

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR ENDLINE EVALUATION

1. INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

Country:	Uganda ALL4WASH In School
Project title:	Program
Project holder:	Viva con Agua Uganda
Funder(s):	Viva con Agua de Sankt Pauli
Project period:	January 2023- December 2025
Date Posted	13/10/2025
Closing date	26/10/2025

About Viva con Agua Uganda

Vivacon Agua Uganda is a registered National NGO and a local partner of the international Viva con Agua Cosmos, promoting safe, sustainable, and inclusive Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) services across Uganda. Our mission involves raising awareness in schools and communities about the importance of improved WASH practices while implementing transformative projects that directly impact lives.

As part of the global Viva con Agua movement, we foster a vibrant community of individuals and organizations committed to creating positive change with joy. Utilizing Universal Languages for Behavioural Change (UL4BC), including music, art, and sports, we engage in fun, creative, and participatory approaches to inspire awareness and lasting behavior change. Our decentralized network aims to ensure that everyone has access to clean drinking water and dignified sanitation, connecting local solutions with global solidarity for lasting impact.

Project Overview

All4WASH InSchool Program is a three-year programme supporting 30 primary schools across Kampala (12) and Wakiso (18) districts. The project integrates WASH infrastructure improvement (water systems, toilets, incinerators, hand-washing stations) with participatory hygiene behaviour and local capacity. It combines hardware with software – creative hygiene education through music, art, and football (the Universal Languages for Change). Working with KCCA, Wakiso District, and school communities, the programme trains teachers and WASH patrons to strengthen institutional capacity, build maintenance plans, and promote hygiene behaviour change and ensure long-term sustainability. By 2026, all target schools will have functional WASH facilities, trained staff, and daily hygiene routines practised by over 12,000 pupils.

2. EVALUATION PURPOSE

This endlineevaluation aimstoassess the project’s performance against its targets and indicators, offering evidence-based insights for learning, accountability, and strategic decision-making. The evaluation will examine the project design, implementation, and results through the six OECD-DAC Criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. The study will further assess project management, partner collaboration, and coordination. By evaluating these dimensions alongside OECD-DAC criteria (relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability), the evaluation aims to provide actionable insights forimproving future interventions.

Specific objectives:

- 1) Determine the extent the ALL 4WASH in schools achieved its results against its set targets in the project log frame, identifying major factors leading to achievement or non-achievement of results,
- 2) Assess the performance of the project based on OECD/DAC criteria,
- 3) Evaluate the impact of project interventions, including institutional capacity strengthening, infrastructure development and social and behaviour change,

- 4) Assess project management effectiveness, coordination, and governance system,
- 5) Examine gender equality, inclusion, and participation of vulnerable groups (girls and children with disabilities).
- 6) Assess the project sustainability and identify key lessons learned, best practices, and actionable recommendations for future project programming

3.SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation will cover the entire project delivery period, capturing project activities implemented from January 2023- December 2025 in Kampala Capital City Authority and Wakiso District. It will encompass the 30 intervention schools and key stakeholders, including teachers, pupils, local government officials, and implementing partners. It will analyse the entire scope of the project indicators in the logical framework, which comprises all elements of the intervention logic. The evaluation will also assess the extent to which gender and social inclusion have been considered, examine the effectiveness of institutional capacity-strengthening efforts and evaluate project management systems and processes. In addition, the evaluation will assess sustainability measures, including operations and maintenance systems and stakeholder ownership. The target groups will include both direct and indirect project beneficiaries, including the project team.

The evaluation will focus on:

- 1) Achievement of intended results and intermediate outcomes,
- 2) Functionality and maintenance of constructed or rehabilitated facilities,
- 3) Behavioural change outcomes related to Menstrual Hygiene Management (MHM) trainings, Universal Languages for Behaviour Change (UL4BC), and institutional capacity strengthening,
- 4) Stakeholders' involvement in the project implementation processes and the project sustainability safeguards and ownership mechanisms,
- 5) Efficiency of project implementation processes and resource use,
- 6) Implementable recommendations for scaling up similar programming in Uganda.

4. INTENDED USERS AND USE OF THE EVALUATION

The primary users:

- 1) Viva con Agua Uganda project team and management
- 2) Local government authorities (KCCA and Wakiso District)
- 3) School administrations and WASH committees

Secondary users

- 1) Viva con Agua de Sankt Pauli
- 2) Ministry of Education and Sports
- 3) Ministry of Water and Environment
- 4) Sectoral partners and development agencies

Use of the findings

- 1) Inform the design and scaling of future WASH projects
- 2) Enhance accountability and transparency to stakeholders, including the intervention schools
- 3) Contribute to institutional learning and sector-wide knowledge sharing

5. EVALUATION QUESTIONS (AND CRITERIA)

The evaluation will focus on the 6 DAC criteria: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability (questions presented should not be considered as exhaustive):

Relevance:

- a. How well do the project objectives align with Uganda's national WASH sector policies and education sector priorities?
- b. To what extent were the interventions responsive to the specific WASH needs and priorities of the main stakeholders and the target project participants/beneficiaries?
- c. Were the chosen project approaches (e.g UL4BC, MHM, capacity building) fit for purpose and contextually relevant?
- d. Did the project build or complement existing government and donor projects, or risk duplication of WinS efforts in the intervention schools?
- e. To what extent did the project remain relevant and adaptive to the emerging sectoral priorities and contextual changes during implementation (e.g., policy shifts, urban growth dynamics and pressures, and or public health developments in the KCCA and Wakiso District)?
- f. To what extent were stakeholders (schools, local authorities, parents, learners) involved in project design, planning, implementation, and monitoring of the project?

Effectiveness:

- a. How do the results compare with baseline data and logframe targets?
- b. To what extent were the planned outcomes achieved within the project implementation period?
- c. What internal and external factors most contributed to or hindered achievement of results (e.g project design, management, external context, stakeholder engagement)?
- d. To what extent are the target groups reached?
- e. How do the target beneficiaries, funder, government representatives, and other stakeholders perceive the delivery and receipt of the project's intended beneficiaries?
- f. Did the project contribute to holistic WinS modelling and broader systems strengthening (at school, district, and city levels) to manage WinS services sustainably with replication potential?
- g. How effective were the project's behaviour change strategies (MHM and UL4BC) in improving knowledge, attitudes, and practices among the schools?
- h. How well did the project monitoring and learning systems inform adaptive management?
- i. What innovations or good practices emerged that could be scaled up or replicated?
- j. How effectively were marginalised groups (girls and children with disabilities) reached?

Efficiency:

- a. Were project resources (financial, time, and human) used optimally to deliver the project outputs and outcomes achieved?
- b. Was the balance between administrative/HR costs and programme costs realistic, justified, and aligned with sector benchmarks in relation to the project needs?
- c. Did the project achieve results on time and within budget?
- d. Did the allocation of project resources demonstrate value for money in terms of economy (procurement and cost control), efficiency (timely and cost-effective delivery), to achieve the intended results?
- e. Did the balance between investments in infrastructure capacity building, behavioural change, and project management represent an efficient mix for achieving sustainable WinS outcomes?
- f. To what extent did the project leverage school contributions, partner competencies, and existing VcA coordination structures to optimise efficiency?
- g. Could the same or better results have been achieved at a lower cost and alternative delivery model, or more results with the same cost?
- h. How flexible and adaptive was the project in reallocating resources to address the unforeseen circumstances such as emerging urgent WASH needs?
- i. Did the project's financial management processes and procedures affect project implementation and delivery?

- j. Were the financial management processes (i.e, budgeting, reporting, and accountability systems) efficient and transparent?
- k. How efficient is the overall management set-up of the project; in other words, how suitable are the management arrangements in place?
- l. How appropriate and effective were the stakeholder management and communication strategies?
- m. To what extent were beneficiaries involved in decision-making and feedback mechanisms during implementation?

Impact:

- a. Is the project contributing to systemic changes, e.g., to improved water, sanitation, and hygiene at communities & schools (including menstrual hygiene management)?
- b. How did the project contribute to systematic improvements in the WinS landscape (policies, institutional practices, financing, and governance)?
- c. What measurable improvements in WASH-related behaviours and practices (e.g., handwashing at critical times, MHM, toilet use, environmental cleanliness, and O&M) can be attributed to project interventions?
- d. Were there any unintended outcomes, either positive or negative?
- e. Did the project take timely measures for mitigating any emerging negative impact?
- f. How did the project affect equity and inclusion outcomes for the marginalised groups?
- g. What factors enhanced or constrained the achievement of project impact?
- h. How did the project specifically impact marginalised groups, including: adolescent girls, persons with disabilities?
- i. To what extent did the project contribute to broader sectoral or policy-level influence, including integration into KCCA and Wakiso District WinS planning and alignment with national strategies?
- j. What broader impacts did the project have at: the macro (national/policy) level & the meso (school) level?

Sustainability:

- a. What is the likelihood of continuation and sustainability of the project outcome and benefits after completion of the project?
- b. Do schools and local stakeholders demonstrate ownership and commitment to continue the project-supported WASH interventions?
- c. Were sustainability strategies integrated into project design and implementation from the outset (e.g., capacity building, O&M, financial sustainability, and government alignment)?
- d. What capacities (institutional, technical, financial, and managerial) exist among the target schools and stakeholders to maintain infrastructure and sustain behavioural change outcomes?
- e. To what extent did the project establish and implement realistic and feasible local ownership and exit or transition strategies to ensure continuation of positive outcomes and minimise dependency on external support & facilitate local ownership?
- f. What enabling or constraining factors (e.g., institutional support, school engagement, funding mechanisms) affect the sustainability of project outcomes?

6.EVALUATIONDESIGNANDMETHODOLOGY

The evaluation will apply a mixed methods approach combining qualitative and quantitative methods to ensure robust triangulation. The consultant will provide the details of the sampling procedure and data collection methods in their technical proposal.

The consultant will develop data collection tools based on the project's logical framework, the key evaluation questions and in reference to the baseline data collection tools. VcA Uganda will provide the consultant with the sampling procedure, data collection tools and methodology of the baseline study. The consultant will propose a detailed methodology, sampling framework, and tools in the inception report for review and approval. As part of the methodology, the consultant will cover;

- 1) Comparative analysis against the baseline and midline data
- 2) Disaggregated data by gender, age, disability, among others
- 3) Ethical considerations to ensure informed consent, confidentiality, and data protection compliance.

7. MANAGERIAL ARRANGEMENTS/ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Consultant's Roles and Responsibilities

The evaluation is commissioned to an external consultant/consulting company to; -

- Design methodology and tools,
- Recruit, train and deploy a data collection team
- Collect, analyse, and validate data
- Lead and supervise data collection,
- Conduct debriefing meetings with project staff and key stakeholders,
- Submit all deliverables (Inception and evaluation reports plus the required annexes).

The roles of the VcA team:

- Briefing of the evaluator/Consultant,
- Provide project documents and Reports to the consultant (Project proposal and logframe, progress reports, Baseline data/report, and monitoring data),
- Review and approve evaluation tools (including qualitative and quantitative), methodology, sample size,
- Review the inception report and provide timely feedback,
- Provide logistics coordination/support on the field itinerary to the evaluator(s),
- Facilitate entry to relevant offices and schools prior and during data collection,
- Organise debriefing meetings with consultant(s) after field-level data collection and provide inputs if the information is sufficient to address the evaluation questions,
- Assign the primary contact person to respond to/address the questions/remarks,
- Organise timely payment for the consultant in line with contract terms.
- Organise a validation meeting (physical or virtual) with relevant participants.

8. DELIVERABLES AND REPORTING DEADLINES.

The following deliverables are expected to be submitted by the evaluator(s) as outlined in the table:

Deliverable	Description	Timelines
Inception report	Detailed evaluation approach and methodology, workplan, methods for data collection and analysis, showing explicit interpretation of the evaluation questions.	Within 2 weeks of contract signing
Draft evaluation report	Comprehensive report (max 35 pages) with findings, conclusions, and recommendations. Comments will be provided on the report 2 weeks after the submission of the draft report. A standard outline for the evaluation report will be provided to the consultant.	Within 30 days of contract signing
Validation meeting	Presentation of key findings to stakeholders for approval.	Within 40 days of contract signing
The final report	Revised based on feedback; includes executive summary, lessons, and annexes.	Within 45 days of contract signing

9. RESOURCES AND AVAILABLE DATA

The consultant will be furnished with relevant documentation to support the desk review of secondary information. The consultant will be encouraged to identify any other sources for appropriate additional information that may be required to supplement what is provided by the project.

Project documents available include:

- Project proposal, logical framework, progress reports, and annual reports,
- Project monitoring and beneficiary data,
- Relevant policy documents and WASH sector reports
- Baseline study report.

10. TIME FRAME / SCHEDULE

The evaluation will be completed by December 12th from signing the contract, including preparatory work, field visits, and report preparation. The assignment will be effective in action from the day of signing of the awarded contract.

11. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND CONFIDENTIALITY

All information and data obtained shall remain confidential and are to be used solely for the evaluation. The consultant will comply with Viva con Agua's data protection and safeguarding policies, ensuring anonymity, informed consent, and secure data storage.

12. EXPERTISE OF THE EVALUATORS

The evaluation shall be carried out by a suitably qualified and experienced evaluator or consulting firm. The evaluator/s should include one team leader responsible for the overall coordination of the evaluation, and the final coherence and quality assurance of the report. He/she must have extensive experience in leading evaluations of development projects, particularly in the WASH sector, and report writing:

The team leader must have:

- A master's degree in development studies, monitoring and evaluation or equivalent degree,
- Minimum 7 years of professional experience leading evaluations of development, International
- Development, Development Economics/Planning, Sanitation, Wastewater Management projects, Proven knowledge of evaluation methods and techniques, at least 5 years' experience evaluating according to OECD/DAC criteria, including a thorough understanding of data collection, evaluation methodologies and design, and strong qualitative and quantitative research skills,
- Proven expertise in the WASH sector and participatory evaluation methods.

Team members:

- Advanced degree in development studies, monitoring and evaluation or equivalent degree,
- Knowledge of evaluation methods and techniques (OECD/DAC), including a thorough understanding of data collection, evaluation methodologies and design, and strong qualitative and quantitative research skills,
- Prior work experience with or working for international development organization's and familiarity with development programmes,
- Team members with WASH skills and experience, particularly WASH in Schools, will be considered as an asset,

The composition of the team of experts should be balanced to enable complete coverage of the different aspects of the consultancy as set out in these terms of reference,

The team leader and team members must have excellent written and verbal communication skills in English. Please consider the option of a translator if relevant.

13. TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL OFFER

Applicants must provide technical and financial offers, including:

- Technical offer including a brief description of the overall design, methodology of the evaluation and tools to answer the evaluation questions and to provide a sample of a similar endline report. The technical offer should not exceed 10 pages and must follow the Terms of Reference,
- Detailed workplan/timetable,
- Financial proposal itemising professional fees, taxes, and (plus the respective Tax/VAT, if applicable), the number of working days proposed and any other costs,
- Signed CVs of the team leader and team members,

The following are key considerations while preparing the budget:

- All insurances are the responsibility of the evaluator(s),
- The budget should include all costs (i.e., anything needed to accomplish the assignment, including, for example, refreshment and transportation costs for participants at FGDs if deemed necessary, or compensation for enumerators, travel for the evaluator and team),
- 40% on approval of the inception report; 60% on acceptance of the final report.

15. DEADLINE FOR PROPOSAL

Proposals should be submitted by October 26, 2025 (17:00 EAT): email kampala@vivaconagua.org

The offer will be evaluated by using the best value for money approach (combined scoring method). The technical proposal will be evaluated at 70%. Whereas the financial one will be evaluated at 30%.

Only short-listed applicants will be contacted for further evaluation.