



Dorcads

Terms of Reference (ToR) – Mid-Term Evaluation Social Empowerment and Protection Programme

Project Name:

Social Empowerment and Protection Programme: Siaya Future for Children (3125), Loitokitok Future for Children (3456), and Loitokitok Social Protection Pilot (KEN 1761)

Country:

Kenya

Partner Organizations:

- 1) North Gem Community Development Programme
- 2) Shokut Naretoi Community Development Programme

Leading Organization:

Dorcads Aid International - Kenya

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
1. INTRODUCTION.....	3
1.1 Programme background.....	3
1.2 Scope of the evaluation.....	3
1.3 Key stakeholders	3
2. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION	4
2.1 Main objectives:	4
2.2 Specific objectives	4
3. EXPECTED RESULTS.....	4
3.1 Evaluation criteria:	4
3.2 Evaluation Questions.....	5
3.3 Work Plan	7
4. METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH.....	7
4.1 Introduction.....	7
4.2 Approach to rigour and learning	7
4.3 Methodological approach	8
4.4 Qualitative and complexity-aware methods.....	8
4.5 Desk review and document analysis	8
4.6 Sampling and stakeholder engagement.....	8
5. DELIVERABLES.....	9
5.1 Indicative Timeline	9
6. REQUIREMENTS	9
6.1 Consultant Qualifications	9
6.2 Application Process	9



1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Programme background

Dorcac Aid International Kenya implements a Social Protection and Empowerment (SEP) Programme aimed at improving the wellbeing, protection, resilience and socio-economic empowerment of vulnerable children, caregivers, youth, women and households facing multiple vulnerabilities. The programme comprises three complementary projects: the Siaya Future for Children (F4C) Project (3125) in Siaya County (2021-2028), Loitokitok Future for Children (F4C) Project (3456) in Kajiado County (2021 – 2028), and the Loitokitok Social Protection Pilot Project (KEN1761) in Kajiado County (2025- 2026).

The Future for Children projects (3125 & 3456) are implemented through four interconnected pillars: life skills development, child protection, household economic resilience, and advocacy for positive social change. Building on this foundation, the Social Protection Pilot introduces the FLOURISH model, which supports the most vulnerable households to strengthen livelihoods, improve household planning, build resilience and progress towards graduation from vulnerability. The Pilot is currently layered on the Loitokitok Future for Children project and tests the FLOURISH model as a structured approach for supporting most-vulnerable households to strengthen livelihoods, improve household planning, build resilience and progress towards graduation from vulnerability.

This Mid-Term Evaluation will assess progress towards intended results across the three projects, including the effectiveness of beneficiary targeting (potential exclusion/inclusion errors), the contribution of programme interventions to household resilience and child wellbeing, and the added value of the FLOURISH model. The evaluation will also examine progress against the project Theories of Change and Results Frameworks to generate evidence and recommendations for adaptive management, learning, and future programming.

1.2 Scope of the evaluation

The Mid-Term Evaluation will assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, emerging outcomes, learning and sustainability of the Social Empowerment and Protection Programme across the Siaya Future for Children Project, Siaya Future for Children project and the Loitokitok Social Protection Pilot Project. It will review progress towards planned outputs and outcomes, assess the validity of the programme Theory of Change and examine contributions to project-specific and Dorcac Results Framework outcomes.

The evaluation will cover implementation from project inception to the time of the evaluation in Gem Sub-County (Siaya County) and Kajiado South Sub-County, specifically Kuku and Rombo Wards (Kajiado County). Particular attention will be given to targeting effectiveness, household resilience and graduation pathways, child protection systems and the added value of the FLOURISH model where comparison is feasible. Findings should be presented by project and, where possible, disaggregated by participant group, gender, age, disability, vulnerability status and participation in F4C-only and F4C+FLOURISH interventions.

1.3 Key stakeholders

Key stakeholders include children and youth participants, caregivers and beneficiary households, Village Saving and Loan Association (VSLA) members, mentors, teachers, school management



representatives, Children's Advisory Committees, anti-FGM and child protection structures, community and religious leaders, relevant government departments, implementing partners and Dorcas programme staff. These stakeholders will provide perspectives on programme relevance, effectiveness, targeting, household resilience, child protection outcomes, sustainability and opportunities for programme improvement.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

2.1 Main objectives:

The main objective of the Mid-Term Evaluation is to assess progress towards the achievement of intended outputs and outcomes, validate the intervention logic, and evaluate performance against the agreed project-specific and Dorcas Results Framework indicators. The evaluation will also generate practical, evidence-based recommendations to strengthen implementation, learning, accountability, and sustainability during the remaining project period.

2.2 Specific objectives

- (i) Assess the relevance and effectiveness of programme interventions in improving child wellbeing, protection, household resilience, economic empowerment, and graduation readiness among children, youth, caregivers, and vulnerable households.
- (ii) Evaluate progress towards intended project-specific Results, contribution to the Dorcas Results Framework and the validity of the programme Theory of Change, including its assumptions and pathways of change.
- (iii) Examine the efficiency and coherence of programme implementation, including resource utilization, delivery mechanisms, partnerships, monitoring systems and alignment with community and government structures.
- (iv) Identify lessons learned, good practices and factors influencing programme performance, including the added value of the FLOURISH model where comparison is feasible.
- (v) Provide practical recommendations to strengthen programme quality, sustainability, scalability, impact and accountability during the remaining implementation period and to inform future programming.

3. EXPECTED RESULTS

3.1 Evaluation criteria¹:

The Mid-Term Evaluation will be guided by the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria of Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Sustainability and Emerging Impact, recognizing that the projects are still under implementation. Cross-cutting themes including Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI), Child Protection, Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP), household resilience, and graduation pathways will be integrated throughout the assessment.

The evaluation will apply a Theory of Change (ToC)-based and Results Framework-based analytical approach. Findings will be assessed against intended pathways of change, project commitments, project-specific Results Framework indicators, and relevant Dorcas Results Framework outcomes.

¹ <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>



For the KEN 1761 pilot, the evaluation will include a comparative assessment of the FLOURISH model within the Future for Children programme, examining its contribution to household resilience and graduation outcomes where comparison with non-FLOURISH-supported households is feasible. The evaluation will also assess the value for money and cost-benefit of Sustainability Boost investments provided to selected VSLA enterprises, including the assumptions, evidence and limitations underpinning the analysis.

3.2 Evaluation Questions

Q#	Core evaluation question	DAC criterion
Q1	To what extent are the three projects relevant to the needs, priorities and vulnerabilities of children, caregivers, youth, women and ultra-poor households in Siaya and Kajiado?	Relevance
Q2	To what extent have the projects achieved planned outputs and made progress towards outcomes related to child wellbeing, life skills, education support, household resilience and social protection? How have the three projects contributed to the relevant Dorcas Results Framework outcomes and indicators?	Effectiveness
Q3	How effective are household economic strengthening interventions, including VSLAs, financial literacy, IGAs, coaching and FLOURISH support, in improving household income, savings, planning and resilience?	Effectiveness
Q4	To what extent have child protection, parenting, mentorship anti-FGM, community safety-net and referral mechanisms been strengthened and used by communities?	Effectiveness
Q5	How efficient and coherent are the programme design, implementation arrangements, partnerships, resource use and monitoring systems across the three projects?	Efficiency/ Coherence
Q6	What emerging changes are visible in child wellbeing, household resilience, empowerment, protection, community participation and access to services?	Emerging Impact
Q7	To what extent are project benefits likely to be sustained through households, VSLAs, community structures, partners, churches, schools and government actors after project support reduces?	Sustainability
Q8	How clear, appropriate and consistently applied are the graduation process and criteria used to assess household readiness to graduate from vulnerability, and what evidence shows movement along the graduation pathway?	Graduation / Sustainability
Q9	What lessons, good practices, adaptations and recommendations should guide the remaining implementation period and future Social Protection and Empowerment programming?	Learning
Q10	To what extent did the project Theories of Change hold true, and which assumptions, pathways and contextual factors most influenced results?	Coherence
Q11	What added value does FLOURISH generate when layered onto Future for Children, compared with Future for Children support without FLOURISH where a meaningful comparison is possible?	Effectiveness



Q#	Core evaluation question	Suggested indicators / areas of inquiry	Methods	Data sources
Q1	Relevance to beneficiary needs and context	Priority needs of children, caregivers and most vulnerable households; appropriateness of F4C and FLOURISH models; inclusion of gender, disability, age and vulnerability; local context differences between Siaya and Kajiado.	Desk review; survey; FGDs; KIIs	Proposals; baseline data; beneficiary records; community FGDs; staff and government KIIs
Q2	Progress towards planned results	Achievement of outputs and outcome indicators; participation in life skills, education support, parenting, mentorship, VSLA, IGA and FLOURISH activities; differences by project, gender, age and vulnerability group.	Indicator review; survey; KIIs; FGDs	Logframes; RFW data; MEAL reports; attendance records; partner reports; beneficiary survey
Q3	Household economic strengthening and resilience	Savings behaviour; household budgeting; income diversification; IGA performance; VSLA participation; access to basic needs; coping capacity; movement towards graduation readiness among pilot households.	Household survey; VSLA review; case studies; MSC	Household data; VSLA records; IGA records; FLOURISH tools; mentor logs; survey data
Q4	Child wellbeing, protection and community safety nets	Self-esteem and life skills; school participation; parenting and mentorship support; child protection awareness; functionality of Children's Advisory Committees, anti-FGM structures and referral pathways; community ownership.	Child-sensitive FGDs; KIIs; observation; case studies	Child/youth FGDs; caregiver FGDs; teacher KIIs; protection records; referral records; mentor reports
Q5	Efficiency, coherence and programme management	Timeliness and quality of implementation; resource use; staffing and coordination; complementarity between F4C and FLOURISH; alignment with government and community systems; usefulness of MEAL data for decision-making.	Desk review; financial review; KIIs; partner reflection	Budgets; expenditure reports; workplans; monitoring reports; staff KIIs; partner KIIs
Q6	Emerging impact and unintended effects	Observed changes in wellbeing, empowerment, resilience, school participation, protection, confidence, decision-making, access to services and community participation; positive or negative unintended effects.	Survey; MSC; outcome harvesting; FGDs	Beneficiary survey; case stories; monitoring data; community FGDs; staff reflections
Q7	Sustainability and graduation pathways	Capacity of households, VSLAs, community structures, schools, churches, partners and government actors to sustain results; risks to sustainability; graduation readiness; linkages to services and social protection systems.	Sustainability assessment; KIIs; FGDs; case studies	Household plans; VSLA records; government KIIs; partner reports; community structure records
Q8	Graduation process and criteria	Clarity and relevance of graduation criteria; household readiness indicators; consistency of assessment; use of graduation scorecards or household plans; evidence of movement from vulnerability towards resilience; barriers preventing graduation.	Scorecard review; household survey; KIIs; case studies	Graduation tools; household plans; mentor logs; FLOURISH records; beneficiary interviews; partner reports



Q9	Learning and adaptive management	Good practices; implementation bottlenecks; adaptations needed; replicable approaches; recommendations for the remaining period and future SEP design.	Learning workshop; KIIs; synthesis review	All evaluation findings; validation workshop; staff and partner reflections
Q10	Theory of Change validity	Validity of individual, community and society-level pathways; assumptions that held true or failed; contextual enablers and barriers; unintended pathway changes.	ToC review; contribution analysis; KIIs; FGDs	ToC documents; proposals; RFW data; monitoring reports; staff and partner KIIs; beneficiary FGDs
Q11	Added value of FLOURISH compared with F4C-only support	Differences in household planning, savings, budgeting, income diversification, resilience, graduation readiness and perceived change between F4C-only and F4C + FLOURISH participants, taking into account differences in project duration and context.	Comparative analysis; survey disaggregation; case studies; KIIs; contribution analysis	FLOURISH records; F4C records; mentor logs; household plans; survey data; project monitoring data; beneficiary interviews

3.3 Work Plan

The work plan will include:

- Methodology and data collection tools
- Sampling framework and stakeholder engagement plan
- Fieldwork plan
- Ethical considerations, including child safeguarding and informed consent procedures
- Data management, analysis and quality assurance approach.
- Timeline and deliverables for each phase of the evaluation.

4. METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH

4.1 Introduction

The evaluation will adopt a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis. It will be participatory, gender-sensitive, child-sensitive and context-appropriate, ensuring that the perspectives of children, caregivers, vulnerable households, community structures, implementing partners and government stakeholders are adequately represented. Given the involvement of children and other vulnerable groups, the evaluation must comply with Dorcas' Child Safeguarding, Prevention of Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment (PSEAH), Data Protection, and Do No Harm policies and standards throughout the evaluation process.

4.2 Approach to rigour and learning

The evaluator will ensure methodological rigour through clear evaluation questions, appropriate sampling, triangulation of data sources, disaggregation of findings where possible, and transparent documentation of limitations. The evaluation should focus not only on whether results are being achieved, but also on why and how change is happening, what implementation barriers exist, and what adaptations are needed. Because several interventions operate simultaneously, the evaluator should



use contribution analysis rather than claim direct attribution and should be explicit about the strength and limits of evidence.

4.3 Methodological approach

The evaluation methodology should include a desk review, household or beneficiary survey, key informant interviews, focus group discussions, direct observation, case studies and Most Significant Change stories. Quantitative data will be used to assess progress against indicators, while qualitative methods will explore beneficiary experiences, implementation quality, contextual factors, sustainability and lessons learned.

4.4 Qualitative and complexity-aware methods

Qualitative methods will be used to understand complex change processes, including household decision-making, empowerment, child protection dynamics, livelihood choices, mentoring relationships, social norms, and the contribution of different intervention components. The evaluator should apply participatory and age-appropriate tools when engaging children and youth. Qualitative inquiry should explicitly explore ToC assumptions, household decision-making, mentoring quality, child and adolescent empowerment, protection-system functionality and the role of community and government actors in sustaining change.

4.5 Desk review and document analysis

The desk review will cover project proposals, log frames, results frameworks, MEAL plans, baseline reports, monitoring data, progress reports, financial information, training records, case stories, household profile data, community records and any other relevant programme documentation. The desk review must include the approved project proposals, project ToCs, project-specific RFWs, Dorcas RFWs, MEAL plans, baseline or previous assessment data, graduation tools, household plans or scorecards, and monitoring datasets.

4.6 Sampling and stakeholder engagement

The evaluator will propose an appropriate sampling strategy during the inception phase. The sample should include beneficiaries from all three projects and reflect key beneficiary categories, including children, caregivers, VSLA members, ultra-poor households, elderly-headed households, single-parent households and households headed by persons with disabilities where applicable. Stakeholder engagement should include both project participants and duty bearers. The sample should deliberately include both F4C + FLOURISH households and comparable F4C-only households in the relevant project areas, where feasible, to enable learning on the added value of FLOURISH while acknowledging differences in timing and context.



5. DELIVERABLES

The consultant will be required to submit the following deliverables:

1. Inception Report that includes evaluation matrix; detailed methodology; sampling strategy and sample sizes; data collection tools; and work plan including timelines.
2. Finalised Data Collection Tools approved by Dorcas before commencement of fieldwork.
3. Draft Mid-Term Evaluation Report.
4. Validation Workshop Presentation summarising key findings, conclusions and recommendations for discussion with Dorcas and relevant stakeholders.
5. Final Mid-Term Evaluation Report, incorporating feedback received during the validation process.

5.1 Indicative Timeline

The evaluation is expected to take approximately 22 working days from inception to final reporting. The exact dates will be agreed with Dorcas Aid International Kenya and the selected consultant during contracting and inception.

6. REQUIREMENTS

6.1 Consultant Qualifications

The lead evaluator should have:

- Master's degree in Social Sciences, Development Studies, Monitoring & Evaluation, Economics, Statistics or related fields
- At least 7 years' experience conducting programme evaluations.
- Demonstrated experience in social protection, child protection, Household Economic Strengthening and graduation models.
- Strong quantitative and qualitative research skills.
- Experience conducting OECD-DAC based evaluations.
- Experience working with NGOs and community-based development programmes in Kenya.
- Excellent report writing and facilitation skills.

6.2 Application Process

Interested consultants or consulting firms should submit the following:

1. Technical and Financial Proposal (combined in a single PDF document), including:
 - Understanding of the assignment and evaluation objectives;
 - Proposed methodology and work plan;
 - Proposed team composition and roles (where applicable);
 - Relevant experience and qualifications;
 - Detailed financial proposal and budget.
2. Company/Consultant Profile, including CV(s) of the lead consultant and key team members.
3. Examples of similar assignments, providing one or two recent evaluation reports or samples of comparable work undertaken.
4. References, including contact details of at least two clients for whom similar evaluations have been conducted.

All applications should be submitted by Close of Business (COB) on **Thursday, 20 August 2026**, by email to kenyaoffice@kenya.dorcas.org with the subject title: ***"Mid-term evaluation of Social Empowerment and Protection Programme"***

