

Annex A: Terms of Reference

RYSE Impact Evaluation
RFP/JOR/AMM/2021/003

Background

RYSE is an ambitious attempt to incrementally develop and mobilize a dynamic, powerful, multi-stakeholder initiative/ eco-system focusing on empowering at least 25,000 displaced and conflict-affected youth to become the much-needed positive change agents in a region marred by war and political instability. The vision is to develop a flagship model, in which youth, governments, private sector companies as well as investors and civil organizations together educate, embolden and enable youth to fulfil their critical role in a future Syria and Jordan and to pursue their life ambitions. The key target group are Syrian youth who are displaced and living as refugees in Jordan but also vulnerable young Jordanians who have been massively affected by the conflicts in the region. The project is implemented by the Danish Refugee Council (DRC) in partnership with Generations for Peace (GFP), INJAZ, Jordan River Foundation (JRF), Mercy Corps (MC). It is funded by the Novo Nordisk Foundation (NNF) and totals 120 million DKK over 3 years from 2020 to 2022.

Focus of the evaluation

RYSE seeks to hire an independent evaluation consultant to assesses the RYSE's effectiveness in achieving its three overarching objectives (1) Objective 1: Youth civic engagement, (2) Objective 2: Economic empowerment of youth and their households, and (3) Objective 3: Creating an enabling and refugee & youth-inclusive supporting environment.

WHY? The purpose of the evaluation can be summarized as follows:

- **Process evaluation:** RYSE aims to assess whether its activities have been implemented as intended. The evaluation would provide an opportunity for understanding how RYSE program delivery mechanism works best, under which circumstances, and how this can be improved in the future.
- **Outcome evaluation:** RYSE aims to measure the project effects in the target populations by comparing the progress against the indicators set out for the target population to achieve. This provides a layer of accountability and learning and enables RYSE and other involved stakeholders, including the donors NNF, Government of Jordan, and the non-governmental organizations (NGO) community, to use evidence to determine the success of the project.

HOW? For the purposes of this evaluation, impact will be understood as the wider effects of the project – educational, social, economic, technical, and environmental. The impact can be direct or indirect, intended or unintended, positive or negative, macro (within the sector) and micro (individual/household level). Impact will be assessed with an Age, Gender, Disability (AGD) lens while also disaggregating results by nationality, region, and AGD. The evaluation results can inform either the next phase of RYSE (from mid-term to end of program) or after the end of program, they can inform the potential continuation of RYSE, should there be positive findings/learnings. The results will be presented in three sections of the evaluation report, mirroring the three project objectives. Additional sections will also be added to highlight any

process-related findings. Two evaluation reports will be delivered, one mid-term evaluation by December 2021 and one final/end-of-term evaluation at the end of the project by December 2022. Additionally, the design and planning tools for these reports will need to be completed by June 2021.

WHO? The evaluation findings and conclusions will generate evidence of key achievements and challenges to inform decision making process for the five consortium implementing partners, new and existing donors (NNF), and possibly other international and national non-governmental organizations pursuing similar interventions. The findings will also offer information for the Government of Jordan (GoJ) in the scenario that there is continued interest in potentially adopting any of the interventions implemented under RYSE.

Scope of Work

Methodology

The impact evaluation should review all aspects of RYSE from the inception phase through to the mid-term (for the first evaluation) and then end-term (for the final evaluation). The evaluator will study RYSE activities in all RYSE regions by conducting a desk review of all key RYSE documents to be provided by the RYSE Consortium Management Unit (CMU), interviewing beneficiaries and key stakeholders who agree to share information, conducting field visits to project activities in different project locations as per the guidance of RYSE CMU, and user pre-collected RYSE beneficiary data from the IM system. The evaluation methodology can be summarized as follows:

- **Desk review:** The evaluator will examine project documents including the Grant Proposal, the Logframe and Logframe Glossary, Learning Briefs, Curricula and Field Implementation Manuals, and Staff Training Guides. These documents will be used to assess *what* the project aims to achieve. Additionally, the evaluator will review internal documents like terms of reference for technical working groups, standard operating procedures, risk mitigation plans, and others. These document will represent *how* the project aims to achieve the goals it set out.
- **Interviews:** The evaluator will conduct interviews with a minimum of 46 stakeholders including direct beneficiaries, RYSE project and Consortium Management Unit (CMU) staff, donors, and community members/policy makers. The purpose of the interviews is to learn more about the impact of the project on all its stakeholders and to better understand how the process of implementation may or may not have aided in achieving such an outcome. At the same time, the information gathered here will be compared against the data collected from the implementing partners through the RYSE Information Management (IM) system. Any big discrepancies or common themes that emerge from both the interviews as compared with the data will be reported and further

assessed. The basic sampling frame for the interviews is as follows for each evaluation report¹:

Group	Disaggregation by	Minimum #	Type of interview
Beneficiaries	Nationality, gender, disability, location, RYSE objective	36 ²	Focus group or in-depth interview
RYSE staff	Partner organization, CMU	6 ³	KII
Donors	N/A	1	KII
Community members OR policy-makers	N/A	3	KII

- **Field observations:** The evaluator will conduct a minimum of 5 field visits for each evaluation report, each observing the implementation of a different RYSE activity. The field visits will be scheduled with the focal point from the CMU for Objective 1 and Objective 2 and will be varied based on the implementing partner and location. The field visits aim to both compare the findings reported by stakeholders during interviews and also to build a better understanding of RYSE target beneficiaries, geographical coverage disparities, and risks related to project implementation.
- **Beneficiary data from RYSE IM system:** The evaluator will request and analyze existing beneficiary data collected by partners and entered by them in the RYSE IM system for each evaluation report. This data will be assessed directly against RYSE’s log frame indicators and will also be compared against all other sources of data previously mentioned. Additionally, the evaluation will review and present findings from beneficiary data reported through the RYSE feedback and complaints mechanism. An overall picture of RYSE’s achievements in relation to its performance indicators will be presented in the report and any discrepancies between data and interviews or field observations will be highlighted.

Evaluation Criteria

Through this impact evaluation, RYSE seeks to build an understanding of the challenges and achievements of RYSE. Certain Specific topics evaluation criteria have been identified for inclusion in the impact evaluation based on the project proposal and log frame. Others may also be added later as the design of the evaluation progresses. Here are the key criteria, based on OECD’s *Better Criteria for Better Evaluation*⁴, for inclusion in the RYSE impact evaluation:

¹ Two evaluation reports will be requested: one mid-term report and one end-of-term report.

² 2 genders * 2 nationalities * 3 objectives * 3 regions = 36

³ 1 per partner organization (5) + 1 for the CMU = 6

⁴ OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation. (2019). *Better Criteria for Better Evaluation Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use*. Retrieved March 2, 2021 from <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/revised-evaluation-criteria-dec-2019.pdf>

1. **RELEVANCE:** Is the intervention doing the right things? To what extent is the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries', global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change? How did the youth/target group participate throughout the program cycle and in the construct of activities?
2. **COHERENCE:** How well does the intervention fit? What is the compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in Jordan, the INGO sector, or the partner organizations? To what extent does the program engage with and influence policies and priorities? This question should examine both internal coherence and external coherence. Internal coherence addresses the synergies and interlinkages between the intervention and other interventions carried out by the same partner organizations, as well as the consistency of the intervention with the relevant international norms and standards to which that organizations adhere. External coherence considers the consistency of the intervention with other actors' interventions in the same context. This includes complementarity, harmonization and coordination with others, and the extent to which the intervention is adding value while avoiding duplication of effort.
3. **EFFECTIVENESS:** Is the intervention achieving its objectives? ⁵ To what extent can the identified changes be attributable to the intervention rather than extraneous factors? What are the unintended consequences of the intervention (if any)?
4. **IMPACT:** What difference does the intervention make? To what extent did the intervention generate or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects. ⁶ What changes in the capacity, ability, behaviors, and/or attitudes of the target group can be observed? Were benefits distributed fairly between nationality, gender, age groups, disability status, and across regions? This criterion is to be investigated in addition to the "effectiveness" question at the end-of-term evaluation (and possibly in the mid-term evaluation if enough data is provided).
5. **EFFICIENCY:** How well are resources being used? To what extent does the intervention deliver, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way. "Economic" is the conversion of inputs (funds, expertise, natural resources, time, etc.) into outputs, outcomes and impacts, in the most cost-effective way possible, as compared to feasible alternatives in the context. "Timely" delivery is within the intended timeframe, or a timeframe reasonably adjusted to the demands of the evolving context. This may include assessing operational efficiency (how well the intervention was managed). For this criterion, the economic costs that are to be analyzed are program running costs, not inception phase costs related to the design (even if there are staffing costs for design phase) of the program as these costs will not be applicable for those seeking to adopt the same design developed by RYSE.
6. **PROCESS:** In what ways did the programmatic implementation affect the overall outcomes of the intervention?

⁵ For this question, direct references will need to be made to the RYSE logframe. Impact analysis will not need to be causal but strong correlational analysis will be needed.

⁶ This question will not require experimental methodologies like Randomized Controlled Trials. Also, we would like to take into consideration specifically how COVID-19 as an extraneous factor could have affected the outcomes.

These topics are to be addressed for *each* of RYSE’s key components/interventions:

1. Objective 1: Youth civic engagement
2. Objective 2: Economic empowerment of youth and their households – *Graduation Approach*
3. Objective 2: Economic empowerment of youth and their households – *21st Century Skills*
4. Objective 3: Creating an enabling and refugee & youth-inclusive supporting environment

Required Competencies of the Evaluator

The evaluation should be led by an individual or team with extensive background in project/program evaluation within the INGO/humanitarian sector. The successful evaluator must be able to work independently within the project structure to deliver the required outputs within a tight deadline and with a large and complex interface with a variety of internal and external stakeholders. In particular, the evaluator should demonstrate the following through CVs submitted:

Essential:

- Must hold a bachelor’s degree in research, economics, or any other relevant field;
- One member of the team must have at least 10 years of professional work experience in the areas of program and impact evaluation, preferably in civic engagement and/or economic empowerment;
- Extensive conceptual and methodological skills and experience in applying qualitative and quantitative research evaluation methods;
- Experience using quantitative and qualitative data analysis software tools like SPSS, STATA, R, or Nvivo;
- Experience in facilitating participation in interviews/focus group discussions and in communicating/coordinating with different stakeholders;
- Experience in Jordan or in the Middle East;
- At least one member of the team must have full proficiency (speaking, reading, and writing) in Arabic to conduct interviews;
- Fluency in English.
- Consultant/ consultancy firm must be based in Jordan

Roles and Responsibilities

Evaluator

1. Schedule, organize, and plan all key data collection activities including KIIs, in-depth interviews, and/or focus group discussions
2. Provide RYSE with a clear breakdown of the stakeholders (beneficiaries, staff, donors, community) sample that will be interviewed and request support from RYSE in providing contact information for these stakeholders
3. Provide human resources for data collection from beneficiaries from the community
4. Provide logistical arrangements and bear the financial costs for all data collection
5. Provide transcriptions or incur additional costs for translations from Arabic to English for any qualitative data.

6. Complete all deliverables listed in the “Reporting Schedule and Deliverables” by the deadline agreed upon with RYSE

RYSE Consortium

1. Compile relevant project documents, technical SOPs, as well as RYSE’s existing monitoring and evaluation data for evaluator’s use in the inception report, desk review, and evaluation reports
2. Provide contact information for stakeholders being interviewed by evaluator
3. Coordinate with RYSE partners to find suitable locations for the evaluator to conduct interviews (i.e. CBOs, beneficiary homes, etc.)
4. Review and provide technical feedback of the evaluator’s key deliverables outlined in the “Reporting Schedule and Deliverables”

Proposal Structure

Evaluators responding to this TOR will need to bid by submitting a detailed proposal that includes all of the following main sections:

- Document 1: Company profile outlining the technical background and experience of the evaluator (1-3 paragraphs)
- Document 2: A basic strategy and technical approach to the TOR, team composition (if team), and initial timeline/workplan (2-5 pages)
- Document 3: Two-three work samples (program evaluation and/or impact research)
- Document 4: CVs of all members of the evaluation team (not more than 3 pages each)
- Document 5: Two-three reference letters (full letters, not just list of references) from previous clients, including their contact information (full name, email address, phone number)
- Document 6: Financial proposal (separated from the technical proposal) in Jordanian dinars (and its equivalent in USD) with a breakdown of budget covering consultancy fees and all related expenses to implement the activities of the consultancy including travel and transportation, accommodation, all logistical requirements for organizing data collection activities, and translation.

**DRC shall be authorized to deduct from each invoice the applicable withholding tax (5% for national consultants and 10% for international consultants) as may be levied under the applicable tax legislation in Jordan, and pay such withholding directly to the tax department. Proof of payment will be provided to the consultant upon request*

Proposal Evaluation

All bidders will be scored on a scale from 1 - 10 for each of the below criteria. All bidders must obtain a score of at least five for the total technical scoring, in order to proceed to the financial evaluation. All received bids meeting the minimum requirements will be assessed for company profile (Document 1), technical approach (Document 2), work samples (Document 3), team qualifications (Document 4), similar experience (Document 5), and the financial offer (Document 6). Bids will be scored according to the criteria below for the initial screening.

1. **Profile, qualifications, and similar experience (Weighted percentage – 50%)**
 - a. The candidate meets the profile and qualifications for the TOR. This is evaluated based on:
 - i. Document 1: Company profile outlining the technical background and experience of the evaluator (1-3 paragraphs)
 - ii. Document 4: CVs of all members of the evaluation team (not more than 3 pages each)
 - b. The candidate demonstrated the experience required by the TOR. This is evaluated based on:
 - i. Document 1: Company profile outlining the technical background and experience of the evaluator (1-3 paragraphs) [The consultant(s) have similar or other relevant experience in conducting impact evaluations within the INGO/humanitarian sector. The consultant(s) have relevant experience in sectors similar to those of the focus of the TOR (economic empowerment, social empowerment, civic engagement, advocacy). The consultant(s) demonstrated relevant experience in Jordan or in contexts comparable to Jordan.]
 - ii. Document 5: Two-three reference letters (full letters, not just list of references) from previous clients, including their contact information (full name, email address, phone number)

2. **Technical approach (Weighted percentage – 50%)**
 - a. The technical approach addresses the key requirements and deliverables of the ToR and presents the required outputs, within the deadlines, demonstrated by a workplan. This is evaluated based on:
 - i. Document 3: Two-three work samples (program evaluation and/or impact research)
 - ii. Document 2: A basic strategy and technical approach to the TOR, team composition (if team), and timeline/workplan (2-5 pages)

3. **The financial offer will then be weighed against the technical proposal (cost/ quality).**
 This is evaluated based on:
 - a. Document 6: Financial proposal (separated from the technical proposal) in Jordanian dinars (and its equivalent in USD) with a breakdown of budget covering consultancy fees and all related expenses to implement the activities of the consultancy including travel and transportation, accommodation all logistical requirements for organizing data collection activities, and translation.

Based on the initial screening, DRC may invite selected bidders for an interview.

Duration

DRC is looking to contract a consultant that meets below requirements as soon as possible. The deliverables of these terms are due based on the timeframe set on the “Reporting Schedule and Deliverables” section. The starting date is beginning of June 2021 and the

ending date is December 2022. The estimated level of effort (LoE) for this engagement is 68 days.

Reporting Schedule and Deliverables

Deliverable	LoE	Timeframe	Notes
Phase 1: Planning and design			
Inception report	3 days	Beginning of June 2021	Detailed description of the planned evaluation including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Methodology to answer the evaluation questions with the proposed source of information and data collection procedures 2. Workplan (detailed schedule for the tasks to be undergone) 3. Role and responsibilities of each member of the evaluation team
Desk review summary	5 days	June 2021	Summary of the internal RYSE documents reviewed by the evaluator
Pre-analysis plan for data	3 days	June 2021	A plan that clearly articulates the data that will be used from the RYSE IM System and how this data will be analyzed against other data sources
Primary data collection tools	1 day	June 2021	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Interview protocol(s) for each group of stakeholders 2. Field observation tool/matrix outlining what will be observed when conducting field visits
Phase 2: Mid-term evaluation report			
Interview and field visit schedule	1 day	October 2021	Will include the list of interviewees that have been identified as well as the timeline for interviews/field visits
Mid-term evaluation report	26 days ⁷	October - November 2021	The report should include the following main sections: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Executive summary 2. Project description (of all 3 objectives) 3. Evaluation purpose

⁷ This includes dates required for field visits and interviews.

Deliverable	LoE	Timeframe	Notes
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Evaluation methodology 5. Findings (for all 3 objectives) 6. Conclusions 7. Recommendations 8. Annexes (list of people interviewed, key documents consulted, data collection instruments)
Evaluation presentation/meeting	1 day	December 2021	Present the results of the evaluation to all RYSE partners and the CMU.
Phase 3: Final evaluation report			
Interview and field visit schedule	1 day	October 2022	Will include the list of interviewees that have been identified as well as the timeline for interviews/field visits
Mid-term evaluation report	26 days ⁸	October - November 2022	<p>The report should include the following main sections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Executive summary 2. Project description (of all 3 objectives) 3. Evaluation purpose 4. Evaluation methodology 5. Findings (for all 3 objectives) 6. Conclusions 7. Recommendations 8. Annexes (list of people interviewed, key documents consulted, data collection instruments)
Evaluation presentation/meeting	1 day	December 2022	Present the results of the evaluation to all RYSE partners and the CMU.

⁸ This includes dates required for field visits and interviews.

Payment Schedule

Payments shall be made within 30 days from completion of each milestone and receipt of invoice and completion certificate as proposed below:

Phase	Payment %
Phase 1: Planning and design	20%
Phase 2: Mid-term evaluation report	30%
Phase 3: Final evaluation report	50%