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1 Background information

1.1 About SOS Children’s Villages

SOS Children’s Villages International is the umbrella organisation for the global federation of 116 national SOS Children’s Villages associations, working in more than 2000 programme locations worldwide. We work together with a single mission: to ensure that every child grows with love, security and respect.

Uniquely, we provide alternative care for children who have lost parental care (family-based care programme/FBC), and we work with vulnerable families and communities to help strengthen them and prevent child abandonment (family strengthening programme/FS). The family-based care programmes are usually organised in the form of a cluster of SOS families and/or foster families, where SOS parents care for small groups of children.

This evaluation is divided in two parts.

- **Part A** includes the terms of reference for the evaluation of the outcomes (results) for children, foster parents and communities after moving from a classical SOS Children's Village in rural areas to community-integrated housing in urban areas in Hungary and Bulgaria.

- **Part B** includes the terms of reference for the evaluation of the project “Improved opportunities for vulnerable children in Békés county”, Hungary.

Evaluation parts A and B are to be completed for Hungary. If the evaluators are only evaluating Part A in Bulgaria, Part B is not required.

2 PART A: EVALUATION OF OUTCOMES (RESULTS) FOR CHILDREN, FOSTER PARENTS, AND COMMUNITIES AFTER MOVING FROM A CLASSICAL SOS CHILDREN’S VILLAGE IN RURAL AREAS TO COMMUNITY INTEGRATED HOUSING IN URBAN AREAS IN HUNGARY AND BULGARIA

2.1 Background: the relocations

From the roots of the organisation, SOS Children’s Villages pioneered family-based child care for children who have lost the care of their own family, through the development of family-based childcare in SOS Children’s Villages (CV)\(^1\). More recently, alternative care forms integrated in the community are developing and favoured. As such is the case in Hungary and Bulgaria, where foster families from two classical CV settings moved to an integrated urban environment.

In 2013 SOS Children’s Villages Hungary decided to relocate CV Battonya to another, bigger location. The CV Battonya was built in 1985, its buildings needed major and costly renovation and the location was by far not optimal in terms of available resources and services to provide quality alternative care for children. After an in-depth analysis process of different possible scenarios and locations, and consultation with relevant stakeholders, relocation to Orosháza was chosen as the best option for the 10 foster families. Orosháza has a wider spectrum of schools and educational services, there is a good public transport system, and it is economically developing. In May 2014 the project was awarded a grant making the move possible. After several preparatory steps, the move took place in the summer of 2015.

SOS Children’s Village Dren (Bulgaria) was established in 1995 in partnership with Radomir municipality, in Pernik region. During the past years the village of Dren was facing low economic development and high emigration rates. Public transport to Sofia and bigger cities in the region was scarce, and the local school in Dren provided primary and elementary education in undersized classes. In addition, the access to health care, psychosocial services and availability of leisure time activities was limited. Negotiations with the local municipality were initiated and the decision was taken to relocate eight families to Sofia and four families to Pernik, in response to the need for foster families

\(^1\) Here and after, the abbreviation CV will be used for “children’s village”.

A loving home for every child
in these two localities, as well as better development opportunities for the children. The move of the families took place in the summer of 2015.

The overall goals of the relocation of SOS families from Battonya to Orosháza as well as from Dren to Sofia and Pernik were to:

- Make positive changes in the lives of children by ensuring:
  - Improved social integration of families/children and their caregivers into community
  - Increased access to community services (health, education, psycho-social development)
  - Increased responsibility and independence/autonomy of families/children and caregivers
  - Improved contact to families of origin – in terms of physical proximity and regularity of contact
- Improved efficiency and reduced costs, to enhance future sustainability
- Improved recruitment possibilities of new foster parents and attractiveness of job at SOS CVs
- Increased partnerships and cooperation with local stakeholders, including strengthening the local foster care system

2.2 Statistics about the situation before and after the move

**SOS Children’s Villages Bulgaria - Sofia/Pernik (including youth facilities):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Number of SOS foster parents</th>
<th>Number of youth in youth facilities</th>
<th>Number of psycho-pedagogical staff and SOS aunts (please distinguish between youth facilities and children’s village)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relocated from Dren to Sofia/Pernik</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Youth facility: 0 Children’s Village: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left since relocation</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2 (1 in pension)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Youth facility:0 Children’s Village: 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New child admissions/new staff in Sofia/Pernik</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Youth facility:0 Children’s Village:0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOS Children’s Village Hungary - Oroshaza (including youth facilities):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Number of SOS foster parents</th>
<th>Number of SOS foster families</th>
<th>Number of youth in youth facilities</th>
<th>Number of supporting staff (please distinguish between youth facilities and children’s village)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relocated from Battonya to Oroshaza</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Youth facility: 6 Children’s Village: 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left since relocation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Youth facility: 0 Children’s Village: 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New child admissions/new staff in Oroshaza</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Youth facility: 0 Children’s Village: 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Instruction to bidders

3.1 General
This bid is open to all national and international suppliers (independent consultants or companies) who are legally constituted and can provide the requested services. The bidder shall bear all costs of the bid; the costs of a proposal cannot be included as a direct cost of the assignment.

The bidders are welcome to bid for the evaluation in either one of the mentioned countries (Hungary or Bulgaria) or in both countries. In this case, the bidder has to prove existence of respective resources to conduct evaluations in both countries simultaneously or at least within the time frame indicated in the price schedule form. The data collection phase can be calculated twice in that case, whereas all other phases and deliverables shall be calculated only once and thus applying the same methodology in both countries. In order to ensure methodological continuity, an Austrian research institute will be accompanying the evaluation(s) throughout the process.

3.1.1 Roles and responsibilities
Roles and responsibilities in the evaluation:
- Main clients of the evaluation: SOS Children’s Villages Hungary, SOS Children’s Villages Bulgaria
- The regional office for Central and Eastern Europe and Commonwealth of Independent States of SOS Children’s Villages International will coordinate the overall process
- Austrian research institute will accompany the evaluation(s) throughout the process

3.1.2 Language of the bid
The proposal and all supplementary documents have to be submitted in English. In addition, the bidder has to cover all translation costs related to field interviews.

3.1.3 Bid currency
The financial bid needs to be stated in EUR.

3.2 Process of Submission of Bids
Proposals should be sent to:
To facilitate the submission of proposals, the submission, duly stamped and signed, can be sent electronically in PDF format to Rosalind.Willi@sos-kd.org

The titles of submitted documents should clearly state “Technical proposal for the evaluation of the relocation project in country XXX by the company/consultant title” and “Financial Proposal for the evaluation of the relocation project in country XXX by the company/consultant title”. Please make sure that the technical and financial proposals are handed in separately (financial proposal to be submitted in a separate PDF file). During the process of evaluation, technical bids will be opened and evaluated first. The financial part of those proposals, which are shortlisted after evaluation of the technical proposal, will then be opened as a second step.

Documents to submit
- Bid submission / identification form
- Previous experience form
- Price schedule form (to be sent as a separate PDF file)
- Technical proposal
- CVs of the research team member(s) including current geographical location(s)
- Three references (at least two of them must be familiar with your work)
- An example of a recent/relevant evaluation report (if available for public use)

Deadline for submission
The proposal has to be received latest by 7th November, 2016. Proposals received after this deadline will not be considered.
Modification and withdrawal of bids
Proposals may be withdrawn as per written request prior to the closing date of this invitation. Any corrections or changes must be received prior to the closing date. Changes must be clearly stated in comparison to the original proposal. Failure to do so will be at the bidder’s own risk and disadvantage.

Signing of the contract
SOS Children’s Villages International will inform the successful bidder electronically and will send the contract form within 3 weeks after closure of the bid submission deadline. The successful bidder shall sign and date the contract, and return it to SOS Children’s Villages within seven calendar days upon receipt of the contract. After the contract is signed by two parties, the successful bidder shall deliver the services in accordance with the delivery schedule outlined in the bid.

Rights of SOS Children’s Villages:
- contact any or all references supplied by the bidder(s);
- request additional supporting or supplementary data (from the bidder(s));
- arrange interviews with the bidder(s);
- reject any or all proposals submitted;
- accept any proposals in whole or in part;
- negotiate with the service provider(s) who has/have attained the best rating/ranking, i.e. the proposal(s) providing the best overall value;
- contract any number of candidates as required to achieve the overall evaluation objectives

4 Terms of Reference

4.1 Overall objectives and scope of the evaluation of the relocation

The evaluation will take place approximately 18 months after the relocation of the families from a traditional Children’s Village setting in rural areas to community integrated housing in urban areas. The evaluation aims to assess the changes in the lives of children and young people, their caregivers and their communities and the overall process of the relocation:

A. Changes (positive/negative, intended/unintended) brought by the relocation process on individual child level: The actual effects of the relocation on current-child participants, whether these individuals are still children living in SOS foster families or young people living in SOS youth facilities and participating in different after care programmes or already independent adults/former programme participants. Dimensions for assessing individual changes/short to medium term outcomes are: accommodation, physical health (including access to health care services), education (including access to educational services), protection & social integration/inclusion (evidence of improved integration), emotional & social well-being and relation with the families of origin (frequency and quality of relation).

B. Changes (positive/negative, intended/unintended) brought by the relocation process on individual caregiver level: The actual effects of the relocation on SOS foster parents. Dimensions for assessing individual changes/short to medium term outcomes are: accommodation, physical health (including improved access to health care services), emotional and social well-being, integration into community, cooperation with the families of origin, professional support structure.

C. Changes (positive/negative, intended/unintended) on community level: The actual short to medium term effects of the programme on the communities with which the programme has been working. Dimensions for assessing community level changes are: effects on foster care system, effects on close neighbourhood (neighbours, schools), effects on the network of foster parents who used to live in the SOS Children’s Village, community-based support systems, progress towards sustainability.
D. **Lessons that can be drawn from the process of relocation** that can be taken to further develop and inform relocation processes (i.e. initial assessments, preparing and planning the move, looking for housing, information flow throughout the process, time frame of overall relocation process, key success factors, key risks/blockers etc.)

E. **Changes in efficiency** of relocated programmes and an analysis of cost-benefits since the relocation

In order to answer the above questions, baseline information from before the move should be reconstructed. Baseline information can be reconstructed by reviewing programme documentation, case files and retrieving the data from an internal programme database.

Major guiding questions that can be answered during the evaluation process can be found in Annex 6.1.

### 4.1.1 Scope

The family based care programme with its child programme participants, including young people participating in the youth care programme (Youth Facilities affiliated to the respective family based care programme), young people participating in different after care programmes (affiliated to the respective family based care programme) and main care givers/SOS foster parents shall be included and participate in the evaluation.

### 4.2 Methodology and approach

The evaluation should apply mixed methods: individual and group interviews with child participants and young people, SOS care-givers, staff, community members using quantitative and qualitative data collections tools (e.g. structured and semi-structured interviews, focus groups, network analysis, service mapping, satisfaction surveys, photo documentation, or any other relevant methodology).

The applicant should describe in detail suggested methods and sampling.

**Key informants are:**

1. Children - currently in care (distinguish between children who were relocated and children admitted later in the new location)
2. Young people - currently in care (including young people living in youth facilities affected by relocation in some way i.e. sibling etc.)
3. Former-child participants who grew up in the “old location”
4. Caregivers/foster parents (distinguish between foster parents who were relocated, those who left after the relocation, and those who were hired later in the new location)
5. Programme Staff
6. National staff
7. Child welfare services

### 4.3 Evaluation process and expected deliverables

The evaluation process is divided into four phases. The first phase, the evaluability assessment, has been carried out in advance through an internal assessment and does not require any further action by the researcher:

1. **Phase 1: Prepare data collection methodology and evaluation design**
   a. Prepare evaluation set-up and data collection procedures.
   b. Composition of an assessment team and training of interviewers (if applicable).
   c. Development of data collection tools for each group of interviewees considering child-friendly methodology where appropriate and making necessary adaptations as per local context.
   d. Plan and organise the data collection process (in collaboration with local SOS staff).
   e. **Submit and secure approval for the evaluation design and methodology at workshop in Vienna with Austrian research institute (possibly 5-7 December): document (i) methodological set-up, (ii) locally adapted data collection tools, (iii) summary of national/local benchmark data (if applicable).**
f. Preparation of checklists, participant lists and other management/organisational information for data collection.

2. **Phase 2: On-site data collection, analysis and synthesis phase**
   
g. Collection of data.
   
h. Analysis and synthesis of the data.
   
i. Workshop on reviewing and comparing data as an input to draft report with Austrian research institute (date to be defined)

3. **Phase 3: Report development, presentation and finalization phase**
   
j. Preparation of a draft report
   
k. Presentation of the findings to the programme staff / national office staff / regional office team of SOS Children’s Villages International / Austrian research institute
   
l. After having received feedback from the various stakeholders – finalise the report

---

**Deliverables:**

1. **Presentation of preliminary results to SOS Children’s Villages XXX Country, regional office team of SOS Children’s Villages International (face-to-face) and Austrian research institute**

2. **First draft of the final report**

3. **Final report**

4. **Refined evaluation methodology and data collection tools**

All deliverables need to be approved by SOS Children’s Villages International.

### 4.3.1 Timetable (Evaluation Work Plan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Time frame</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 1:</strong> Prepare data collection methodology and evaluation design (including evaluation design workshop with Austrian research institute)</td>
<td>31st of December 2016</td>
<td>Up to 4 weeks</td>
<td>Desk / workshop location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 2:</strong> On-site data collection Analysis and synthesis phase (including workshop on reviewing and comparing data as an input to draft report with Austrian research institute)</td>
<td>Jan-Feb March</td>
<td>Up to 8 weeks / Up to 4 weeks</td>
<td>Programme locations / Desk / workshop location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase 3:</strong> Report development, presentation and finalization phase</td>
<td>April-May</td>
<td>Up to 8 weeks</td>
<td>Desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deadline of final report:</strong></td>
<td>31st of May 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3.2 Qualification of the researcher / research team

The researcher / team of researchers must have:

a) proven competency (record of previous experiences) in project/programme evaluations, including mid-term evaluation and cost-benefit analysis

b) a good understanding of development work in CEE/CIS
c) a good understanding of child rights and issues affecting vulnerable children and their families
d) good facilitation, organisational and interpersonal skills
e) proven experience in participatory processes and data collection methods (including age-appropriate data collection methods)
f) strong skills in coordinating teamwork
g) strong analytical and conceptual skills
h) excellent writing skills
i) ability to transfer complex concepts and ideas into practical and simple language
j) ideally experience in organising research processes with/for SOS Children’s Villages

4.3.3 Logistical arrangements
When at the programme location, accommodation and transport to the field will be covered by the member association (not to be included in price proposal).

National or location level staff (SOS) will be available to help organize the interviews including contacting SOS programme participants, announcement and local preparation of evaluation, linking to community duty bearers and national authorities if required.

4.4 Duration of the contract and terms of payment
Payment will be made only upon SOS Children’s Villages’ acceptance of the work performed in accordance with the above described deliverables. Financial proposals should include proposed stage payments. Payment will be effected by bank transfer in the currency of billing and is due 30 days after receipt of the invoice and acceptance of work.

Funding and Payment: The consultant will be paid by SOS Children’s Villages as follows:
25% upon the submission and approval of Technical Proposal
25% upon completion of the Draft Report
50% upon successful completion of the activities and delivery of the expected outputs

Duration of the contract: the contract is effective from the moment it was signed until the acceptance of the work by SOS CVI.

4.5 Notice of delay
If the successful bidder encounters delays in the performance of the contract, which may be excusable under unavoidable circumstances, the Contractor should notify SOS Children’s Villages in writing about the causes of any such delays within one (1) week from the beginning of the delay.
After receipt of the Contractor’s notice of delay, SOS Children’s Villages shall analyse the facts and extent of delay, and extend the timeframe for performance if in its judgement the facts justify such an extension.

4.6 Copyright and other proprietary rights
SOS Children’s Villages shall be entitled to all intellectual property and other proprietary rights including, but not limited to, copyrights, and trademarks, with regard to products, processes, inventions, ideas, know-how, or documents and other materials which the Contractor has developed for SOS Children’s Villages under the Contract and which bear a direct relation to or are produced or prepared or collected in consequence of, or during the course of, the performance of the Contract.

All materials: plans, reports, estimates, recommendations, documents, and all other data compiled by or received by the Contractor under the Contract shall be the property of SOS Children’s Villages and shall be treated as confidential, and shall be delivered only to SOS Children’s Villages authorized officials on completion of work under the Contract. The external consultant is obliged to hand over all raw data collected during the assessment to SOS Children’s Villages.

4.7 Termination
SOS Children’s Villages reserves the right to terminate without cause this Contract at any time upon forty-five (45) days prior written notice to the Contractor, in which case SOS Children’s Villages shall
reimburse the Contractor for all reasonable costs incurred by the Contractor prior to receipt of the notice of termination.

SOS Children’s Villages reserves the right to terminate the contract without any financial obligations in case if the contractor is not meeting its obligations without any prior notice:

- agreed time schedule
- withdrawal or replacement of key personnel without obtaining written consent from SOS Children’s Villages
- the deliverables do not comply with requirements of the ToR

5 PART B: EVALUATION OF PROJECT “IMPROVED OPPORTUNITIES FOR VULNERABLE CHILDREN IN BÉKÉS COUNTY”, HUNGARY

5.1 Background information and statistics

5.1.1 Background

PART B of the evaluation is an extension of PART A in the case of Hungary. The relocation of foster families from CV Battonya to Orosháza to integrated housing was financed by a grant from Velux Foundation. However, the relocation was only one part of the larger project: “Improved opportunities for vulnerable children in Békés county”. The overall goal of the project was to improve the opportunities of vulnerable children by widening the scope of community-based services provided by SOS Children’s Villages Hungary in Békés county.

In PART B of the evaluation the following parts of the Velux project should be considered:

- Family Strengthening programme in Battonya (focus on economic empowerment by participation in a chicken farming programme)
- Family Strengthening programme in Orosháza (focus on psycho-social support for vulnerable families)
- Advocacy activities in the community of Orosháza to raise awareness on the rights of vulnerable children
- Independent living programme for young people – expansion of care places, where young people live independently and diversification of services for young people to improve their employability
- Partnerships developed in Orosháza location, to where the SOS families were relocated.

5.1.2 Statistics on the family strengthening programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Strengthening programme</th>
<th>Date of start</th>
<th>Number of children and young adults involved (data from 09/2016)</th>
<th>Number of families involved (data from 09/2016)</th>
<th>Number of staff (data from 09/2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Battonya</td>
<td>07/2015</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orosháza</td>
<td>03/2016</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Overall objectives and scope

5.2.1 Overall objectives

The evaluation aims to assess whether the planned activities of the Velux project were successfully and efficiently implemented. A special focus should be given to the newly started community based programmes: family strengthening programmes, independent living programme for young people and advocacy activities which all started after July 2014 within the Velux project. The evaluation aims to assess what short-to-mid-term changes these new programmes brought to the local community, the families and children involved in the programme, and the relevance of these programmes to the needs of vulnerable children and families in the affected communities (Battonya, Orosháza).

5.2.2 Scope

Staff members, stakeholders and beneficiaries of the new programmes that started within the Velux project should be involved in the evaluation.

It is important that Part A and Part B form one evaluation, since they are part of the same project and complement each other.

For example: young people are affected by relocation (PART A) and by the expanded youth programmes (PART B). Local stakeholders are affected by the relocation (PART A) and the new programmes (PART B). Staff is also involved in the implementation of the relocation (PART A) and new programmes (PART B).

Velux Foundation will organize the financial evaluation of the project. Therefore this evaluation does not include a financial report.

5.3 Methodology and approach

As in PART A, the evaluation should apply mixed methods, which the evaluator has the freedom to develop. Several additional sources of information will be available for the Velux project:

- Velux Project Summary
- Work plan
- Progress reports (every 6 months)
- Logframes for family strengthening programmes
- Mid-term monitoring report of family strengthening programme

Key informants are partly the same as in PART A:

- Young people in care and who recently left care
- Programme staff
- National staff
- Child welfare services

Additional key informants for PART B:

- Children and families in the family strengthening programmes, both locations
- Local government, local partners

The evaluation of the Velux project should follow the description of monitoring indicators included in the Annex

Chapters 3 and 4.2-4.6 and annex chapters 6.2-6.8 of the Request for Proposal apply for PART B as well.
6 Annex

6.1 PART A: Evaluation questions related to the relocation

These questions are to serve as a guideline for the external evaluators. Questions can be further elaborated and supportive methodology to be determined by the external researcher in agreement with the contracting party.

A. Changes (positive/negative, intended/unintended) brought by the relocation process on individual child level

Subquestions:
Accommodation
- What are the main characteristics of the current accommodation?
- Are there any structural issues regarding the current accommodation?
- How similar/different is the current accommodation and living conditions from those of the neighbours?
- What are significant positive/negative changes of the current accommodation in comparison to the previous one?
- What is the level of satisfaction with the current accommodation?
- How can the accommodation and living conditions be further improved?

Protection & social integration/inclusion (evidence of improved integration)

- How has the social integration process started in the first year?
- What is the feeling of security and protection in the new environment?
- Do children experience any type of discrimination in the new environment?
- What is the personal network of children/young people? What is the evidence of diversification of the personal network?
- Are children/young people more independent?
- How has family autonomy developed?
- What is the satisfaction level with possibilities for social integration?
- Do children feel part of the community? If not, why?
- How can the social integration process be further supported?

Physical health (including access to health care services)
- How did the access to health care services change?
- How different is the access, extent and quality of health care services in the new location in comparison to the previous one?
- Are there any health care issues that cannot be addressed? If yes, why?
- What is the satisfaction level with health care services?
- How can the access to quality health care services be further improved?

Education (including access to educational services)
- What is the level of school enrolment?
- What is the level of school attendance?
- How has the performance at school changed during the past year?
- How has the access to educational services changed?
- What is the level of satisfaction with the quality of educational services?
- How can the access to quality educational services be further improved?

Some key markers for social integration:
- access to community services (school, health, psychosocial)
- diverse social networks
- similar living conditions
- sense of belonging to community/larger social structure
- happiness, self-esteem
- participation in voluntary work
Emotional & social well-being
- What is the level of happiness and emotional wellbeing?
- What is the level of social well-being?
- How has the move affected social and emotional well-being?

Relationship with the families of origin (frequency of contact and quality of relationship)
- How have relations with the families of origin changed – in terms of frequency and quality?
- Are children satisfied?
- How can the relationship with the families of origin be further improved?

General
- What in your opinion were the most significant changes (positive or negative) that the relocation process has brought to your life?
- How did the relocation process affect you?
- Were you well-informed about the relocation process?
- In what way were you engaged in the relocation process?
- What are the main changes in terms of support provided from the level of SOS CV?
- What would you suggest to be done differently if a similar process were initiated in the lives of your peers?

Additional questions for young people from youth facilities and after care programmes
- What major changes have happened in terms of frequency of contact and quality of the relationship with your SOS family?

B. Changes (positive/negative, intended/unintended) brought by the relocation process on individual caregiver level

Subquestions:
Accommodation
- What are the main characteristics of the current accommodation?
- Are there any structural issues with the current accommodation?
- How similar/different are the current accommodation and living conditions from those of your neighbours?
- What are significant positive/negative differences of the current accommodation in comparison to the previous one?
- What is the level of satisfaction level with current accommodation?
- How can the accommodation and living conditions be further improved?

Integration into community
- How has the social integration process started in the first year?
- What is the personal & professional network of the caregiver? What is the evidence of diversification of the personal & professional network?
- Is the caregiver more autonomous and independent?
- How has family autonomy developed?
- What is the level of satisfaction with possibilities for social integration?
- Do caregivers feel part of the community? Why, why not?
- How can the integration process be further supported?

Physical health (including access to health care services)
- How different is the access, extent and quality of health care services in the new location in comparison to the previous one?
- Are there any health care issues that cannot be addressed? If so, why?
- What is the satisfaction level with health care services?
- How can the access to quality health care services be further improved?

Emotional & social well-being
- What is the level of social and emotional well-being of the caregiver?
- Do caregivers feel well supported by the organisation?
- What is the level of contact of caregivers with peers from SOS and external foster parents? What is the level of contact to neighbours?

**Relation with the families of origin (frequency and quality of relation)**
- How have relations with the families of origin changed – in terms of frequency and quality?
- How have relations with families of origin changed for the caregiver? Did the relocation cause any significant change?
- How can the relations with families of origin be further improved?

**Professional support structure**
- What are the main changes in terms of support provided from the level of SOS CV to caregivers?
- What are the main changes in terms of professional support provided from the level of SOS CV to caregivers?
- Did relocation process bring additional opportunities for professional development and growth?

**General**
- What in your opinion was the most significant change (positive or negative) that the relocation process has brought to your life?
- How did the relocation process affect you?
- Were you well informed about the decision to relocate and the process?
- In what way have you been engaged in the relocation process?
- What would you suggest to be done differently if a similar process would happen in the life of your peers?

**C. Changes (positive/negative, intended/unintended) on community level**

**Subquestions:**
**Effects on the close neighbourhood/network of foster parents**
- Were community members and key partners properly informed and involved in the relocation process?
- What are the effects of the relocation process on the relationship between the SOS families formerly living in Dren/Battonya (frequency of contact etc)?
- How has the relocation affected neighbouring communities?

**Community-based support systems**
- Is there a strong social support system in the community that can effectively respond to the situation of children and young people today and in the future?
- How well do community networks respond to the situation of the target group?
- How is SOS CV’s involved in community networks?
- How established is the child protection system in the community? How does SOS CV work within these mechanisms?
- Do partners work in a coordinated fashion to support the target group? How is SOS CV involved?
- In how far is there civic engagement of community members for the situation of the target group?

**Progress towards sustainability**
- To what extent do community-based partners of SOS CV have the capacities required to take a leading role in responding to the situation of children?
- What is the situation of alternative care in the community?
- How many other alternative care providers are there? What is the contribution of SOS CV to the situation of our target group in this regard?
- How many new children have been admitted to SOS foster families since the relocation? Is there a difference in the number of admittances to before?

**D. Lessons that can be drawn from the process of relocation**

**Subquestions:**
- How efficient was the relocation process?
- How was the integration process supported?
- What are important factors for a successful relocation process?
E. Efficiency (including cost-benefits analysis)

Subquestions:

**Efficiency**
- Are adequate and sufficient resources invested in the programme, in terms of human resources, infrastructure and equipment, adequate transport and funds?
- What is the ratio of cost/quality?
- How have the running costs developed?
- Could the outcomes and results have been achieved at a lower cost through applying a different approach?
- Have the costs for the innovative approach been rational and efficient comparing with the effect occurred?
- What are the annual total running costs and the average running costs per child per month in family based care? And how do these costs compare with the conventional SOS children's Village approach in other locations of the country where SOS runs the programme?

6.2 PART B: Monitoring indicators related to the project: Improved opportunities for vulnerable children in Békés county, Hungary

Planned activities, expected outputs and outcomes of the Velux Foundation project: Improved opportunities for vulnerable children in Békés county, Hungary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned activities</th>
<th>Planned outputs and outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Baseline studies</td>
<td>Study on children’s needs Feasibility Study Orosháza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Establish new partnership with local stakeholders</td>
<td>8 written agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Establish community-based integrated family based care in Orosháza</td>
<td>6-10 new houses for SOS families in Orosháza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Expand the programme for young people leaving care</td>
<td>1 programme for young people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Strengthen social support structures in Battonya and Orosháza by launching family strengthening programmes in both locations</td>
<td>50 children involved in FSP Battonya: families are socially and economically empowered to meet the basic needs of their children. Local support structures to protect and support vulnerable families are improved compared to baseline. 70 Children involved in FSP Orosháza: families are socially and economically empowered to meet the basic needs of their children. Local support structures to protect and support vulnerable families are improved compared to baseline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Advocacy: raising awareness on the situation, needs and rights of vulnerable children and children in alternative care, strengthen inclusive and child centered education</td>
<td>100 participants (pedagogues and other social professionals) in trainings and round table discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Evaluations</td>
<td>Mid-term family strengthening monitoring Final evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Communication</td>
<td>36 visibility documents in media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Project management</td>
<td>2 concept notes for further funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dissemination</td>
<td>Lessons learned document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3 SOS Children's Villages International Child Protection Policy and Code of conduct

**Child Protection:** SOS Children’s Villages International has a Child Protection Policy and Code of Conduct that all consultants will be expected to comply with and they will be required to sign a statement of commitment to the policy.

The Child Protection Policy is binding for all member associations as well as the General Secretariat (GSC) of SOS Children’s Villages International. The policy is applied across the whole organisation at all levels and in all types of programmes.

All employees and associates of the SOS Children's Villages are obligated to report any concerns, suspicions or allegations of any child abuse. Types of child abuse are described in the SOS Children’s Villages Child Protection Policy, along with the mandatory steps to be taken by the employee if a case of abuse is suspected. The policy support document “Working together to protect children. General Secretariat (GSC) roles and responsibilities in child protection reporting and responding” then defines mandatory steps to be taken by the GSC in regards to the reported child protection cases including those where a consultant hired by the GSC is the alleged perpetrator. The SOS Children’s Villages Code of Conduct underscores that each employee is personally responsible for reporting and further procedures are in place to protect those who submitted the report against punishment or retribution for reporting.

The steps for dealing with reported cases vary depending on the type of abuse, the individual context and the local laws, but each concern or incident reported is taken seriously. The reported case is assessed, managed and documented by the child protection team of the respective member association within the framework defined in the “Reporting and Responding Procedures for Member Associations (MAs)”; the National Director is ultimately responsible for any decisions and actions taken. In case of conflict of interest which cannot be properly addressed in a particular MA or a GSC office or concrete evidence of negligence on the part of an MA or a GSC office to decisively deal with a reported case, the case needs to be escalated to a higher level of the organisation. First level of escalation is the respective International Office Region (IOR) of SOS Children’s Villages International’s general secretariat.

The SOS Children’s Villages Child Protection Policy makes no difference between current child protection cases and historical cases of abuse. The member association takes all reported cases seriously, listens to the allegations and takes necessary steps to address the cases. The member association needs to make sure that any child currently under our care is protected from the person alleged to have been an abuser. The member association also seeks to promote the welfare of those adults who allege historical abuse.

However, it may sometimes be difficult to address the root cause of a historical case of abuse, i.e. due to the long period of time passed between the time when the abuse happened and when the case was reported. In such situations, the member association collects all available information about the case and based on thorough assessment of the case, takes necessary preventive measures to ensure that such cases will not happen again.

In addition to the above mentioned Child Protection Policy and Code of Conduct, the following key areas for ethical consideration need to be taken into account: [http://childethics.com/ethical%20guidance/](http://childethics.com/ethical%20guidance/)


Member Associations in which the evaluation is going to be carried out, have been asked to develop guidelines on how and when SOS CV would be able to provide support (or to refer to other service providers) in case of any crisis situations coming up during the interviews with either current or former programme participants. The successful bidder is requested to act in accordance with those guidelines.

The successful bidder is requested to obtain written consent from all participants of the evaluation process and/or their official guardians/representatives (when applicable)!
6.4 Bid submission / identification form

This bid form must be completed, signed and returned to SOS Children’s Villages. Bids have to reflect the instructions described in the Request for Proposal.

Any requests for information regarding this Request for Proposal shall be sent to Rosalind.willi@sos-kd.org

The Undersigned, having read the complete Request for Proposals including all attachments, hereby offers to supply the services specified in the schedule at the price indicated in the Price Schedule Form, in accordance with the Terms of Reference included in this document.

Offering service for:

☐ SOS Hungary
☐ SOS Bulgaria

Company/Institution Name/Individual’s Name___________________________________________

2. Address, Country: _______________________________________________________________

3. Telephone: _______________ Fax _______________ Website___________________________

4. Date of establishment (for companies): _________________________________

5. Name of Legal Representative (if applicable): _________________________________________

6. Contact Person: ________________________________ Email: __________________________

7. Type of Company: Ltd. Other _________________________

8. Number of Staff: ______________________________________

9. Subsidiaries in the region:

Indicate name of subsidiaries and address
a)___________________________________________________________
b)___________________________________________________________
c)___________________________________________________________

10. Commercial representative in the country (for international companies only)

Name: _______________________________________________________

Address: _______________________________________________________

Telephone: _______________________________ Fax: ______________________

Validity of Offer: valid until:____________________________________

Date

Signature and stamp
## 6.5 Previous experience form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N#</th>
<th>Description (services and products provided to the clients relevant to the current Request for Proposal)</th>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Contact person/phone, e-mail address</th>
<th>Date of assignment (from/to)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.6 Price schedule form

The financial proposal needs to include all taxes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Staff involved (indicate profile)</th>
<th>No of persons</th>
<th>No of days</th>
<th>Daily rate</th>
<th>Price (all incl.)</th>
<th>Percentage of total price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of the evaluation design and data collection methodology</td>
<td>A B C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D=AXBxC</td>
<td>E=D/F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation on preliminary results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First draft of the final report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Price (F)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accommodation and local transportation to be covered by Member Association, and is thus not to be included in the price proposal.

This proposal should be authorized, signed and stamped

(Name of Organisation)

Name of representative

Address:

Telephone/Fax/Email:

² In case that the bidder should offer the evaluation for both above described countries, the section on data collection can be put twice (one per country). All other sections shall be calculated only once.
6.7 Technical proposal (guideline)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organisation/Firm/Independent Consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of contact person for this proposal (for organisation/firm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The technical bid should be concisely presented and structured in the following order to include, but not necessarily be limited to the following information listed below.

1. Quality and Relevance of Technical Proposal
   - Describe all actions related to all required steps in the three phases (Prepare data collection methodology; Field phase; Synthesis and presentation phase) of the evaluation of the relocation projects including development of evaluation design and methodology (description of evaluation target groups; description of quantitative and qualitative research methods that will be used; description of sampling and size of sample)
   - Realistic work plan with timelines in accordance with terms of reference requirements
   - Explain suggested training procedures and content for interviewers (if applicable)
   - Detailed quality assurance process for all deliverables

2. Qualification and expertise of organisation/team of consultants/consultant submitting proposal
   - Reputation of firm/organisation and staff and individual consultant/s (competence and reliability) in carrying out evaluations
   - Relevance of:
     - Specialized knowledge
     - Proven expertise in carrying out evaluations
   - Proposed Team Structure: The proposed composition of the team in the country of assignment and/or at the home office, and the work tasks (including supervisory) which would be assigned to each.
   - CVs of key staff
### 6.8 Proposed structure of the final report

The final evaluation shall be a written report oriented on the proposed outline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title page</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of the programme, country, date, implementing agency of the evaluation, name of the authors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Summary of conclusions and recommendations (2 pages max)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive summary (2 pages max, main recommendations) (including Part A and Part B if applicable)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>1. Introduction (1 page max)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Description of the objectives and scope of the evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Short description of the overall evaluation process, the research team and methodologies applied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>2. Programme description (per programme separately, max. 1 page each) (part A and part B – if applicable)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Programme description (location, current status, duration, beneficiaries/participants) and programme results framework (programme goal, objectives, expected results and activities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Management structure and budget (short description of the management structure and overview of the human resource allocations/staffing patterns, implementation partners, budget)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>3. Evaluation results: evaluation of the results of relocation projects</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1. Key findings according with overall objectives and scope of the evaluation (see chapter 4.1):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Changes (positive/negative, intended/unintended) brought by the relocation process on individual child level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Changes (positive/negative, intended/unintended) brought by the relocation process on individual caregiver level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Changes (positive/negative, intended/unintended) on community level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Lessons that can be drawn from the process of relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Efficiency of current programme interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2. Other findings and unexpected results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>4. Evaluation results: evaluation of the project on improved opportunities of vulnerable children in Békés county</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1. Key findings according to the planned activities and expected outcomes of the project (see chapter 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2. Other findings and unexpected results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>5. Evaluation results: Refinement of methodology</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1. Recommended methodology for evaluations of relocations of SOS families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2. Recommended methodology for evaluations of family strengthening, independent living programme for young people and advocacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6. Lessons learnt, Conclusions and Recommendations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1. Conclusions on the changes brought about by the relocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2. Conclusions on the results of the evaluation of project on improved opportunities for vulnerable children in Békés county</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3. Recommendations for further action within the programmes: Identify components of the programme that have great potential for further development, but also interventions that need to change or even phase out.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>7. Annex</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.1. Tools applied during the evaluation process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>