectively and then discussed/agreed with the CO. Primarily, the result will be disseminated to the CO senior management. The findings will be discussed at the management team meetings, programmatic reviews to inform the CO’s programming. The plan for dissemination and advocacy of the Evaluation result will be cleared by the CO’s RSE Steering Committee.

The Evaluation Team should propose a timeline to submit the deliverables in their implementation plan (in proposals). Necessary and adequate time (at least two weeks) should be allocated for review and quality assurance processes of the deliverables by the Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor and External Institution.
The Evaluation Team should produce the above assessment and conduct the meetings for submitting each Deliverable. Deadline for each deliverable to be agreed between the Evaluation Team and UNICEF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Reporting format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall evaluation schedule and implementation plan, with staffing, brief description of approach, field trips, dissemination plan incl. presentation, other relevant information</td>
<td>Prepared and agreed with UNICEF via exchange of e-mails evaluation schedule, implementation plan, staffing (CVs) etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Inception Report</td>
<td>Electronic version in English and Ukrainian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field work</td>
<td>Meeting notes, participant lists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the First draft of Evaluation Report</td>
<td>Electronic version in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Second draft of Evaluation Report</td>
<td>Electronic version in English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Report (Final draft)</td>
<td>Electronic and hard copy versions in English and Ukrainian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power point presentation on key findings and recommendations</td>
<td>Electronic version in English and Ukrainian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All deliverables should be drafted in English, Inception Report and Evaluation Report should be translated and submitted both in English and in Ukrainian. All reports should follow the structure and detailed outlines discussed and agreed with UNICEF in Ukraine.

All deliverables should respond to UN Evaluation Group QA criteria, including UNEG quality checklist for Inception Report and Evaluation Report (http://www.unevaluation.org/document/library)

**Performance indicators:**

a) Timely developed and agreed with UNICEF evaluation schedule and implementation plan, with staffing, methodology, field trips;
b) Timely carried inception meetings;
c) Timely delivered Inception Report;
d) Timely carried out field work;
e) Timely prepared Drafts (the First, the Second and Final) of the Report;
f) Timely carried out meetings with ERB and ERG to discuss all Drafts of the Reports;
g) Comments from UNICEF and QA institution, if any, to the Drafts of the Report, are addressed and incorporated;
h) Timely finalized and submitted Evaluation Report (final version after external QA review);
i) Quality and context of all required reports corresponds to the TOR requirements and, if any, incorporates recommendations of UNICEF and/or QA review;
j) Qualifications of involved staff correspond to TOR requirements.

12. TECHNICAL QUALIFICATION CRITERIA

12.1. UNICEF is seeking to contract a Consultancy company, corresponding to the following requirements:

- Duly registered in the country of residence, without limitation as to the countries of registration.
- Proven experience in evaluation (not less than three years) and in assessing and/or in consultancy on humanitarian response (not less than one year).
- Consulting experience on conflict in Eastern Ukraine and/or on conflicts in post soviet countries is an asset.

12.2. The Consultancy company shall provide the Evaluation Team

The Evaluation Team should be comprised of (at least) Team Leader, Evaluation Specialist, Data Analyst, and Child Protection/PSS Specialist.

The Evaluation Team should have the following qualifications:

- Advanced university degree, preferably in economics, social studies or development/humanitarian aid, statistics or a related field. A combination of relevant academic background and relevant work experience may be accepted in lieu of the advanced university degree;
- At least three years’ experience in evaluation, including experience in an emergency setting; familiarity with UNICEF and the UN system (CVs required);
- Expertise to analyze and develop a good understanding of child protection issues;
- Strong analytical skills and qualitative and/or quantitative statistical data processing applications;
- Ability to produce content for high standard deliverables in English;
- Sensitivity towards ethics with regards to human and child rights issues, different cultures, local customs, religious beliefs and practices, personal interaction and gender roles, disability, age and ethnicity.

**Evaluation Team Leader** should have the following qualification in addition to the above:

- At least five years’ experience in evaluation, including experience in an emergency setting; familiarity with UNICEF and the UN system (CVs required);
- Proven international experience.

The proposed Evaluation team must correspond to the minimum criteria – team composition and minimum experience of the proposed staff. In case of deviation, the offers may be considered technically not compliant.

### 12.3. Evaluation of technical proposals

All technical proposals will be evaluated using the evaluation criteria as indicated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mandatory Requirements (Pre-qualification Criteria)</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Companies/organizations with a minimum of one year of experience in the evaluation and assessment consultancy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company organizations has valid registration in Country of Residence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General adherence to Terms of Reference and tender requirements; Understanding of scope, objectives and completeness and coherence of response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous experience</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Company/organization experiences in consultancy on humanitarian response in last 10 years</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Experience in evaluation and/or assessing in last 5 years</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Consulting experience on conflict in Eastern Ukraine and/or on conflicts in post soviet countries in the last 4 years.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualifications</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Experience (evaluation, assessment, survey and/or related field, with a Masters in relevant field) of <strong>Team Leader</strong> (CV to be provided as part of technical proposal ). Minimum experience – 5 years.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Experience of <strong>Evaluation Specialist</strong> (CV to be provided as part of technical proposal ) Minimum experience – 3 years.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Experience of <strong>Data Analyst</strong> (CV to be provided as part of technical proposal) Minimum experience – 3 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Experience of <strong>CP/PSS Specialist</strong> (CV to be provided as part of technical proposal) Minimum experience – 3 years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quality of similar work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>Links to similar reports in Evaluation undertaken by the company/organization. Evaluation reports conducted for UN Agencies are an asset.</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>The quality of a similar evaluation report with the suggested sample report that would be most similar the that indicated in the TOR. Evaluation reports conducted for UN Agencies are an asset.</td>
<td>Sample report of appropriate quality 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sample report conducted for UN Agencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capacities and work schedule for current proposal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1</th>
<th>Comprehensive mobilization/work plan indicating proposed approach/methodology/tools and travel to accomplish the TOR.</th>
<th>Mobilization and implementation plan with detailed and self explanatory work schedule 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Methodology brief that includes sources of information to be used for each of sub-topics of the evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total score**

|      | 100 |

The Offer is considered technically acceptable (and therefore eligible for opening of financial offers), when it obtains 70 Points out of 100 in course of technical evaluation. The final selection of the Contractor will be based on a quality and cost basis with weightage of 70% of the technical proposal and 30% of the financial proposal.

### 12.4. Price proposals

All interested institutions are requested to include in their submission detailed costs including:

- **Daily rate including hours per day**
- **Expenses** (external and internal travel, field works, interpretation and translation etc. Please include all relevant costs that are required for this exercise) to be agreed prior to commencing project
- **Any additional requirements needed to complete project or that might have an impact on cost or delivery of products**
- **The consultants would be required to use their own computers, printers, photocopier etc.**

Payment is contingent on approval by the Evaluation managers and will be made in three instalments:

- **15% upon clearance of an Inception Report by RSE Steering Committee**
- **45% upon submission of the first draft of the evaluation report**
c) 40% upon submission of finalized evaluation report, power point presentation.

The institutions may propose different payment schedules that will be considered during the assessment of the proposal.

It is expected that the evaluation team would make a visit to the country (if located outside) including areas for field work as per methodology finalized for this evaluation. All travel costs should be planned properly in the technical proposal and included in the financial proposal. Please note that if selected, the contract can be a supporting document to obtain entry visa (if necessary). UNICEF will be unable to secure travel visas.

The number of travels planned for each member of the team shall be specified and justified in the technical proposals (duration, number of journeys etc.) in line with the TOR. Bidders shall be required to include the estimated cost of travel (as a separate line in the financial proposal, total and costs per trip) in the financial proposal.

It is essential that:

i) travel cost shall be calculated based on economy class travel, regardless of the length of travel; ii) costs for accommodation, meals and incidentals shall not exceed applicable daily subsistence allowance (DSA) rates, as promulgated by the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC); and iii) Travels and other incidental expenses that were not known ex ante or any additional costs with regards to the travel expenses submitted in the proposal should be justified by the Consultant and accepted by UNICEF before they are incurred. Such expenses may be paid as reimbursable against actual cost incurred and in these cases necessary documentation shall be submitted with the invoice for reimbursement (e.g. proof of airline ticket purchased).

REFERENCES

The evaluation process should adhere to the United Nations evaluation norms and standards and Ethical Guidelines for evaluation available at:


The evaluation should be consistent with The Procedure for Ethical Standards in UNICEF Research, Evaluation, Data Collection and Analysis and is complemented by, and builds on, the pre-existing Strategic Guidance Note on Institutionalizing Ethical Practice for UNICEF Research and the Evaluations Technical Note No. 1, Children Participating in Research, Monitoring And Evaluation (M&E) — Ethics and Your Responsibilities as a Manager, UNICEF Evaluation Office, 2002.

Reference documents:

- Standard Operations Procedures (SOP) for Quality Assurance and Ethical Standards in UNICEF–supported Research, Studies and Evaluations (RSEs) towards Measurable Results for Children in the CEE/CIS Region;

2017 Ukraine: Evaluation of the Country Programme of Cooperation between the Government of Ukraine and UNICEF 2012-2016:
https://www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/index_95963.html

Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO):

2018:https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/node/156653

Humanitarian Response Plans (HRP):

Annex 12. Translation of Consent Form

[ДАТА]

Уважаемая госпожа / уважаемый господин,

ЮНИСЕФ Украина выбрали организацию ОАГ для проведения Оценивания предоставления услуг психосоциальной поддержки и защиты Дружественными общественными центрами и пространствами защиты детей и юношества на востоке Украины (сопроводительное письмо Регионального представительства ЮНИСЕФ Вы найдете в приложении).

Оценивание проанализирует работу данных центров, идентифицирует изменения, произошедшие в жизни семьи и детей. Кроме того, оценивание позволит лучше понять, как были получены достигнутые результаты, и какие методы работы показали свою эффективность. Оценивание также проанализирует вклад ЮНИСЕФ в полученные изменения. Важно также отметить, что это так же и способ получения новых знаний, как для ЮНИСЕФ, так и для Вашей страны.

В процессе оценивания, мы так же планируем учитывать позицию детей. В своих интервью они смогут озвучить свою позицию, поделиться опытом и видением ситуации. Мы также заинтересованы обсудить с детьми их непосредственный опыт и эффективность предоставляемых поддерживающих услуг: общественных центров, семейных центров и т.д. Именно поэтому мы просим Вашей поддержки в привлечении Вашего ребенка к обсуждению в рамках фокус-групп.

В приложении Вы сможете найти краткое письмо для Вашего ребенка с объяснением процесса и его прав. В процессе обсуждения с ребенком его участия, пожалуйста, покажите ему это вступительное письмо.

Обсуждение в фокус-группе

Дискуссия будет проходить в помещении центра, который Вы посещаете или в другом общественном месте, с которым Вы или Ваш ребенок уже знакомы. Если ребенок будет чувствовать себя в большей безопасности в сопровождении взрослого, которому он доверяет, в таком случае взрослый может присутствовать. Вся дискуссия будет длиться приблизительно 60 минут.

Неразглашение и конфиденциальность

Полученная информация будет обработана анонимно, а при стенографическом цитировании будет указана только роль респондента, то есть «ребенок».

Документы и собранная информация, формы согласия, записи интервью, образцы отчетов будут собраны организацией ОАГ, которая будет сберегать их в течение 10 месяцев с момента получения. В случае если запись интервью затребует ЮНИСЕФ, они могут быть пересланы в представительство ЮНИСЕФ в Украине.

Если ребенок, которого Вы представляете, согласен принять участие в оценивании, и Вы, в свою очередь, тоже не препятствуете Вашему ребенку принять участие в оценивании, пожалуйста, заполните «Форму информированного согласия законного представителя/опекуна».

Если у Вас возникли дальнейшие вопросы касательно данного оценивания, пожалуйста, контактируйте с [Имя, фамилия Мари], чтобы задать Ваши вопросы.

С уважением,

[Имя, фамилия Мари]

Телефон
Email
ФОРМА ИНФОРМИРОВАННОГО СОГЛАСИЯ ЗАКОННОГО ПРЕДСТАВИТЕЛЯ/ОПЕКУНА

Я (законный представитель/опекун) __________________________ даю свое согласие ребенку __________________________ на участие в интервью, которое будет проводиться ....................... ОАГ в рамках Оценивания предоставления услуг психосоциальной поддержки и защиты Дружественными общественными центрами и пространствами защиты детей и юношества на востоке Украины.

Данным я подтверждаю что:

3. Я прочитал/а информацию, предоставленную во вступительном письме;
4. Все детали процедуры были мне разъяснены в должном для моего понимания объеме;
5. Я понимаю, что:
   - ребенок, которого я представляю, не получит прямой выгоды от участия в этом оценивании;
   - ребенок может в любое время прекратить свое участие в интервью и может в любой момент отказаться отвечать на любой поставленный вопрос;
   - когда полученную во время этого оценивания информацию опубликуют, то личность ребенка, которого я представляю, не будет раскрыта и вся остальная личная информация останется конфиденциальной;
6. Я понимаю, что информация, которую ребенок предоставит во время этого интервью, будет использована ОАГ исключительно для оценивания. Я также понимаю, что ОАГ конфиденциально передаст полученную информацию в представительство ЮНИСЕФ в Украине, но не будет ее копировать, передавать или сохранять для каких либо иных целей.

Имя: _____________________ Фамилия: _______________________
Дата: __________________________
Контактный телефон: ________________________________
Подпись:

Данная форма должна быть заполнена и подписана в двух экземплярах, один из которых остается консультанту, а второй сохраняет законный представитель/опекун.

54
Здравствуй,

Меня зовут Х. Я и мои коллеги Симон и Десислава хотим представить тебе наше исследование, в котором, возможно, ты захочешь принять участие.

Дети иногда попадают в ситуацию, когда им либо их родителям нужна поддержка, чтобы пережить сложные жизненные ситуации, такие как война и необходимость уехать из родного дома. В таких случаях есть помощь, чтобы детям росли здоровыми и в безопасности. Со временем эта помощь может меняться.

В своем исследовании мы хотим определить, как ты относишься к изменениям в нашей помощи. Дети – важная составляющая этого исследования и мы хотим, чтобы ты тоже мог поделиться опытом и своими наблюдениями, так же, как и взрослые, которые о тебе заботятся.

По результатам мы сделаем отчет и отправим его в ЮНИСЕФ, международную организацию, которая занимается правами ребенка. ЮНИСЕФ в дальнейшем будет сотрудничать с властями твоей страны, чтобы улучшить качество работы и чтобы дети вместе со своими семьями жили лучше, чтобы они себя чувствовали как дома.

8. Мы хотим пригласить тебя принять участие в обсуждении с другими детьми, если ты согласен. Во время разговора мы можем делать записи, но твое имя мы указывать не будем, поэтому другие люди, которые будут эти интервью читать, его не узнают;

9. Если ты согласен принять участие в этом исследовании, то можешь прийти со взрослым, который будет с тобой во время дискуссии;

10. Твое имя и другая информация о тебе в отчете упоминаться не будет;

11. Интервью займет не более 60 минут;

12. Ты можешь остановить интервью в любой момент и тебе не обязательно объяснять почему;

13. Если тебе зададут вопрос, на который ты не хочешь отвечать, то ты можешь его пропустить;

14. Если тебе что-то не понятно, то ты можешь уточнять вопросы у меня (или у того, кто берет у тебя интервью).

Если ты хочешь принять участие в исследовании тебе нужно сказать об этом тому взрослому или взрослой, который/ая дали тебе это письмо, что ты согласен принять участие в интервью.

Если у тебя еще есть вопросы о своем участии или об этом исследовании, то, пожалуйста, не стесняйся их мне задать.

Большое спасибо,

[Имя, фамилия]

Телефон
Email