

TERMS OF REFERENCE (ToR)
IMPACT EVALUATION OF EMPATHY TRAINING
June-December 2021

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The Royal Civil Service Commission as the Central Personnel Agency is mandated with the responsibility of maintaining ‘a small, compact and efficient’ civil service to support the government of the day in carrying out its mandates. The civil service, with its bureaucracy of 31,000 plus civil servants, has been shouldering the responsibilities of policy formulation, regulation, development planning, program implementation and Public Service Delivery (PSD) for last many decades with great success. Public Service Delivery is generally defined as “*the institutional mechanism through which public services are delivered to the people by the Local/Municipal, State or Central Gov’ts. wherein ‘public service’ is understood as either ‘services’ or ‘public goods’ essential for people to fulfill their basic needs and are generally provided by the Gov’ts.*” Public service/goods carry the two attributes of being i) non-excludable which means no one can be denied access to it; and ii) non-rivalrous meaning consumption by one does not reduce its availability for others.

In our context, PSD can be understood at two levels. At one level, there is the budgeted activity originating from government commitments towards socio-economic development that results in infrastructure creation such as roads, schools, hospitals, etc. and production of agriculture and livestock goods and commodities, etc. which can be referred to as ‘Infrastructure Creation and Production’. At another level, PSD consists of services availed by citizens on a frequent basis such as services related to water supply, electricity, land, census, education, health, administrative clearance/ approvals, etc. that do not necessarily involve capital expenditure but are nonetheless critical to the citizens. This category of PSD can be referred to as Commonly Availed Services (CAS). Since the civil service provides all these services, it can be safely said that the *raison d’etre* of the Civil Service is Public Service Delivery.

The first category of PSD, referred to as ‘Infrastructure Creation and Production’ has been the most popular kind of service delivered by the government to its citizens. It has also been the most sought after service by the citizens as well since it caters to the basic socio-economic needs of the people. However, due to sustained progress of the country over many years, there is now a dramatic shift in the needs of the people. Infrastructure creation and production, a basic need in the early years of planned development, has achieved satisfactory levels of progress through the successive five-year plans. There is now a visible reduction for ‘infrastructure creation’ but the ‘production’ of Agri goods and commodities will have to grow commensurately to sustain the growing population and diverse needs. It is still possible for ‘infrastructure creation’ needs to feature from time to time to keep up with new human settlement project requirements of the government and

also due to developmental progress exposing us to more needs and continuously elevating the concept and meaning of what is ‘basic’.

The other category of PSD that is referred to as Commonly Aailed Services is the one that needs to be focused on as it is the area that needs a review and revamping for several reasons. The first reason why service delivery with regard to CAS is poor is because it was not seen as critical in comparison to services that led to ‘infrastructure creation and production’, which had a visible benefit while the latter did not. The second reason is poor monitoring due to lack of tools to measure the service delivery standards (SDS) of CAS. The GPMS tool measures ‘infrastructure creation and production’ but not CAS. The third reason is poor accountability due to lack of clarity in the roles and responsibilities of the provider and receiver of public service. The fourth reason is the absence of a robust system to receive client feedback to improve service delivery. The existing performance system only looks at the provider side and completely neglects the most important partner in the service delivery cycle – the receiver of the service. The fifth, and the most important, is the lack of a system to hold the service provider (agency/individual) accountable for its success or failure to deliver based on assessment of the CAS measurement parameters.

Towards this end, RCSC in collaboration with the Public Service Delivery Division under Cabinet Secretariat, Gross National Happiness Commission, and UNDP has embarked on this PSD initiative to carry out various activities to understand the current status, exploring pain points and opportunity spaces in the select CAS. Based on the consultation meetings, deep-user interviews, collective intelligence workshops and sensing making workshops with both the service providers and citizens (service receivers) at central agencies and local government, “empathy” came out as one of the most important values that citizens seek in service providers.

The initiative therefore plans to conduct an empathy training to improve public service delivery in an experimental manner. As an initial phase, the taskforce will be experimenting the training interventions with a select group of officials who are at the forefront of delivering three public services, namely land transaction, inter Dzongkhag census transfer and issuance of new CID. These services are delivered by the National Land Commission and Department of Civil Registration and Census, Ministry of Home and Culture Affairs, and by their respective offices in the Dzongkhag and Thromde administrations.

PURPOSE OF THE ASSESSMENT AND INTENDED USE

The main purpose of this impact assessment is to measure through an independent evaluation the effectiveness of the training and lessons learnt: (i) to evaluate its effectiveness and impacts to make sure that this intervention has positive effect on the service providers who attended this training, and (ii) to provide RCSC, UNDP and its partners with objective inputs and recommendations to

make appropriate changes in the training design to possibly upscale the training intervention for all public service providers in the Civil Service.

The impact can be on the individual service provider's behaviours, skills, attitudes, mindsets and any other attributes of empathy towards citizens availing public services. The hypothesis is that the positive impact on the service providers will contribute towards improved citizen experience of accessing public services. The evidence gathered through this impact evaluation will be used by the implementing and partner agencies in understanding how this training intervention works best, and how it can be improved.

Findings and recommendations from this assessment will be shared with all the relevant agencies including the training partners. This study will be one of the reference points for decision makers in planning or implementing any future training interventions such as empathy training.

SCOPE OF WORK AND METHODOLOGY

The impact assessment should review all aspects of the current empathy training programme from the start through to the end of the training phases. The evaluator should also carry out the impact assessment of the training on the participants some months after the training.

Assessment and evaluation methodology should include, but not limited to the following list:

- **Desk review:** a desk review of relevant documents and comprehensive analysis of training modules.
- **Observation:** a close observation of the training sessions to understand the delivery methods and relevance of the contents to the participants.
- **Quick training impact assessment:** pre and post training surveys of the participants on the attributes of empathy such as attitude, mindset, communication skill, etc.
- **Case studies:** a case study on some of the training recipients in the workplace to assess changes attributable to the training intervention.
- **Interview with stakeholders:** interview with relevant stakeholders to re-confirm the effectiveness of the training recipients in service delivery.
- **Interview with the public:** Interview with the citizens who availed services from the officials who have attended training to see any possible sign of impact.

ISSUES TO BE COVERED

This evaluation and documentation exercise should mainly aim at relevance and adequacy of the training contents and its design. It should also look at possible impacts of the training interventions,

establishing causal relations between the changes in training recipients and the programme inputs. In the process, evaluators should assess its effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, coverage and sustainability through trying to answer the following questions:

- Did the training intervention reach the right and intended target group?
- Are the training contents and modules relevant and adequate?
- Are the resource persons for this training intervention competent enough?
- To what extent has the training intervention achieved its objectives? / How long would it take to see visible impacts of the training interventions?
- To what extent can the identified changes be attributable to this training intervention?
- What could have been done better to make the intervention more effective?
- What are the intended and unintended, positive and negative, direct and indirect effects of this intervention on the service providers, service receivers and institutions at large?
- How has the intervention affected the public service delivery at large?
- To what extent has the intervention contributed to capacity development of the service providers towards strengthening public service delivery?
- How is this training intervention complimentary with activities supported by other government agencies in improving public service delivery?
- What could have been done better to yield a better impact on the training with the same resources?
- Do you recommend formalising and upscaling this training intervention to the rest of the service providers?

QUALIFICATION AND REQUIRED COMPETENCIES OF EVALUATION CONSULTANT

Evaluation consultant must have the following qualification and competencies:

- Master's Degree preferably in Social Science, with expertise in programme/project evaluation preferably in the field related to public services.
- S/he must have demonstrated experience in conducting national/large-scale evaluations, and studies.
- S/he should have at least 5 years of documented experience in research and evaluation.
- Exceptional communication skills both in written and verbal communication.

REPORTING AND DELIVERABLES

The main deliverables of the evaluation include:

- **Inception presentation:** report/present evaluators’ understanding of the evaluation scope, objectives and questions. Presentation should also include a detailed methodology, sampling strategy and data collection method and data analysis plan. It should have a clear monitoring and evaluation plan (M&E plan) with a comprehensive evaluation matrix, etc.
- **Preliminary finding presentation:** The preliminary findings of the training should be submitted to the Public Service Delivery taskforce after the completion of the first phase of empathy training. The evaluation team should present the same to the taskforce either virtually or in-person. The discussions during the presentation will provide useful feedback and suggestions to be included in the final evaluation report along with documentation process, as well as testimonies from different stakeholders involved in this initiative.
- **Draft evaluation report:** The first draft evaluation report will contain a summary of key findings, lessons learnt, and a set of recommendations. The evaluation team should make a powerpoint presentation to the taskforce. The draft will be shared with relevant stakeholders for their comment.
- **Final evaluation report:** After incorporating feedback received on the draft report, the evaluator will submit a final report as per the agreed timeline. The evaluator will make a final presentation of the evaluation findings to the taskforce and relevant stakeholders.

TENTATIVE SCHEDULE

30 working days over a period from June 2021 - December 2021 (UNDP expects all deliverables to be completed by September 2021, but the contract will be signed for a period until December 2021 to account for any unexpected delays due to COVID-19 etc.)

Deliverable	Deadline	Working days	Payment %
Inception presentation with detailed workplan	June - July	10 days	40
Preliminary findings			
Draft evaluation report	September	20 days	60
Final evaluation report			

PAYMENT MODALITY

The payment modality would be based on the following milestones:

- Upon acceptance of the presentations on inception and preliminary findings (40%)

- Upon submission and approval of the final evaluation report (60%)

EXPRESSION OF INTEREST

Expressions of interest should be submitted to UNDP Bhutan not later than **9th June 2021** (5:00 PM, Bhutan time).

The application should comprise of:

- A detailed technical proposal
- Financial proposal with detailed cost breakdown
- An updated copy of the CV
- Two examples of recently completed evaluation reports

The proposal with complete set of documents can be submitted to procurement.bt@undp.org