

## **TERMS OF REFERENCE (ToR)**

### **Mid-Term External Evaluation**

#### **Schools for Democracy: Strengthening Democratic Resilience in Ukraine and Moldova (2024–2027)**

#### **The European Wergeland Centre (EWC)**

### **1. Background**

Schools for Democracy (SfD) is a multi-year education programme aiming to facilitate systemic democratic reforms in education and strengthen European cooperation by promoting democratic culture and democratic citizenship in policy and practice. The programme is implemented by the European Wergeland Centre (EWC) in close cooperation with the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine (MoES). Funding is provided by Norad – The Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation..

SfD builds on the earlier programme cycles (2015-2017, 2017-2021, and 2021–2024) which supported policy development, strengthening school autonomy, development of teaching and learning resources, and international and regional experience exchange.

The programme continues to draw on international frameworks for democratic citizenship education (e.g., Council of Europe’s Reference Framework on Competences for Democratic Culture and EDC/HRE Charter) and the whole-school approach (UNESCO, CoE, AI). Since 2024, the programme has expanded its geographic reach by including a program component in Moldova. Given the early stage of implementation, the Moldova component will be excluded from this mid-term evaluation.

### **2. Purpose and Intended Use**

This mid-term evaluation is initiated for accountability and learning. It will:

- Assess programme relevance, effectiveness and results achieved so far, with coherence and efficiency considered in line with OECD DAC criteria.
- Provide evidence-based recommendations to inform programme correction, portfolio management, and subsequent programming.
- Serve reporting needs to Norad and strategic dialogue with MoES and other stakeholders.

### **3. Evaluation Criteria and Questions**

The evaluation shall apply the OECD DAC evaluation criteria, with primary focus on Relevance, Coherence, and Effectiveness in line with the programme’s stage of implementation. Impact and Sustainability may be considered selectively where early indications exist but are not primary criteria at this mid-term stage.

The evaluation study will address the following questions:

1. Is the programme relevant in the implementing context, including for the recipient country's reform agenda, donor priorities, as well as the situation of war?
2. To what extent has the implementation process and approach been complete, appropriate and responsive to date? Are there any emerging inclusion-related findings (e.g., conflict-affected or vulnerable groups)?
3. How coherent are the programme's components and partnerships, including complementarity with other national and international initiatives and avoidance of duplication?
4. To which degree is the programme achieving the expected outputs and outcomes so far, given the evolving context in Ukraine? Provide an evaluation of progress in relation to planned results.

Indicative (Optional) Mid-term Questions

5. What are the programme's contributions to effects at the level of objectives and impact? Are there plausible early signs of longer-term impact and lasting changes at individual, institutional and policy levels, such as changes in school practices, institutional uptake, or strengthened capacities, acknowledging the limitations of mid-term assessment? What measures have been taken to provide for sustainability of changes?

Refinement clause: The evaluation questions may be refined, expanded, or adjusted during the inception phase in consultation with EWC, to ensure methodological feasibility and alignment with the programme's evolving context and information needs.

#### **4. Scope**

Geography: Primarily Ukraine

Thematic coverage: Democratic citizenship education, school democratization, policy engagement, teacher professional development, online resources, partnerships.

Timeframe for analysis: Programme period 2024–2026 (to date), with reference to prior cycles (2015-2017) (2017–2021) (2021-2024) for continuity and learning.

#### **5. Evaluation Approach and Methodology**

The evaluation shall follow a utilization-focused and participatory approach, ensuring stakeholder involvement (EWC, MoES, partners, school representatives), and adherence to OECD DAC Quality Standards. Indicative design elements may include:

- Document review: programme design, results framework, monitoring data, trainer

reports, donor reports, and relevant policy documents.

- Quantitative analysis: use of programme monitoring data to assess reach, outputs, and selected outcomes; triangulation with external statistics when available.
- Qualitative inquiry: semi-structured interviews, focus groups (teachers, students, school leaders, trainers, policymakers), and case studies of exemplar schools.
- Fieldwork: If security allows, one field visit to Ukraine, potentially aligned with planned events. Remote methods shall be used if field access is restricted.
- Conflict sensitivity & ethics: duty of care, confidentiality, and safe-do-no-harm principles; attention to gender equality and human rights lenses, consistent with OECD DAC guidance.
- Data protection: GDPR-compliant data handling and secure storage/transfer.

## **6. Quality Standards and Independence**

Apply OECD DAC Quality Standards for development evaluation across process and reporting. Maintain independence from EWC and implementing partners; report any conflicts of interest. Document substantive disagreements from stakeholders and indicate how these were treated in findings and conclusions.

## **7. Qualifications**

Proven track record in complex education evaluations and democratic citizenship/human rights education.

Expert(s) with deep knowledge of the education sector and local context; Ukrainian language proficiency.

M&E specialist skilled in mixed-methods and contribution/causal analysis.

Education policy specialist (curriculum, teacher development, school governance).

Language: Strong proficiency in English and Ukrainian is required.

## **8. Management, Roles, and Responsibilities**

EWC Programme Manager Anders Glette will coordinate access to documents, stakeholders, and logistics.

Evaluation Governance: EWC will document the selection process; an evaluation committee will be convened for higher-value competitions per EWC procurement guidelines.

Stakeholder engagement: Norad and key partners will be consulted at inception and final stages.

Approvals: Inception and Final Report will be approved by EWC management and Norad (as applicable).

## **9. Deliverables**

### 1) Inception Report (Evaluation Plan)

- Refined questions, methodology, sampling, instruments
- Workplan, roles, risks, ethics & data protection plan
- Limitations and mitigation measures (max 15–20 pages)

### 2) Draft Evaluation Report

- Executive Summary (max 10 pages)
  - Methodology, findings, conclusions, recommendations
  - Annexes: ToR, tools, list of people consulted, references, data tables
  - (EWC comment round)
- 3) Final Evaluation Report
- Incorporates comments; states and justifies any divergences
  - Executive Summary in Ukrainian included
  - Presentation (virtual or in-person) of key findings to EWC/key partners/Norad

## **10. Timeline**

Contracting & Kick-off: April 2026

Inception Report: May 2026

Data collection & (if feasible) field visit: May - July 2026

Draft Evaluation Report: October 2026

Stakeholder presentation & comments: November 2026

Final Evaluation Report: by end of December 2026

## **11. Budget**

The maximum budget for the mid-term external evaluation is NOK 450,000 (VAT included). Proposals should present a detailed budget in NOK (person-days, rates, travel, translation, incidentals), team role allocations, timeline, and demonstrate cost-effectiveness.

## **12. Ethical, Legal, and Procurement Requirements**

Exclusion grounds: bankruptcy, professional misconduct, tax/social security breaches, fraud/corruption/money laundering, child/forced labour, discrimination, and violations of freedom of association/collective bargaining under ILO core conventions. Written confirmations are required.

Conflict of interest & misrepresentation: grounds for rejection/termination.

Transparency and competition: Publication/invitation practice documented, objective award criteria set ex-ante.

Record-keeping: Maintain procurement file and evaluation documentation per EWC guideline requirements.

## **13. Submission Requirements**

- Organization profile: brief presentation, legal form and ownership structure.
- Team: contact person (team leader), CVs and documents evidencing required qualifications; proficiency in English and Ukrainian.
- Letter of interest: brief description of approach and methods to be applied for analysis and additional data collection, signed by an authorized representative.
- Budget & timeline: document specifying the total budget (in NOK), delivery timeline, and internal allocation of roles and resources within the team.
- Samples: previous external evaluation reports in education/democracy/HRE carried out

by the organization or team.

- References: if available.

## **14. Annexes**

Previous SfD mid-term evaluation report