

## **Terms of reference: Evaluation to enhance the sustainability of schools-based accountability models**

### **Introduction**

Integrity Action's goal is for societies in which all citizens can – and do – successfully demand integrity from the institutions they rely on.

Since 2017, we have supported students aged 14-18 to establish “[Integrity Clubs](#)” in their schools, through which they learn about matters of integrity and work to actively identify and solve problems in the services they experience.

In our current programme, which began in 2024, we are working with our partner [Kesho Kenya](#) to establish and support new Integrity Clubs at ten schools in Kilifi County.

This current work builds on our earlier [SHINE programme](#), which ran from Jan 2017 to Dec 2021. Kesho Kenya were a partner in that initiative too, supporting Integrity Clubs in 45 schools in Kilifi. While the formal programme has ended, many of these Integrity Clubs are still running.

We are now seeking evaluators to help us strengthen the sustainability of the new Integrity Clubs. This will be done by capturing emerging outcomes from the new Integrity Clubs, and by re-visiting and learning from some of the SHINE Integrity Clubs that are still running. Focus will also need to be given to the wider enabling system, including actors such as the Ministry of Education, the Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission, and the Teachers Service Commission.

This study is being funded by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida). The total available budget is £17,500, with a deadline for the final report in May 2025. Full details are set out in the terms of reference below, and the closing date for responses is Sunday 2<sup>nd</sup> June.

BACKGROUND.....	2
EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND PURPOSE .....	3
EVALUATION APPROACH, PRINCIPLES, AND RISKS .....	5
EXISTING DATA .....	6
BUDGET AND DELIVERABLES .....	7
APPLICATION DETAILS .....	8
ANNEX 1: THE INTEGRITY CLUB MODEL .....	9
ANNEX 2: RESPONSIBLE USE, APPROPRIATE PRACTICES, AND INTEGRITY ACTION’S ETHICAL COMMITMENTS .....	10

## Background

Integrity Action is a charity registered in England and Wales, and based in London. We help citizens to monitor the delivery of essential services, infrastructure, and development projects – and to solve the problems they find.

We do this by partnering with a range of organisations in different countries, by producing research, learning, data, and tools that can assist people pursuing similar goals, and by supporting and influencing institutions so that they are more inclusive and accountable to citizens. Integrity Action has no physical presence outside the UK, and so we work closely with our local partners to implement our programmes.

Our [organisational theory of change](#) aims towards outcomes in three areas:

1. The citizens themselves, in which we also include groups such as migrants and refugees who may not legally have citizen-status;
2. The institutions upon which citizens rely in order to enjoy their rights and entitlements;
3. The platforms that exist, or that we provide, through which citizens and institutions interact.

Our [Integrity Club model](#) contextualises this approach to a secondary school setting<sup>1</sup>. From 2017-2021, we implemented this model in five countries through a programme called *Students acting for Honesty, Integrity and Equality (SHINE)*, funded by the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad), Sida, and the Allan and Nesta Ferguson Charitable Trust.

During SHINE, approximately 12,000 young people participated in Integrity Clubs across 500 schools, bringing about many positive changes to their school environments and how education services were delivered. Areas where outcomes were observed include:

- Empowerment of individual Integrity Club members, in the form of increased confidence and leadership skills, new knowledge on topics of integrity and inclusion, and enhanced life skills such as problem solving and communication.
- Improved relationships within schools, including between students and their teachers, and school management becoming more responsive to student needs.
- Improved learning environments, including the physical environment, with facilities being made safer and more inclusive – for example, toilets for girls and students with disabilities.
- Behavioural change amongst students, leading to greater engagement with their education and reductions in dropouts.

---

<sup>1</sup> See Annex 1 for more details

Many of these outcomes are described in SHINE's [endline evaluation](#). The following 90-second videos also provide case studies of Integrity Club outcomes:

- [Nepal](#): Students with disabilities secure eye tests for all
- [Afghanistan](#): Ensuring teachers turn up to work

Integrity Action is now establishing ten new Integrity Clubs in Kilifi County, Kenya. These are being funded by the Allan and Nesta Ferguson Charitable Trust, and our local partner is Kesho Kenya. Kesho were also one of our partners in SHINE, in which they successfully supported 45 Integrity Clubs – many of which are still running.

Our specific goals for this evaluation are detailed in the next section, but an overarching aim is to help us increase the likelihood of these new Integrity Clubs continuing beyond the current grant period (Jan 2024 to Dec 2025). We want to learn from what has worked before, and what is happening in the new schools, in order to shape positive impacts in the future<sup>2</sup>.

Throughout the period of this assignment, Integrity Action will be actively seeking funding to expand our Integrity Clubs programming. Should we be successful then there is a chance this study (and its budget) could grow to cover more schools, which would be discussed and agreed with the successful candidates as the situation arises.

For more on Integrity Action's approach, including several features on SHINE, see our past [annual reports](#).

## **Evaluation questions and purpose**

The questions to be answered in this assignment are as follows:

1. What is, or should be, the value of past and present Integrity Clubs in the eyes of stakeholders in Kilifi County? Which specific aspects of the approach do these actors support or encourage, what changes would they suggest, and why?
2. What specific changes (if any) have there been in outcome areas targeted by Integrity Clubs? These include the quality of services and of the wider school environment, the engagement of students with their education, and changes in individual Integrity Club members' confidence, leadership, or other life skills.
3. What signs are there (if any) of other actors adopting elements of the Integrity Club approach, or otherwise adapting their behaviours in response to Integrity Action's programmes with Kesho Kenya?

---

<sup>2</sup> A relevant overview of Integrity Action's thinking around sustainability, and scalability, may be found in [this briefing note](#).

The first of these questions reflects the DAC criterion of *relevance*; i.e. whether our approach is seen to be “doing the right things”. Stakeholders include Integrity Club members and their fellow students, but it is expected that this evaluation will give particular attention to the views of school management and relevant enabling authorities. This is not to discount the views of young people, but is rather to address the area where we have the biggest evidence gap.

“Relevant enabling authorities” will include the Ministry of Education at county level, the Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission, the Teachers Service Commission, and any others that the evaluators or evaluation participants may identify.

The second evaluation question reflects the DAC criterion of *effectiveness*; i.e. whether the approach is achieving what it set out to do. The expectation is not to quantify progress towards specific pre-defined outcome indicators, but rather to explore what has changed (or not changed), for whom, in which circumstances, and why.

Improved educational outcomes, such as academic grades, are not directly targeted by the Integrity Club model, so “quality of services” should be read as relating to the inclusivity, suitability, equity, accountability, and/or safety of school management behaviours and physical environments<sup>3</sup>. Given the existing availability of the SHINE evaluation, it is expected that question 2 will be answered primarily in relation to the new Integrity Clubs.

The third question relates to the DAC criterion of *sustainability*, which as mentioned above is a core focus of this whole assignment. Exploring the full extent of what has and has not been sustained in the 45 SHINE schools is not in scope, but recommendations from ongoing SHINE Integrity Clubs should be presented that will help increase the chances of current (and potential future) Integrity Clubs lasting beyond our involvement.

Question 3 also addresses behavioural changes among other non-school actors, such as education authorities, as well as instances of Integrity Clubs being established independently in schools unconnected to our programmes. Integrity Action’s model is informed by the COM-B model of behaviour change, in which Behaviours are influenced by Capabilities, Opportunities, and Motivations, and this is likely to be a useful lens for analysis.

Across all three questions, it would be beneficial to consider the overarching criterion of *impact*. This is not a strict impact assessment, but the evaluation should be open to capturing the differences (if any) that the Integrity Club approach is making to attitudes, norms, or the lives of those involved. This includes active consideration of unintended as well as intended changes, which may be negative as well as positive.

---

<sup>3</sup> In turn, Integrity Action’s thinking around issues such as “inclusivity” and “equity” may be illustrated by our [“Power with”](#) approach.

## **Evaluation approach, principles, and risks**

Since the new Integrity Clubs are just being established in term 2 of 2024, and to avoid disrupting students' exam preparation during term 3, visits to schools cannot take place until term 1 of 2025. Applicants may decide for themselves how much (if any) engagement with the programme and/or non-school actors they wish to budget for 2024, and how much to leave for during and after the period of school visits.

It is expected that the evaluation sample will cover 6-10 of the new Integrity Clubs and a similar number from SHINE. All interactions with evaluation participants will be arranged in collaboration with Kesho Kenya, whose relationships with these actors must be protected.

Considering the evaluation's purpose and setting, it is expected that the successful candidates will apply a theory-based methodology. The context-mechanism-outcome analysis of a Realist evaluation may fit particularly well, and a complementary approach such as Most Significant Change or participatory systems mapping would also add value. Selected principles of outcome mapping, process tracing, or contribution analysis could add further insight into specific questions.

However, Integrity Action does not have a preferred methodology for this evaluation, and applicants are free to propose any methodologies they deem suitable. All approaches must adhere to our **PICTURE** principles on quality evidence, appropriate practice, and responsible use.

These principles mean that we define *quality evidence* as that which is:

1. **Precise.** Claims are not generalised, but are specific about their context and have findings disaggregated according to relevant social and demographic differences.
2. **Inclusive.** The perspectives of communities and other stakeholders are clearly represented in all evidence, with space given to divergent views.
3. **Credible.** The data and methodology accurately measures what it is intended to measure, with sample size and composition being in proportion to the conclusions sought.
4. **Triangulated.** Data is collected consistently from multiple sources, with tools to capture both quantitative and qualitative information.
5. **Useable.** Evidence is fit for purpose and responds to users' needs and timelines, with no data being collected unless there is a clear purpose or commitment to using it.
6. **Results-focused.** Evidence clearly demonstrates what (if any) changes have happened, and explores our contribution to these alongside the roles of other actors and factors.
7. **Ethically collected, analysed, and used.** Quality evidence processes are ones that are appropriate and responsible, and that focus on improving the lives of participants.

As per the E of *PICTURE*, we view collection, analysis, and use of quality evidence as an ethical issue, and the above principles set the framework for how we think about evaluation ethics. 'Appropriate' and 'responsible' practices around evidence are further defined in the Annex of this document. Our assessment framework for translating these principles into measurable criteria is available on request.

In addition to the above principles, the Annex also includes the ethical commitments that Integrity Action makes, and to which successful candidates would be expected to commit. However, we understand that ethical practice can require more fluidity than just procedural compliance, and emergent issues are to be identified as they arise and will be managed by Integrity Action.

Finally, the successful application will take consideration of the specific risks surrounding schools-based evaluation, and the additional measures needed to safely collect data from and about children.

### **Existing data**

While the evaluation is focused on collection and analysis of new primary data, it is expected that the successful candidates will also consider existing programme knowledge. Aside from background information, the main resources that may be of value are:

From SHINE:

- The [endline evaluation](#), whose sample included Integrity Clubs supported by Kesho
- Integrity Action's final report to Norad at the end of the grant period
- Narrative progress reports prepared by Kesho, and a small number of case studies of Integrity Clubs' activities
- Surveys on students' knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP), completed by a sample of Integrity Club members each year

From the new Integrity Clubs:

- The MEL plan is light-touch, reflecting the size of the budget, but there is a framework (largely centred on activities and outputs) that can be shared
- Baseline surveys of Integrity Clubs members, which will be being collected in May/June 2024
- Any relevant learning that arises through programme management and regular calls between Integrity Action and Kesho

From wider Integrity Action learning:

- [This research](#) into the factors influencing the behaviour of various actors, which included teachers in Kenya
- [This research](#) into solving problems in public service delivery, which included SHINE as part of its sample

## Budget and deliverables

The total budget available for this assignment is £17,500. This is inclusive of all costs, including any professional fees, international travel, visas, in-country costs (including interpreters where appropriate), translation and printing of any materials, and all relevant taxes.

We expect the successful applicants to deliver:

- An inception report, at the end of the inception period
- A final evaluation report
- A brief, engaging evaluation summary document<sup>4</sup>

The final outputs are to be submitted by 16<sup>th</sup> May 2025. A verbal or visual presentation of findings in advance of, or to accompany, the draft report is encouraged.

The following is an outline of when these key milestones are expected.

Output / Activity	Date expected
Closing date for proposals	2 Jun 2024
Interviews with shortlisted candidates	w/c 10 Jun 2024
Appointment of successful candidate	25 Jun 2024
Draft inception report shared with Integrity Action	Aug-Nov 2024*
Final inception report approved by Integrity Action	Within 2 weeks
Draft evaluation report shared with Integrity Action	18 Apr 2025
Final evaluation outputs submitted and approved	16 May 2025

\*As mentioned under the *evaluation approach*, there is considerable flexibility as to how much of the evaluators' effort is used during 2024. The inception period may begin as soon as the successful candidate is appointed, or may be postponed until closer to the period of school visits.

Payment will be made in instalments, on a schedule that will be agreed with the successful candidates. This would typically be 30% of the contract value on approval of the inception report, 40% on satisfactory receipt of the draft evaluation report, and the final 30% on approval of the final evaluation outputs. However, due to the flexibility in timelines noted above, an alternative split may be justified.

---

<sup>4</sup> Examples from past Integrity Action studies may be found on our website, such as the two pieces of research linked in the section above



## Application details

Applications are welcomed from individuals or teams, whether belonging to an organisation or otherwise.

The following skills and experiences are essential criteria for applicants:

- Strong understanding of appropriate methodologies, their benefits and limitations
- Experience in conducting similar or comparable assignments (preferably within East Africa)
- Excellent facilitation and communication skills, with experience of working collaboratively with civil society organisations, and proven ability to identify, test, and refine theoretical assumptions about the thoughts and behaviours of evaluation participants
- Ability to conduct in-person data collection in Kilifi to the extent required by the proposed methodology
- Ability to present findings and recommendations in a clear, concise format
- Experience of working with children and/or in school settings, and knowledge of relevant safeguarding and child protection protocols

Knowledge of the social accountability field in which Integrity Action works would be beneficial, as would relevant language skills. Applicants should have appropriate levels of both professional indemnity insurance and public liability insurance.

Interested parties should submit a proposal to Integrity Action, to include:

1. A brief cover letter demonstrating how you or your team meets the essential criteria above (*no more than two pages*)
2. An outline of your proposed methodology, including explanation of why it is suitable for this evaluation as well as any associated risks and proposed mitigations (*no more than three pages*)
3. A draft high-level work plan and summary budget, to include the daily rates of all individuals involved and what role they each play within the team (if applicable)
4. CVs for all individuals, with references available to be contacted<sup>5</sup>
5. Maximum two examples of previous work that demonstrates skill or experience relevant to this assignment. These may be provided as links, or if unpublished then they may be attached and will be reviewed in confidence

Applications will be assessed on the relevance and suitability of their proposed approach (55%), the expertise and experience of the applicant/team (35%), and the quality/coherence of the proposal's overall structure and use of budget (10%). Consideration will also be given to each proposal's value for money.

---

<sup>5</sup> Referees will only be contacted for applicants who reach the interview stage, and applicants will be informed in advance



Please send your complete proposals to [daniel.burwood@integrityaction.org](mailto:daniel.burwood@integrityaction.org) by the end of 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2024.

Please note that, due to capacity, we cannot commit to giving feedback on unsuccessful applications.

### **ANNEX 1: The Integrity Club model**

While Integrity Action's student-led approach allows Integrity Clubs to be tailored to specific country needs, there are a few core components of each club:

- 1. Students are trained as monitors.** Through interactive exercises, students are trained on their rights and entitlements within the school community, how to identify problems in education delivery, how to record issues through monitoring, and how to constructively engage with school authorities for effective problem resolution. This includes training on communication, negotiation, and problem-solving skills.  
We use a train-the-trainer approach, where Integrity Action trains partner CSOs and they facilitate the training with the focal teachers and students. CSO partners also conduct engagement and sensitisation meetings with school authorities and local government to gain their buy-in and engagement in the activities.
- 2. Students identify and monitor problems.** Problems are recorded and solutions are sought by discussing the issues with school authorities, teachers and other students or parents. Schools are encouraged and supported to establish working groups for collaborative discussion, but Integrity Clubs can decide who to engage and how. Solutions that are implemented are also recorded, to keep track of duty bearers' responsiveness and the students' success rate in leading on finding solutions.
- 3. Students meet regularly to learn about integrity and accountability,** exploring these concepts through exercises and discussion points. This is facilitated by the focal teacher, based on the training and an [Integrity Club Guidebook](#). Students are supported to understand the role they can play as active members of their communities, and to develop debating and communication skills.
- 4. Integrity Clubs champion integrity and accountability** within their schools. The clubs are made up of 20-30 student members and a focal teacher. Working with a select number of students gives each member more opportunity to be actively involved in meetings and with engagements with school authorities. Integrity Club members often spread awareness through their schools, such as through presentations and events, to indirectly engage other students.

Within this model, schools are given the flexibility to adapt the model to work for their context, deciding the details of what they monitor and when and how often to meet. Support is received directly from the partner CSOs.

At the end of the SHINE programme, a [new "how-to" guide](#) was developed with content provided by Integrity Club members. Kesho Kenya also developed resources (a manual on what an Integrity Club is, and an activity handbook with a 22-week curriculum for Integrity Clubs to follow), which can be made available to the successful candidates.

It should be noted that the term "Integrity Club" is not exclusive to Integrity Action and there are other actors supporting schools-based clubs of the same name, including notably within the Kenyan curriculum. However, as far as we are aware, these models all share parallels only with component #3 (and sometimes #4) of the list above – i.e. they do not involve students actively participating in monitoring their school environments and holding authorities to account.

## **ANNEX 2: Responsible use, appropriate practices, and Integrity Action's ethical commitments**

Integrity Action's *PICTURE* principles state that all data must be collected, analysed, and used appropriately and responsibly.

*Appropriate practices* mean that:

### **Our data is collected and quality-assured:**

- With the active and informed participation of affected communities, including those at risk of exclusion
- By teams with appropriate skills and characteristics to capture the voices of different groups
- Using justifiable methodologies, relevant to the purpose and context
- Using reliable tools, neutrally worded, that produce consistent and meaningful results
- In alignment with existing programme management and organisational needs, capacities, and timelines

### **Our data is analysed and reviewed:**

- Collectively, through ongoing dialogue with participants and other stakeholders to sense-check and validate conclusions
- Sensitively, with understanding of the local power dynamics and their importance
- Systematically, with clear logical links between data collected and conclusions reached
- Transparently, so that methods are protected from intended or unintended bias
- In comparison to other relevant data sources, such as through use of baselines to show whether a change has occurred

*Responsible use* means that:

**Our evidence is presented and used:**

- In accordance with what was communicated and agreed with participants
- In accessible formats for all appropriate audiences, including consideration of language and literacy. One piece of evidence may need to be shared in multiple formats
- With acknowledgment given to everyone who contributed significantly (unless anonymity was requested), and with references provided for all sources used
- Without assumptions, especially regarding any unidentified changes or causal links between identified changes and the programme
- With aggregation of people avoided wherever possible, and with real case studies presenting the real stories of real individuals

**Communication of our evidence is open about:**

- The tools and methodologies used to collect and analyse data, and any associated limitations
- The questions and audiences that drove the collection and analysis activity, and how the evidence responds to these needs
- The results and changes identified by the analysis, whether intended or unintended, negative or positive
- The sources of quotes or judgements, with any conflicting perspectives clearly presented and explored<sup>4</sup>
- The independence, or otherwise, of everyone involved in data collection, analysis and presentation; including explanation and justification of any potential bias

Integrity Action makes the following further commitments to ethical research and evaluation:

- We will respect the dignity, privacy, and agency of all who contribute to, or are affected by, our research. We will work within all international human rights conventions and covenants to which the UK is a signatory, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, as well as all relevant local and national laws.
- We will recognise the burdens and costs for all stakeholders in participating in our research, and will only conduct such activities when the benefits can reasonably be expected to outweigh the risks. This includes aiming for evidence of a sufficiently high quality that it can be used for its intended purpose.
- We will pursue objectivity, while recognising that all stakeholders will bring their own agendas. We will not use tools or methods designed to produce misleading results or misrepresent findings, and our communication of evidence will be clear about the roles of authors and participants. We will encourage and enable all

stakeholders to follow appropriate procedures if they feel under pressure to provide inaccurate results.

- We will take reasonable precautions to ensure our design and application of tools, methods and methodologies do not cause harm to participants; such as stress, loss of dignity or self-esteem. This includes consideration of the extent to which methods or questions are intrusive or sensitive, and applies to the wellbeing of the data collectors as well data providers and subjects.

This requires consideration of local behaviours and norms, and the ways in which risk of harm may vary based on each individual's gender, age, disability, ethnicity, religion, marital status, social position, sexual orientation, level of education, physical and mental health, and more.

- We will maintain confidentiality of information, and store all records in line with our data protection policy. Identifiable data will not be shared or used without consent, but any publication of evidence will include publication of anonymised primary data alongside a description of the methodology to allow validation of findings.
- We will ensure participation in our research is based on informed consent, with each individual being accurately informed of the purpose and what the method involves – including their right to refuse or withdraw. Where feasible and appropriate, this information should be provided in advance (e.g. before potential participants have travelled to the venue). It also includes providing participants with contact details should they later wish to make a complaint, withdraw their consent, or simply find out more about the activity.

In the case of children, informed consent should be obtained from both the child and their parent or guardian. In the case of vulnerable adults, a judgement should be made about their capacity to give consent; if it is deemed that such capacity does not exist then the individual's participation should be reconsidered, and only proceed if there is a justifiable purpose and with the informed consent of a guardian or next of kin.