Terms of Reference (ToR)

Joint evaluation of AFSC’s projects
‘BADER: Youth Civic Engagement in Jordan’
and ‘Palestinian Youth: Together for Change (PYTC 3)’

1. Introduction

American Friends Service Committee (AFSC) is a US-based Quaker organization devoted to service, development, and peace programs throughout the world. It works with people and partners worldwide, of all faiths and backgrounds, to meet urgent community needs, challenge injustice, and build peace.

Through its regional office in Jordan, AFSC implements programs in the Middle East. AFSC’s projects ‘BADER: Youth Civic Engagement in Jordan’ and ‘Palestinian Youth: Together for Change (PYTC)’, both with their current implementation period from 01/2020 to 12/2022, are supported by Brot für die Welt, the development and relief agency of the Protestant Churches in Germany.

This joint evaluation is to assess both projects individually, while on a synthesis level generating cross-project learnings and providing an assessment of the organisational and project management set-up of the projects.

The evaluation will be commissioned by AFSC Philadelphia and will be accompanied by AFSC and Brot für die Welt jointly. The evaluation is expected to take place from April to June 2022.

2. Scope, objectives and users of the evaluation

The joint evaluation is to provide an independent assessment of the projects, on a project specific and on a synthesis level, as well as assessing the organizational and project management setup of the projects between the different units and offices of AFSC and Brot für die Welt.

The objective of this joint evaluation is to generate insights that enable project specific but also cross-project learning and exchange. Furthermore, the evaluation is to yield recommendations for the improvement of the organisational and project management set-up of the projects between the different units and offices of AFSC and Brot für die Welt.

Specific objectives are:

1. The underlying results logic of the projects is reconstructed and assessed.
2. The projects have been assessed along the OECD/DAC criteria. Within this assessment:
   a. Hindering and helpful factors as well as unintended positive and/or negative results have been captured.
   b. Good practices and lessons learned from the projects are highlighted.
3. The effectiveness of the projects’ organizational management, partnerships, and project management set-up is reviewed.
4. Recommendations for future programming, organizational management, partnerships, and organizational cooperation.

The evaluation will be primarily used by AFSC Jordan and Palestine and its projects’ partners and youth participants. Further users are AFSC Philadelphia and Brot für die Welt.

3. Information on the subject of evaluation

3.1 Organizational and Project Management
Both projects are managed locally in each country. Overall supervision and support are provided by the regional office in Jordan as well as concerned staff at AFSC-HQ in Philadelphia, USA.

On the country level, program managers lead a team of project officers implementing the projects’ activities with local partners. Finance teams in each country oversee financial expenses under the supervision of the regional finance manager and additional finance staff in Philadelphia.

Through periodic reports and reviews, both regional and HQ teams ensure implementation alignment with project objectives, timeline, donor regulations, and financial compliance.

3.2 The project ‘BADER: Youth Civic Engagement in Jordan’

3.2.1 Programmatic context of the BADER project

Jordan is a strategic country at the crossroads of the Middle East region. It has been affected by instability and ongoing conflicts surrounding it. This combination of external and internal challenges that Jordan faces have affected the country’s social and economic development, from the educational system to the high rate of unemployment, and the absence of productive civic engagement opportunities for youth and other civil society groups, in Jordan.

In response, the project aims to overcome these limitations and enable youth to make a difference in their communities. To this end, the project team conducted capacity assessments of local organizations that identified four key community partners to establish the ground base for successful cooperation on achieving the project objectives. AFSC has moved to develop a strategic level of work with students and youth to refine an interactive methodology at schools with adolescents and youth in communities.

The reality of the COVID-19 pandemic offered an opportunity to maximize the aspects of adaptability to community organizing during times of emergency and uncertainty. AFSC developed the model considering social distancing and governmental restrictions, which added to the limitation of civic engagement, and negatively impacted the potential for youth to actively participate. Subsequently, social events and extracurricular activities were minimal during this time. There were also periodic closures of educational and social institutes, suspending access to schools, universities, and other civil society organizations. These procedures made it challenging for youth to receive civic education, limiting their ability to effectively mobilize or participate in their community’s society. The pandemic further limited youth’s ability to exchange ideas and engage in joint planning with their peers.

3.2.2. Target group, project objectives and Theory of Change of the BADER project

The first component: AFSC targets 380 Jordanian and Syrian school aged students (14-16), 180 Male and 180 Females, aggregated in Amman and Zarqa.

First component objective: Common issues for Jordanian and Syrian school students in their schools and communities are identified and addressed.

The second component: AFSC collaborates with local NGOs to identify 60 Jordanian young adults ages 18-25 in Amman and Zarqa. AFSC provides these youth with training starting in the first few months of Year 1 of the project (2020). These 60 young adults commit to participating in this project (training, identifying community initiatives, and implementing) for at least 15 months. Later, AFSC will recruit a second group of 60 young adults who undergo the same process.

Second component objective: Civic engagement initiatives are implemented by young adults from Amman and Zarqa in their communities.
The main theory of change of the project is stated as follows:

“If Jordanian and Syrian youth and adolescents design and implement community initiatives jointly, then they will be able to address common issues in their schools and communities with influence on social change and policy issues.”

AFSC conducted a baseline assessment for the project from March to September 2020 to determine the state of youth civic participation and youth ability to contribute to decision-making in Jordan. In addition, the baseline assessment looked at youth concepts of volunteerism and measured the levels of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that revolve around civic engagement. The present evaluation will look to see what changes have occurred among the youth on these issues.

3.3 The project ‘Palestinian Youth: Together for Change (PYTC)”

3.3.1. Programmatic Context of the PYTC project

The project addresses current Palestinian fragmentation through the creation of spaces in which the youth can brainstorm and act collectively. The PYTC project began in January 2020 and ends December 2022.

In general, within the last three years, the political and social situation in Palestine has deteriorated. The degree to which a Palestinian is subject to the occupying power has been evolving and has for the most part intensified, with Palestinians continuing to suffer from poverty and marginalization as a result. In addition, the COVID-19 pandemic impact has added another layer of subjugation over the past two years.

The split and/or reconciliation attempts between Fatah and Hamas have dominated Palestinian politics during recent years. The split and/or reconciliation process is having a direct impact on available “spaces” for civil and political engagement. The blockade imposed on the Gaza Strip since 2007, Israeli-imposed restrictions on movement in West Bank, Israeli-imposed arrests, and securitized constricting policies on Palestinian living in Israel or Jerusalem, and general COVID restrictions have collectively further shrunk the civil spaces for youth to express their opinions and engage with their communities.

All of this has led to increased tensions within the region, further enabling an endless cycle of violence and conflict. These tensions were also reflected in AFSC surveys results, assessments and in other local and international reports. As a result, youth are losing hope, searching for opportunities abroad, and seeking any available spaces for youth activism.

As part of developing a deeper understanding of the state of Palestinian youth on fragmentation and identity, AFSC had been conducting public surveys every three years, in 2016 and 2019. Furthermore, AFSC had engaged with local key informative and local Palestinian civil society to contextualize the project’s design to respond to youth needs. Additionally, the AFSC builds on previous experience and lessons learned in similar projects in Palestine.

3.3.2. Target group, project objectives and Theories of Change of the PYTC 3 project

This project focuses on Palestinian adolescents aged 14-20 years, males and females living in Israel and the occupied Palestinian territory, including East Jerusalem, in organized tours and day camps under “Tawasalo” (First component). Additionally, a selected group of Palestinian youth aged 20-25 years, both males and females regardless of their place of origin and residence, to participate in the “Youth Space” (Second component).

Theories of Change:

(First component) IF Palestinian youth leaders from the occupied Palestinian territory and Israel engage in continuous and systematic face to face exchanges, THEN they will modify mutual perceptions of the
Palestinians living in other areas which will contribute to overcoming existing fragmentation BECAUSE they will increase their knowledge and understanding of one another.

First component relevant project objective 1 (Outcome 1): By the end of 2022, Palestinian adolescents, males and females (aged 14-20), from the occupied Palestinian territory and Israel overcome geographic separation and social fragmentation.

(Second component) IF Palestinian youth leaders from the occupied Palestinian territory and Israel are familiar with each other’s context, generate ideas together, and act together THEN they will be able to introduce relevant initiatives to their communities with influence on social change and policy issues BECAUSE those initiatives will be grounded in the realities of those communities.

Second component relevant Project Objective 2 (Outcome 2): By the end of 2022, Palestinian youth, male and female (aged 20-25), from the occupied Palestinian territory and Israel challenge existing geographic and social fragmentation among communities.

4. Evaluation questions

The evaluation should take into consideration both the programmatic and institutional perspectives. The following evaluation questions are listed according to the evaluation criteria of OECD DAC. They should be understood against the background of an assessment of the two projects specifically as well as an assessment on a synthesis level. The evaluator is expected to work with AFSC team on developing the questions further as required during the inception phase.

Relevance
1. To what extent are the projects relevant to the target group and valid in the implementation context?
2. To what extent are the projects’ objectives, planned activities and planned outputs consistent with the intended outcomes and impact?
3. How did COVID-19 impact the relevance of the projects’ objectives, activities, and outputs?

Coherence
4. To what extent are the projects aligned with national strategies?
5. To what extent are the projects coherent with those of other local actors which have similar objectives in the region?

Effectiveness
6. To what extent do the projects meet the stated objectives or outcomes?
7. How did the COVID-19 mitigation plan and re-designing of activities influence the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
8. To what extent did the projects’ implementation / methodology consider the recommendations of the baseline study?
9. Is the management set-up of the projects conducive to achieving results and objectives?

Efficiency
10. Are activities cost-efficient?
11. Were time, technology and systems allocated for objectives and activities efficient?
12. Are the projects implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?
Impact / Intended Changes

13. What has happened because of the projects? (Intended and unintended impact).
14. How might the COVID-19 pandemic have influenced attaining the intended impact?

Sustainability

15. Is there capacity and intent in the community to continue the projects’ activities on their own?
16. What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the projects?

5. Evaluation design and methodology

The principles and standards of OECD DAC for a participatory, credible, gender-sensitive and fair evaluation shall be observed. Both quantitative and qualitative methods shall be used. Data collection shall promote self-reflection amongst the target groups. The chosen methods shall be inclusive and respect the social and cultural context of the target groups. In the development of the evaluation design and the choice of methods, correct research ethics need to be applied. The evaluation should be guided by the “do-no-harm” principle. The anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants should be protected. In addition, the evaluator(s) will keep confidentiality of the evaluation’s information, data, and findings. The evaluation will have to triangulate information. The evaluator(s) will have the opportunity to dissociate themselves from particular judgments and recommendations. They should acknowledge any unresolved differences of opinion within the team in the report.

The methodical design is to be suggested and described in the technical proposal and refined in the inception report by the evaluator(s). The documentation of the methodical approach is a fundamental component of the evaluation report.

6. Process, reporting and timetable of the evaluation

6.1 Timetable and phases:

The following timetable is indicative and may be subject to change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Duties and Responsibilities</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kick-off and initial meetings between evaluator(s), AFSC and Brot für die Welt. Delivery of documentation and beginning of desk review.</td>
<td>12.04.2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Delivery of Inception report and discussion meeting on inception report with AFSC and Brot für die Welt.</td>
<td>25.04.2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Development of agenda for field work.</td>
<td>28.04.2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Data collection for the two projects</td>
<td>12.05.2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Two debriefing sessions for feedback on the preliminary findings (one for each project)</td>
<td>10.06.2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Preparation of first draft evaluation report and submission.</td>
<td>13.06.2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Feedback on the draft report in a final workshop (from AFSC, partners and Brot für die Welt)</td>
<td>23.06.2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Include feedback and submit final report in English and Arabic</td>
<td>05.07.2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The exact number of working days depends on the proposed methodology and should be outlined in the proposal in line with the suggested methodology.

6.2 Reporting/ Products of the evaluation

Products to be produced during the evaluation:

- Inception Report, including detailed methodology, evaluation matrix showing with which methods the questions will be assessed, data collection tools and proposed timeline, in English.
- Discussion meeting on inception report.
- Agenda for fieldwork.
- Debriefing presentation on preliminary findings for each project in English.
- Draft final report in English.
- Presentation of preliminary results and recommendations to AFSC and Brot für die Welt in English and gathering of feedback.
- Final report in both English and Arabic.

6.2.1 Evaluation design/inception report

The draft and final version of the inception report have to be provided in English.

- The consultant(s) will submit an inception report of approx. 5-8 pages without the annexes
- The inception report shall contain:
  - key data of the evaluation (name, number, duration of the projects to be evaluated, title of the evaluation, commissioner of the evaluation, contractor of the evaluation, date of the report)
  - a detailed description of the evaluation design and methodological approach, including the selection of samples, strategies for analyses and collecting data, hypothesis on outcomes and impacts, an analysis of risks, mitigation measures and limitations
  - an evaluation matrix detailing the methodological operationalization of the evaluation objectives and questions (annex)
  - a detailed actual timeline and field work agenda (annex)
  - data collection tools to be used (annex).
- The inception report will be presented and discussed in a meeting of the evaluator(s) with AFSC and Brot für die Welt.

6.2.2 Final evaluation report

The draft and final evaluation version of the evaluation report have to be provided in English. Additionally, an Arabic translation of the final report is to be submitted after approval of the final evaluation report in English.

The final report (60 pages max + annex) shall have an Executive Summary of 5 pages maximum. It is expected to contain a section with the assessment of the project along the OECD DAC criteria and related questions for each project as well as a section of evaluation findings on an overarching, synthesis level. As a minimum, it will include the following contents:

- Key data of the evaluation.
- Executive summary: about 5 pages.
- Introduction: the purpose of the evaluation, evaluation scope, and key questions. Short description of the evaluated subject and relevant frame conditions as well as the reconstructed results logic of the projects
- Evaluation design/methodology
Project specific key results/findings: regarding the questions pointed out in the TOR and structured according to the OECD DAC evaluation criteria for each of the two projects.

- Results and findings on a synthesis level.
- Conclusions based on evidence and analysis.
- Project specific and overarching actionable and realistic recommendations regarding future steps/activities/follow-up.
- Lessons learned (generalizations of conclusions applicable for broader use).
- Annexes (ToR, list of persons/organizations consulted, literature and documentation consulted etc.).

The draft evaluation report, specifically findings and recommendations will be presented to AFSC and Brot für die Welt and oral as well as written feedback provided will be integrated into the final report. The opportunity for comment on the draft evaluation report is intended to clarify any issues that staff and partners feel may be unclear or misunderstood and for quality assurance. Any issues on which staff, partners, and evaluators disagree may be dealt with by including an Appendix for staff and partners' comments.

7. Responsibilities and duties

The selected evaluator(s) will enter into two contracts with AFSC, one under each of the projects. However, the evaluation is to be understood and carried out as one integrated evaluation assignment. Please note that the evaluator or evaluation team is expected to travel to both project locations to conduct data collection (Jordan and Palestine). AFSC will manage the evaluation as it will be the organization entering into a contract with the selected evaluator(s). Focal points for the evaluator(s) will be AFSC Jordan and AFSC Palestine Program Managers. Comments to the products of the evaluation will be provided by the project partners, AFSC and Brot für die Welt. The AFSC Regional Director assisted by the Program Managers is responsible for approving the inception report and providing comments on the draft Evaluation report in collaboration with relevant AFSC units and Brot für die Welt. AFSC will:

- Facilitate the necessary documentation.
- Assist in contacting individuals and groups to conduct in-depth interviews, focus groups, etc.
- Provide and cover the cost of venues for focus group discussions (if necessary).
- Book accommodation where required.

The evaluator(s) will:

- Finalize the arrangement of the agenda for interviews, etc.
- Arrange and cover the cost of transportation to the project locations.
- Arrange and cover the cost for translation.

8. Dissemination of Evaluation Results

The evaluator(s) will present the main findings to AFSC staff, partners and Brot für die Welt and discuss the results. The discussion will help shape the final evaluation report (in the proposed timetable, the number of sessions can be specified). Also, the evaluators will present initial findings to the project participants closely after the fieldwork.

The project team will use the final evaluation report to implement the projects' consultations and design for a possible next phase. AFSC will distribute the report to AFSC donors and partners.

9. Literature

AFSC will provide the evaluator(s) with the following documentation:

- The three years project proposals approved by Brot für die Welt, including the budget.
- The contracts with Brot für die Welt
- The six-month progress reports submitted to Brot für die Welt
- Baseline reports
- Other project material, reports from the meetings with youth, partners budgets and plans, etc.
- Lesson learned workshop report
- Project stages reports
- List of participants of the activities
- Other information and documentation as requested by the evaluators
- Access to AFSC website and other relevant electronic material.

10. Profile of the consultant(s)

- Sound experience in carrying out evaluations in the context of development cooperation, using a mixed methods approach and triangulation.
- Deep understanding and knowledge of the Jordanian and Palestine context and youth situation.
- Deep understanding of current youth projects carried out in Jordan and Palestine/Israel.
- Previous experience of work with a faith-based organization would be an asset.
- Ability to read and write and communicate in English and Arabic.

11. Submission of evaluation offers

Qualified candidates should submit offers to bolimat@afsc.org, dhammoudeh@afsc.org and evaluation_ausschreibung@ewde.de by COB March 30th, 2022, in electronic format in English language. A complete offer consists of:

- A technical evaluation proposal including a timeline and methodology (Max 8 pages). In the case of a team of evaluators, the proposal should specify the roles and tasks of each consultant, their respective daily rate, and the number of days dedicated. The proposal should also indicate the evaluator entering a contract with AFSC if selected.
- CV(s) with details of relevant evaluations conducted recently (including references of those evaluations) of the evaluator/ all members of the evaluation team.
- A financial proposal in USD, including daily rate(s), other expenses, and VAT. Please note that the commissioned party (evaluator(s)) will pay any income tax related to this consultancy. The proposed budget should include all expenses (daily rate, transportation, per diem, translation, etc.), VAT, and income tax included, except those costs explicitly indicated in these TORs (cost of venues for focus groups, transportation, etc.).

The submission of offers from qualified female evaluators is welcomed.

The commissioning party reserves the right to conduct telephone or personal interviews in order to reach a decision. Furthermore, the right to award the contracts at the time of the submission of the offer is reserved. Only complete offers will be considered. The evaluation award will be granted to the most economical offer, based on the following award criteria and weighting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award criteria</th>
<th>Weight of award criteria in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the technical proposal, with a special focus on understanding the ToR and proposed methodology</td>
<td>35 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications of the evaluators</td>
<td>30 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>