

# Terms of Reference

## Evaluation of Phase One of Children, Youth and Communities for Change

Delivered by  
Church and Society Programme, CCAP Synod of Livingstonia

In partnership with  
Transform Aid International



## Contents

<b>Contents .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1. Evaluation Summary.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. Background.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. Description of Project.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>About Church and Society Programme .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>About Transform Aid International.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>About the CYCC Project .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4. Evaluation Audiences.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4.1 Target Communities .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4.2 CSP staff and board .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4.3 TAI staff, board and supporters .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4.4 Other audiences .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>5. Evaluation Type .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>6. Evaluation Purpose .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>7. Key Evaluation Questions .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>9. Evaluation Approach.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>9.1 Methodology .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>9.2 Ethical Standards and Principles .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>9.3 Evaluation Criteria.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>10. Evaluation Team .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>10.1 Authority and Responsibility.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>11. Limitations .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>12. Logistics.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>13. Timeframe.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>14. Deliverables and key tasks.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>14.1 Deliverables .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>14.2 Key tasks .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>15. Management and Reporting Arrangements.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>16. Security .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>17. Ownership and confidentiality.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>18. Child safeguarding and PSEASH .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>19. Budget/Costs.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>20. Insurance.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>21. Terms of engagement .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>22. Disclaimer .....</b>	<b>15</b>

<b>23. Submission of Interest.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>24. Closing date.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Annex 1: Stakeholders.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Annex 2: Essential Criteria (skills and experience) .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Annex 3: TAI Impact Indicators.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Annex 4: Post-evaluation Questionnaire .....</b>	<b>17</b>

## 1. Evaluation Summary

Project	Children, Youth and Communities for Change (CYCC)
Location	Rhumpi and Karonga, Northern Region, Malawi
Implementing Organisation	Church and Society Programme, CCAP Synod of Livingstonia
Evaluation Type	Formative/Process
Evaluation Purpose	End of phase one (years 1-3) to inform phase 2 (years 4-6) and phase 3 (years 7-9)
Methodologies	Primary and secondary research methodologies, including desk and field-based research, as selected by evaluator and agreed with CSP and TAI.
Evaluation start-end dates	10 <sup>th</sup> January 2022 – 14 <sup>th</sup> February 2022
Anticipated Evaluation Report Date	14 <sup>th</sup> March 2022

## 2. Background

The Church of Central Africa Presbyterian (CCAP) Synod of Livingstonia's Church and Society Programme (CSP), in partnership with Transform Aid International (TAI) is looking to recruit a qualified and experienced consultant to conduct an end-of-phase project evaluation. The consultant will evaluate the Children, Youth and Communities for Change (CYCC) project as implemented by CSP in Rhumpi and Karonga districts of Northern Malawi. This Terms of Reference provides an overview of the project to be evaluated, the aims of the project evaluation, the expectations of what will be delivered and how, and full details on how to apply for the consultancy assignment. The Terms of Reference have been developed in collaboration between CSP and TAI staff.

## 3. Description of Project

The CYCC project is implemented by CSP in partnership with TAI.

### **About Church and Society Programme**

Established in 1999, the Church & Society Programme is the human rights and governance department of the Central Church of Africa Presbyterian (CCAP) Synod of Livingstonia. The northern region of Malawi is the primary catchment area for the projects of Church & Society. However, projects are implemented at local, district, regional and national levels. While CSP is a department of the Synod of Livingstonia, it operates with its own independent board of trustees, management and staff team, and financial systems.

### **About Transform Aid International**

Transform Aid International (TAI) is a faith-based, development agency, working alongside locally based Christian partner agencies to enable vulnerable children, youth and their communities to lift themselves out of poverty. Transform Aid, formerly Baptist World Aid Australia (BWAA), has been running a child sponsorship program for 43 years. The CYCC program has evolved from initially being welfare-based, to community development projects implemented by local partners that benefit children, youth, and their community in a holistic manner. Projects are designed and implemented by local partners according to each individual context, and with a strengths and rights based approach. TAI values genuine

partnerships with locally based partner organisations, children, youth, communities and other stakeholders to improve the well-being, rights, and life opportunities of children and youth, and their families, in poor communities. TAI is committed to evidence-based practice, efficiency, effectiveness, equity and ethics in its development programs.

### **About the CYCC Project**

The project is based on the theory that a vibrant community that promotes the wellbeing of children, youth and other vulnerable and marginalized community groups has to have skilled, knowledgeable and functional community structures where children, youths and other vulnerable groups meaningfully participate. Such structures would spur improved public service delivery that is accessible, affordable and of high quality and would contribute to the wellbeing of children and youth. It is further assumed that informed children, youth and the community at large regarding their rights and responsibilities would be able to exercise their entitlements and demand fulfilment of the same.

### **Approach and Methodology**

The project takes a Human Rights Based Approach and Group Based Approach.

HRBA is executed to empower rights holders (children, youth and communities) to demand their rights and strengthening duty bearers to fulfil their obligations. The supply side of this divide involves building the capacity of duty bearers, both elected and appointed, for improved responsiveness. The demand side of it involves capacity building in social accountability toolkit, including citizen report cards and community score cards, that will enable them to effectively demand quality service delivery, participatory budgeting and public expenditure tracking as well as development of citizen charters.

Under the group-based approach, CSP will establish and train self-help groups (SHGs) in the project area. The self-help group approach (SHGA) is a social, economic and political empowerment tool that primarily targets homogenous women that come together with a common purpose of saving money, sharing business ideas, taking loans from their savings to finance such ideas and repay the loans with a small interest, as well as helping each other in addressing individual, household and community problems through their social discussions.

Apart from SHGs, CSP will also target other groups such as children's groups, youth groups, VDCs and VDCs. These groups will be trained on their roles and responsibilities in relation to achieving the CYCC goal and outcomes. With knowledge on reflection action, CSP will facilitate the development of community action plans based on identified needs and priorities.

### **Target Groups**

The CYCC programme is being implemented in Rumphu (TA Mwamlowe) and Karonga (TA Wasambo) districts in northern Malawi. The proposed project impact area is a lakeshore that forms part of the great East African rift valley. The epicentre of the project is Uliwa on the Karonga side where the field office is situated. The area has a combined population of 62,763 people. Within this area the project is specifically targeting:

- 15,700 direct beneficiaries
- 37,740 indirect beneficiaries

This is achieved through:

- 1,300 Child Partners

- 7,200 households
- Groups and structures:
  - Self Help Groups and community structures - 308
  - Registered Structures - 11
  - Government Structures - 37

Goal	<b>An enabling environment is created in which children and youths are able free and safeguarded to effectively participate in public life, development, survival and protection initiatives at local level.</b>
Long term OUTCOME	
1	Skilled, knowledgeable and functional community structures where children, youths and other vulnerable groups meaningfully participate.
2	Improved public service delivery that is accessible, affordable and of high quality contributes to wellbeing of children and youth
3	Children and youth enjoy safer communities where harmful practices are reduced.
4	Vulnerable children, youth and women are empowered to access socio and economic opportunities
Intermediate OUTCOME	
1	Inclusive community structures that are functional and able to initiate local development
2	Rights holders particularly children, youth and most vulnerable groups are knowledgeable and skilled to engage with duty bearers who are responsive to community demands for improved service delivery
3	Children, youth and community informed and aware of their rights and responsibilities leading to questioning of harmful practices and increased reporting and documentation of abuses and violations
4	Youth and Women skilled, knowledgeable and confident to actively pursue economic activities
OUTPUTS	
1	Community structures that include children and youth are established and trained on their roles and responsibilities
1	Middle level duty bearers trained on RBA approach and their roles and responsibilities (traditional leaders, Director of Planning and Development, Traditional Authority, councillors etc)
1	Local structures and communities at large aware about human rights and RBA

2	Community equipped with knowledge and skill of social accountability toolbox.
2	Community linked to duty bearers and platform for dialogue between rights holders and duty bearers established.
2	Local development initiatives are pursued and implemented by local structures
2	Communities sensitized on covid-19 on prevention and containment measures
3	PPEs procured and distributed to CSP staff and project structures
3	Traditional and opinion leaders trained on Human Rights and CRC and their responsibilities
3,2	Children and youth groups trained on Human Rights and their responsibilities
3	Children, Youth and other CP structures trained and equipped with rights, CRC, case management
4	Youth and women mobilised, and groups established
4	SHGs and women forums trained on business skills
4	Groups linked to markets and micro finance institutions

## 4. Evaluation Audiences

The main audiences of this evaluation are the target communities, TAI and CSP.

### 4.1 Target Communities

The project was designed with the participation of children, youth, and the communities within the target area. As well as contributing vital input to the evaluation process they will receive summary feedback on the evaluation findings.

### 4.2 CSP staff and board

Project staff will use the evaluation to improve project design and implementation. Management will use the evaluation to ensure organisational procedures and policies are being effectively followed and that they are conducive to effective project delivery. The board will use the report to ensure accountability of resources and contribution of CYCC to CSP's strategic objectives.

### 4.3 TAI staff, board and supporters

TAI programme staff will use findings to support CSP in improving the project where needed. TAI supporter relations staff will use the information to communicate the successes of the project with supporters, including the Australian NGO Cooperation Program (ANCP). The TAI board will use the findings to ensure they understand how funds are being spent, what is being achieved and to promote organisation transparency and accountability.

### 4.4 Other audiences

CSP and TAI may share findings from the evaluation with other stakeholders as relevant.

## 5. Evaluation Type

This is formative (process) evaluation. This is the end of the first phase of the project, three years have been completed and there are 6 more years of implementation ahead. As such, it is too early to measure longer term outcomes and impact. Instead, the evaluation will measure implementation of activities, short-term outcomes as a means of assessing if the project is on course to achieve its longer-term objectives and where possible highlight areas of adjustment that improve likelihood of meeting these long-term objectives.

## 6. Evaluation Purpose

The purpose of the evaluation is to:

- Identify whether or not the project is being implemented as planned.
- Measure progress towards target indicators.
- Assess the effectiveness of the CYCC communication strategy.
- Investigate the integration of programme activities and CYCC Connections.
- Assess the project approaches to allow for learnings about the CYCC Framework
- Understand how different structures and resources were used.
- Understand the involvement and experiences of different stakeholders, including:
  - Involvement of the most vulnerable
  - Extent and effectiveness of youth-adult partnership
  - Extent and strength of the relationships with stakeholders
  - Identify opportunities for growth or future focus.
  - Identify the extent to which stakeholders appreciate the empowerment approach as opposed to ‘hand outs’
- Assess exposures, reach, knowledge, attitudes.
- Identify any implementation failure or theory/design failure
- Identify challenges, barriers, enablers and lessons learned to implementation.
- Capture contextual factors and how these might have impacted the short-term outcomes and how they might continue to impact future outcomes.
- Integration of the CYCC project within wider CSP activities including:
  - Operation of Uliwa field office
  - Extent to which organisational policies and procedures were adhered to and whether they enhanced or frustrated project implementation
  - Support for implementation of CYCC beyond project staff, i.e., management, administration and board.

### **Covid-19 Context**

While the evaluation seeks to understand the impact of the wider context of the project’s implementation, the majority of Phase One was implemented in the context of Covid-19. Therefore, the evaluation also needs to assess the projects effectiveness in adapting to changing circumstances and needs, as well as recommending changes required to meet new and additional vulnerabilities.

## 7. Key Evaluation Questions

Below are suggested key evaluation questions that will be further refined with cooperation of CSP, TAI and the evaluation consultant. The final questions will form the bases for designing interview and discussion tools.

**Relevance (Is the intervention doing the right thing?)**



1. Is the project reaching the target population?
  - a. Is the project reaching the right groups of people? E.g., Involvement of youth, women, children, persons with disabilities and other vulnerable groups.
  - b. Are beneficiary number estimates/targets realistic?
  - c. Is the program being monitored and evaluated as planned?
  - d. To what extent are the project objectives, outputs, approaches, and assumptions suitable to the priorities of community and aligned with local government priorities?

**Effectiveness (Is the intervention achieving its objectives?)**

2. Has community awareness and engagement been effective?
  - a. Has CYCC Connection been implemented as planned? E.g., Child partner recruitment targets reached, child partner households understand progress, awareness of relationship between child partners and delivery of project activities.
  - b. To what extent do community stakeholders understand the project, its activities and the goals to which they contribute?
  - c. To what extent do stakeholders appreciate the empowerment approach as opposed to 'hand outs'?
  - d. To what extent are the project objectives, outputs, approaches, and assumptions suitable to the priorities of community and align with the local government priorities?
  - e. Has the project been delivered with quality according to the proposed approaches and good practices (i.e., development principles) in the sector?

**Impact (What difference does the intervention make?)**

3. What progress has been made towards target indicators?
  - a. What changes are being seen in child and youth well-being in communities (positive, negative and unexpected/surprising)? How has the project contributed toward those changes?
  - b. What have been some changes (positive, negative and unexpected/surprising) on formal education in communities? How has the project contributed toward those changes?
  - c. What are changes (positive, negative and unexpected/surprising) on health in communities? How has the project contributed toward those changes?
  - d. What degree of child participation can be seen in communities (to what extent do children have a voice in decisions and activities that affect them)? How has the project contributed to this?
4. Is there evidence of positive change for project beneficiaries and partners?
  - a. Have there been any changes in the most significant issues that were identified at the start of the project? If so, what?
  - b. At child/youth, household and community levels; what contribution has the project made so far toward development, protection and livelihoods?
  - c. How have these changes been experienced and distributed among project beneficiaries? E.g., most vulnerable, geographic spread, other relevant disaggregation.

**Coherence (How well does the intervention fit?)**

5. Are TAI and CSP individually and as a partnership providing a conducive environment for project success?

- a. Are relevant policies well-articulated, available and being implemented? E.g., child safeguarding and PSEAH
- b. Is the partnership effective as evidenced through communication, reporting and funding, for example?

### **Efficiency (How well are resources being used?)**

6. Have project activities been implemented as planned?
  - a. How does project implementation vary from the original plan?
  - b. Why have these changes happened?
  - c. What are the effects of the changes on the programme?
7. Is the projected being implemented efficiently?
  - a. Is the project being implemented in a cost-effective way?
  - b. Have activities been conducted on time?
  - c. Have intended outputs been achieved?
  - d. Are local structures being well-utilised to maximise efficiencies?
  - e. Is the project structure (e.g., staffing, field office, etc.) effective in supporting efficient project delivery?
8. Have the project outputs been achieved at cost-effective and value for money manner? Will other approaches lead to the same results at a more reasonable cost?

### **Sustainability (Will the benefits last?)**

9. Is the project sustainable?
  - a. Has phase one established a good foundation for completion of the 9-year programme and attaining the long-term objectives?
  - b. Do children, youth, duty bearers and other community members have 'ownership' of the project?
  - c. Do children, youth, duty bearers and other community members want the project to continue?

### **Inclusion**

10. What changes are evident of the community demonstrating greater gender equality, disability and social inclusion (increasing access, removing barriers to participation, encouraging agency and self-reliance, and ensuring representation of vulnerable and marginalised people in community life and decision-making processes/bodies)? How has the project contributed to this?
11. How safe are communities for vulnerable and marginalised people (consider protection and environment-related risks)? How did/is the project contributing to the establishment and/or quality of safeguarding and protection mechanisms?

### **Effective Partner organisations**

12. How has the partner organisation enhanced their localisation, good governance and effective management? In what ways did TAI help and hinder in the process?
13. Has the project been delivered with quality according to the proposed approaches, methodologies, and existing good practices in the sector? What are a few evidences that show partner has been truly impactful on the ground/communities?

### **Covid-19**

14. How has Covid-19 effected the group methodology approach adopted by the project? What alternatives, if any, have been emerged to group methodology and how effective are they?

## 9. Evaluation Approach

### 9.1 Methodology

Development of the evaluation methodology is principally the responsibility of the evaluator, in collaboration with CSP and TAI. The proposed methodology should be included in submission for consideration for the consultancy and will be a key component in assessing applications. Following recruitment, the methodology will be refined in collaboration with CSP and TAI.

The following information sources are available to the evaluators, and it is expected that effective methods will be selected to assess each source:

- CSP and TAI staff who have been involved in the project
- Local partners – government stakeholders, community structures, community-based educators and other volunteers who have been part of or directly interacted with the project
- Project documentation including project design documents, monitoring reports, activity-based financial reports, child partner letters, child partner and household letters, 18-month design check evaluation report and minutes from key stakeholder meetings.
- Project participants and beneficiaries – child partners, households, community members.
- Project groups and activity participants – e.g., youth clubs, child protection committees.
- Project financial data – budgets, fund requests, implementation costs, and project audits.<sup>1</sup>
- Other sources – e.g., public health data, school attendance data, district social welfare, police and district health office.
- All project stakeholders, including those mentioned above, are outline in Annex 2.

Proposed methodology should clarify:

- Data collection methods – for example. surveys, focus groups, desk-based research. The research proposal should show which methods will be used with justifications.
- Sources and Sampling – Who will data be collected from? Justify the sampling approach and explain any expected limitations.
- What type of data will be collected and how will it be analysed? Indicate the specific data types, drawing on the project explanation and available sources. Outline your approach to analysis with justification.
- Reporting – provide an outline of your proposed reporting format.
- How will you ensure data reliability and validity? Summarise any limitations and confirm approach to triangulation and verification of data.

### 9.2 Ethical Standards and Principles

CSP and TAI insist that ethical practices are observed throughout project design, implantation, monitoring, evaluation and research. Prospective evaluators must demonstrate

---

<sup>1</sup> TAI and CSP are also conducting a financial review ahead of this evaluation and output of this review may be made available to the evaluator.

commitment to ethical practice and show evidence of critical thinking of how ethical issues might arise and be mitigated within their evaluation plans.<sup>2</sup>

### 9.3 Evaluation Criteria

*In their application, the applicant should refer to how the relevant standards (below) will be adhered to and followed.*

[OECD/DAC Criteria:](#)

[ANCP/DFAT guideline](#)

[ACFID code of conduct](#)

[Humanitarian standard](#)

## 10. Evaluation Team

Submissions should describe the skills and experience (matching the essential criteria in Annex 3) of those who will be involved in the design and conduct of the evaluation. If there are multiple members of the evaluation team the application should describe how responsibilities and time will be shared. CVs for key members of the evaluation team will be submitted with the application and should only be of those actively involved in the evaluation.

### 10.1 Authority and Responsibility

Upon final agreement of the evaluation plan the evaluator will lead the evaluation and ensure it is delivered as agreed.

## 11. Limitations

Prospective evaluators should outline any expected limitations of the evaluation within their proposals.

## 12. Logistics

CSP and TAI will facilitate all reasonable logistics for the delivery of the evaluation based on an agreed workplan and activities including:

- Travel to evaluation site(s)
- local transport with evaluation site(s)
- accommodation and subsistence
- communication and stationery.

Depending on the proposed plan this will be through direct provision (e.g., vehicle and driver), agreed day rates (e.g., subsistence) or reimbursement on provision of receipts.

Prospective evaluators should budget for all salary/staff related costs through their proposed budget.

## 13. Timeframe

In order to complete the assignment in a timely manner for ongoing project design and management activities the following schedule has been agreed between TAI and CSP:

- Deadline for submission of proposals – 14<sup>th</sup> December 2021
- Possible selection interviews – 15<sup>th</sup> December 2021
- Selection of evaluator – 17<sup>th</sup> December 2021

---

<sup>2</sup> Applicants are encouraged to read the [Principles and Guidelines for ethical research and evaluation in development](#) (ACFID and RDI).

- Research activities to be completed - on dates agreed between 10<sup>th</sup> January 2022 and 14<sup>th</sup> February 2022
- Feedback including to community – by 28<sup>th</sup> February 2022
- Completion of reports – 14<sup>th</sup> March 2022

## 14. Deliverables and key tasks

Below is a breakdown of the deliverables, tasks and reporting requirements for the evaluation.

### 14.1 Deliverables

- Evaluation plan – based on the research proposal submitted and refined in consultation with TAI and CSP. It should include research method(s), data collection, data analysis, timeframe, stakeholder involvement plan, ethical practice considerations, refined evaluation questions, data collection instruments, etc.
- Draft evaluation report for review and response from CSP, TAI and other stakeholders.
- Support for community-based discussion to share findings and reflections.
- Final evaluation report based on feedback on review of draft report.
- Dissemination recommendations and key documents:
  - Presentation of findings
  - One-page plain English summary of findings

### 14.2 Key tasks

- Work with CSP and TAI staff to develop project specific evaluation questions.
- Develop a comprehensive evaluation project plan.
- Conduct a desk review of existing CYCC data (e.g., monitoring and evaluation data, situational analysis, community consultations, design workshops, baseline, Child Partner and Household Surveys etc.).
- Design relevant evaluation data collection methods and tools in line with policy documents, international standards and analytical frameworks to enable the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data.
- Follow participatory, strength-based approaches to the evaluation. E.g. Evaluating the extent to which the project includes community in project delivery and maximises potential of existing strengths within community. Ensure vulnerable and marginalised people (including women, children, youth and people with disability) are able to participate and actively engaged in the evaluation. Evaluation design and execution
- Work with CSP to plan and conduct field data collection, data entry and analysis (including triangulation) of both quantitative and qualitative data.
- Ensure reports (Preliminary, Draft and Final) are provided in a timely manner and in the agreed format for CSP and TAI to review.
- Respond to feedback in a constructive, timely and respectful way and apply suggested changes where possible; and
- Produce final report and conduct a presentation of key findings for TAI staff and other stakeholders, as agreed. The report should also report on contribution toward TAI impact indicators (see Annex 3 & 4), this can be in the report's annex if required.

## 15. Management and Reporting Arrangements

Delivery of agreed evaluation plan will be the responsibility of the evaluator under the management of CSP's Director of Programmes. Reports shall be submitted through the Director of Programmes at CSP for onward communication to CSP and TAI staff and boards. Any variations in the evaluation plan, activities or budget should only be considered approved when done so in writing with the Director of Programmes at CSP, following any necessary consultation with CSP and TAI.

To manage the overall process, an evaluation working group will be formed including:

- The evaluator(s)
- CYCC Project Manager (CSP Director of Programmes)
- CYCC Child Partner Coordinator (CSP)
- CYCC MEL Officer (CSP)
- TAI Representative (TAI)

## 16. Security

A risk assessment will be conducted by CSP staff with support of TAI where necessary prior to the field visit. CSP will provide advice on the current security situation, risk assessment and mitigation planning in the area two weeks prior to travel to the field.

## 17. Ownership and confidentiality

All intellectual property and data relating to the evaluation, including reports, will be the property of CSP/TAI. The Consultant agrees that the information obtained remains confidential and any publication or citing needs prior written approval from CSP/TAI.

All discussions and documents relating to this ToR will be treated as confidential by the parties.

## 18. Child safeguarding and PSEASH

CSP and TAI are dedicated to ensuring the safety of children and other vulnerable people involved in and connected with our projects. CSP and TAI consider child abuse, sexual exploitation, abuse and harm to be unacceptable in all circumstances and are therefore committed to ensuring that all steps are taken to ensure the safety of children and vulnerable people that we work with. For that reason, the Consultant, evaluation team and translator (where required) engaged for this evaluation will be required to complete Child Safeguarding and other safeguarding documentation.

## 19. Budget/Costs

TAI, through CSP, will fund all reasonable aspects of the evaluation based on an agreed budget. The proposed budget is to cover, as required:

- In-country logistic related expenses
- Evaluation materials
- Expenses of Partner staff involved in evaluation activities
- Field visits, lodging, food and travel of evaluation consultant/s and independent translator
- Consultancy fees
- Translator fees

Consultant's fees and total budget should be agreed on in writing in advance of commencement of the consultancy.

## 20. Insurance

The successful applicant will be required to have in place insurance arrangements appropriate to provision of the requirement in this TOR including (without limitation) travel insurance.

## 21. Terms of engagement

Upon selection of a successful evaluation bid, terms of engagement will be drafted and form the basis of all working for the assignment. All payments are based on invoices and a schedule to be agreed, pre-payment requests should be made at the time of agreeing the evaluation workplan.

## 22. Disclaimer

CSP and TAI, their Boards and staffs make no express or implied representation or warranty as to the currency, reliability or completeness of the information contained in this ToR. Nothing in this ToR should be construed to give rise to any contractual obligations or rights, expressed or implied, by the issue of this ToR or the submission of Expression of Interest in response to it. No contract would be created until a formal written contract is executed between TAI and a selected consultant.

## 23. Submission of Interest

Interested evaluator(s) are requested to submit an expression of interest which includes:

- CVs of key team members.
- Details of at least two referees.
- A statement addressing the essential criteria.
- Professional fees.
- An example of a previous evaluation report developed by the applicant.
- A draft evaluation plan which includes:
  - Any proposed revision to Key evaluation questions and sub questions.
  - Indicators for the evaluation.
  - Detail of key stakeholders and approaches to engaging them
  - Proposed methodology (data collection approach and tools, detailed data analysis plan, data sources (quantitative and qualitative) and how findings will be verified).
  - A risk management plan for the evaluation which includes a child safeguarding risk assessment.
  - Detail of the resources required.
  - A detailed timeframe of the evaluation and key activities and deliverables.
  - An overview of how attribution will be measured (where possible); and
  - Details on how the findings could be used.

## 24. Closing date

Deadline for submission of proposals –14<sup>th</sup> December 2021

Please send your Expression of Interest to **both** of the following contacts:

Gary Brough: [gary.brough@csplinia.org](mailto:gary.brough@csplinia.org)

Rebekah Cochrane: [Rebekah.Cochrane@transformaid.org](mailto:Rebekah.Cochrane@transformaid.org)

## Annex 1: Stakeholders

CYCC is a partnership with children, youth, families and communities and involves a variety of other stakeholders who are engaged either directly by CSP project staff or through the community participants. Below is a list of stakeholders:

- Children
- Youth
- Members of parliament
- District councillors
- District Executive committee
- District Health Office
- District Education Office
- Police
- Health service providers
- NGOs, CBOs and other CSOs
- Schools
- School Management Committees
- Health Centre Management Committees
- Child Protection Committees
- Village Development Committees
- Traditional authorities
- Religious leaders
- Parents and care givers
- CSP staff
- Project volunteers and CBEs

## Annex 2: Essential Criteria (skills and experience)

It is expected that submissions will only be made by those based in Malawi who have

- Experience and evidence of undertaking similar evaluations.
- Experience working in/conducting evaluations in the same/similar context.
- Experience conducting evaluations in the subject area (e.g., economic dignity/collective action and social cohesion/child and youth wellbeing, inclusion for all/disaster management/empowering local churches/partner effectiveness).
- Experience working with faith-based organisations, churches and groups.
- Experience in the international development sector.
- Ability to be flexible and adaptive.
- Experience and evidence of rigorous and ethical research and evaluation practice.

## Annex 3: TAI Impact Indicators

TAI would like the consultant to map the data generated from this project evaluation to a minimum one of following TAI's impact indicators per each yellow highlighted category.

Child and Youth Well-Being	Number and % people, including children, adopting positive health practices
	Number and % who report an increase safety, participation and learning outcomes for children through attendance at child friendly schools
	Increase in the number and % of children and youth enrolled in school or accessing alternative education
	Increase in the number and % of children and youth accessing alternative education or vocational training
	Number and % of children and youth reporting that they can influence decision making for their well-being
	Number and % of people, including children and youth, from different stakeholder groups reporting a reduction of harmful practices (such as child marriage, corporal punishment, abuse, and neglect) related to child protection)
	Number and % of children and youth with increased access to sufficient and nutritious food



<b>Economic Dignity</b>	Number and/or % of household/people (including women, youth, and most vulnerable community members) with increased incomes
	Number and/or % of HHs reporting that their basic needs (e.g., access to sufficient and nutritious food, essential health services, education, and housing, increase in food security) are met.
<b>Social Cohesion and Collective Action</b>	Number and % of functional local structures (e.g., receiving support from government and other stakeholders, regular meetings etc.) addressing their individual/group and community developmental issues through different initiatives
	Number and % of people who report a significant increase in positive changes in their community as a result of their collective actions including advocacy efforts
<b>Inclusion for All</b>	Number and % of vulnerable and marginalised people who report greater inclusion in social, political, and economic life and that they are able to influence decision making to improve their well-being
	Number of community structures, including local government, reporting changes in their practices and policies or guidelines as a result of work with/for vulnerable and marginalised people.
<b>Empowered Local Churches</b>	Number of community people reporting an increase in positive perception of local churches as a result of development initiatives taken by churches
	Number of churches reporting an increased understanding and responsibility for holistic development/social gospel for their communities
	Number of people experiencing significant positive changes in their lives because of church based community development
<b>Resilient communities</b>	Increase in the % of the most vulnerable and marginalised that feel better prepared for, and able to respond to, crisis and withstand shocks
	Number of people that report greater resilience as a result of diversification of livelihoods and or increase in assets/income
<b>Effective partner organisations</b>	% of TAI partner organisations demonstrating maturing organisational capacity across key domains (such as safeguarding, financial management, governance, transparency, and accountability)
	Number and % of TAI partners reporting having an equitable and quality partnership with TAI
	Number and % of TAI partner organisations having increased decision-making power over financial matters (e.g., pre-agreed funding amounts for DM, partners managing financial risks)

## Annex 4: Post-evaluation Questionnaire

After completion of evaluation, consultant and partner are asked to assess these key evaluation questions with ranking scale from 1-10 as given below. Before rating these questions, please provide your narrative explanation on findings in each evaluation question. Please see a doc below.



Assesment of  
KEQs\_Updated 2021.x