



Phoo Pwint Wai Thi

19 Street, between 59 & 60. Block (44), Dawnabwar,
Aungmyaethazan Township, Mandalay.
Office Phone: +95 9 765 453 844

TERMS OF REFERENCE

External Evaluation Consultant

Child Safeguarding Pilot Programme

UNICEF-supported pilot in five monastic schools, Mandalay Region

Evaluation emphasis: learning, feasibility, appropriateness, acceptability, ownership, behavioural and cultural change, sustainability and future institutionalization

Project implementation period stated in draft: 8 December 2025 – 7 December 2026

1. Assignment Title

External Evaluation of PPWT's Child Safeguarding Pilot in Five Monastic Schools

2. Background

Phoo Pwint Wai Thi (PPWT), with financial support from UNICEF, is implementing a one-year pilot in five monastic schools in Mandalay Region from 8 December 2025 to 5 December 2026. The pilot seeks to ensure that children learn, live and play in environments that are physically, emotionally and psychologically safe.

The pilot focuses on strengthening Child Safeguarding Committees (CSCs); establishing school-level safeguarding policies, procedures and action plans; improving safe and inclusive learning and boarding environments; strengthening the capacity and practices of school leaders, teachers and caregivers; increasing children's awareness and participation; and improving reporting, referral and response mechanisms.

The pilot is being implemented in a distinctive institutional and social context. Monastic schools operate through leadership structures, relationships and practices shaped by the monastic education system, Buddhist values, Myanmar cultural norms and close relationships among school leaders, teachers, children, families and communities. The evaluation therefore needs to examine not only whether project activities were delivered and agreed indicators were achieved, but also how safeguarding principles and practices are understood, accepted, adapted, used and owned within this context.

PPWT requires an independent, learning-oriented external evaluation to assess the experience of the five-school pilot and generate practical evidence for future programme design and dialogue with UNICEF and other partners. The evaluation should identify what appears workable now, what requires adaptation or additional support, what requires longer-term institutional development, and what should be protected as a fundamental safeguarding principle regardless of contextual adaptation.

3. Purpose and Intended Use of the Evaluation

The primary purpose is to learn from the pilot: to understand whether the safeguarding approach introduced through the project is feasible, appropriate, acceptable and potentially sustainable in monastic schools, and what would be required for meaningful continuation, institutionalisation or future expansion.

The evaluation will also provide an independent assessment of progress against the project's agreed results and UNICEF streamlined indicators. Indicator achievement is an important part of the evaluation, but it should not be treated as sufficient evidence of meaningful safeguarding change.

- Assess achievements, gaps, variation across schools and unintended positive or negative effects.
- Understand how safeguarding requirements have translated into actual school practices and relationships.
- Identify practical barriers, enabling factors, resource requirements and adaptations.
- Assess the depth of school understanding, acceptance, participation and ownership.
- Examine whether the pilot is beginning to influence attitudes, behaviour, school norms, decision-making and organisational culture.
- Assess the respective contributions and roles of UNICEF, PPWT and participating schools.
- Identify realistic requirements for sustainability and institutionalisation beyond the pilot period.
- Inform PPWT's future safeguarding programme design, discussions with UNICEF and other partners, and any future expansion within the monastic education sector.

4. Evaluation Objectives

1. Assess the relevance, appropriateness and coherence of the pilot design in relation to safeguarding risks, children's needs and the institutional, cultural and operational realities of monastic schools.
2. Assess achievement against the confirmed project results framework and UNICEF streamlined indicators, while examining the extent to which these measures reflect meaningful school-level safeguarding change.
3. Examine practical implementation experience across the five schools, including barriers, enabling factors, workload, leadership support, resources, technical assistance and differences between school contexts.
4. Assess which elements of the safeguarding model are feasible and realistic for routine use in monastic schools, and which require adaptation, simplification, additional resources, stronger systems or longer-term support.
5. Examine how monastic school norms, Buddhist values, Myanmar cultural practices, leadership structures and school-community relationships interact with safeguarding principles and practices.
6. Assess the extent to which safeguarding is understood and accepted as a legitimate school responsibility, including whether any activities or requirements are experienced as externally imposed, culturally unfamiliar or difficult to integrate.
7. Distinguish contextually adaptable implementation approaches from fundamental safeguarding principles that should not be compromised.
8. Assess changes in knowledge, attitudes, practices, relationships, norms, decision-making and perceived safety among relevant stakeholders, including intended and unintended effects.
9. Assess school participation and ownership, including what would enable schools to move from compliance toward active adoption, local leadership and sustained practice.
10. Assess the roles and contributions of UNICEF, PPWT and participating schools, including technical guidance, translation of expectations into practice, support, monitoring, communication and accountability.
11. Assess what capacity, technical support, coaching, resources and institutional systems PPWT and schools would require to sustain safeguarding beyond the pilot.
12. Assess whether one year is a realistic timeframe for meaningful change in awareness, attitudes, behaviour, school systems and organisational culture, and identify a realistic pathway and timeframe for institutionalisation.
13. Identify a realistic minimum package of safeguarding practices that could potentially be adopted by a wider number of monastic schools, alongside areas requiring phased or longer-term development.
14. Generate practical, prioritised recommendations for adaptation, continuation, institutionalisation and any future expansion.

5. Scope of the Evaluation

Dimension	Scope
Geographic / institutional	All five participating monastic schools in Mandalay Region and relevant PPWT programme and management functions. Amarapura, Chanmyathazi, Pyigyitagon, Aungmyaetharsan
Time period	Full pilot implementation period stated in the draft: 8 December 2025 to 7 December 2026.
Stakeholders	Children, principals/head monks, teachers, caregivers/boarding staff, CSC members; parents, relevant PPWT staff and relevant UNICEF staff.
Programme components	Governance; school safeguarding policies, procedures and action plans; capacity development; positive discipline; reporting, referral and response; child participation; psychosocial support; safe and inclusive learning and boarding environments; monitoring and quality assurance.
Analytical scope	Relevance and appropriateness; effectiveness and emerging outcomes; feasibility; acceptability; equity and inclusion; ownership; behavioural and cultural change; efficiency/resource implications; sustainability; institutionalisation; and readiness/pathways for wider adoption.

6. Evaluation Framework: From Compliance to Institutionalisation

To avoid equating formal compliance with meaningful safeguarding change, the evaluation should distinguish five levels of progress. These are analytical lenses rather than a predetermined scoring system:

Level	Meaning
1. Compliance	Required structures, documents, training, activities or reporting mechanisms are formally in place or completed.
2. Adoption and use	Safeguarding practices and mechanisms are actually being used in routine school life, rather than existing mainly on paper.
3. School ownership	School leaders, staff, CSC members, children and relevant community stakeholders understand the purpose of safeguarding, see it as relevant, participate in it and take responsibility for maintaining it.
4. Behavioural and cultural change	There is credible evidence of changes in behaviour, relationships, norms, decision-making, help-seeking, adult-child interactions or expectations about safety and respectful treatment.
5. Sustainability and institutionalisation	Core safeguarding functions are embedded in routine school and PPWT systems, leadership, roles, resources, monitoring and accountability, with a realistic prospect of continuing beyond external project support.

7. Key Evaluation Questions

A. Relevance, appropriateness and design

- To what extent did the pilot respond to priority safeguarding risks and needs of children in the five schools?
- How appropriate were the intervention package and one-year implementation period for the participating monastic-school contexts?
- How well did the pilot fit existing school governance, leadership, boarding arrangements where relevant, PPWT systems and school-community relationships?
- Which elements of the model were immediately understandable and relevant to schools, and which were less familiar or more difficult to integrate?

B. Achievement and meaningful change

- To what extent were planned outputs, outcomes and confirmed UNICEF streamlined indicators achieved, for whom, and with what variation across the five schools?
- Which components produced the most meaningful and verifiable changes, and what evidence supports this?
- How functional are CSCs, policies/action plans, reporting, referral and response arrangements, documentation and accountability mechanisms in practice?
- What intended and unintended positive or negative effects has the pilot had on school practices, relationships, norms, values or decision-making processes?
- Are reported changes in knowledge or attitudes consistent with observed behaviour, school records and accounts from children and other stakeholders?

C. Feasibility and implementation experience

- What practical challenges did schools experience in implementing safeguarding activities, tools and requirements, and how did they respond?
- What factors enabled implementation, including leadership, staff commitment, existing practices, community relationships, PPWT support or other factors?
- Which safeguarding elements are feasible within existing school roles, time, staffing and resources? Which require adaptation, additional resources, specialist support or longer-term accompaniment?
- What are the workload, recurrent resource, monitoring and management implications for schools and PPWT?

D. Context, culture and safeguarding principles

- How do monastic school norms, Buddhist values, Myanmar cultural practices, leadership structures and school-community relationships support, shape or challenge safeguarding principles and practices?
- Which safeguarding concepts or approaches resonate with existing values and responsibilities within monastic schools?
- Are any elements perceived as externally imposed, culturally unfamiliar, inappropriate in their current form or difficult to reconcile with existing practices? Why?
- Where can language, tools, training methods, participation mechanisms or implementation arrangements be adapted to improve contextual fit?
- Which fundamental child safeguarding principles, rights and protections should remain non-negotiable despite contextual adaptation, and how can these be communicated and implemented respectfully and effectively?

- Have any tensions emerged between safeguarding requirements and existing authority relationships, disciplinary practices, privacy expectations, community norms or decision-making processes? If so, how might they be constructively addressed?

E. Understanding, acceptability, participation and ownership

- How do principals/head monks, teachers, caregivers, CSC members, children and parents understand the purpose of safeguarding and their respective roles?
- To what extent do stakeholders accept safeguarding as relevant, legitimate and beneficial rather than primarily a PPWT/UNICEF project requirement?
- How do participating schools perceive the activities, tools, requirements, training, monitoring and support provided through PPWT and UNICEF?
- What evidence is there of active participation and local initiative beyond minimum compliance?
- What factors strengthen or weaken school ownership, and what would help schools take greater responsibility for safeguarding systems?

F. Children, safety, participation and inclusion

- Do children understand expected adult behaviour, available feedback/reporting channels and trusted sources of help?
- Do children perceive safeguarding and reporting mechanisms as accessible, confidential, safe, trustworthy and responsive?
- What changes do children report in respectful treatment, positive discipline, inclusion, participation, wellbeing and perceived safety?
- How meaningful and safe has child participation been in programme activities and relevant school decision-making?
- Where data permit safe analysis, how do experiences differ by gender, age, disability, displacement status, boarding/day status or other relevant characteristics?

G. Roles of UNICEF, PPWT and participating schools

- Were the respective roles, responsibilities, expectations and accountability arrangements of UNICEF, PPWT and participating schools clear, appropriate and workable?
- Was UNICEF's financial and technical support appropriate to the needs and realities of the pilot as experienced by PPWT and schools?
- How effectively did PPWT translate UNICEF safeguarding expectations, technical guidance and indicators into practical approaches suitable for monastic schools?
- How effective were PPWT's training, coaching/support, communication, monitoring and problem-solving arrangements?
- Were expectations placed on schools realistic, sufficiently explained and matched by appropriate support?
- What should each actor do differently in any continuation or future expansion?

H. Adequacy of indicators and evidence

- Do the confirmed UNICEF streamlined indicators capture meaningful safeguarding change at school level, or do they primarily measure completion/compliance?
- What important dimensions of adoption, ownership, behaviour, culture, child trust, system functionality or sustainability are insufficiently reflected?
- What additional or refined measures would be practical and useful for future PPWT monitoring without creating an excessive reporting burden?

I. Sustainability and institutionalization

- Which safeguarding systems and practices are likely to continue after external funding ends, and what evidence supports this judgement?
- To what extent are safeguarding roles, procedures, time/resources, reporting, monitoring and leadership accountability embedded in routine school and PPWT systems?
- What dependencies could cause practices to weaken or stop?
- What capacity, technical support, coaching, resources and institutional systems would PPWT and schools require to sustain acceptable quality?
- Is one year a realistic period for establishing meaningful change in awareness, attitudes, behaviour, school systems and organisational culture? Which changes can reasonably occur within one year and which require longer?

J. Future pathway and wider adoption

- Based on evidence from the five schools, what would a realistic pathway and timeframe for meaningful safeguarding institutionalisation in monastic schools look like?
- What lessons from the five pilot schools regarding school characteristics, leadership commitment, readiness, capacity and contextual conditions should inform the selection and preparation of schools for future safeguarding programming or expansion?
- What minimum safeguarding practices could realistically be adopted by a wider number of monastic schools with limited additional resources?
- Which components require phased development, more intensive support, specialist capacity or further testing before wider adoption?
- Which elements should be retained, adapted, simplified, strengthened or discontinued?
- What school/context characteristics affect feasibility and what adaptations may be needed across different monastic-school settings?
- What lessons should inform PPWT's future programme design and discussions with UNICEF and other partners?
- What is the evidence-based recommendation for the next stage: consolidation in the five schools, adaptation and further testing, phased expansion of a minimum package, broader expansion, or another approach?

8. Evaluation Approach and Methodology

The consultant shall propose a rigorous but proportionate mixed-method evaluation design. The final methodology will be agreed during inception and should be explicitly learning-oriented, child-centred, context-sensitive and suitable for a five-school pilot. It should use contribution analysis or another defensible approach to examine how the pilot contributed to observed changes, rather than making unsupported claims of direct attribution.

8.1 Minimum methods

- Desk review of relevant programme design and contractual documents, results framework/indicator definitions, monitoring data, baseline/endline information where available, budgets or cost information where available, training records, school policies and action plans, CSC records/minutes, safely anonymised case/referral information where ethically appropriate, progress reports and learning products.
- Key informant interviews with relevant PPWT management/programme staff, UNICEF staff, principals/head monks, safeguarding focal persons, CSC members and other justified stakeholders.
- Separate focus group discussions or other safe participatory methods with teachers/caregivers, parents and children, organised to minimise power imbalance and safeguarding risk.
- Structured observation of school and, where applicable, boarding environments, including visible reporting mechanisms, accessibility, privacy, WASH/safety conditions and observable evidence of routine practice.
- A short anonymous/confidential KAP, attitude or structured rating tool for relevant adult stakeholder groups where feasible and useful.
- Five concise school-level case summaries comparing implementation experience, results, attitudes, contextual factors, ownership, constraints and sustainability/readiness.
- A stakeholder validation process focused on factual accuracy and interpretation, without exposing confidential or child-level information.

8.2 Sampling

All five participating schools shall be included. The inception report must justify sample sizes and respondent-selection procedures by stakeholder group. Sampling should deliberately seek a range of perspectives, including less positive or less engaged participants. School authorities should not be permitted to select only favourable respondents. Participation must be voluntary.

8.3 Analysis and triangulation

- Triangulate self-report with observation, records and perspectives from different stakeholder groups.
- Compare findings across schools rather than relying only on aggregate results.
- Clearly distinguish verified findings, stakeholder perceptions and evaluator interpretation.
- Analyse evidence across the five levels of compliance, adoption/use, ownership, behavioural/cultural change and sustainability/institutionalisation.
- Identify contextual variation and avoid treating the five pilot schools as automatically representative of the wider monastic education sector.
- Explain missing data, potential bias, limitations and the strength/confidence of major conclusions.
- Where disaggregation is safe and analytically meaningful, consider gender, age, disability, displacement status, boarding/day status and other relevant characteristics.

8.4 Assessment of UNICEF streamlined indicators

The evaluator shall assess achievement against the confirmed UNICEF streamlined indicators and targets using available project evidence. This analysis should be clearly presented, but the evaluator must also assess whether the indicators adequately capture meaningful safeguarding change and identify important dimensions that are not captured.

PD Output	SUBCATEGORY	PD INDICATOR	ACTIVITY/MODALITY	Unit	Activity Target
Improved functionality of child safeguarding committees (CSC) and institutionalized child safeguarding systems supporting safe school environment	Strengthen Community structures	# of groups and members in established/strengthened community-led mechanisms	Community-based mechanisms	Individual	40 CSC members
	CPIE	# of staffs/volunteers/community frontline workers/CPG members trained on CP	Capacity building	Individual	40 CSC members
Children have increased access to safe, protective and inclusive monastic school environment	CPIE	# of people reached through Child Protection awareness raising activities (including community events related with CP)	Awareness Raising (Non-Digital)	Individual	6918 students (3501 Male and 3417 Female)
	CPIE	# of staffs/volunteers/community frontline workers/CPG members trained on CP	Capacity building	Individual	25 teachers
	MHPSS	# of staff (volunteers, facilitators, frontline responders) received ToT on PSS Activity Package; I Support My Friends, Child Wellbeing PSS Activities Guidebook for Safe Spaces		Individual	25 teachers
	MHPSS	# of children and adolescents participated in structured and non-structured PSS activities through safe spaces (ie: fixed and mobile child friendly spaces (CFS))	CFS Activities	Individual	6918 students (3501 Male and 3417 Female)
	MHPSS	# of staff (volunteers, facilitators, frontline responders, community focal) received ToT on PFA	Capacity Building	Individual	65 Teachers and CSC members
	AAP-PSEA in CP	# of staffs/frontline worker trained in PSEA	Capacity Building	Individual	40 teachers
	Case Management	# of children who received individualized support at community level, including through referrals to essential services	Service referral	Individual	350 Students (5% of totals students)
	AAP-PSEA in CP	# of children and adults reached with awareness activities and community mobilisation interventions on PSEA and children's rights, Number	Awareness Raising (Non-Digital)	Individual	2075 students (30% of totals students)
	CAAC & MRM	# of people trained on MRM	Capacity Building	Individual	65 (CSC and teacher)
	AAP-PSEA in CP	# of people sharing their concerns and asking questions/clarifications to address their needs through established feedback mechanisms (this indicator is related with AAP/CFRM)	Feedback mechanisms	Individual	100 students
	GBV	#of staff/frontline workers/community volunteers trained in GBV prevention, risk mitigation and response	Capacity Building	Individual	70

9. Judgement and Learning Framework

The evaluator should agree transparent judgement criteria in the inception report. A simple rubric may be used where it improves clarity, but numerical ratings should not substitute for evidence and explanation. Any rating should be supported by triangulated evidence and should distinguish between formal compliance and deeper adoption or institutionalisation.

The final synthesis should, at minimum, identify: (a) practices that are already feasible and should be maintained; (b) practices that are promising but need adaptation or support; (c) practices that require longer-term institutional development or additional resources; and (d) any practices or conditions that raise safeguarding concerns or are not currently feasible.

The evaluation should also identify which implementation approaches can appropriately be adapted to context and which fundamental safeguarding principles should remain non-negotiable.

10. Ethical, Child Safeguarding and Data-Protection Requirements

The evaluation must comply with applicable PPWT and UNICEF safeguarding requirements and the do-no-harm principle. Before fieldwork, the consultant must submit an ethics and safeguarding protocol acceptable to PPWT.

At minimum, the consultant shall:

- Sign and comply with relevant safeguarding policies and codes of conduct.
- Use voluntary, informed adult consent and age-appropriate child assent together with required caregiver consent.
- Explain confidentiality and its limits, especially where a child may be at risk of harm.
- Use appropriately trained data collectors, safe venues, non-leading tools and methods suitable for age, gender, disability and power dynamics.
- Establish an agreed distress, disclosure and referral/escalation protocol before any contact with children.
- Never investigate alleged abuse, promise absolute secrecy, provide inducements for disclosure or include identifiable case details in evaluation files or outputs.
- Collect only data necessary for the evaluation; store it securely; restrict access; anonymise reporting; and agree retention/deletion arrangements.
- Report safeguarding concerns immediately through the agreed pathway.
- Ensure respondents can express criticism or negative experiences without retaliation risk.
- Avoid collecting identifiable details about safeguarding cases unless strictly necessary, ethically justified and explicitly agreed in advance.

In addition to PPWT safeguarding and ethical requirements, the evaluator shall comply with applicable UNICEF ethical and safeguarding standards throughout the assignment. These include, but are not limited to:

- Partner Declaration requirements, including the obligation to promptly inform UNICEF of any incident or report that is inconsistent with the representations and declarations provided in the Partner Declaration.
- Appropriate reference and/or background checks for personnel engaged in the evaluation.
- UNICEF safeguarding requirements, including Prevention of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA) policies and related safeguarding standards.
- UNICEF Procedure on Ethical Standards in Research, Evaluation, Data Collection and Analysis.

PPWT will provide the selected consultant with the relevant PPWT's policies, procedures, guidance documents, reference materials and web links during the inception phase. The consultant will be responsible for ensuring that all evaluation activities are conducted in accordance with these requirements.

11. Expected Deliverables

Deliverable	Minimum content	Timeline
1. Inception report	Refined evaluation questions; reconstructed/refined theory of change if required; evaluation matrix; methodology; sampling; limitations; indicator assessment plan; ethics/safeguarding protocol; work plan; data-management plan; analysis and judgement framework.	28-Oct-2026 to 31-Oct-2026 (4) days
2. Data-collection package	KII/FGD guides; child-friendly tools; KAP/attitude or rating tool if used; observation checklist; consent/assent materials; disclosure/referral protocol; data-management instruments.	2-Nov-2026 to 3-Nov-2026 (2) days
3. Fieldwork debrief	Concise confidential briefing on emerging findings, data gaps, methodological issues and any immediate safeguarding issues communicated through the agreed pathway.	4-Nov-2026 to 9-Nov-2026 (5) days
4. Draft evaluation report	Evidence-based findings against the evaluation questions; assessment of confirmed indicators; five school case summaries; cross-school analysis; conclusions; lessons; future pathway; and prioritised recommendations.	10-Nov-2026 to 14-Nov-2026 (5) days
5. Validation presentation/workshop	Accessible presentation for PPWT, UNICEF and agreed stakeholders; facilitation of factual validation and discussion of implications and recommendations. The presentation deck shall be provided in both English and Myanmar languages to support dissemination and learning sessions with participating schools and monastic education stakeholders.	15-Nov-2026 to 16-Nov-2026 (2) days
6. Final evaluation package	Final report incorporating consolidated feedback; stand-alone executive summary (maximum five pages); presentation deck; clean final tools; and anonymised data/analysis files as agreed.	17-Nov-2026 to 18-Nov-2026 (2) days

PPWT proposes the above turnaround times as indicative timelines for the assignment. Consultants are expected to submit a realistic workplan and delivery schedule as part of their proposal, taking into account the scope of

PPWT | External Evaluation ToR | Child Safeguarding Pilot

work, methodology, and quality requirements. The proposed timeline will be finalised during contract negotiation with the selected consultant.

12. Final Report Requirements

- Executive Summary (maximum five pages).
- Background and description of the pilot.
- Evaluation purpose, scope, framework and questions.
- Methodology, ethics, limitations and strength of evidence.
- Results against the confirmed UNICEF streamlined indicators.
- Findings organised around the main evaluation questions, with relevant stakeholder and cross-school comparisons.
- Five concise school case summaries.
- Analysis across compliance, adoption/use, ownership, behavioural/cultural change and sustainability/institutionalisation.
- Analysis of cultural and institutional fit, including adaptable implementation approaches and non-negotiable safeguarding principles.
- Conclusions on feasibility, appropriateness, acceptability, ownership, sustainability and institutionalisation.
- A realistic pathway and indicative timeframe for continued development and any future expansion.
- Minimum safeguarding practices potentially suitable for wider adoption and areas requiring phased/longer-term development.
- Prioritised recommendations, linked to evidence, with responsible actor, indicative timeframe and resource implication.
- Lessons, promising practices, adaptations required and unresolved questions for further testing.
- Annexes including the ToR, evaluation matrix, tools, sampling, documents/persons consulted (non-identifying where required), and any agreed management-response matrix.

The main report should normally not exceed 35 pages excluding annexes, unless otherwise agreed. It should be written in clear English and accompanied by a concise presentation deck.

13. Recommendation Format

Recommendations must be specific, feasible, prioritised, linked directly to findings and differentiated by actor. They should avoid assuming that all elements of the pilot should be scaled in the same way or at the same pace.

Finding / evidence	Recommended action	Priority	Responsible actor	Indicative timeframe	Resource implication
Specific evidence or gap	Specific action	High / Medium / Low	PPWT / School / UNICEF or partner	Immediate / short / medium term	Low / Moderate / Significant

14. Management Arrangements and Quality Assurance

- The consultant will report to a designated PPWT focal person and will remain independent from programme implementation staff in forming evaluative judgements.
- PPWT will facilitate access to relevant documents and stakeholders while protecting voluntary participation and evaluator independence.
- PPWT will provide consolidated comments on deliverables within agreed review periods.

- UNICEF may provide technical and factual comments on agreed evaluation deliverables and participate in the validation process. PPWT will consolidate stakeholder feedback for the evaluator. Such review will not compromise the evaluator's independence or require alteration of evidence-based findings or conclusions.
- Deliverables will be assessed for methodological quality, safeguarding compliance, completeness, evidence traceability, clarity, contextual sensitivity and practical usefulness.
- The evaluator should maintain a clear audit trail from evaluation questions to evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations.
- Any disagreement over interpretation should be documented and resolved through evidence-based discussion; PPWT or other stakeholders should not require findings to be changed solely because they are critical.

PPWT focal person: Project Manager

Approval/review group: Management team

15. Duration and Level of Effort

The existing draft estimates approximately (15- 20) working days over an agreed calendar period, with bidders permitted to propose a justified level of effort. Given the requirement to include all five schools, child participation, mixed methods, cross-school analysis, indicator assessment and meaningful validation, the final level of effort should be sufficient to deliver safe and credible work.

Activity	Draft indicative working days	
Desk review and inception	4–5	4 Days
Tool finalisation and preparation	2–3	2 Days
Field data collection across five schools	6–8	5 Days
Analysis and draft report	5–6	5 Days
Validation, revision and finalisation	3	4 Days

16. Evaluator / Consultant Qualifications

- Advanced degree in child protection, education, social sciences, development studies, monitoring and evaluation or a related discipline.
- At least five years of progressively responsible experience conducting programme evaluations, including mixed-method and qualitative evaluation.
- Demonstrated expertise in child protection, child safeguarding, education or humanitarian/development programming.
- Proven experience in child-sensitive research or evaluation and safe participatory work with children.
- Ability to assess behavioural and attitudinal change, institutionalisation, sustainability and feasibility for scale or wider adoption.
- Strong analytical, facilitation and English report-writing skills.
- Myanmar-language capacity within the evaluation team is strongly preferred.
- Knowledge of Myanmar's education, monastic education and child-protection/safeguarding context is highly desirable.
- Demonstrated ability to work respectfully with religious leaders and culturally specific institutions is highly desirable.
- No actual or perceived conflict of interest with implementation of the pilot.

17. Required Proposal Contents

- Technical proposal demonstrating understanding of the assignment and learning purpose.
- Proposed evaluation framework, methodology, sampling approach, analysis plan and safeguarding/ethics approach.
- Explanation of how the proposed approach will distinguish compliance, adoption/use, ownership, behavioural/cultural change and sustainability/institutionalisation.
- Approach to assessing cultural and institutional fit while maintaining fundamental safeguarding principles.
- Work plan and proposed level of effort.
- Team composition, roles, relevant CVs and availability.
- Two relevant examples or references from comparable evaluations.
- Financial proposal showing professional fees, travel and other costs.
- Disclosure of any actual or potential conflict of interest.

PPWT will cover the consultant fee, travel, accommodation, and field-visit transportation costs. All other costs required to undertake the evaluation, including enumerator/data collector fees, interpretation services, printing, data processing, and other operational expenses, shall be budgeted and covered by the consultant and clearly reflected in the financial proposal.

18. Suggested Proposal Assessment Criteria

Criterion	Draft weight
Relevant evaluation and methodological expertise	25%
Child safeguarding and child-participation expertise	25%
Quality, feasibility and learning orientation of proposed methodology	25%
Myanmar/monastic education contextual understanding and language capacity	10%
Work plan and availability	5%
Financial competitiveness/value	10%

19. Confidentiality, Ownership and Conflict of Interest

All documents, tools, anonymised datasets and reports produced under the assignment will be handled in accordance with the contract and applicable PPWT/UNICEF data-protection requirements. The consultant may not publish, share or reuse programme or respondent information without written authorisation. Any actual or potential conflict of interest must be declared before contracting and if it arises during the assignment.

20. Documents to be Made Available to the Evaluator

Subject to availability and appropriate confidentiality controls, PPWT should provide the evaluator with the documents required to understand the pilot and verify results. These may include:

- Approved project proposal/design and relevant agreement documents.
- Results framework and the confirmed UNICEF streamlined indicators, definitions and targets.
- Programme work plans and progress reports.

- Baseline/endline or monitoring datasets and tools, where available. Formative assessment reports, monitoring reports, monthly activity reports, training reports, mentoring reports, and associated tools and materials, where available.
- Training materials, attendance records and coaching/support records.
- School safeguarding policies, procedures and action plans.
- CSC terms of reference, records and minutes where available.
- Monitoring and school-assessment tools and results.
- PPWT safeguarding policies, codes of conduct, data-protection requirements and referral/escalation procedures.
- Relevant UNICEF technical guidance or requirements that formed part of the pilot.

21.Contact Details:

- Email Address: phyoeinge@medg.org
- Phone number: 09767119891
- Office Address: 19 Street, between 59 & 60, Dawnabwar, Block (44), Aungmyaethazan Township, Mandalay, Myanmar.
- The deadline for submission is on 12 October 2026.