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1. Introduction

1. These Terms of Reference (TOR) are for the evaluation of Right2Change: Youth Justice Reform in Policy and Practice, Northern Uganda. This evaluation is commissioned by Right2Change Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning unit and will cover the implementation period of the first two years of implementation in Agago and Pader districts.

2. This TOR were prepared by the Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Unit in collaboration with the Right2Change in Uganda and Chance for Childhood, UK. Initial conceptualization of evaluation ideas was contributed by Comic Relief in collaboration with the project staff. The purpose of the TOR is twofold. Firstly, it provides key information to the evaluation team and helps guide them throughout the evaluation process; and secondly, it provides key information to stakeholders about the proposed evaluation.

3. The Midterm Review, which is the subject of this ToR, shall assess the continued programme’s relevance, efficiency and effectiveness as well as the progress made towards achieving the planned objectives and outcomes. The evaluation is to be composed of two interlinked parts: a) a process review including activities and outputs and b) project outcome evaluation specifically as to whether they will be achieved or not. Both parts of the evaluation shall draw on quantitative and qualitative (focus group discussions and key informant interviews) methods. Analysis of quantitative indicators shall be based on the Project grant start up form using existing programme and monitoring reports as well as primary data to be collected as part of the evaluation activities.

2. Reasons for the Evaluation

4. The reasons for the evaluation being commissioned are presented below.

2.1. Rationale

5. The Right2Change project is approaching the midway point in two of the four implementation districts. The Project is testing a first structured diversion programme in partnership with grassroots organization Passion for Community (P4C) to build the capacity of the judiciary and empower the community to support rehabilitation of young offenders resulting in lasting behavior changes and reducing re-offending rates, thus it is crucial to document the project’s achievements and its potential to improve the lives of children in conflict with the Law, as well as to assess the potential for improvement in its implementation process.
6. The Midterm Evaluation will have the following uses for the Chance for Childhood: it shall test the validity of the project design by assessing how well the project has been implemented to meet the needs of children in conflict with the law. Secondly, it will also seek to determine if the project has made sufficient progress towards achieving the planned objectives. The evaluation will, lastly, assess whether the project is on track to deliver lasting change for children in conflict with the law (CicL), including through strengthening the juvenile justice system. The midterm evaluation shall inform stakeholders about the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency demonstrated by the project made so far. Such information is crucial to decide on changes to be made in the programme’s design and implementation as well as to inform a possible scale-up of the programme. Moreover, the Review shall inquire whether the innovative elements introduced under the Right to Change, specifically the role of community based diversion program, the combination of CBT and economic empowerment are effective.

2.2. Objectives
8. Evaluations in Chance for Childhood’s projects serve the dual and mutually reinforcing objectives of accountability and learning.

- **Accountability** - The evaluation will assess and report on the performance of implemented activities and related outputs and on results of the Right to change project in Uganda.
- **Learning** - The evaluation will assess and identify key achievements and challenges to determine and draw lessons and best practices for learning. The learning will be based on a set of three learning questions (mentioned below) that were developed at the beginning of the project. It will provide evidence-based findings to inform operational and strategic decision-making and partnership coordination improvement. Findings will be actively disseminated and lessons will be incorporated into relevant lesson sharing systems.

9. Given that the Chance for Childhood implements similar projects in the region and is expecting possible scale-up, the learning component will have an even greater importance than the accountability component for this evaluation. It is crucial to identify good practices as well as bottlenecks in the programme’s implementation to further improve the programme during the remaining project period. Secondly, the findings of the outcome evaluation are important to document the programme’s
potential to improve the lives of its primary participants/beneficiaries, which in turn will constitute an evidence base for the allocation of funds for Chance for Childhood or similar programmes in the future.

2.3. Stakeholders and Users

10. A number of stakeholders both inside and outside of Chance for Childhood have interest in the results of the evaluation and some of these will be asked to play a role in the evaluation process. Table 1 below provides a preliminary stakeholder analysis, which should be deepened by the evaluation team as part of the Inception phase.

11. Accountability to affected populations, is tied to Chance for Childhood’s commitments to include beneficiaries as key stakeholders in their work. As such, Chance for Childhood is committed to ensuring the involvement of children in conflict with the Law, their guardians and parents and members of the support system including Judiciary.
### Table 1: Preliminary Stakeholders’ analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Interest in the evaluation and likely uses of evaluation report to this stakeholder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance for Childhood, UK</td>
<td>Responsible for planning and operations implementation of the project. It has a direct stake in the evaluation and interest in learning from experience to inform decision-making and advocacy with donors for adequate investment for children in conflict with the law (CiCL) It is also called upon to account internally as well as to its beneficiaries and partners for performance and results of its operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passion for Community (P4C)</td>
<td>Given that Chance for Childhood’s operations of support to the primary beneficiaries is implemented by P4C, the Office in Agago also has a direct stake in this evaluation and interest in learning from experience to inform decision-making. It is also called upon to account internally as well as to its beneficiaries and partners for performance and results of its operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comic Relief</td>
<td>Comic Relief has an interest in the lessons that emerge from evaluations, particularly as they relate to Comic Relief strategies, policies, thematic areas, or delivery modality with wider relevance to programming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries</td>
<td>As the ultimate recipients of the P4C interventions, beneficiaries have a stake in Right2Change determining whether its assistance is appropriate and effective. As such, the level of participation in the evaluation of children, parents and guardians will be determined and their respective perspectives will be sought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF, Uganda Law Society and JLOS</td>
<td>The P4C approach was developed with input from UNICEF Uganda, Uganda Law Society and JLOS thus it would be in their interest to find out if the proposed approach worked as per the design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. The primary users of this evaluation will be:
- Chance for Childhood will use the findings to enhance decision-making notably related to programme implementation and/or design, Organizational Strategy and partnerships. It will also be used to inform changes in the programme’s design and implementation of the Right2Change approach.
- The organization expects to use the midterm review findings to provide strategic guidance, programme support, and oversight as well as learning and accountability.

3. Context and subject of the Evaluation

3.1. Context
Chance for Childhood in partnership with a grass root organisation Passion for Community for has been working in Northern Uganda to support vulnerable children at risk, including those children in conflict with the law (CiCL). In Northern Uganda, the legacy of war and prolonged poverty continues to affect young people with limited education and skills, forcing them to survive in a subsistence environment with little to no prospect of gaining employment. The latest Statistical Abstract released by the government of Uganda confirms that the incidence of poverty remains highest in the Northern region (44% in comparison to 5.4% in the Central Region), whilst a recent youth survey highlighted that up to 70% of the 15-24 age group are involved in subsistence farming, often sharing already limited earnings with their parents and siblings (Dynamics, 2016). In Patongo, where Chance for Childhood has been implementing the project; an average 100 children are imprisoned each year in Patongo prison, and often subjected to sexual and physical violence. Children might be arrested because they have stolen food in order to survive. In 2011, UNICEF’s action oriented research on Juvenile Justice in Northern Uganda highlighted “the need for significant, sector-wide capacity building”. Pressingly, this report evidences the systemic breach of children’s right in relation to conditions and length of detention, as well as in the administration of justice. Undertrained judiciary and police personnel (1) the absence of child-friendly facilities (there are only four remand homes in Uganda and only one in Northern Uganda) and their lack of capacity to adequately cater for the needs of CiCL (2), and
the lack of awareness about alternatives to detention and more specifically the concept of diversion (3), are all factors contributing to grave violations of CiCL’s rights. The project in its efforts to address the above challenges integrates best practices to build the capacity of the judiciary and empower the community to support rehabilitation of young offenders resulting in lasting behavior changes and reducing re-offending rates through:

Embedding child protection standards in all juvenile justice proceedings
The project training of the police, magistrates, probation officers and local councils (LC1s), judicial Officers and Grade 1 and Grade 2 Magistrates to use appropriate methods of restorative justice and structured diversion. In addition we are working to ensure active participation of all of these groups within the District Chain-Linked Committees, the legal body at district level responsible for coordinating the work of all juvenile justice stakeholders.

Addressing the root causes of crime and reoffending
In Uganda 60% of CiCL are apprehended for petty crimes and the most common offence after defilement is theft. Our project aims to address the root causes of engaging into crime; depression and poverty, both of which are push factors which result in cycles of desperation leading to re-offending. The United Nations JDL rules on juvenile justice state that “every juvenile should have the right to receive vocational training in occupations likely to prepare them for future employment”. However there is no evidence in Uganda of aftercare support available to young offenders. Our structured diversion scheme provides practical aftercare services that involves guidance in finding a meaningful occupation; occupational therapy in the form of functional literacy, numeracy and accredited skills in agribusiness tailoring and business skills alongside intense psychosocial counselling.

Challenging family and community attitudes and harnessing positive behavioral change
Experience demonstrates that children and youths in conflict with the law are affected by relationships with family and community members, whose attitudes and behaviours often stigmatisate youth and deny them access to skills, mentoring and opportunities to build a livelihood, reinforcing the likelihood of exclusion and re-offending. In the worst cases of reinsertion, communities might be tempted to make justice themselves and cases of children lynched upon their return at home have been reported.

In response to this the project is implementing a social development rehabilitation programme based on a cadre of peer educators to provide psycho-social support for children and youth feeling desperate and isolated. Peer educators act as points of contact for CiCL in their communities, helping mediate tensions and referring cases to P4C for intervention. The project promotes community service orders through initiatives like collecting trash or planting trees, benefiting the wider community. In cases where youths may not be re-united with their family, our probation officers act as foster parents whilst intense family mediation sessions are undertaken. In addition the project is also providing training for children in Conflict with the Law in
different vocational skills -such as agribusiness, soap making, hairdressing tailoring and embroidery. These young people have started to learn how to save, budget, and manage money. This is aimed at breaking the cycle of desperation that leads to re-offending. With the above background, Right2Change identified and trained and supported a team of frontline workers: peer educators, police officers, Community Development Representatives, Probation Officers, judiciary personnel, members of Child Protection Committees and Local Councils to help address the judicial needs and cause behavioral change of communities towards CiCL.

4. Midterm Evaluation Approach

4.1. Scope

27. The evaluation shall focus on the first two years of this four year programme implemented in two of the four districts. The districts as mentioned earlier include Agago, Pader, Kitgum and Lamwo.

4.2. Mid Term Evaluation Criteria and Questions

28. Evaluation Criteria: The evaluation will apply the international evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and shall also evaluate the project progress towards achieving the set project objectives

29. Evaluation Questions:

The learning will be based on a set of three learning that were developed at the beginning of the project.

1. How successful are Passion 4 Community (P4C) at overcoming community-level barriers to the reintegration of children and youth in conflict with the law?

2. What role does gender play in the effectiveness of vocational education and counselling to rehabilitate young offenders in Northern Uganda?

3. To what extent can a local NGO such as P4C, influence the practice of Juvenile Justice reform at district and national level?

4.3. Data Availability

30. The evaluation team can draw on data from the Right2Change Data management platforms. The data includes a whole range of monitoring data in addition to beneficiary profiling data that details characteristics of the beneficiaries.

31. Concerning the quality of data and information, the evaluation team should:

   a. Assess data availability and reliability as part of the inception phase
expanding on the information provided above. This assessment will inform the data collection

b. Systematically check accuracy, consistency and validity of collected data and information and acknowledge any limitations/caveats in drawing conclusions using the data.

4.4. Methodology

32. In order to answer theses research questions, the evaluation team shall evaluate both the process of implementation of the Right2Change programme in Northern Uganda, and the outcomes of the intervention:

33. A process evaluation will assess the implementation of Right2Change in Northern Uganda through the analysis of indicators, review of programme documents, case studies as well as interviews with key informants among the different layers of stakeholders. Moreover, focus group discussions will be organized among beneficiaries to clarify details of the implementation as well as to get a better understanding of the challenges faced by the programme and how corrective mechanisms were adopted (or not) and why.

34. An outcome evaluation will analyse outcome indicators, as well as the perceived impacts of the programme among key stakeholders.

37. In order to measure the effectiveness, efficiency, and outcomes of the Right2Change project in Northern Uganda, the evaluation shall collect qualitative and quantitative data. This approach will help to disentangle changes which can be attributed to the Right2Change project.

38. Process Evaluation. The process evaluation will draw on both, the analysis of quantitative indicators, and on qualitative methods. The evaluation team shall develop a list of indicators which are going to be collected in order to answer the research questions listed. The list of indicators will be an important part of the evaluation plan (deliverable 1) and need to be approved by Chance for Childhood before the beginning of the field work.

39. Moreover, the process evaluation will draw on focus group discussions with The stakeholders identified in the stakeholders analysis above.

40. Outcome evaluation: The outcome evaluation shall be based on the analysis of quantitative indicators, as well as on qualitative methods.

41. Before-and-After comparisons

It is expected that the evaluation can draw on baseline data documenting the
situation of CiCL before and after the programme. The evaluation team shall collect similar data describing the current situation. A before-and-after comparison of the data shall give a sense of how the situation among beneficiaries has changed since the intervention.

42. Qualitative Evaluation on the perceived outcomes

The qualitative part of the outcome evaluation shall draw on focus group discussions with key, as well as on key informant interviews with persons involved in the management of the project.

43. The evaluation team shall develop a catalogue of questions to be posed during the different focus group discussions and key informant interviews in the evaluation plan. This list also needs to be approved by CfC before the beginning of the fieldwork.

44. Cultural Sensitivity of the Evaluation: The evaluation shall address cultural sensitivities including child-friendly and gender sensitive approaches to the greatest possible extent. During the FGD and data collection in the field, the evaluation shall draw on local personnel speaking Lwo and being familiar with local traditions and particularities.

45. The methodology will be refined by the evaluation team during the inception phase. It should:

- Employ the relevant evaluation criteria above
- Demonstrate impartiality and lack of biases by relying on a cross-section of information sources (stakeholder groups, including beneficiaries, etc.) The selection of field visit sites will also need to demonstrate impartiality.
- Using mixed methods (quantitative, qualitative, participatory etc.) to ensure triangulation of information through a variety of means.
- Apply an evaluation matrix geared towards addressing the key evaluation questions taking into account the data availability challenges, the budget and timing constraints;
- Ensure through the use of mixed methods that women, girls, men and boys participate and that their different voices are heard and used;
- Mainstream gender equality and women’s empowerment, as above;

46. The following mechanisms for independence and impartiality will be employed: Evaluation Committee shall be established in order to oversee the implementation of the evaluation and guarantee its impartiality.

4.5 Quality Assurance

47. This quality assurance process shall not interfere with the views and independence of the evaluation team, but ensures the report provides the necessary evidence in a clear and convincing way and draws its conclusions on that basis.
48. The evaluation team will be required to ensure the quality of data (validity, consistency and accuracy) throughout the analytical and reporting phases. The evaluation team should be assured of the accessibility of all relevant documentation within the provisions of the acceptance disclosure of information procedures.

5. Phases and Deliverables
49. The evaluation will proceed through the following phases:

- Desk Review and elaboration of an evaluation plan: Review of relevant programme documents, reports on data availability, the local context, and the evaluation methodology. Elaboration of an inception report and detailed evaluation plan. During this inception phase, weekly skype calls shall be scheduled between Chance for Childhood and the evaluation team. These calls shall provide an opportunity for Chance for Childhood to transfer its knowledge on the project to the evaluation team and to provide guidance and advice on the development of the evaluation plan.
- Discussion of the midterm evaluation plan with Right2Change and CfC. Incorporation of adjustments if needed.
  - (Northern Uganda): Briefing meetings with Right2Change and P4C offices, as well as relevant other stakeholders in Uganda.
  - (Agago and Pader): Collection of the quantitative and qualitative data foreseen in the evaluation plan. In case that parts of the data cannot be collected as foreseen in the evaluation report; the evaluation team shall report back to CfC to discuss possible alternatives/solutions.
- Elaboration of a draft evaluation report: CfC shall review the draft evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria and planned objectives.
- Discussion of the draft evaluation report with CfC.
- Elaboration of the final evaluation report and evaluation brief.
- Participation in at least 1 knowledge sharing event.

50. The deliverables and deadlines for each phase are as follows:

1. Detailed Evaluation Plan & Inception Report (2 weeks after the beginning of the evaluation activities): Based on the desk review, an evaluation plan shall be prepared, detailing the evaluators’ understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, suggested sources of data and data collection procedures. The plan should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product. Moreover, it shall include a list of indicators that the evaluation team aims at collecting during the
fieldwork and a list of questions to be posed for each of the FDGs and key informant interviews.

The evaluation plan provides CfC and the evaluating team with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misinterpretation at the beginning. Upon approval of the evaluation plan, the evaluating institution can start the data collection in the field.

2. Final field work report (1 week after the end of the fieldwork): The final field work report shall describe the data collection process in detail. In particular, it shall provide a list of all indicators which have been collected (by district), and also include information on the focus group discussions and key informant interviews (time and date, number of participants, unforeseen circumstances, an appendix with summaries of all FDGs and interviews)

3. Draft Evaluation Report (2 weeks after the end of the fieldwork): The evaluation report shall answer the evaluation questions of this ToR. Moreover, the report shall include a detailed description of the Right2Change programme in Northern Uganda, a description and justification of the adopted evaluation methodology, and a detailed presentation and discussion of the evaluation results.

4. Final Evaluation Report (4 weeks after the end of the fieldwork)

5. Evaluation Brief (5 weeks after the end of the fieldwork)

6. Power Point Presentation on the Evaluation Results (5 weeks after the end of the fieldwork)

6. Organization of the Evaluation

6.1 Evaluation Conduct

51. The evaluation team will conduct the evaluation under the direction of its team leader and in close communication with the Executive Director at P4C and the MEL unit.

52. The evaluation team will not have been involved in the design or implementation of the subject of evaluation or have any other conflicts of interest. Further, they will act impartially and respect the code of conduct of the evaluation profession.

53. The evaluation shall respect the evaluation schedule. Changes to the timeline are subject to the consent of CfC.

6.2 Team composition and competencies

54. The consultant will be multi-disciplinary with appropriate balance of expertise and practical knowledge in the following areas:
7. Communication and budget

7.1 Communication

55. To ensure a smooth and efficient process and enhance the learning from this evaluation, the evaluation team should place emphasis on transparent and open communication with key stakeholders. These will be achieved by ensuring a clear agreement on channels and frequency of communication with and between key stakeholders. In particular, the evaluating institution shall provide bi-weekly email updates to the evaluation committee in order to inform about the state of the evaluation. Emails and inquiries from evaluation committee members shall be answered as soon as possible, with a maximum delay of three working days.

7.2 Budget

The total budget for this consultancy is UGX 9,680,000.

This is rate is inclusive of all, taxes, expenses, transportation and accommodation in field and administrative costs incurred by the consultant.

The evaluator(s) will be selected based on their relevant experience and expertise, rigor of their design, availability and value for money.
Annex 1   Evaluation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOR finalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOR advertisement - call for expression of interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of CVs and interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation team announcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue of contracts</td>
<td>1st June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk Review &amp; elaboration of an evaluation plan</td>
<td>2nd to 6th June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion and revision of the evaluation plan</td>
<td>7th-10th June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field research &amp; briefings in Northern Uganda</td>
<td>12th - 17th June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaboration of the Mid Term evaluation report</td>
<td>19th- 23rd June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft discussion</td>
<td>27th June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of final Midterm evaluation report</td>
<td>30th June 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>