**Terms OF REFERENCE FOR END of PROJECT EVALUATION**

**for the project “I-Restore 2.0 - FOR ACCESSIBLE QUALITY RESTORATIVE JUSTICE PROCESSES FOR CHILDREN IN CONTACT WITH THE LAW IN EUROPE”**

Terre des hommes Romania is seeking a qualified external evaluator for conducting an end of project evaluation for the EU funded project I-Restore 2.0.

# Presentation of Terre des hommes

Terre des hommes (Tdh) founded in 1960 is the leading Swiss child relief agency committed to improving the lives of millions of the world's most vulnerable children. Through innovative protection and health projects, Tdh provides assistance to over three million children and their families in almost forty countries each year. In Europe, Terre des hommes intervenes directly or indirectly in many countries, relying on teams based in Budapest, Albania, Greece, Kosovo, Romania, Moldova and Ukraine. Every year thousands of children and their families benefit from projects implemented either at a national or regional level.

In Romania, Terre des hommes (Tdh Ro) has been active since 1992. For the past few years, the delegation has been working on three main intervention areas: (1) **Strengthening child protection and juvenile justice systems, (2)** Protection of children affected by migration and/or trafficking and (3) Social inclusion of minorities.

Since 1996, Tdh has been working on juvenile justice in numerous countries across the globe. Built on 26 years of experience and capitalization of best practices, Tdh’s actions are based on a child-friendly approach to justice, which means that justice is adapted to children, to their maturity and level of development, and on a restorative approach, which seeks to repair the damage caused to the individuals, the affected parties and the wider society, requiring active participation of the child offender, the victim and other involved members to resolve the conflict.

Tdh’s work in Access to Justice contributes directly to Sustainable Development Goal N°16, namely 16.2 reducing violence against children and 16.3 reinforcing access to justice. It also endeavors to protect the rights of children in conflict with the law (articles 37 and 40 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child) and of children victims (article 19), as well as the involvement of the family and the community in the development of children (article 5), and the protection of the rights to non- discrimination (article 2), to have their best interest taken into consideration (article 3), to life survival and development (article 2), right to participation in all matters affecting them (article 12). In 2020, 93,400 children, young people and members of their communities were supported in access to justice.

# Context

Globally, over 7 mil. children are deprived of liberty per year; 2.5 mil. children participate in judicial proceedings across EU per year; 1 mil. children face criminal justice proceedings in EU per year; Individual assessments of children involved in criminal proceedings is not conducted systematically; 33% of European countries prosecute children above the age of criminal responsibility for offences committed while under the age of criminal responsibility[[1]](#footnote-2).

According to Thematic Area 4 on Child-Friendly Justice of the European Union (EU) Strategy on the Rights of the Child (2020-24)[[2]](#footnote-3), the European Commission (EC) recommends to Member States to “develop robust alternatives to judicial action: from alternatives to detention, to the use of restorative justice and mediation” and “contribute to training of justice professionals on the rights of the child and child friendly justice”[[3]](#footnote-4). Similarly, the recommendations formulated by the 2020 EC Forum on the Rights of the Childspecifically refer to “[bringing in] community-based, peer-to-peer models for diversion and alternatives to detention and restorative justice models”.[[4]](#footnote-5)

In line with the EU Victims’ Rights Strategy, the **I-Restore 2.00** project aims to increase awareness of families, practitioners, policy makers and the media on restorative justice for children in criminal proceedings, increase the number of practitioners who can provide child-friendly restorative justice services and empower children, including victims, to express their views about restorative justice through digital and child-led creative approaches.

**Project Description**

**Title:** I-Restore 2.0 - For Accessible Quality Restorative Justice processes for Children in Contact with the Law in Europe

I-RESTORE 2.0 proposes an expansion of “I-RESTORE - Protecting Child Victims through Restorative Justice”, which successfully built the capacities of practitioners and children and raised their awareness on what restorative justice is. I-RESTORE 2.0 goes a step further – through the lens of accessibility aiming to ensure restorative processes are accessible for children in contact with the law in Estonia, Greece, Netherlands and Romania.

**The overall objective of I-RESTORE 2.0 is to enhance accessibility to high-quality restorative justice processes for child victims and children suspected and/or accused of crime in Europe**.

The specific objectives of the I-RESTORE 2.0 to ensure accessibility of restorative justice for children:

* Build the capacities of national practitioners in Romania, Greece, Estonia and The Netherlands to address issues relating to the rights of children victims and suspected when involved in restorative justice processes.
* Increase knowledge sharing among EU justice actors and the community about access of child victims and children suspected and/or accused of crime to quality restorative justice processes.
* Empower child victims and children suspected and/or accused of crime to be agents to play a meaningful role when involved in restorative justice processes.

The right to access restorative justice includes: a duty to inform and support, as well as the availability of trained professionals - offering, preparing for and, if agreed by the parties, facilitating the restorative justice process.

I-RESTORE 2.0 focus on investing in further capacity building of practitioners, using opportunities offered through a solid mutual learning methodology built around cross-border twinning arrangements, giving a meaningful voice to children in assessing restorative justice processes and increasing knowledge in this area, as well as enlarging the circle of key stakeholders who need to be made aware of the role they play for successful and accessible restorative justice processes with children (policy makers, families, communities, schools and the Media). Ongoing education for practitioners and other professionals is the road towards a more restorative culture – for children and adults – that will have a large impact on the well-being of all parties.

Project time frame: This 27-month project ran from **October 2022 until December 2024** andwas coordinated by Terre des hommes Romania.

I-RESTORE 2.0 involves 6 EU countries carefully chosen for their complementarity and pre-disposition to learn from each other, based on: their experience in conducting restorative justice with children and favorable environments to share mutual learnings (Netherlands, Estonia), the needs of child victims and suspects with whom the consortium can interact to develop child-friendly solutions and the high demand of practitioners for capacity building and awareness raising (Greece, Romania), the access to high level expertise on restorative justice through the EFRJ, lead European network (Belgium), and Tdh Regional Hub working for child justice throughout Europe (Hungary). The Netherlands and Estonia have much to share on restorative justice experience. The project is implemented in partnership with the Regional Office of Terre des hommes in Europe, Terre des hommes Hellas, European Forum for Restorative Justice, Restorative Justice Netherlands, Social Insurance Board of Estonia and STICHTING HALT Netherlands.

**Project Objectives**

* Enhancing the ability of practitioners in Romania, Greece, Estonia and the Netherlands to handle cases involving the rights of child victims and children suspected or accused of crimes, who are engaged in restorative justice procedures (WP2)
* Improving knowledge sharing among EU justice actors about access to high-quality restorative justice for child victims or offenders (WP3).
* Empowering child victims, suspects, or accused individuals to become agents of change and take on a meaningful role in restorative justice procedures (WP4).
* Raising awareness among multidisciplinary actors and the community about access to high-quality restorative justice for child victims, suspects, or accused individuals (WP5).

I-RESTORE 2.0 focuses on the following **target groups:**

• Approximately 264 children and youth with increased knowledge and exposure to the concept of restorative justice processes and child-friendly justice in general, reached through Child Advisory Boards (CABs), awareness-raising and advocacy events.

• 40 Young people aged 18-24 years with experience in the justice system: to give them a sense of meaningful participation and fair justice and share their experience from their own involvement in justice proceedings. Reached through Child Advisory Boards, for awareness-raising, advocacy and training events.

• 640 Families and school staff: to increase their understanding of the role they can play for children in restorative justice processes. Reached through advocacy and awareness circles.

• Approximately 820 multidisciplinary practitioners, namely mediators, facilitators, police officers, judges and prosecutors, probation officers, victim support professionals, child protection professionals, child psychologists, social workers and professionals from the educational sector, whose knowledge on how to best collaborate and skills about restorative justice with children will be enhanced. Reached through trainings, twinning arrangements, advocacy events and mutual learning activities.

• Approximately 80 Policy makers: to actively engage them in finding solutions to make restorative justice accessible for all children. Reached through advocacy events, awareness-raising campaigns, and the Policy Brief in Budgeting for restorative justice for Children.

• 150 media professionals: to actively engage them via a media toolkit to raise awareness, spread favorable attitudes and encouraging messages, portraying restorative justice for children

# 3. Objectives of the evaluation

The primary objective of this evaluation is to assess the relevance, impact and lessons learnt of the I-Restore 2.0 project in achieving its goals. The evaluation will focus on:

* Assessing the **effectiveness** and **impact** of the implemented activities aimed to create an accessible quality restorative justice process for children in contact with the law, including identification of areas for improvement, and making recommendations for enhancement.
* Assessing the **relevance** of the intervention.
* Provide with **organizational learning and knowledge** forconcluding all important lessons learnt from the way the project was set up, implemented and managed; and how it has succeeded or, potentially, not succeeded to achieve all its intended (or unintended) results.
* Sustainability & replicability: **evaluating the sustainability** of the project’s outcomes in implementing countries and the potential for replication in other EU member states.

# 4. Scope of the evaluation

The final (external) evaluation will **cover the entire I-Restore 2.0 project**, including all partner organizations. Geographically, it will cover the **four local implementation countries: Estonia, Greece, Netherlands, Romania.**

The evaluation will start **during the final month of the project**; thus, it will focus on the project activities carried out and results achieved up to the end of the project implementation.

The external evaluation should focus on gathering data and information from Tdh and project partners as well as direct beneficiaries.

# 5. Intended users of the evaluation

The results of the final evaluation will be used by the:

* **I-Restore 2.0 project team:** to reflect on and learn from how the project has performed and how it can inform the follow-on future initiatives.
* The **broader Access to Justice programme team within Tdh:** to learn from the findings, build institutional knowledge, and assess how findings can generally inform future programming in this field.
* **Senior management of all implementing organizations** **as well as Tdh HQ**: to assess how project learning can inform future programmatic portfolio decisions and strategy-making, and what effective and corrective actions might need to be taken going forward in similar or continuation projects.
* **the donor EC DG Justice and Consumers**: to assess how its support and funds have contributed to delivering project objectives and positive changes for children’s beneficiaries of restorative justice.

# 6. Evaluation criteria and questions

The evaluation should respond to the following questions:

**Effectiveness:**

1. To what extent the capacity building approaches used for national practitioners, family members and school staff empowered them to promote positive changes for children’s beneficiaries of restorative justice processes?
2. To what extent the capacity building approaches used for children empowered them to fully understand and promote the concept of restorative justice? Was the project approach participatory and did it contribute to empowering children and building their capacity to become a meaningful voice in assessing restorative justice processes?
3. How effectively twinning arrangements & mutual learning activities worked for national practitioners in providing restorative justice processes in an enhanced collaborative way?
4. How effectively will the social media use the resources produced by the project to raise awareness, spread favorable attitudes and encouraging messages, portraying restorative justice for children?
5. Has the engagement of policy makers contributed to making restorative justice accessible for all children?
6. What training methods have been most effective for engaging professionals with restorative justice principles?Which strategies (e.g., workshops, simulations, role-playing, etc.) have led to the greatest engagement and understanding?
7. Are the materials or tools developed accessible and relevant to the children, considering their age, language, and experiences?

**Relevance:**

1. How relevant were the innovative and practical methods used to empower local practitioners, community members (including family members and school staff), social media and policy makers to enhance accessibility to high-quality restorative justice processes for child victims and children suspected and/or accused of crime in Europe?
2. How relevant were the innovative methods used with children for allowing them a meaningful participation and a useful sharing of their experience from their own involvement in justice proceedings ?
3. What is the understanding and application of restorative justice principles among project participants?How do participants describe restorative justice in their own words, and how do they incorporate its values in their work or community interactions?
4. To what extent does I-RESTORE 2.0 address the specific needs and rights of child victims and children suspected/accused of crimes in Europe?
5. How well does the project align with current legal, social, and institutional priorities for child protection and restorative justice in the target countries and at the EU level?
6. Are there significant gaps between the project's objectives and the needs of key stakeholders (e.g., children, families, restorative justice professionals, legal authorities)? If yes, which ones?
7. Are there emerging trends or challenges that the project should have addressed/prioritized during the implementation?

 **Sustainability:**

1. How sustainable are the project results once the project and donor funding ends?
2. Has the project influenced any long-term policy changes or institutional practices that enhance access to restorative justice for children?
3. To what extent could the project model be replicable for other EU countries, aiming to enhance the accessibility to restorative justice systems for its children?
4. Based on the main findings from the effectiveness and relevance perspectives, what sort of interventions should Terre des hommes and the implementation consortium focus on?

  **Child participation& empowerment:**

1. How effective was the child participation component and the work with the CABs throughout the project? Are there any lessons learnt in terms of effectiveness?
2. Did the adopted child participation approach empowered CAB members and contributed to their confidence to address justice issues (in line with outcome indicator: % of CAB members who feel empowered and perceive themselves as change agents to address issues of justice (target: 80%)

# 7. Methodology

 Interested applicants are invited to **propose their methodology for the conduct of the evaluation.**

Qualitative approaches to data collection will be preferred but will not exclude the use of quantitative methods. Field visits are recommended at least for evaluating the activities implemented in Romania and Estonia.

Existing M&E data and collected quantitative and qualitative information (from the rapid needs assessment, quantitative mid-term, feedback forms after the training of trainers, facilitators and sessions with children) will also be made available for the evaluator.

The I-Restore 2.0 project team members should be closely involved in the data collection tools development (for consultation). They typically include one country or local coordinator per organization. Tdh and partners will be able to facilitate contact with the local practitioners, partners and children who will also be involved for data collection.

Generally, a participatory approach should be followed throughout the evaluation. ***The methodology proposed should also be feasible in an online format.***

The evaluation methodology should keep in mind the following **underlying principles:**

* **equality and non-discrimination** of any individual involved in the data collection and consultation process.
* **participation and inclusion of different diversity groups** to the extent possible, while ensuring that participation and inclusion does not cause any harm or distress to the individual.
* **transparency and accountability** throughout the evaluation and assessment process towards all organizations and individuals involved.
* **confidentiality** must be preserved, and names and personally identifiable information should not be collected or, if they are necessary, they should be duly coded and encrypted;
* **informed consent and assent:** should be sought from all participants, including providing them with information on the objective of the evaluation and how data will be used as well as ensuring the opportunity to ask and confirm questions before agreeing to participate.
* **child safety:** whenever children are involved, the evaluator(s) and anyone affiliated with the evaluation (assistants, translators) must sign the Tdh Child Safeguarding Policy and Code of Conduct and adhere to its principles.

# 8. Deliverables

During the contract, the Evaluator will provide as deliverables (all of them **in English**):

1. **INITIAL (INCEPTION) REPORT – in 1 week within contract start,** that includes the following: results of the initial desk review, the proposed methodology and data collection tools, an evaluation/analysis plan (in Tdh’s template to be shared after contracting), and overall work plan for the assignment.
2. **DE-BRIEFING and presentation of findings from the field – in 4 weeks (after previous stage),** that includes**:**
* ***Data collection report*** *(documents analysis, discussions with the team and beneficiaries, feedback from beneficiaries)*
* ***Short review*** *indicating the first findings, provisional conclusions, main trends identified etc.*
1. **PRELIMINARY REPORT – in 1 week (after the previous stage),** comprising of**:**
* ***Narrative report*** *(min. 20 - max. 25 pages);*
* ***Summary table with the main conclusions, main lessons learned and recommendations****.*
* ***Short review and PPT*** *with main lessons learned, recommendations and conclusions.*
1. **FINAL REPORT – in 1 week (after the previous stage**) comprising of**:**
* ***Executive summary*** *(max. 3-4 pages);*
* ***Narrative report*** *(max. 25 pages);*
* ***Summary table with the main conclusions, main lessons learned and recommendations.***
* ***Annexes:*** *Containing the technical details of the evaluation, surveys protocols and questionnaires when the case, protocols of interviews, tables or graphics, secondary review references, persons and institutions contacted, a PowerPoint presentation of the findings and recommendations, transcription of relevant selection of interviews, focus groups, observations*

After each stage, a feedback meeting is organized with Tdh and feedback is incorporated in the evaluation document. The evaluator is also expected to be available for regular and brief check-in calls, as necessary, throughout the assignment to share updates on the progress.

# 9. Chronogram

We estimate that the evaluator will require at most 25 working days. The intermediary stages of the Final Evaluation Report are flexible, but it should be submitted by the end of February 2025, the latest. The final schedule will be mutually agreed considering Tdh’s timeline and the suggestions made by the Evaluator in the Technical Offer.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Deliverables to be provided:** **Provisional Calendar:**  | **Week** **1**  | **Week** **2**  | **Week** **3**  | **Week** **4**  | **Week** **5** | **Week** **6** | **Week** **7** |
| 1. **INITIAL (INCEPTION) REPORT**
 |  |   |   |   |  |   |   |
| 1. **DE-BRIEFING**
 |   |   |   |  |  |   |   |
| 1. **PRELIMINARY REPORT** (design)
 |   |   |   |   |  |  |   |
| 1. **FINAL REPORT** (delivered)
 |   |   |   |   |  |   |  |

# 10. Roles and responsibilities

Tdh will designate an **Evaluation Manager** who will be the main focal point vis-à-vis the evaluator.

**Evaluator roles and responsibilities:**

▪ To deliver the assignment as per the signed contract, Terms of Reference and the Technical and Financial Offer and relevant annexes, including Tdh policies where applicable (e.g. those related to Data Protection and Child Safeguarding). To submit all required deliverables as per the agreed deadlines.

▪ To ensure that all the underlying principles (described in the methodology section) are respected throughout the evaluation.

▪ To ensure that the Evaluation Manager is regularly informed in case of any questions and issues (particularly, delays and blockages) that may emerge during the assignment and may require mutual discussion/planning.

▪ To be available for quick updates, whenever requested, on the progress of the assignment.

▪ To generally ensure the confidentiality of the process as well as the information and documents received from the Evaluation Manager and the people involved at any stage in the evaluation.

▪ To immediately inform the Evaluation Manager in case of any risk of not being able to comply with any of the above points.

# 11. Profile of the consultant/evaluator: qualifications and experience

Tdh will accept applications from individuals, teams, academic entities, NGOs and companies as long as they are officially registered with a European tax number (i.e. are able to issue an invoice) and have evaluation, research, impact study or similar and/or consultancy as their object of activity, which can be proven by legal documentation.

**Required experience and skills:**

* At least 3 quality research/evaluations/impact studies prepared for 3 different projects. Examples can be

annexed unless confidential. Previous experience in conducting research/evaluations of projects in justice systems is a significant asset.

* Extensive experience in monitoring and evaluation, particularly within the context of restorative justice and children’s rights.
* Proven skills in using quantitative and quality data collection and analysis methods.
* Strong understanding of data collection methodologies, with experience in evaluating tools and systems.
* Excellent analytical and report-writing skills
* Fluency (written and oral) in English.
* Strong computer proficiency to prepare quality written reports with clean data visualization and presentation of findings.
* Master’s degree (or higher) in a relevant field, such as human rights, public policy in social sciences, law, research and evaluation, management or other related field(s) from an accredited university.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Contract awarding criteria:** | No. ofpoints |
| **Technical Offer – best approach:**The Technical Offer will contain: Methodology and tools proposed, showing understanding of the objective of the study and the Terms of Reference (ToR); a chronogram showing details for the realization of each of the evaluation phases. The best Technical Offer will be granted with 50 points out of the total score of 100. | **50 points** |
| **CV and expertise corresponding to the required criteria** | **25 points** |
| **Financial Offer –demonstrating congruence with the technical approach submitted**The Financial Offer with will be granted with 25 points out of the total score of 100.Prices will be expressed in Euro and should be inclusive of all expenses, charges, taxes incurred by the Contractor in fulfilment of its obligations. Additional costs for translation, logistics, transportation, accommodation, per diem etc. will not be covered separately by Tdh. | **25 points** |
| **TOTAL possible** | **100 points** |

The points thus received will indicate the hierarchy of the bidders and the one that will be contracted. The Technical Offer will be evaluated by a Commission of 2 representative staff from Tdh Romania. All bidders will be informed by email of the results of the selection.

# 12. Budget

The proposed budget for the evaluation will be provided by the consultant in the Financial Offer. All costs should be included in the budget, such as translations costs.

Upon the review of the Financial and Technical Offers, Tdh may choose to negotiate the final price with the preferred evaluator considering the Financial Offer and Tdh’s available budget. Tdh may also consider the combination of the quality and competitiveness of the Technical and Financial offers. Half of the payment will be made at the beginning of the evaluation, with the other half being paid after its conclusion.

# 13. Application procedures

Questions relating to the assignment, the project or the application process can be submitted to Manuela.gazibar@tdh.org. Answers that may concern all applicants will be shared with everyone as deemed necessary. Interested applicants shall submit their application via e-mail to the following e-mail address: Manuela.gazibar@tdh.org. The e-mail should have the subject-line: I-Restore 2.0 End of project evaluation proposal. The deadline for submission is **December 18, 2024** (23:59).

The application package shall include:

• Technical Offer – max. 10 pages

* + Expression of interest
	+ Methodology and tools proposed, showing understanding of the objective of the study and the Terms of Reference (ToR)
	+ A chronogram showing details for the realization of each of the evaluation phases. The schedule proposed should include time for briefing and debriefing with Tdh representatives as far as possible.

The Technical Offer will be developed by the bidder on its own design, but it will not exceed 10 pages.

The Technical Offer will mention on the first page the following information: Company/NGO name, Address, Phone number, email, registration number, legal representative name and function, contact person (if different) name and function, phone number and email, if different. The Technical Offer will be signed and stamped on the last page by the legal representative, mentioning the company/NGO, name of the legal representative, date, signature, stamp.

• Financial Offer – with a detailed line-item budget, indicating costs in EUR. The indicated prices should be 1) NET amounts to be received by the consultant plus 2) all local taxes.

• Up-to-date CV of the evaluator(s) – max. 3 pages/CV.

• Example of previous work carried out (if any, unless confidential or if it can be anonymized);

• Contacts of 3 professional references.

• Confirmation of legal registration (e.g. tax number, EU VAT number) of the applicant for providing evaluation services and the ability to issue an invoice.

• Declaration of impartiality (in the applicant’s format).

Applications – incl. all annexes – must be in **English**. Other languages will not be accepted.

Applications must be submitted as a single application package. Documents sent separately will not be accepted.

**The assessment of the applications** will last until the **20th of December**. During the evaluation process, Tdh Romania, may ask for clarifications and check the references provided.



The content of this document represents the views of PRI in its capacity as consortium member on the current project only and is PRI’s sole responsibility. The European Commission does not accept any responsibility for use that may be made of the information it contains.

Funded by the European Union.
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