# TERMS OF REFERENCE
## FULL ASSESSMENT OF SOCIAL CENTRES
## (QWA QWA, SEKHUKHUNE & MATHANJANE)

### Background

SOS Children's Villages are best known for their residential child and youth care centres (CYCCs). In these centres SOS provides care and development services for children who have been abandoned, neglected or abused. The organization has 8 such facilities in South Africa.

However, SOS South Africa also runs 3 Social Centres (SCs) in Sekhukhune (Limpopo), Mathanjana (Mpumalanga) and Qwa Qwa (Free State). At these SCs the organization provides family strengthening services to community families. In addition, in Sekhukhune SOS runs a drop-in centre, in Mathanjana a safe-park, and in Qwa Qwa the organization provides direct support to 4 foster care homes.

These 3 Social Centres represent a new approach for SOS, with the organization making family strengthening a core pillar of its strategy.

In February 2017 SOS conducted a 'Rapid Assessment' of these 3 Social Centre programs. The objective was to review their performance in three areas: 1). Relevance; 2). Impact and 3). Cost Efficiency. The team assembled to conduct this review included the entire SOS National Management Team as well as colleagues in the SOS Regional Office.

The Rapid Assessment revealed that the 3 Social Centre programs were indeed very relevant to the communities in which they operated. However, their impact over the past few years has been limited, and there are concerns about the cost efficiency of the programs[1].

It was decided by the reviewers to affect "significant change" in the 3 programs, and some tentative solutions were discussed. However, before proceeding it was agreed that a full external assessment should take place, to guide decision-making around which model of care would be most appropriate in each location,

### Purpose of the external assessment
These terms of reference provide a national frame which guides the full assessment of all three Social Centre programmes (Qwa Qwa, Mathanjane and Sekhukhune). It is with the understanding that the assessor will put this frame into the context of the respective programmes that are being assessed taking into consideration the specific objectives and interventions of the particular programme.

The Social Centre full programme assessment seeks to answer the following overarching questions:
1. What are the relevant significant changes that should take place in each of the three Social Centres?
2. What changes have the programme made in the lives of the participating children within target group, their families and their communities?
3. How relevant, effective, efficient, sustainable and participatory are the programme interventions?
4. What lessons can be drawn from the three Social Centre programmes that will inform significant changes?

The full assessment exercise should identify the key lessons learned that can be applied to improve the relevance; efficiency; effectiveness; sustainability and impact of the programme interventions within the three Social Centres and what the significant change for each of the Social Centre programmes will be.

### Scope and focus of the full assessment
The full assessment should analyse the progress that the three Social Centre programmes have made against the agreed SOS national and programme specific indicators. In addition, the assessment should ascertain whether:

---

[1] The full Rapid Assessment conclusions are available

o Children who are at risk of losing the care of their family are enabled to grow within a caring family environment.
o Children of participating families realise their developmental needs and rights by accessing essential services.
o The families of child participants have the capacity and commitment to take care of their children.
o Communities and/or local authorities/governments' commitment and/or capacities are strengthened to promote and protect the rights of children to grow within a caring family environment.
o An active network of stakeholders exists and contributes to ensure that all children can grow within a caring family environment.

Additionally, the external full assessment should focus on the following programme aspects (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and participation)

### Relevance
o To what extent is the programme focussed on target group – children most at risk of losing the care of their family?
o To what extent the programme interventions respond to the needs and priorities of the programme participants?
o To what extent programme design address locally defined needs and priorities?

### Effectiveness
o To what extent are the objectives of the programme being attained?
o To what extent have children remained in their families instead of losing their care? To what extent has their quality of life improved?
o How many children and families successfully left the programme since the beginning and became self-reliant?
o To what extent have beneficiaries been satisfied with the programme interventions?
o To what extent community capacity to protect rights of children has been strengthened?
o To what extent does the approach of following a structured family development planning process contribute to families becoming self-reliant?
o Is replication or removal of certain approaches required to increase effectiveness?

### Efficiency
o What are the social benefits for children/families/communities compared with resources spent for activities?
o What are the annual total running costs and the average running costs per child per month? And how do these costs compare with the similar initiatives in the country?
o Have resources been used most economically?
o Are there any alternatives for reaching the same result with less input? Are there feasible options for cost reduction and cost saving while realizing the same level of results and quality? Could the outcomes and results have been achieved at lower cost through applying a different approach?

### Sustainability
o Has the capacity of the implementation partner been developed?  If so, in what areas and how?
o Is the programme supported by local/national institutions?
o Do these institutions demonstrate commitment and capacity to continue programme activities or replicate it?
o To what extent can activities, results and effects be expected to continue after SOS involvement has ended? Do partners have financial capacity to maintain programme?

o Is there progress towards SOS withdrawing from its direct involvement and handing over the full responsibility to run the programme to an implementation partner?

## Participation
o To what extent are stakeholders (participant families, particular children, partners, local authority) involved in the design and implementation of the programme? In particular, to what extent are stakeholders involved in the family development planning process?
o To what extent is the programme designed to develop the necessary local institutional (governmental and/or non-governmental) capacity to respond to the problem?

## Key areas for the external evaluation
Within the Social Centre programmes, children, families, and communities have been supported in various areas, which the full assessment exercise should look at. The assessment will focus on following key areas and illustrative set of questions. However, it has to be taken into consideration that individual Social Centre programmes provide different kinds of services. Therefore, the assessor needs to decide in cooperation with the local programme team and in consultation with the SOS South Africa National Office which of the below mentioned areas and in what extent apply to the particular Social Centre programme and set of questions will be further elaborated during preparatory phase. Nevertheless, main sections 1-6, which look at the definition of the target group as well as the selection process of participating families; programme interventions supporting children, families and communities; main approaches; programme partners; allocated resources should apply for all of the three Social Centres.

| Key areas | Illustrative full assessment questions |
|---|---|
| **Target group** | • How the target group has been defined<br>• How participant families are identified, verified and selected (criteria and process) |
| **Programme interventions supporting children and families** | |
| **Nutritional support** | • Number of children and caregivers receiving the support;<br>• Type and appropriateness of nutritional support provided for children by the programme directly or through referral (i.e. food package, food vouchers); identify the impact and if there is something to be added, reduced or removed.<br>• Any other support caregivers get from the programme with regard to nutrition of their children (e.g. cooking lessons)<br>• Type of meals (composition), quantity, and frequency per day<br>• How long families receive food support; is food support gradually reduced or are there signs of dependency?<br>• If caregivers and/or programme staff feel that children have weight/height according to age; any symptoms of malnutrition observed by mothers and/or programme staff; find out the reasons.<br>• Level of satisfaction of children and caregivers regarding this support |
| **Health support** | • Number of children and caregivers receiving the support – if possible in proportion *(number should be proportionate to the total of those who have been identified as needing such support*<br>• Type and appropriateness of health support provided to children and/or care givers by the programme directly or through referral; any health education provided; identify the |

| | |
|---|---|
| | impact and if there is something to be added, reduced or removed.<br>• Access to medical care by children and care givers; Frequency of health checks for children as well as for caregivers; constraints for visiting and undertaking regular health check-ups for children and caregivers;<br>• Capacity of the program to respond to medical problems commonly experienced by the target group (e.g. related to HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, drug addiction)<br>• How the health conditions of children and caregivers in the programme are; did they improve, decrease or remain the same since they joined the programme?<br>• What difference this support has made in the participants' lives<br>• Level of satisfaction of children and caregivers regarding this support |
| **Educational support** | • Number of children supported to access pre-school, formal basic (primary and secondary) education as well as informal education – if possible in proportion *(number should be proportionate to the total of those who have been identified as needing such support)*<br>• Type and appropriateness of educational support provided to children by the programme directly or through referral; identify the impact and if there is something to be added, reduced or removed.<br>• How is the track record concerning children's attendance, as well as staying enrolled in the educational system<br>• Level of educational performance of children against their past performance and against national standards/averages (explain the parameters used for evaluating this)<br>• Level of satisfaction of caregivers and children regarding this support |
| **Psychosocial support** | • Number of children and caregivers being supported to access counselling services – if possible in proportion *(number should be proportionate to the total of those who have been identified as needing such support)*<br>• Type and appropriateness of psycho-social support provided to children and/or care givers by the programme directly or through referral; identify the impact and if there is something to be added, reduced or removed.<br>• How children and caregivers have been effectively supported to address relevant issues<br>• Participation of children in seminars/workshops on life skills (if possible provide their number and frequency and type of participation)<br>• How the programme staff and other external specialists view children's psychological development – (if possible provide number of children who have improved in their psychosocial development after the intervention) |

| | |
|---|---|
| | • Frequency of counselling sessions for children and care-givers and the impact of counselling<br>• Frequency of family home visits by the programme<br>• Participation of caregivers in community life<br>• Number of caregivers who have recovered from drug and alcohol addiction<br>• Level of satisfaction of children and caregivers regarding this support |
| **Living conditions** | • Number of families/children supported with shelter and other items related to child's living conditions<br>• Type and appropriateness of support provided by the programme directly or through referral (e.g. shelter, clothes, and blankets); identify the impact and if there is something to be added, reduced or removed.<br>• How safe families' living conditions are, and how they feel about it<br>• Are living conditions adequate relative to acceptable local standards? (Relates to such things as number of rooms, especially sleeping rooms; size of house; sanitation; source of light and heat; water supply, etc.)<br>• Level of satisfaction of caregivers and children regarding this support |
| **Promotion of child rights/parenting skills** | • Number of children and caregivers taking part in education workshops in child development and child rights e.g. parental education programmes/trainings<br>• Type and appropriateness of activities provided to children and/or caregivers by the programme directly or through referral; identify the impact and if there is something to be added, reduced or removed.<br>• To what extent children, caregivers and communities have knowledge on children's rights<br>• Any example where children have started to exercise their rights<br>• If caregivers have improved their parental skills (provide specific information on the parameters used for improved parental skills)<br>• Any changes or improvements in parent and child relationship and child care practices (if possible provide number of cases known) |
| **Legal support** | • Type and appropriateness of legal support provided by the programme directly or through referral; identify the impact and if there is something to be added, reduced or removed.<br>• Number of families who have got the necessary legal documents, and indicate the documents obtained.<br>• Number of families who have secured their property and assets through proper documentation (e.g. wills, ownership documents) |
| **Economic support** | • Type and appropriateness of economic support provided by the programme directly or through referral (e.g. skills training, |

| | |
|---|---|
| | income generation activities, debt payment, short term cash support; referral to employment service); identify the impact and if there is something to be added, reduced or removed. |
| | • The extent to which this support has changed the lives of families; caregivers have jobs or other income generation activities providing "stable" and "sufficient" income |
| | • Role of economic support in reducing dependency, stress and building confidence; Appropriateness of the economic support responding to the needs and expectations of participants |
| | • If loans are provided, how much and at what rate, and to what extent repayment system is working |
| **Other types of support** | • What other types of support programme provided to target children and families? |
| | • The extent of appropriateness to child/family needs; |
| | • The extent to which this support has changed the lives of families |
| **Main approaches applied by programme contributing to families becoming self-reliant** | |
| **Family Development Planning** | ▪ Number of families who have an up-to-date family development plan *(in proportion to the total number of participating families)* |
| | ▪ To what extent does the approach of following a structured family development planning process contribute to families becoming self-reliant |
| | ▪ What are particular strengths and weaknesses of following the family development planning process – where are areas of improvement |
| | ▪ To what extent families take responsibility (ownership) in developing and realising the goals set in FDP |
| | ▪ What constraints they encounter to take such responsibility |
| | ▪ Level of satisfaction and participation of caregivers and children regarding the FDP process |
| | ▪ Analysis of drop-outs: Number of families who have exited the programme – broken down into: how many families successfully achieved goals in their FDP; how many were dropped from the programme due to lack of commitment; and how many simply moved out of the programme for other reasons, e.g. changed place of living. |
| **Other approaches leading to family self-reliance** | • What other kind of approaches does the programme implement to support family self-reliance? Types and appropriateness; |
| | • To what extent applied approaches are effective and efficient? |
| **Programme interventions supported community structures** | • Type of community based structures (e.g. family committees, community groups, self help groups, volunteer groups) the programme collaborates with |
| | • Type and number of community structures and activities established with the support of the programme to support families to prevent child abandonment |
| | • Kind and number of community based structures or activities |

| | which existed, but have been strengthened by the programme (specify the type of capacity building work carried out) |
|---|---|
| | • Type and number of community based implementation partners, and what interventions they carry out. |
| | • Is the capacity of community structures built in a way that leads to sustainability? Is it foreseeable that families will be supported by community structures without SOS involvement? |
| | • Satisfaction level by the families of the services provided to them by community based structures |
| **Programme partners** | • Type and number of local implementation partners (e.g. local government, local NGOs, international NGOs) |
| | • Is the capacity of the implementation partner strengthened in a way that is sustainable? Is it foreseeable that families will be supported by partners also without SOS involvement? |
| | • Type of partnerships with other service providers with whom the programme collaborates; type of services they each provide |
| | • Kind and number of local organisations that have their capacity strengthened through the programme; in what way |
| | • The trend in number of families supported by other service providers collaborating with the programme (number in the increase or decrease) |
| | • Satisfaction level by the participants/clients of the quality of services provided |
| **Resources** | |
| **Management/administration system** | • How well the programme is structured regarding management and staff is supervised |
| | • To what extent the programme is supported by an appropriate management system?  Is this system geared towards sustainability (with takeover of implementation partner in mind)? |
| **Monitoring and evaluation system** | • What are main tools//mechanism for monitoring and evaluation of programme progress? |
| | • What are main tools//mechanism for monitoring and evaluation of programme interventions? |
| | • To what extent the programme is supported by an appropriate monitoring and evaluation system? |
| **Human resources** | • Adequate human resources in programme? If not, where/how? |
| | • Relationship between staff members and team work |
| | • Relationship between staff and implementation partner (including volunteers) |
| | • Training of staff and volunteers; Any training needs? |
| | • Clear division of roles and responsibilities between the staff |

| Infrastructure/ programme budget | • To what extent infrastructure is appropriate to programme activities? <br> • Adequate budget for programme development? |
|---|---|
|  |  |

### Existing informational sources relevant for the full assessment:

#### Key reference documents:
- FSP Manual (*manual, working paper, Jan 2007*)
- SOS South Africa Strategic & annual plan;
- Social Centre Programme annual plans;
- Relevant Social Centre Programme progress reports; annual reports; self-evaluation reports; SWOT analyses; programme annual budget;
- Social Centre Programme Databases; case files; any other collected data by programme teams
- Previous monitoring and /or continental/ internal / audit reports

#### Key stakeholders relevant for this full assessment
- Children and families participating in the Social Centre program;
- Families who left the programme
- Social Centre Programme team
- Programme partners (e.g. community members, Social Development etc)
- Local Social Centre Programme management

### Evaluation Approach, Process and Methods:
Full assessment Approach
- Pre-existing information sources should be used for the full assessment
- The full assessment should use participatory methodologies to involve programme participants (families currently on the programme as well as families that have already left the programme).
- The assessment team must respect participants' rights regarding voluntary participation in the evaluation, including their right to withdraw such participation at any stage if they so decide.
- The assessment team must respect participating communities' culture, social norms, values and behaviour; and maintain appropriate relationships with participants to this full assessment.

### Main responsibilities of external full assessor:
#### Draft full assessment plan
External full programme assessor should plan the assessment design in coordination with programme staff on local/national level. That includes:
- Identification of the major stakeholders who are associated with the programme to be interviewed, such as programme participants (children, care-givers), CBO implementing partners, key local government representatives, and other service providers
- Selection of representative sample of communities or groups to be interviewed on the basis of agreed criteria
- Agreeing on the type of information to be collected
- Preparation of checklists and other tools for data collection
- Develop a methodological tools for data collection and consult with Social Centre programme staff on programme level

### Data collection and field mission
The programme full assessment will include a site visit to programme location to meet programme participants (children; families); stakeholders; and to collect information in accordance with the requirements

stipulated in the full assessment design. Programme team is to be consulted on visit period. Main tasks include:

- Review the Social centre programme documentation and other sources of information
- Undertake a SWOT exercise with programme staff
- Collecting of data
- Facilitate learning during the data collection exercise

### Data analysis and elaboration of full assessment report
The external programme assessor will analyse collected data and will prepare a full assessment report that describes the main assessor's findings, recommendations and lessons learned. The final report should follow the structure and content as outlined in the terms of references.
That stage includes:

- Analysis of the data
- Preparation of a draft assessment report
- Present the findings to the respective programme staff on local and national levels
- Finalise the report after inputs from various stakeholders.

### Methodology
The assessment should use both quantitative (e.g. surveys) and qualitative data collection methods such as semi-structured interviews (for example with focus groups, large groups, individual interviews, etc.) as deemed necessary by the assessor. The methodology of assessment will include the following:

o Document review including analysis on key reference documents listed in these Terms of Reference;
o Case study of randomly selected beneficiary files (present and those who exited the Social Centre programme)
o Interviews (structured and/or semi-structured; in person and/or by telephone) with key interviewees listed in these Terms of Reference
o Focus groups with selected key interviewees – children, youth, care-givers, partners, community members etc;
o Other methods relevant to assessment objectives and scope

### Expected deliverables:
The External assessment team will commit to the following key deliverables

o A draft assessment report (submitted no later than the ---/-----/2017.
o A final report should be submitted to national Director 1 week after receiving comments from SOS
o Final assessment report that provides an overview of the current situation as well as recommendations on how best to proceed in each of the Social Centre programmes.

### Profile of the external consultant
The consultant (e.g. research institutions, university, independent freelancers, etc.) must have:

- proven competency and experience in monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment
- a social science background
- a good understanding of development work and partnerships
- good facilitation and interpersonal skills
- proven experience or participatory evaluation and data collection methods
- strong skills in coordinating teamwork
- strong analytical and conceptual skills
- Excellent writing and communication skills in English and local language.

- ability to transfer complex concepts / ideas into practical and simple language
- ideally experience in organising research processes with/for SOS Children's Villages

**Appendix 1:** Structure of final evaluation report

**Title page**
Name of Social Centre programmes, country, date & names of the authors

**Summary of conclusions and recommendations**
Executive summary (4-6 pages)

**1.     Introduction**
1.1.    Description of the objectives of the full assessment
1.2.    Short description of the overall full assessment process, the assessment team and methodologies applied
1.3.    Short description of each of the Social Centre programmes (location, history + current status, duration, programme participants, budget)
1.4.    Description of the Social Centre programme's overall objectives, activities and expected results after programme implementation
1.5.    Short description of the Social Centre programme management structure
1.6.    Overview of the human resource staffing patterns of the Social Centre programme and its implementing partners

**2.     Evaluation results**
2.1.    Children who are at risk of losing the care of their family are enabled to grow within a caring family environment
2.2.    Children of participating families realise their developmental needs and rights accessing essential services
2.3.    The families of child participants have the capacity and commitment to take care of their children
2.4.    Communities and/or local authorities/governments' commitment and/or capacities are strengthened to promote and protect the rights of children to grow within a caring family environment
2.5.    An active network of stakeholders contributes to ensure that all children can grow within a caring family environment
2.6.    Relevance
2.7.    Effectiveness
2.8.    Efficiency
2.9.    Sustainability
2.10.   Participation

**Lessons learnt, Conclusions and Recommendations**
**2.11.  Social Centre programme lessons learnt**
2.12.   Conclusions
2.13.   Recommendations for further action – identify components of the Social Centre programme that have great potential for further development, but also interventions that need radical significant to change.

**Costs related to the full assessment of the 3 Social Centres:**
Budget depends on the tasks and activities to be carried out as per this Terms of Reference. Also refer to call for proposals for budget.

**Approval Signatures**

‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾          ‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾
*Signature of the ND or Authorised Personnel*          Date, Place


‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾          ‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾‾
*Signature of the Consultant*          Date, Place