

## **Terms of Reference - Independent Final Evaluation**

**Programme name:** Improving sexual and reproductive health and creating sustainable livelihoods for youth (15-24 years – with a focus on girls) in Freetown slums in Sierra Leone; Pull Slum Pan Pipul (PSPP)

**Programme duration:** 19/05/2013 – 01/11/2017

**Donor:** Comic Relief

---

### **1. Scope of consultancy**

#### **1.1 BRAC Introduction**

BRAC is a development success story, born in Bangladesh, spreading solutions to ten other countries around the world – a global leader in creating opportunities for the world's poor. What started out as a limited relief operation in 1972 in a remote village of Bangladesh has turned into the largest development organisation in the world. Organising the poor using communities' own human and material resources, it catalyses lasting change, creating an ecosystem in which the poor have the chance to seize control of their own lives. BRAC's holistic development approach is geared towards inclusion and focuses on microfinance, education, healthcare, legal services, community empowerment, youth empowerment, livestock, agriculture, youth skills and social enterprises. The organisation touches the lives of an estimated 138 million people, with staff and BRAC-trained entrepreneurs numbering in the hundreds of thousands. While BRAC was founded in Bangladesh, Stichting BRAC International which was founded in the Netherlands in March 2009, and operates in Afghanistan, Myanmar, Pakistan, Philippines, Nepal, Liberia, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda. BRAC Sierra Leone is one of the largest NGOs in the country with 30 branch offices across the country delivering microfinance, livestock, agriculture, health and livelihoods, malaria and Empowerment and Livelihoods for Adolescents (ELA).

BRAC UK an independent UK charity based in London and affiliated to BRAC. It supports with donor engagement, partner development, new business development and programme management with a focus on UK and European governments, institutional donors, foundations, NGOs, research organisations, media and think tanks.

#### **1.2 Project background**

The project aims to improve the quality of life of people living in 10 slums in Freetown<sup>1</sup>. Activities will be implemented to improve the sexual and reproductive health of young people, particularly young women. BRAC's trained Urban Health Promoters conduct Household visits in 10 slums where they provide advice on sexual, maternal and child health, provide health products and make referrals to government health facilities. Youths and communities are also engaged in sexual health meetings and awareness campaigns. The project also supports youth to develop sustainable livelihoods through training and access to micro-finance loans and loans for enterprise development. An emphasis will be placed on working collaboratively with local and national government as well as with other non-governmental agencies working in Freetown slums. As a result of the project sexual and reproductive health is expected to significantly improve, livelihoods opportunities will be created and household incomes will be increased.

BRAC is seeking an evaluator in the global development health sector to conduct the independent final evaluation on this project, facilitated by the BRAC team, in Sierra Leone. The evaluation will be delivered on or before the 1<sup>st</sup> of October 2017.

#### **1.3 Aims and objectives of the project**

---

<sup>1</sup> Target slums are Congo town, Kroo bay, Susan's Bay, Falcom Bridge, Marbella, Margazine wharf, Moe Wharf, Old Wharf, Portee/Rokupr, and Palmoronkoh

This project aims to improve the livelihoods and sexual health of participants through close community engagement and training and to increase the livelihood and economic opportunities for young people through training and microfinance.

**Outcome 1:** By October 2017, 1,500 young people (15-24, 80% female) will have improved sexual and reproductive health

**Outcome 2:** By October 2017, estimated 4,896 women of reproductive age (15-49) and estimated 2,754 under-fives will have improved health

**Outcome 3:** By October 2017, 1,320 young people (15-24) will experience increased incomes and improved livelihoods

**Outcome 4:** By October 2017, CBOs will have improved capacity to improve access to services in slums

**Outcome 5:** Learning and collaboration: a more collaborative and informed civil society is responding to priority slum issues

#### **1.4 Evaluation Stakeholders**

The results of this evaluation are primarily intended for internal use by BRAC to inform future improvements to the project and to transfer learning across the Health and Livelihoods Programmes. Results and findings will also be shared with the funder, Comic Relief. Relevant results and lessons learned will be shared with other stakeholders.

#### **1.5 Donor background**

Comic Relief is a UK based charity providing funding civil society organisations (CSOs) in the UK and internationally. PSPP is a part of Comic Relief's four cities initiative which seeks to explore different approaches to poverty alleviation in communities across 4 cities in Africa; Lusaka, Freetown, Kampala and Cape Town.

#### **1.6 Purpose of independent final evaluation**

The independent final evaluation of the project will evaluate the progress and impact achieved and performance of relevant stakeholders. The evaluation should provide findings and conclusions based on robust and transparent evidence, using BRAC's own data, key person interviews and where necessary, supplementing it with independent research. The evaluation will inform:

- The stakeholders' understanding of BRAC's performance at the project level, which it will assess through project reporting and independent final evaluation; this process may include ad hoc follow up or clarification requests, therefore when supplementing information with primary research, the independent final evaluator should include transparent sources from which BRAC can draw after completion.
- The stakeholders' assessment of overall performance at the 4 Cities Initiative level. The analysis of the information from the independent evaluation is a major source upon which all stakeholders will assess the final performance of PSPP.
- BRAC's learning objectives

#### **1.7 Key objectives of the evaluation**

The evaluation has two explicit objectives:

1. To independently verify (and supplement where necessary), the record of achievement of the project as reported through its Annual Reports and defined in the start-up form;
  - a. This exercise could include verifying information collected by BRAC for reporting purposes and possibly supplementing this data with additional information collected through primary and secondary research.
  - b. Other activities and results that occur that may require examination in order to respond to the different evaluation questions. Verifying reporting will also necessarily include a review of the data and systems that were used to populate results

**BRAC UK**  
19 Wootton Street  
Southwark  
London SE1 8TG  
UK

T: +44 (0)203 434 3074  
E: [info@bracuk.net](mailto:info@bracuk.net)  
W: [www.bracuk.net](http://www.bracuk.net)  
W: [www.brac.net](http://www.brac.net)

Registered in the UK  
as BRAC UK  
Charity No 115482  
Company No 5802246

2. To assess the extent to which the project was good value for money. This includes considering the following questions:
  - a. How well did the project meet its objectives?
  - b. How well did the project apply value for money principles of effectiveness, economy, efficiency in relation to delivery of its outcomes?
  - c. How well did the project align with Comic Relief objectives and support in the delivery of SDGs 1,3 and 8?
  - d. How well did the project align with national priorities of expanding access to health and livelihoods opportunities in Sierra Leone?

### **1.8 Evaluation questions**

Evaluator(s) should use discretion in the weighting given to each question, as this may vary depending on the objectives of certain projects and the availability of data. Questions should be organised according to the structure provided in section 2.4.

- General Exploratory Questions:
  - To what extent have project outcomes been achieved?
  - If objectives were not reached, why was this?
  - What changes in environment and context (both supporting and constraining factors) had an impact on the project implementation?
  - How did the project address and respond to changes in the environment?
  - Which aspects of the project proved most successful/beneficial?
  - Which aspects of the project proved most challenging?
  - Which aspects of the project could, on reflection, be subject to revision and why?
  - In what ways could aspects of the project be effectively revised/improved?
- Specific Exploratory Questions. Conversation with the donor has led to a set of more focused questions which ought to receive some consideration during the evaluation (these questions may be treated under other headings – it is down to the evaluators discretion to decide where to include this information):
  - Which livelihood training courses were most/least effective and why?
  - To what extent did recipients benefit from the microfinance?
  - With a focus on a few specific business set up during the project, what were the key challenges faced and how effective was microfinance and training and helping beneficiaries to overcome these challenges?
  - What additional support, if any, would be required to ensure that business develop after initial project inputs?
  - How was BRAC's Microfinance work affected by the Ebola outbreak and what was the response?
  - What have been the strengths and weaknesses of working in collaboration with other PSPP partners?
- Relevance
  - To what extent did BRAC support achievement towards the SDGs?
  - To what extent did the project target and reach the poor and marginalised?
  - To what extent did the project mainstream gender equality in the design and delivery of activities (and or other relevant excluded groups)?
  - How well did the project respond to the needs of target beneficiaries, including how these needs evolved over time?
- Effectiveness
  - To what extent are the results a fair and accurate record of achievement?
  - To what extent has the project delivered results that are value for money? To include but not limited to:
    - How well the project applied value for money principles of effectiveness, economy and efficiency in relation to delivery of its outcome;

- What has happened because of Comic Relief funding that would not have otherwise happened;
  - To what extent has the project used learning to improve delivery?
  - What are the key drivers and barriers affecting the delivery of results for the project?
- Efficiency
  - To what extent did BRAC deliver results on time and on budget against agreed plans?
  - To what extent did the project understand cost drivers and manage these in relation to performance requirements?
- Sustainability
  - To what extent has the project leveraged additional resources (financial and in-kind) from other sources? What effect has this had on the scale, delivery or sustainability of activities?
  - To what extent is there evidence that the benefits delivered by the project will be sustained after the project ends?
- Impact
  - To what extent and how has the project built the capacity of civil society?
  - What has been civil society's response to this project?
  - To what extent and how has the project affected people in ways that were not originally intended?
  - To what extent has the project delivered the intended results?
  - What unintended results has the project achieved?

### **1.9 Time-Frame of the Evaluation**

All project activities related to community health and youth livelihood enhancement ended in April 2017. However monitoring will continue in order to effectively assess the long term impact of skills training on participants (outcome 3) 5 months after activities end (this post-activity monitoring period will run from May 2017 – October 2017). It will be possible therefore to undertake the evaluation as follows:

- The BRAC monitoring team will continue activities and maintain contact with beneficiaries until October 2017 when the evaluation will be conducted by the external evaluator and will take place over a period outlined below:

<b><u>Date</u></b>	<b><u>Task</u></b>	<b><u>Delivery time</u></b>
October 1st	preparation of tools, methods, and logistics	3 days
October 4 <sup>th</sup>	training and pre-test	4 days
October 8 <sup>th</sup>	research supervision	6 days
October 14 <sup>th</sup>	data cleaning and analysis	7 days
October 21 <sup>nd</sup>	reporting	7 days
October 28 <sup>th</sup>	revision	3 days
November 1st	Report Submission to BRAC	

The final evaluation consultant(s) will submit the final report (in line with the structure stipulated in section 2.4) to BRAC, in line with an evaluation schedule agreed with the evaluator(s). The suggested timeframe is currently 30 days.

## 2. Evaluation methods

### 2.1 Research methods and sources

Evaluation methods should be rigorous yet at all times proportionate and appropriate to the context of the project intervention, in collaboration with BRAC staff. The evaluator(s) and BRAC will be jointly responsible for choosing the methods that are the most appropriate for demonstrating impact.

Evaluator(s) are encouraged to triangulate data sources where possible, so that findings are as robust.

- Evaluator(s) are encouraged to apply a mixed-methods approach for assessing impact. This would combine qualitative data to provide an explanation of 'why' and 'how' the project has achieved the type and scale of results that are quantitatively observed.
- A contribution-based approach should result in a 'plausible' account of the difference Comic Relief funding has made to the impact of grantees. Such an approach is typically informed by a wide range of evidence sources that are brought together to produce a 'plausible' assessment of the 'contribution' of grantees to high-level outcomes and impacts;
- Qualitative retrospective investigation to explore how, in the absence of this project, the beneficiaries would have received services;
- Other methods proposed by evaluators in their response;

The evaluation should consist of:

**a. Review of project documentation:** Key project documentation will be shared with the evaluator to facilitate the process of the evaluation which will include:

- Full original project proposal (narrative, log frame and budget)
- Comic Relief Start up form
- Annual Donor reports (narrative and financial)
- Comic Relief feedback to reports and Comic Relief monitoring trip report
- Internal reporting
- Project community implementation framework and toolkits
- Sustainability toolkits
- Training modules (produced and developed under this project with partners)
- Project data (baseline and end line data)
- Microfinance portfolio data

**b. Development of an evaluation approach in collaboration with BRAC and the data collection tools/methods:**

- Detailed time line and work plan, methodology and data collection tools
- Outline of any proposed changes to the scope of the evaluation
- Key interview questions
- Proposed quantitative and qualitative sampling framework
- List of stakeholders to be consulted/key informants to be interviewed:
  - Direct project beneficiaries in selected communities including
  - BRAC project staff
  - Wider stakeholders – for example, relevant BRAC staff from head office, local government representatives, the Comic Relief Programme manager etc.
  - BRAC partners from the other PSPP projects in Freetown – Restless Development, Sierra Leone Urban Research Centre (SLURC), YMCA, Y-Care, Youth Development Movement (YDM), COHDESAPA

- c. **Briefing with BRAC and implementing partners:** This should take place immediately prior to the field work. Ensure the project team members supporting the evaluation are fully aware of activities to be carried out and any support required.
- d. **Field visits:** field visits to all 10 beneficiary communities. Communities are based in Freetown:
  - Focus group discussions with beneficiaries ensuring equal representation from marginalised or vulnerable groups. (Separate discussion groups with women, men and adolescents).
  - In depth interviews with selected beneficiaries (gathering quantitative and qualitative data for analysis)
  - Interviews with CBOs, community leaders, local government, Mayor's office
  - Capturing case studies/quotations during site visits to include in the evaluation report
  - The focus group discussion methodology for selection of participants, lists of participants, and discussion guide should be included in an annex to the report.
- e. **Provide a debrief to BRAC and implementing partners:** using a draft set of results conduct a verbal presentation of preliminary findings and recommendations to project partners. This should be done shortly after the end of the field work.
- f. **Submit a draft evaluation report:** corresponding to the requirements outlined below for review and feedback from BRAC and project partners.
- g. **Submit a final evaluation report:** incorporating any relevant feedback from BRAC and Project Partners

## **2.2 List of indicative materials to review:**

BRAC's original application for funding; grant agreements; updated versions of organisational project start-up form; monitoring data; monitoring systems, annual reports and comments provided by the Fund Manager; organisational monitoring & evaluation strategy; studies undertaken by the BRAC; financial information / information on resources spent; information on synergies / collaboration with and grant recipients and other actors; published material (e.g. to demonstrate sharing of learning with others); and additional relevant documents.

## **2.3 Indicative methods for conducting primary and secondary research**

Relevant primary and secondary research may include: interviews with staff at BRAC involved in the management and delivery of work; focus group discussions with ultimate beneficiaries; surveys with other relevant stakeholders where possible and proportionate; systematic reviews of secondary studies and sources, measuring impact where possible and proportionate through comparison groups and other quantitative methods; and verifying reported data through back checking and quality control assessments.

## **2.4 Structure of report**

The main body of the report (draft and final version) must be limited to 40 pages (this can include or exclude annexes).

The following structure should be used for reporting:

- Executive Summary
- Introduction
  - Purpose of the evaluation
  - Organisation context
  - Country and national policy context

- Project and location context
- Logic and assumptions of the evaluation
- Overview of 4 Cities Initiative and other donor funded activities
- Evaluation Methodology
  - Evaluation plan
  - Strengths and weaknesses of selected design and research methods
  - Summary of problems and issues encountered
- Findings
  - Overall Results
  - Assessment of accuracy of reported results
  - Relevance
  - Effectiveness
  - Efficiency
  - Sustainability
  - Impact
- Conclusions
  - Summary of achievements against evaluation questions
  - Summary of achievements against rationale for GPAF and donor funding
  - Overall impact and value for money of GPAF and donor funded activities
- Lessons learned (where relevant)
  - Project level - management, design, implementation
  - Policy level
  - Sector level
  - GPAF and other donor management
- Recommendations
- Annexes (such as)
  - Independent final evaluation terms of reference
  - Evaluation research schedule
  - Evaluation framework
  - Data collection tools
  - List of people consulted
  - List of supporting documentary information
  - Details of the evaluation team
  - BRAC management response to report findings and recommendations

### **3. Contractual and reporting arrangements**

#### **3.1 Coordination with BRAC staff**

The external evaluator will lead this process and report directly to the Country Representative at BRAC Sierra Leone. The head of BRAC's Independent Evaluation and Research Cell (IERC) will work alongside the evaluator as a 'technical commentator'. The evaluator will liaise with:

- The Project Management Team based in BRAC UK who are the direct managers of the grant
- The project delivery team in Sierra Leone, including:
  - Sierra Leone Country Representative
  - Head of IERC Sierra Leone
  - Health Programme Manager
  - PSPP Project Coordinator
  - PSPP Monitoring Officer

#### **3.2 Profile of the Independent Final Evaluation provider**

The Independent Evaluator should be a suitably-qualified and experienced consultant or consulting firm. The consultant profile should include:

- An evaluation specialist with extensive experience in programme/project evaluation in an

**BRAC UK**  
19 Wootton Street  
Southwark  
London SE1 8TG  
UK

T: +44 (0)203 434 3074  
E: [info@bracuk.net](mailto:info@bracuk.net)  
W: [www.bracuk.net](http://www.bracuk.net)  
W: [www.brac.net](http://www.brac.net)

Registered in the UK  
as BRAC UK  
Charity No 115482  
Company No 5802246

international development context (a mixed approach that incorporates the technical skills of an evaluation specialist but includes some inputs from a sector specialist is most effective).

- Experience of results-based monitoring and evaluation;
- Ability to design and plan the evaluation approaches and research methodologies, including quantitative and qualitative research methods. Where feasible and proportionate, the person or team should include skills and expertise required to design, plan and conduct impact evaluation, potentially using experimental or quasi-experimental techniques;
- Relevant subject matter knowledge and experience such as health sector, livelihoods, youth, gender, non-state actors and economic growth to ensure the evaluation design and research methods are as relevant and meaningful as possible given the aims and objectives of the project and the context in which it is being delivered;
- Ability to design, manage and implement primary research in potentially challenging project environments, such as fragile and conflict affected states. This may include the design of surveys, in-depth interviews, focus group and other research the evaluator may recommend for cross-checking existing evaluation data;
- Utilise information systems capable of analysing large datasets of monitoring and evaluation data to arrive at meaningful findings, such as SPSS+;
- Consideration of the extent to which the evaluator or evaluation team has appropriate country knowledge/experience. This includes language proficiency to conduct the research required or that resources be made available (e.g. translator or social gatekeeper) to enable the research to proceed smoothly; and while evaluation consultants may be nominated by the grantees they must not have a conflict of interest with the on-going activities of BRAC.

### **3.3 Terms and conditions for submissions**

BRAC is responsible for contracting and briefing of the evaluator(s), and the logistical and technical support to facilitate any meetings and interviews agreed with the evaluator in Sierra Leone.

The submission of quotations for this work should include:

- A detailed breakdown of the different work parcels including, daily rates and type of number of proposed personnel;
- A detailed schedule of activities and timing (this must balance with the work parcels)
- A detailed breakdown of all travel and accommodation costs

Submissions should be no more than £13,623 for labour and no more than £2,500 for travel and accommodation.

Submissions must include:

- A budget as outlined above
- A schedule/work plan
- A narrative proposal of how you will deliver the contract
- Documentary proof of similar work, capacity and any CVs of key personnel
- Minimum of 2 references from clients you have performed similar work for