Christian Aid Ireland is also commissioning an evaluation for a 3-year Humanitarian Programme, also funded by Irish Aid. We welcome joint submissions for both consultancies from qualified teams.¹

1. Background

2020 is the penultimate year for Christian Aid Ireland’s (CAI) 5-year Irish Aid Programme Grant II (PGII). CAI wishes to commission an external evaluation of this programme.

PG II’s international work is implemented across six programmes in seven countries: Angola; Central America (a joint programme across El Salvador & Guatemala), Colombia, Israel occupied Palestinian Territories, Sierra Leone and Zimbabwe.

All international programmes are implemented by local partner agencies and PG II works with 39 partner agencies in total. Each country programme works at micro, meso and macro levels and addressed on each of the following three outcome areas:

1. **Realising human rights**: marginalised women and men realise their human rights by having more equitable access to land, housing, basic services, and secure livelihoods, benefit from progressive taxes and fiscal policies, and actively participate as citizens and influence decisions that affect their lives.

2. **Tackling violence and building peace**: marginalised women and men facing violence have greater safety, security and resilience, and inclusive peace building initiatives contribute to lasting justice.

3. **Gender Equality**: marginalised women and girls have increased access to and control over assets and resources, and increase their participation in decision-making at all levels, whilst mitigating threats of gender based violence or intimidation.

Across all outcome areas Christian Aid is committed to addressing issues of gender and inclusion.

The PG II programme is using, for the first time, an **Adaptive Programming** approach, in response to the complexity of the programme contexts and outcome areas. Under this approach, programme implementation is guided by Theories of Change (ToC), which exist at partner (project) level, country programme level and PG II levels. Project-level ToC are tested and adapted at least annually, using Strategy Testing and informed by evidence generated through Outcome Harvesting. Each country reports annually to the donor using a Results Framework.

¹ Request for Proposals for this Humanitarian Evaluation consultancy are being circulated simultaneously with this document, please contact mcollison@christian-aid.org for more information or to obtain a copy.
In 2020 Christian Aid is commissioning a year-long research on the effectiveness of this adaptive approach. It is important for Christian Aid that the evaluation complements the Adaptive Programming research, and that the methodology responds to the complexity in programmes’ context and content.

PG II has a small Ireland-facing programme of work on Public Engagement; engaging the Irish public on poverty and development issues with a particular focus on Protestant churches in Ireland. The objectives of the programme are:

- to encourage church leaders in Ireland to play a greater role in support of issues of social justice globally by learning from the experience of our overseas partners;
- to create public engagement on issues of climate change, ‘From Violence to Peace’, tax justice, poverty, inequality and injustice;
- to mobilise an effective movement in Ireland, both church-based and in the general public, which will take solidarity actions, in support of a more just and equal world.

2. Evaluation Purpose

The primary purposes of the evaluation are:

- To provide an independent assessment of the quality the PGII programme to Irish Aid.
- To create quality and ethical analysis and insight to inform future programmes and projects.

The secondary purposes of the evaluation are:

- To create learning for use by countries and partners that will be exiting from Christian Aid’s portfolio in the coming two years;
- To inform improvements for the final year of programming.
While the secondary purposes are important, resource constraints mean that the evaluation process must prioritise primary purposes, and meet secondary purposes where feasible (as agreed between Christian Aid Ireland, Country Teams and External Evaluation Team), and in line with evaluation principals.

**Evaluation Principles**
Respect for People; Independence & Impartiality; Utility; Credibility; Validity; Transparency;  
See Annex 1 for detailed interpretation of these principals

3. **Evaluation Scope**

The evaluation will evaluate the PG II programme as a whole, as well as provide programme (country)-specific findings.

- The Evaluation scope will cover all six programmes and seven countries under PG II, covering all years of implementation. The evaluation will focus on all three programme outcomes funded by Irish Aid, as well as the value added of Christian Aid (as outlined in specific questions).
- Due to resource constraints the evaluation will not holistically evaluate all partners projects, but will aim to evaluate an aspect of each partner’s work. These aspects will be strategically sampled to meet evaluation requirements, informed by CAI and CA country teams. There will be partner-specific findings but a report will not be produced for each partner.
- During the evaluation year PG II will be conducting research on its Adaptive Management approach, led by external consultants. Whilst the scope of that work is still being established, the evaluation will aim to be complementary to that process, and will avoid duplicating areas of inquiry. Information, narratives and conclusions from the evaluation will be shared with the research team. Likewise, the research team will have valuable input to the evaluation process.
- The Public Engagement component of PG II will be covered by the evaluation, however due to its relative size will have a modest scope, with its own specific evaluation questions. It should require approx. 3% of overall evaluation resources.

4. **Key Evaluation Questions**

*In responding to all questions, the different needs, preferences and experiences of different genders, ages, PWDs, ethnic/religious groups, should be considered.*

**Questions for PG II (excluding Public Engagement)**

1. **Relevance (20%)**: To what extent did the PG II Programme respond to the needs and priorities of primary stakeholders in the evolving context?
   a. To what extent were the programme outcomes, and associated strategies, relevant to Primary Stakeholders’ needs and priorities?
   b. Do the most recent project, programme and PG II Programme - level Theories of Change (ToC) hold true, and are the assumptions valid?
   c. Were ToC (both the assumptions and the implemented strategy) adapted appropriately by partners, country teams and CAI;
      i. When the ToC did not hold true/ assumptions were not valid
      ii. When there were changes in the context
iii. In response to Primary Stakeholders’ expressed needs and perspectives

2. Effectiveness (60%): To what extent has the PG II Programme achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives and its results, including differential results across groups?
   d. Is there evidence that anticipated results are being achieved at the current stage of the PG II Programme - and if so, for whom - in each of the three outcome areas (Governance & Human Rights; From Violence to Peace; Gender & Inclusion).
      i. Has the articulation of ‘Gender and Inclusion’ as a distinct outcome (rather than a cross-cutting theme) strengthened achievements in this area?
   e. To what extent can the emerging results (in 2a) be attributed to the PG II Programme?
   f. Where results have not materialised as anticipated, what are the reasons for this?
   g. How has working at micro, meso and macro levels, across all projects, impacted the effectiveness of the programme?
   h. Has Christian Aid’s role as facilitator and convenor (at ‘Global’ and at ‘county’ levels) enhanced the effectiveness of the above results, or led to other results not captured in programme documentation (including partner capacity strengthening)?

3. Sustainability (20%): The extent to which the net benefits of the PG II programme are likely to continue.
   i. To what extent are results achieved likely to be sustainable? Are some types of change more likely to be sustained than others, and what can we learn from this?
   j. To what extent did Christian Aid build institutional capacity of local partners. (‘Local partners’ are Christian Aid’s partner organisations as well as local CSOs (partners’ partners), community groups and local government)?
      i. Did the programme enhance local ownership and capacity to influence policy?
      ii. Where relevant, did the programme contribute to localisation of humanitarian aid?
   k. How has working at micro, meso and macro levels in each programme impacted the sustainability of results across the different thematic areas?
   l. For each of the above questions what approaches to sustainability have/ have not worked well, and why?

Questions for PG II Public Engagement

4. Relevance (20%): Is the Public Engagement Programme doing the right things?
   a. To what extent did the Public Engagement programme objectives and design respond to organisational needs and capacities and the programme context?
   b. Did the Public Engagement programme logic of intervention hold true and were the assumptions valid?
   c. Did Christian Aid adapt appropriately in response to changes in context and lessons learned from implementation of its Public Engagement strategies?
5. **Effectiveness (60%)**: Is there evidence that anticipated results are being achieved at the current stage of the programme?
   
   d. To what extent can the emerging results be attributed to Programme Grant?
   
   e. What were some of the important enablers of results and issues that limited achievement of results (where relevant)?

6. **Sustainability (20%)**: Will the changes, identified in Q5, endure?
   
   f. To what extent did Christian Aid build capacity of local partners (i.e. supporters, volunteers and churches) to act beyond the programme timeframe?
   
   g. How likely are the results identified in question 5 to endure beyond the programme?
   
   h. In answering questions 6a and 6b, what has worked well/ not worked well, and why?

7. **Responsibilities & Lines of communication**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Key Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Evaluation Reference Group** | Review key planning documents, methodology,  
|                           | Monitor progress against milestones,  
|                           | Sign off on outputs and deliverables,  
|                           | Agree to key strategic decisions  
|                           | Lead on Management Response |
| **Evaluation Manager**     | Focal point for external evaluation team  
|                           | Close engagement with External Evaluation Team and input to technical documentation & design decisions (e.g. inception report, methodology, sampling)  
|                           | First line of quality control for evaluation outputs & deliverables  
|                           | Development of key CAI-led documentation  
|                           | Oversee implementation of evaluation communication plan |
| **External Evaluation Team** | Responsible for leading on evaluation process, in line with ToRs, inception plan and budget  
|                           | Produce deliverables, in line with agreed quality and schedule  
|                           | Provide timely updates to Evaluation Manager |
| **Country Programme teams** | Provide programme-specific input to the evaluation design  
|                           | Coordinate and facilitate data collection and collation  
|                           | Coordinate and facilitate use of evaluation findings in the country programme and lead on programme-specific management response |
8. Evaluation Methodology: Phases, & Key Deliverables

The Evaluation methodologies must be ethical, entail no risk of harm for primary stakeholders and evaluation participants and, in particular, pay close attention to Evaluation Principal, ‘respect for people’. All methodologies used must be alert to issues of gender and other inclusion issues (such as age, disability, ethnicity, literacy), as well as conflict sensitivity.

The evaluation methodology will be defined in collaboration with the External Evaluation Team. Methodologies used will be systems-aware and appropriate for complex contexts and strategies (for example, methodologies such as process tracing, outcome harvesting / mapping, network analysis) and take into account the diverse perspective of programme stakeholders. It is anticipated that the methodologies will be primarily qualitative, although where useful some evaluation questions might benefit from development of a rubric developed (by External Evaluation Team with input from CAI) to assist in interpretation and comparison of qualitative data. There is scope to review and refine the methodology following the first country-specific evaluations.

* It is expected that the Public Engagement evaluation methodology will be more modest in ambition and scale, and will include; Review of documentation and key datasets; Interviews with CAI staff; Interviews with a selection of external stakeholders and targeted audience; Presentation of conclusions and initial recommendations to CAI staff, for verification and evolution of recommendations.

### Evaluation Phases & Key Deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Phase</th>
<th>Suggested Process</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design phase</td>
<td>PG II induction for external evaluation team and initial document review and interviews with CA staff completed by External Evaluation Team.</td>
<td>Thorough document review (using harvested outcomes, Strategy Testing reports, Result Frameworks, emergent research findings, field trip reports) and interviews with CA staff. Review and interviews to be structured, and documented using a clear framework which responds to the evaluation questions. Develop a detailed methodology.</td>
<td>Detailed Inception report Covering both international programmes and Public Engagement Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April – June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop country-specific ToRs, based on the PGII level ToRs, and identify specific partner strategies to explore for each country and sample communities/ groups/ individuals/ institutions.</td>
<td>Country / Programme-specific Terms of Reference</td>
<td>External Evaluation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-country* evaluation June – end October 2020</td>
<td>In each programme country conduct in-depth data collection / creation, interpretation and evaluate programme against evaluation questions. Findings and draft recommendations to be shared with country team, partners and other stakeholders for feedback and validation. Draft reports, including recommendations, to be produced and finalised following feedback from Country Teams and Evaluation Reference Group.</td>
<td>7 Programme-level reports 1 per programme - including Public Engagement*</td>
<td>External Evaluation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis To be completed by end December 2020</td>
<td>Use findings from all programmes to evaluate the overall PGII programme. Draft report, including recommendations, to be produced and finalised following review by the Evaluation Reference Group.</td>
<td>PG II-level report (plus datasets, notes, other artefacts and data generated through evaluation), containing methodology, findings and recommendations.</td>
<td>External Evaluation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response To be completed by end January 2021</td>
<td>Following completion of each report, a management response will be completed. A light ‘lessons learnt’ document on the evaluation process will be produced for organisational learning.</td>
<td>Programme-level and PG II level Management responses</td>
<td>Country teams, Evaluation Reference Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Lessons Learnt’ document from evaluation experience</td>
<td>Evaluation Manager with country teams, External Evaluation Team and Irish Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Design</td>
<td>In early 2021 Christian Aid Ireland will develop a proposal for a future programme of work, and may require the services of the External Evaluation Team to inform that process. The scope and details of this input will be covered by a later contract, but will likely require a maximum of 3 days input in quarter 1, 2021.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. External Evaluation Team Requirements

The external evaluation team will comprise one lead evaluator and at least one additional team member. The team must be able to travel to all programme locations.

The external evaluation team should possess the following qualities:

- Demonstrated experience and understanding in the PG II technical areas (Realising Human Rights, Tackling Violence, Building Peace, Gender Equality) and an understanding of gender and inclusion as a cross-cutting issue
- Demonstrated experience and expertise in evaluating large, multi-country programmes
- Ability to design and use evaluation methodologies that are appropriate for complicated and complex programmes
- Fluency in English and Spanish and clear verbal and written communication skills
- Experience of the International NGO sector and appreciation for the principals of working in partnership.
- Experience and understanding of at least some of the PG II programme countries
- Understanding and ability to apply the evaluation principals.

10. Proposals & Selection process

Financial Information
The budget available is €100,000.

Content of proposals
The proposal should include:

- A brief outline of the overall approach and proposed methodology to produce the identified deliverables
- A statement of availability for conducting the evaluation
- A profile of the proposed evaluation team, including key roles and responsibilities
- Costed proposal in Euro, with breakdowns by key deliverables and estimated number of days, and include fees and VAT.
- With the proposal please also submit two pieces of work completed by the proposed team, and the Curriculum Vitae for each team member

Submission of proposals
Please submit your proposal to Maria Collison at mcollison@christian-aid.org, with the subject line, ‘Irish Aid Final Evaluation’. Deadline for submissions is 5pm GMT 19th March.

Please send any questions or clarifications to the same address.

Selection Process
Applications will be assessed based on the quality of the proposal, ability to meet requirements above, and overall budget. A shortlist of applicants will be interviewed the week of 30th March.

The selected Evaluation Team will be asked to sign and abide by Christian Aid’s Code of Conduct and a non-disclosure agreement (as personal information will be handled during the evaluation).
Annex 1: Evaluation Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Independence &amp; Impartiality</strong></th>
<th>The evaluation process must be;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Transparent &amp; demonstrably free from bias – planning &amp; management of evaluations needs to be independent of the wider programme management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Free of external pressure, no conflict of interest, no previous involvement in the programme/project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Utility</strong></th>
<th>Evaluations should meet the needs of users &amp; help decision-making. This will require:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Needs &amp; priorities of the stakeholders established at the outset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Timing of the evaluations coincides with the period when critical decisions are being made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relevant, evidence based findings are clearly presented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Credibility</strong></th>
<th>Clear connections need to be established between evidence &amp; findings. The evaluation manager will ensure that:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Highest technical standards are applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Necessary human &amp; financial resources are made available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The process is transparent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Validity</strong></th>
<th>Evaluations should generate reliable evidence &amp; reach accurate conclusions. Look at the appropriateness of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The approach &amp; methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rigor of the analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Capacity of the evaluation team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Extent to which the report fairly reflects the findings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Transparency</strong></th>
<th>Planning &amp; conduct of the evaluation and dissemination of findings should be undertaken in a manner that is open and accessible to all stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respect for People</strong></td>
<td>Evaluators and the evaluation process respects the security, dignity and self-worth of the respondents, programme primary stakeholders, clients, and other stakeholders with whom they interact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>