Consultancy (International Consultant)
Terms of Reference (ToR) for Baseline, Mid Term Review, and End Line Evaluation of TeamUp Uganda Program

Posting level: International Consultant.
Language Required: English, and understanding of Luganda is an asset.
Organization (Benefiting country): Uganda (Mityana, Kassanda and Kampala districts).
Expected duration of assignment: Four (4) years duration with the level of efforts to conduct Baseline, Midline, and Endline evaluation.
Program thematic areas: Agriculture, WASH, and Sexual Reproductive Health (SRH).
Procurement Reference: Published date: June 20, 2022. Closing date: August 12, 2022.

1. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION
Please include the following information in each section.

a) DSW Background

Deutsche Stiftung Weltbevölkerung (DSW) is a global development and advocacy organization focusing on the needs and potential of the largest youth generation in history. We are committed to create demand for and access to health information, services, and supplies, and to securing their right to a brighter future. We achieve this by engaging in gender-sensitive advocacy, capacity development, and family planning initiatives.

With our headquarters in Germany, DSW maintains offices in Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda, as well as liaison offices in Berlin and Brussels. DSW also advocates for investment in research and innovation to fight poverty-related and neglected tropical diseases.

b) Project Background

Historical project context
TeamUp Uganda program is an international consortium dedicated to improving the lives of young people in rural Uganda by leveraging their respective teams and resources to produce outcomes with higher measurable impact than could be achieved independently. After having piloted collaboration models with three partner organizations in the areas of agriculture, water and health in five sub-counties of Mityana District from 2018 - 2022, TeamUp Uganda seeks to scale and replicate successful approaches at the district level (meso/horizontal) and at the national level (macro/vertical). At the meso level, implementing partners (IPs) will introduce a management framework for cross-sector collaboration and public-private partnerships (PPP) to communities, government stakeholders, and development partners in five districts. At the macro level, national-level actors will be engaged, i.e. NGO networks and associations, parliamentary fora, ministries, and development partners.
Problems/situations that led to the intervention idea
At the macro (national) level, relevant policies are published but not effectively communicated or implemented at the meso (district) level, largely because the District Local Governments have decentralized authority and themselves are weakened by poor accountability cultures. TeamUp Uganda program facilitates dialogues amongst the stakeholders at the national, regional, district, and community levels to boost the execution of approved policies and guidelines, as well as advocating for strategic budget allocations at the national and district level to facilitate implementation of priorities in the district development plans, and NDP.

Logframe higher results level (Overall Outcome, Specific Outcome, and Impact).
The program aims to improve the quality of life of the youth aged 15 – 30 years in Uganda through scaling up the TeamUp Uganda program approach from micro through meso to macro level, and other development partners replicating the TeamUp Uganda program cross-sectoral collaboration approach.

The following evaluation questions are based on the Logframe developed during the planning phase of the project. They may be refined, and additional evaluation questions may be developed. This process will take place in intensive consultations between the evaluator and the project teams in Germany and Uganda. TeamUp Uganda program desires to create the following five (5) specific outcomes with their corresponding evaluation questions to guide the indicators performance assessment:

**Overall outcome:** Youth (young men and women) in rural Uganda - in particular in Mityana and Kassanda districts - have an enhanced quality of life and regional and national stakeholders actively promote cross-sector collaboration across Uganda.
- To what extent has the TeamUp Uganda program improved the quality of life of the youths (direct beneficiaries)?
- To what extent have the national stakeholders advocated for consideration of youth interests, cross-sector collaboration and sustainable service delivery?

**Specific outcome 1:** Youth organizations represent youth interests in agriculture, health, and water in rural Uganda at all levels (Micro/Meso/Macro).
- To what extent have the youth organizations been formalized (legally recognized by the government) and their actions addressed the issues affecting the youth, especially unemployment, inequalities, and limited youths-friendly services?
- What types of and how many services are provided by the youth organizations to the targeted youths?
- To what extent have the youth-led engagements conducted with government/non-government stakeholders enhanced the implementation of policies?
- To what extent has the youth network influenced the national policies, development plans, and budgets?

**Specific outcome 2:** Youth have improved their economic situation (Micro) and regional and national level stakeholders contribute towards these enhanced and gender-sensitive income opportunities in rural Uganda (Meso/Macro).
- To what extent has the TeamUp Uganda program boosted business income earned from the youths’ individual or group businesses? How many youth businesses that were created in the first two (2) initial years of the program are still operating successfully in year four (4)?
- To what extent are women represented in senior roles in the community water committees?
● To what extent did the increased presence of women in leadership roles within the water committees lead to improved income generating opportunities for female youth?

● How many private and public national-level stakeholders developed youth-friendly products and services after consultation with TeamUp Uganda program youth representatives? What are these youth-friendly products and services?

Specific outcome 3: Youth increasingly utilize professional health services (Micro) and regional and national level stakeholders contribute towards improved service provision in rural Uganda (Meso/Macro).

● To what extent have the youths reached through the Nurse BEEs, Youth Clubs (YCs) and Youth Empowerment Centers (YECs) utilized youth-friendly and gender-sensitive SRH services?

● How effective have the local government and development partners communicated the central government policy on rural water reliability assurance to the targeted communities?

● By what extent has the national budget allotted to the SRH/FP line increased over the lifespan of the TeamUp Uganda program?

Specific outcome 4: TeamUp Uganda program implementation partners have increased individual and joint capacities to promote TeamUp Uganda program concerns (Meso).

● To what extent have the targeted TeamUp Uganda program stakeholders contextualized and/or scrutinized the program achievements through the lens of cross-sector collaboration and learning?

● To what extent have the cross-sector collaboration and learning continued to strengthen TeamUp program synergies?

Specific outcome 5: Public and private regional and national level stakeholders engage in cross-sector planning and sustainable service delivery models (Meso/Macro).

● How many PROs are participating in the TeamUp Uganda program community of practice? And, how actively are they participating in the TeamUp Uganda program community of practice?

● How many of the PROs actively participating in the TeamUp Uganda program community of practice are committed to adopting the TeamUp Uganda program approach?

Geographical scope

The TeamUp Uganda program-implementing partners will implement the program within the twelve sub-counties: seven new sub-counties (five (5) in Mityana, and two (2) in Kassanda), and five (5) sub-counties in Mityana where the program was piloted. Whave Solutions will expand its work to the entire Kassanda, Mityana, and three (3) additional neighboring districts (Kakumiro, Kiboga and Nakaseke) guided by the replication strategy. Since, the TeamUp Uganda program approach is flexible and willing to integrate other partners into its cross-sectoral and cross-stakeholders approach, the list of stakeholders below will be updated over the program period.

TeamUp Uganda program stakeholders

The project stakeholders to guide sampling (sampling frame) that answers the evaluation questions:

Youth organizations: 90 Out-of-school youth clubs; 40 In-school-youth clubs (1,200 youths); 180 Youth Farmers Field Schools (YFFS) – also implementing the VSLAs approach;

Community-based organizations: 750 Water and Sanitation Committees; 8 Farmer Organizations; 40 Parent Teachers Associations (PTAs); 40 Senior Management Committees (SMCs); 20 Nurse BEEs.
**Government Institution:** 40 Schools (20 Schools from the pilot phase); 2 Districts, and 12 Sub-counties in the two districts

**Youth members:** 2,700 youths from the 90 Out-of-school youth clubs; 1,200 youths from the 40 In-school-youth clubs; 54 Peer Facilitators; 240 Peer Educators; 24 Youth Champions; 36 Youth Hand Washing Station Entrepreneurs; 54 Youth Water Assurance Champions; 5,400 YFFS members; 60 YFFS Facilitators; 360 Change Agents; 2,700 VSLA leaders; 180 VSLA Coaches; 720 Crop Experts; 180 Social media trainer;

**Community members:** 750 Communities (Average of 250 served by a water point: 750 x 250 people = 187,500 people); 20 BEEs (Each reaching approximately 50 women on monthly basis for three years = 20 x 50 x 12 x 3 = 36,000 women); 39,000 (Each of the 3,900 youth club members will reach out to 10 peers = 39,000).

**Governmental body members:** 52 Health facilities staff; 30 Senior Government Extension Personnel (GEPs) and the 150 Field Government Extension Personnel (They will help Whave Solutions to sign agreements with 750 communities); and 80 teachers.

**Non-Governmental organizational body members:** 6 Senior NGO staff and 18 Field-level NGO staff supporting advocacy and implementation of the water points preventative maintenance contract.

c) **Scope of Assignment**

The scope of the assignment is to facilitate program performance through recommending better strategies and processes to enhance synergies through improving collaboration, learning, and adaptive management, and providing accountabilities to the program stakeholders. The M&E functions to be performed entail strengthening the M&E system through conducting three (3) evaluations across the life of award of the program:

1. The formative (baseline) evaluation to assess the status of the situations/conditions that the TeamUp Uganda program intends to change before the program implementation (For all indicators in the Logframe assigned to the evaluation consultant).
2. Midline evaluation to assess the continued relevance, progress made towards achieving intended outcomes (For all indicators in the log frame assigned to the evaluation consultants), taking stock of initial lessons learned, and guiding evidence-based decisions making regarding how to strategize to optimize program performance as well as contribution to the program impact.
3. Endline evaluation to assess the achievement-level of overall program performance (For all indicators in the log frame assigned to the evaluation consultants), provide evidence for use in policy formulation, and judge the possibilities for future collaborations for a sustained replication of TeamUp Uganda program model, approaches and best practices within Uganda.

**Evaluation Questions and Criteria.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNo.</th>
<th>DAC Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Farsi</th>
<th>Evolution</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Terms of Reference</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | Relevance.         | ● To what extent does the TeamUp Uganda program design respond to beneficiaries needs?  
● How well aligned is the TeamUp Uganda program with national and international policies and standards?  
● To what extent has the overall program design remained valid? |
| 2 | Effectiveness.     | ● To what extent has the lessons learning system been strengthened and used to guide adaptive management? And, how effectively has the lesson learning system guided the strengthening of TeamUp Uganda program knowledge management?  
● To what extent has the communication between Implementing Partners, Program Coordinating Unit and International Coordinating Unit improved the culture of evidence-based decision making, and ensured smooth TeamUp Uganda program implementation?  
● To what extent has the TeamUp Uganda program used the midline evaluation findings to inform TeamUp Uganda program adaptation, and systemic change? And, to what extent has the program adaptation resulted into an enhanced program performance and systemic change?  
● To what extent has the TeamUp Uganda program integrated climate change into agribusiness, and SRHR and adopted environmentally friendly Income Generating Activities (IGAs)?  
● By how much has the designed water harvesting and irrigation technologies reduced the cost of irrigation, labor requirement, and drudgery? In addition, to what extent has it improved agricultural production and productivity (meso)?  
● To what extent has the partnership with agri-inputs dealers (youth-friendly inputs scheme) and UNADA (Uganda National Agro-inputs dealers Association) improved access to genuine and quality inputs (meso)?  
● To what extent has the introduction of CommCare changed data processing outputs and overall quality? |
| 3 | Efficiency.        | ● How cost-effective is the TeamUp Uganda program approach as an integrated and holistic service delivery model?  
● By how much has the designed water harvesting and irrigation technologies reduced the cost of irrigation, labor requirement, and drudgery? In addition, to what extent has it improved agricultural production and productivity (meso)?  
● To what extent have the TeamUp Uganda program approaches reduced waste of resources (financial, human, and physical assets) or boosted program performance with the least resources (financial, human, and physical assets), time and efforts? What context of the efficiency would you attribute to: (1). collaboration amongst the IPs, (2). collaboration between IPs and external stakeholders, and (3). Amongst the external stakeholders? |
| 4 | Sustainability     | ● To what extent have the youth organizational (YECs, YFFS, and YCs) capacities been strengthened to sustain representation of youths’ interests in the three sectors, |
### TERMS OF REFERENCE GUIDELINE

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>improved gender-sensitive income opportunities, and utilization of professional health services, also beyond the program period?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● To what extent has the TeamUp Uganda program strengthened the capacity of the youth organizations for institutional and financial sustainability?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● To what extent has the TeamUp Uganda program increased Implementing Partners’ capacities to both individually and jointly promote TeamUp Uganda program concerns, and engagement of public and private regional and national stakeholders promoted cross-sector planning and service delivery models sustainably?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● To what extent will the achievements in gender equality persist after the conclusion of the TeamUp Uganda program? Have processes contributed to sustaining these benefits? Have mechanisms been set up to support the achievement of gender equality in the longer term?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● To what extent have the youths’ income opportunities been diversified? And, how well have these income opportunities addressed the economic inequality, and disability inclusion for both males and females living in the twelve (12) sub-counties of Mityanna and Kassanda districts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Are the TeamUp Uganda program 8,940 targeted youths who benefited from more interventions experiencing better quality life than those who benefited from fewer interventions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● To what extent has the TeamUp Uganda program fostered gender equality and female empowerment in the twelve (12) sub-counties of Mityanna and Kassanda districts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● To what extent has the program increased its political visibility and benefits through representation in the ministries’ Technical Working Groups (TWGs), national budgeting processes, and promoted information sharing on the national platforms?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● To what extent have the achieved program outcomes in agriculture, WASH, and SRHR translated into gender equality for the YFFS members, youth clubs members, WASH entrepreneurs, and Water Youths Assurance Champions within the twelve sub-counties of Mityanna and Kassanda districts?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● To what extent have the social enterprise models achieved the program outcomes as well as scaled up at the meso and micro level, and replicated at the national level?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● What kind of synergies evolved or emerged because of the integrated and cross-sectoral collaboration (meso, micro and macro)? To what extent have the program synergies been enhanced through the TeamUp Uganda program cross-sector and cross-stakeholders collaboration, and layering of interventions across the targeted youth groups?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● To what extent have the program stakeholders been actively involved in the program decision-making, participatory solving, and owning the achieved program outcomes?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### METHODOLOGY
TeamUp Uganda program is interested in assessing the level of impact and synergy of the TeamUp Uganda program on the targeted 8,940 youths. The consultant should develop and test the level of statistical differences of the synergy merge for the youths benefiting from the different number of interventions, that is, (1) one intervention, (2), two interventions, and (3), three interventions. The evaluation study should also assess the TeamUp Uganda program performance, and assess if these performances are attributed to the TeamUp Uganda program interventions. For reliability purposes, the Consultant’s preferred design should be suitable for the three evaluations (Baseline, Midline, and End line evaluation).

Given the evaluation purposes and questions under section (c), as well as the list of all the direct participants, indirect participants and intermediaries, and geographical scope; the consultant should recommend the most appropriate sampling techniques for the different samples required to answer the evaluation questions as well as assess the values for all the indicators assigned to the external consultant.

Key indicators to guide the sample size calculation:

- **Micro (Targeted youths):** 80% of 8,940 direct target beneficiaries perceiving that their quality of life has improved by the end of the program (disaggregated by sex and sector).
- **Micro (Youth organizations):** 80% of target youth organisations provide at least 2 services to 8,940 target youth by the end of the program (disaggregated by sex, marital status, youth structure).
- **Micro (Businesses):** 70% of target youth generating income from their individual or group businesses by the end of the program (disaggregated by sex).
- **Micro (Indirect TeamUp Uganda program beneficiaries):** 40% increase of target 75,000 youth utilising youth-friendly and gender-sensitive SRH services by the end of the program (disaggregated by sex, age, type of service and sub-county).
- **Micro (Community water committees):** 70% of women that are trained to be members of community water committees understand the terms and conditions of water supply assurance service agreements and effective communication to community members by the end of the program.

Please specify the level of significance and power used for the sample size calculation.
The data collection methodology.

The study shall involve data collection with the different target groups from the direct groups, direct institutions, and intermediaries’ participants. The study will employ both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods: (1) individual interviews, (2) focus group discussions, (3) observations, (4) surveys, (5) direct measurement, (6) use of secondary data, and (7) participatory approaches.

3. TASKS AND DELIVERABLES

This section outlines the minimum standards for the activities, and deliverables expected of the consultant. The consultant should detail a comprehensive list of tasks to be executed under each activity to produce the intended deliverables, and use the details as a guide for compiling the financial proposal. The consultant should be flexible to adopt additional activities and deliverables as deemed necessary to satisfactorily meet the purposes of the TeamUp Uganda program evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNo.</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | Developing and submitting inception report to DSW with refined methodology and data collection tools | ● Inception report  
● Detailed fieldwork plan  
● Refined methodological framework  
● Data collection tools  
● Data collectors training manual. |
| 2    | Recruiting, orienting, and training experienced research assistants/ enumerators | ● Recruit and train research assistants/ enumerators  
● Pre-testing and adjustment of questionnaires, incl. follow-up training  
● Approved survey tools and methodologies.  
● Enumerators training report. |
| 3    | Collection of Data                                                       | ● Validated list of the program participants and stakeholders (Provided by the TeamUp Uganda program M&E team).  
● List of the sampled study populations.  
● Approved data collection plans shared with the program team for effective mobilization.  
● Raw datasets for the study, including recordings transcriptions, and interview notes for KII s and FGDs  
● Regular data quality checks and succinct progress updates  
● Field-level data collection report.  
● Research ethical clearance (Authorization to conduct evaluations with the study populations, and publish the evaluation findings). |
| 4    | Data analysis and drafting of the report.                                | ● Raw data of evaluation findings  
● Requested baseline, midline, and endline indicator values  
● First draft of baseline, midline, and endline evaluation reports. |
| 5    | Validation Meeting with Stakeholders.                                    | ● Report summarizing stakeholder inputs and information acquired during the meeting |
| 6    | Final Report & Dissemination                                             | ● Final baseline, midline, and endline indicator values |
Findings at both international and national levels

- Final baseline, midline, and endline datasets.
- Final baseline, midline, and endline reports.

7 Dissemination of results, action learning, and feedback

- Presentation of the main baseline, midline, and endline results, including baseline values, new target values, and suggested project priorities
- Filled 360° feedback questionnaire

4. DURATION AND TIME SCHEDULE

The applicant should include their proposed work plan - a detailed list of all the tasks with their respective durations for each activity required to deliver the respective deliverable(s). The financial proposal should be task-oriented; therefore, detailed and thought-out tasks are required for an effective financial proposal evaluation.

The baseline is scheduled between July and September, Midline must be accomplished between October and December 2024 so that it guides strategic adaptive management for the subsequent planning phase, and end-line evaluation to be conducted between December 2025 and February 2026

5. FINANCIAL PROPOSAL

The Consultant fees should be reflected in the fees per workday (a full day is a minimum of 8 working hours) including taxes, social security contributions and VAT, and the number of workdays. The consultant should state the total budget, including expenses such as travel, insurance and communication costs.

The eligible consultant should also indicate the amount budgeted for as (1). contingency, and (2). research ethical clearance.

The payment schedule and milestones will be negotiated before contract signing.

6. REQUIRED EXPERTISE AND QUALIFICATIONS.

The TeamUp Uganda program is aiming to collaborate with a consulting firm that either operates internationally with a base in Uganda or operates internationally with an agreement to collaborate with an Uganda-based national consulting firm. In case it’s a hybrid of an international and a Uganda-based national consulting firm then the International Evaluation Consultant will lead the evaluation process and will decide on the planning and distribution of the evaluation workload and tasks. The Team Leader will have the overall evaluation responsibility and accountability for the report writing and data analyses. The National Evaluation Consultant will provide support to the International Evaluation Consultant throughout the evaluation process.

Due to the nature of the program, the consultant team should be interdisciplinary as well as methodically and technically competent, impartial and independent fulfilling the following requirements:
● Ph.D. or Postgraduate degree in social and development sciences, development economics, statistics, data science, econometrics, public health, agriculture, social works, and social administration, public policy, public administration, international relations, evaluation, or a related subject with credible research skills.

● At least 10 years of relevant working experience in monitoring and evaluation and research with a proven track record of multi-stakeholder program evaluations (applies only to team leaders).

● Previous experience in evaluations in national and politically sensitive environments and in managing multiple stakeholders.

● Understanding of Logframes, and smart indicators;

● Experience assessing large-scale multi-sector projects and their synergy effects;

● Understanding of civil society networks and advocacy concepts/frameworks;

● Good communication skills and ability to communicate with various stakeholders and to express concisely, clearly ideas and concepts;

● Research experience in rural water supply and/or WASH, social entrepreneurship, agricultural innovation in rural settings, and SRHR.

● Excellent communication and reporting-writing skills in English.

● Language proficiency: English is mandatory; Luganda and Swahili are an asset;

Functional Competencies:

● Strong analytical and M&E skills;

● Generates innovative, practical solutions to challenging situations;

● Conceptualizes and analyses problems to identify key issues, underlying problems, and how they relate;

● Demonstrates strong oral and written communication skills;

● Demonstrates openness to change and ability to manage complexities;

● Responds positively to critical feedback and differing points of view.

● A good understanding of Gender Equality, Gender-Based Violence, and women’s rights challenges in the TeamUp Uganda program area.

● Context (Agriculture, WASH, and SRH) is highly desirable.

7. PAYMENT SCHEDULE

The agreed contract sum will be divided by three to facilitate the baseline, midterm review, and end-line evaluation respectively. For example, the baseline would take a third of the overall contract sum. The same applies to the midterm review and end-line evaluations.

The payment for each of the evaluations, that is baseline, midterm review, and end-line evaluation, will be in four installments, which shall be disaggregated as follows:

● First installment of 30% of the contract sum for each of the evaluations (baseline, midterm, and end-line) after approval of the inception reports, detailed work plan, refined methodology, and data collection tools.

● Second installment of 30% of the contract sum for each of the evaluations (baseline, midterm, and end-line) after approval of the raw data of evaluation findings and program indicator values.

● Third installment of 30% of the contract sum for each of the evaluations (baseline, midterm, and end-line) after approval of the final evaluation (baseline, midterm, and end-line) report, and presentation of the main findings to both the international, and national team.
● The remaining last 10% payable after submission of the satisfactory final endline evaluation report.

8. SUBMISSION OF REPORTS, AND DATA SETS
All the raw data, and agreed deliverables are to be delivered to the DSW team.

9. CONFIDENTIALITY AND DATA OWNERSHIP
The consultant will maintain the confidentiality of those participating in the survey at all stages. All data is confidential and is the property of DSW. No data or other information from this survey will be released to third parties without the written approval of DSW. The consultant will handover the overall data and filled questionnaires to DSW and will not destroy information and material at the end of the project and after all data and original documentation has been delivered to DSW.

10. APPLICATION GUIDELINES
The eligible consultants should apply with the following documents no later than July 20, 2022. Note that the max. page number of the proposal is limited to 15 pages (excl. sample copies).

● A cover letter expressing your interest and motivation for this job and a brief methodology on how you will approach and conduct the work.
● A brief description of the proposed methodology for carrying out the baseline, midterm evaluation, and evaluation;
● Time and work plan incl. any comments on the timeframe in accordance with the timeframe and deliverables specified in this ToR
● The CVs of each researcher indicating experience in similar evaluations and the contact information of three (3) references.
● Financial Proposal - The proposed budget should include daily fee rates in Euro for consulting services (national and international consultants) broken down by task. Please note that the financial proposal is all-inclusive and shall consider various expenses incurred by the consultant during the contract period (e.g. fee and any other relevant expenses related to the performance of services).
● Copy of two recent relevant evaluation reports.

11. SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL
Please send your proposal in PDF format by July 20, 2022 (1700 Hrs, EAT) to the following e-mail. Lora.Yousef@dsw.org and bonni-face.labeja@a4huganda.org
Please note that due to the large number of applications, we can inform only successful candidates about the outcome or status of the selection process. Applications will be reviewed on a rolling basis.