

Appendix A: Terms of Reference

1. Introduction

Danida Fellowship Centre (DFC) was founded in 1990 to manage and implement the Danida supported Fellowship Programme. Today, DFC is specialised in supplying courses and other training interventions for Danida's programmes and projects. In addition, DFC administers grants for development research, but this last area of responsibility falls outside the realm of the present assignment.

The Fellowship Programme supports Capacity Development (CD) in developing countries (primarily, but not solely, Danida's partner countries) by organising and/or implementing CD support in terms of courses, studies, research, study tours, seminars, etc. in Denmark as well as in developing countries – nationally as well as regionally. The support includes interdisciplinary courses, tailor-made courses, degree studies, strategic initiatives and study/exposure tours, with a duration varying from two weeks to full master or PhD programmes. The DFC has seen important changes over the years, not least the decision from 2009 to branch out its capacity development support to take place in developing countries, emphasising the wish to align more closely to the capacity needs and capacity development policies of the countries. Thus, a variety of activities (primarily interdisciplinary courses) are now carried out in developing countries through cooperation with partner institutions. Over the years, considerable resources have been allocated to the Fellowship Programme. In recent years, DKK 60 million has been allocated from the MFA, in addition to co-financing by Danida programmes related to specific courses and activities. This has however now been reduced to DKK 45 million. Danida's Evaluation Department now wishes to commission an evaluation of the support to the Danida Fellowship Programme (DFP) under DFC.

2. Purpose and Objectives

The overall purpose of the evaluation is to document and assess the supported activities and the related results, with an aim to contribute to both accountability and learning. To this end, it must assess the different achievements of the programme, as well as the framework and processes for accomplishing the results.

The evaluation is expected to apply the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, with the emphasis on relevance, effectiveness and efficiency. It should be noted that a solid assessment of impacts

and, by implication, the longer term sustainability of effects from training and education, poses strong requirements on quality and quantity of data. Thus, it is expected that it will only be possible to assess impact and sustainability to a limited degree, due to data constraints. In relation to effects, it may be challenging to assess certain types of outcomes; i.a. learning outcomes for some areas of DFP activities. By implication, an important part of the evaluation is expected to be a fitness-for-purpose assessment, investigating if and how the activities are likely to lead to the expected outcomes and impact both at the level of the individual activities and at the level of the programme as a whole; including the role of possible enabling and hindering factors, framework conditions etc. Further, the evaluation will need to include a comparison of the DFP to international fellowship programmes offered by other bilateral stakeholders.

3. Scope

The evaluation is expected to have its main focus on the period 2008-11, so as to be able to include assessment of learning outcomes. However, in order to be able to understand and assess the current organisation, way or working, interplay with changes in conditions for DFP as well as the implications hereof, the evaluation must include a more overall consideration of the period 2001-08 as well.

The portfolio of activities under the fellowship programme is diverse, as is the group of participants. As an example, app. 1100 persons from 45 countries participated in different courses/activities in 2010. The evaluation is expected to establish a coverage of activities that ensures adequate attention to the main clusters of activities (with focus reflecting the relative weights of different activity categories in the overall portfolio), while at the same time allowing for consideration of the variety of activities, so as to be able to address strengths and weaknesses of different activity areas and develop conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations with regard to the different areas of activity. The important changes in the work of DFC in relation to the branching out so as to have more activities taking place in developing countries capacity cooperation with partners in developing countries and the implications hereof should be addressed by the evaluation as well.

The evaluation will cover the entire geographical scope of DFP, but not in equal depth. In order to ensure sufficient depth and specificity in the analysis, and the possibility of providing examples of induced changes at the outcome and impact level, field work will be conducted in two selected partner countries, where local training institutions run DFP courses, and from which a substantial amount of participants have come. As point of departure, Uganda and Ghana are suggested as appropriate choices, but the final selection is to be made during the inception phase, based on the overview of activities, categories etc. An addition to these more in-depth country studies, the evaluation is expected to enhance coverage by including DFP activities and partners in relation to other countries as well, i.a. by use of remote evaluation techniques (see further below). This enhanced coverage should include a consideration of different

types and levels of DFP use and users, so as to be able to complement the proposed selection of Ghana and Uganda.

The evaluation is expected to include both the specific activities (course content, planning, implementation etc.), but also the framework supporting the activities (learning conditions, organisational framework, quality assurance, selection of partners etc.), including the interplay between DFP in Denmark, the local training institutions and the participating organisations and individuals.

As part of the basis for assessing possible strengths and weaknesses of DFP, the evaluation must contain a brief overview and comparison with the parallel organisations and activities supported by like-minded donors. It is expected that this will include, but not necessarily be limited to, activities parallel to DFP supported by Ireland, the Netherlands and Sweden.

4. Methodology and approach

The evaluation will entail a combination of desk studies, and primary data collection in Copenhagen and in the case-study countries, and is expected to be based on both quantitative and qualitative methods. It should be noted that it is expected that a well thought-out combination of data sources and data types is expected to be required to shed light on the different questions and issues, since it is unlikely that any one source will contain information of the necessary quantity, quality and coverage. Triangulation and validation is of core importance. The monitoring data from DFP will be available to the evaluation, and is expected to be useful in relation to establishing an overview of outputs, CD efforts in relation to different partner countries and partner organisations etc., as well as indications of the relevance and benefit of the training as perceived by participants. Administrative information on a range of procedures etc. will also be available. For some activities external assessments of learning outcomes is expected to exist in the form of exam results, but for the majority of activities, monitoring of outcomes have taken the form of satisfaction surveys. And while the evaluation may make use of these monitoring data, and possibly collect more such data, it is also expected to judiciously consider the limitations. It is expected that in order to gain more in-depth insight into both processes and results, as well as to ensure the information necessary for triangulation and validation purposes, additional data collection will be required.

As indicated above, it is expected that it will be challenging to assess outcomes and impacts in a solid and systematic manner. This is a well-known challenge when assessing the effects of education/training activities, both at the individual and the organisational level, and issues concerning selection bias, difficulties in distinguishing effects of training from other influencing factors and the fact that user satisfaction does not necessarily reflect the actual effect of a course are well described in the literature within this field. The evaluation is expected to explore and assess different options for assessing the effects in a solid and relevant manner as possible, in light of these challenges. This should include possibilities for using comparative approaches to assess the difference that training has made for individuals or organisations. Further, it is expected to

include using a different range of data sources to carry out a contribution analysis, based on a thorough understanding of the pathways and prerequisites for the achievement of outcomes and, to the degree possible, impact. Given that the wider effect of training activities will always depend on both contextual factors and other intervening factors, the evaluation is not expected to be able to attribute specific changes observed at the impact level to the programme activities. It is, however, expected that the evaluation will provide an example-based qualitative analysis of the contribution of the training activities to the achievement of wider impact, and indicate enabling and hindering factors, as part of the identification and lessons learned.

As mentioned, an important element of the evaluation is expected to be to carry out a fitness for purpose analysis. This will entail an assessment of the relevance of the strategies and contents of the programme in light of the overall objectives and priorities. It will also entail an identification of the relationships between inputs, outputs, outcomes and wider effects, so as to allow for an assessment of the appropriateness and suitability (e.g. relevance and quality) of the specific inputs and processes as the foundations for achieving results in the contexts in which they are applied (e.g. considering the prerequisites of fellows, their positions in their organisations, and operating environment of their organisations). These issues should be assessed, *inter alia*, through review of course materials and other existing information, as well as through interviews with DFC staff, course facilitators and current fellows. Former fellows and their organisations should be interviewed, not least in the case study countries, but also using remote techniques (questionnaires, interviews by phone or Skype, video meetings (possibly facilitated by Danish embassies, where relevant and possible) or other means, so as to include information on the wider portfolio and experience. Further, the match between the work processes, the content-side of courses (subject matter, level, teaching methods, link to practice etc.), and expected learning outcome and effects, should be assessed, and may include external peer assessments of the level and content of the material taught, and through assessments by peers and superiors from the fellows' organisations, the MFA, the board of DFC and Danish embassies and other actors as relevant.

In order to ensure that the contribution analysis and fitness-for purpose oriented investigation of the links from inputs to effects is sufficiently based on an understanding of the prerequisites and pathways for learning and wider effects, and to ensure that the assessment is based on an appropriate and realistic yardstick, it is considered important that the evaluation can draw upon the input of experts who can contribute with special insights in relation to the planning, implementation and continuous quality assurance of teaching and training activities as relevant in relation to DFP. Important aspects include, but are not necessarily limited to, organisation and implementation of adult education/vocational training and skills transfer issues in general, and education and capacity development in developing countries specifically.

The evaluation process and results must comply with OECD/DAC evaluation quality standards and be coherent with EVAL evaluation guidelines.

5. Evaluation Criteria and questions

As indicated above, the evaluation shall address the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, with the main emphasis on relevance, effectiveness and efficiency. In assessing the different questions or issues, care should be taken to identify enabling and hindering factors; strengths and weaknesses, and not least the implications hereof.

5.1 *Relevance*

As point of departure, the criterion of relevance relates to the extent to which the objectives of an intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, needs, overall priorities and partners' and donors' policies, relevant Danida strategies etc. In the present case, this also means to look at whether the specific activities are consistent with the objectives for learning and wider outcomes. By implication, the evaluation should include assessments of relevance at different levels: At an overall level, the relevance of the composition of the portfolio and approach/way of working of DFP to the core strategies, plans and objectives for the efforts should be assessed, including how well they are matched to overall needs and priorities. At a more general level, the relevance of the more specific activities to participants needs, relevance in light of organisational requirements and changing priorities should be assessed. The evaluation is expected to include, but not necessarily be limited to the following:

1. The relevance of the overall DFP strategy and approach, the overall portfolio of activities, and individual activities in light of the overall DFC objective and mandate of capacity development and links to wider strategies, development objectives and priorities.
2. The relevance of the content of the portfolio of activities and individual activities in relation to the needs of participants, organisational requirements and changing priorities. This may also include the content of study tours (training, cultural activities etc.)
3. How and to what degree relevance of the specific DFP activity is ensured in a continuous manner (feed-back loops, updating etc.), including the relevance and adequacy of information systems to allow for follow-up;
4. How and to what degree relevance of the overall DFP portfolio and approach, is ensured in a continuous manner (feed-back loops, updating etc.), including the relevance and adequacy of information systems to allow for follow-up.

5.2 *Effectiveness*

As point of departure, the criterion of effectiveness relates to the extent to which the intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved taking into account their relative importance. In the present case, this links to assessing the delivered outputs and, to the degree possible, outcomes; both for the specific training activities but also at the more aggregate levels; i.a. in cases where an organisation has benefited from having a substantial number of staff par-

ticipate in activities, or for – to the degree possible – assessing the effectiveness at portfolio level. The assessment is expected to consider contribution and fitness for purpose. In line with the focus on a theory-based approach, this entails investigating how the different outputs and outcomes are expected to be realised, the assumptions and prerequisites at play, enabling and hindering factors etc. This should include consideration of the heterogeneity of fellows/course participants, and the implications for results. The evaluation is expected to include, but not necessarily be limited to the following:

5. The appropriateness, plausibility of assumed causal pathways from training inputs over outputs to learning and behavioural outcomes and wider impact, including framework conditions.
6. The quantity and quality of outputs delivered against plans and objectives; including changes in the composition of portfolio over time and the implication for achieving different types of outputs.
7. Whether and how the activities undertaken and outputs achieved have been/are likely to be effective with respect to the expected learning objectives and other learning outcomes; including teaching strategy, content, links between course content, teaching methods and practice, handling of heterogeneity of participants etc.
8. Whether and how the activities undertaken have been/are likely to be effective with respect to desired behavioural changes of the participants and their organisations, i.e. whether knowledge obtained by individuals has been/is likely to be transferred and applied in a manner beneficial to the organisations involved.
9. The appropriateness of the DFP's overall organisational set-up, resources/competences and way of working in light of the purposes of the programme. This should include assessing the learning environment, processes of course facilitator selection and selection of partner institutions etc. The role of the Danish embassies in facilitating dissemination of information regarding the programme in partner countries as well as the recruitment of fellows should also be included.
10. The relevance of follow-up procedures in place to assist positive transfers of capacity from fellows to their organisations.
11. Whether the servicing of fellows in Denmark (e.g. regarding accommodation arrangements, facilitation of travel, social and cultural activities) has been enabling for the effectiveness of the programme as expected. This may include the issue of added value of i.a. the exposure of fellows to Danish culture.
12. The relevance and adequacy of information systems to allow for follow-up on the effectiveness of the diverse portfolio of activities, the organisation etc.

5.3 *Efficiency*

The criterion of efficiency can be seen as a measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results. It is not expected that a full cost-benefit

analysis can be carried out, since this would entail a specific comparison with alternative use of resources. However, it is expected that the evaluation will assess if resources have been put to good use, whether feed-back loops are in place to allow for assessment and follow-up of this, strengths and weaknesses of different types of activities and organisation thereof (i.a. in Denmark and in partner countries) and whether important bottlenecks or constraints can be found. This is expected to include an element of comparison with other ways of working, i.a. relevant fellowship programme approaches of other donors. Further, the issue of heterogeneity amongst fellows and the implications for efficiency should be considered. Specific issues to address include, but are not necessarily limited to the following:

13. An assessment of the resources employed in the process of course design, including issues related to the planning and prioritisation of activities. This will also entail an assessment of the strength and weaknesses in relation to the cost-effectiveness of implementation of training courses in Denmark as compared to implementing it locally or regionally.
14. Whether activities have been undertaken as planned, i.e. implemented on time, using resources planned, delivering outputs as planned, etc.
15. The cost-effectiveness of the implementation of courses, in light of outputs; e.g. the scope of courses, number of participants, etc.
16. Efficiency with respect to achieved and/or anticipated outcomes and effects of the courses.
17. The relevance and adequacy of information systems to allow for follow-up on the efficiency of the diverse portfolio of activities, organisational issues etc.

5.4 *Impact and sustainability*

Impact and sustainability can be seen to be interrelated in the sense that impact relates to the wider and longer-term effects, and sustainability to whether effects and achievements will be sustained over time. It is expected that it will only be possible to assess impact and sustainability to a limited degree. If possible, the evaluation should assess the likelihood of and prerequisite for longer-term impact, including the collaboration with national/regional training institutions contributing to capacity development of the said institutions. This may include example-based impact assessments – effects on institutional or, if feasible, sectoral performance and/or policies as well as wider implications, with due consideration of the limitations of such examples. Further, it should to the degree possible include unanticipated or wider areas of impact; including areas of added value of the DFC, beyond the specific objectives of the activities. Similarly, the evaluation should to the degree possible assess the likelihood of and prerequisites for achieving sustainable results.

6. Outputs

The evaluation will lead to two main deliverables (outputs):

- An inception report in draft(s) and final version (not exceeding 20 pages, excluding annexes) based on desk study and a first round of interviews at DFC headquarters as well as relevant staff in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Copenhagen (to be supplemented with other interviews as needed and relevant). The report will present the detailed methodology for the evaluation, as well as the final selection of countries for field visits and the anticipated analytical implications hereof. Further, it will outline the content of a sample of activities to be evaluated comparably more in-depth than the rest of the portfolio of activities. An overview of fellowship programmes of other bilateral donors and any existing assessments hereof should further be presented in the report, and it should be indicated, how this information will feed into the main evaluation. The inception report will also suggest if any changes to the evaluation questions are appropriate, and present a detailed field schedule to facilitate the logistics of the field work in advance. Finally, a short outline of the structure of the evaluation report should be included.
- An evaluation report in draft(s) and final version, (not exceeding 50 pages, excluding annexes).

In addition, smaller outputs include:

- Debriefing notes and/or presentations should be carried out in relation to the country visits (prior to leaving the country and in Copenhagen, after finalisation of country visits).
- Presentations of draft inception report and draft and final evaluation report (in Copenhagen).

All outputs must be delivered in English and comply with Danida's Evaluation Guidelines. The final evaluation report should follow Danida's Evaluation Layout Guidelines.

7. Evaluation management and implementation

The evaluation will be managed by EVAL, and EVAL will be responsible for printing and dissemination of the final Evaluation Report. An evaluation reference group may be established, comprised of stakeholders from the MFA and DFC as well as possibly other relevant parties. The reference group will not be a decision-making forum, but a body for consultation.

The responsibilities of the evaluation team include, but are not necessarily limited to the following:

- Carrying out the evaluation as per the ToR. As part hereof the evaluation team is responsible for planning and logistics in relation to country visits.
- All findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.
- Reporting to EVAL, maintaining regular contact, coordinating mission timing and key events with EVAL and seeking its advice when needed.

8. Staffing and QA

The evaluation is expected to be carried out by a team of approximately three international consultants, supplemented with local consultants in the countries selected for field visits. The evaluation should be able to draw on a combination of expertise with regards to evaluation planning and methodology, including evaluation of education activities as well as expertise with regards to teaching and learning, especially in relation to education and training of the types and levels included in the DFP portfolio (i.a. adult and post graduate education, life-long learning and vocational training perspectives). Inclusion of both genders on the team is preferred. In order to be able to access documentation in Danish, at least one team member should be fluent in Danish or it should be documented that the team will be able to access the necessary translation throughout the process. At least one team member should have knowledge of Danish development assistance.

All suggested profiles will be assessed with a view to the role, competences and tasks they are suggested to cover in the team. In addition, the composition of the team will be assessed, since the team leader and team members may complement each other and in order to assess fulfilment of the requirements mentioned above.

The Tenderers should clearly state who of the proposed team member(s) are to cover which qualification criteria.

In connection with the evaluation, each proposed team member will be given a weight in proportion to the duration of the proposed input. An adequate balance between evaluation expertise and expertise with regards to capacity development and planning and implementation of training and education should be ensured. Therefore, a personnel assignment chart must be included in the technical tender with a clear indication of amount of person months proposed allocated to each specialist. An adequate balance between time at home and in partner countries as well as adequate time/resources for the different tasks should be ensured and will be assessed in relation to the work plan. The person responsible for quality assurance should have a background suitable for this specific task (including experience with evaluations), and the quality assurance approach should allow for strengthening both evaluation process and product quality.

More specifically, the evaluation team should cover the following competencies:

Qualifications of the **Team Leader**:

General experience:

- Relevant higher academic degree.
- A profile with major emphasis on development issues, with preferably 10 years or more of relevant professional experience from development cooperation, including education/training and/or capacity development issues.

- Experience as team leader for multi-disciplinary teams (at least three references), including multi-country evaluations.

Specific experience:

- Extensive experience in evaluation of development assistance (preferably three or more references), including evaluations in relation to capacity development and/or training and education activities.
- Extensive knowledge on and experience from establishing evaluation approaches and application of evaluation methods, including theory based evaluations, contribution analysis and mixed methods evaluation.

Country experience and language:

- Experience from different development countries, including Danida partner countries
- Fluent in English

Qualifications of the international team members (expectedly two persons in addition to the team leader):

General experience:

- Relevant higher academic degree
- Profile with major emphasis with preferably five years or more of relevant professional experience from: a) development cooperation issues including experience with evaluations or b) support to education, training and capacity development, also in relation to development cooperation.

Specific experience (to be covered by one or more of the proposed international team members and/or the team-leader):

Evaluation and methodology:

- Substantial experience with qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods, including sampling issues collection and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data and data triangulation.
- Experience with evaluation of institutional and capacity development efforts, in relation to both overall development needs and specific organisational needs.
- Experience with evaluation of education and training activities and organisations carrying out such activities.

Capacity development and training/education:

- Extensive knowledge of the role of capacity strengthening in relation to development; preferably including needs assessments and approaches to capacity strengthening in relation to organisational needs, tasks or specific issues.
- Extensive knowledge on and experience with overall planning, organisation and management of institutions for and/or portfolios of training and education, preferably from capacity strengthening for development from developing countries and donor countries.
- Knowledge of and experience with implementation of relevant types of training and education activities, preferably including issues of learning environment and education quality enhancement, pedagogical/didactic issues and skill transfer.

Country experience and language:

- Working experience from a range of different Danish partner countries, preferably including Uganda and Ghana
- Fluent in English

Since the selection of countries for site visits has not yet been decided, no specific requirements are set for the local consultants. However, it should be made clear if and how the Tenderers have established the necessary contacts for engaging with local consultants in relevant countries, including Uganda and Ghana. Budgeting should be made on the assumption that these two countries will be selected.

In addition, it will be considered an advantage if the consultant has established contacts to a pool of experts (researchers or internationally recognized practitioners) to help provide in-depth insight in the specific areas of assessment, such as organisation and implementation of adult/further education, relevant pedagogical and didactic considerations, prerequisites for skills transfer etc., also in relation to capacity building for development. This pool of experts should complement and strengthen the capacities of the core team. If research assistants or similar are to be used, their role should similarly be clarified. The pool of experts or suggested research assistants will not be assessed as part of the team, but as part of the overall team composition and back up, with due consideration of the competences present on the team. Any foreseen costs for such a pool of experts or suggested research assistants should be reflected in the budget.

9. Inputs

The total budget for the consultancy services is a maximum of DKK 1.5 million. This includes all fees and reimbursables required for the implementation of the contract.

EVAL will cover the expenditures of printing of the final evaluation report, summaries and any additional dissemination activities as and if agreed upon.

10. Timing and reporting

The evaluation is expected to commence in March 2012. The draft inception report should be submitted April 10, 2012. A final version should be submitted no later than two weeks after having received comments from EVAL. The draft evaluation report should be submitted June 18, 2012, with the final report to be submitted in the beginning of August 2012.

11. Background material

Ministry of Foreign affairs guidelines for Danida Fellowships:

http://www.dfcentre.com/?Programmes_%26amp%3B_Projects:MoFA%27s_Guidelines

The constitution for DFC, information on staff etc. is available online:

http://www.dfcentre.com/?About_Us:Organisation

Guidelines for DFC'S administration of study tours:

http://www.dfcentre.com/?Programmes_%26amp%3B_Projects:Study_Tours

DFC Annual report 2010: http://www.dfcentre.com/?About_Us:Annual_Reports

Statistics on fellowships for different years can be accessed at:

http://www.dfcentre.com/?About_Us:Fellowship_Statistics

Further information from DFC: <http://www.dfcentre.com/>

Evaluation Guidelines, MFA/Danida, January 2012 will be available online at

<http://www.evaluation.dk>

Quality Standards for Evaluations, OECD (2006), available on-line: <http://www.oecd.org>

Overall Danida policies can be found at: <http://amg.um.dk/en/menu/OverallPoliciesDenmark>
MFA