Terms of Reference (ToR)
End of Project Evaluation
THE PROJECT: “Standing together for Free, Fair and Peaceful Elections in Sierra Leone”

Project Start Date: December 2016
Project End Date: 31 July 2018

1. Background and Context

Founded in 1982, Search for Common Ground (Search) works to transform the way the world deals with conflict, away from adversarial approaches towards collaborative solutions. With headquarters in Washington DC and a European office in Brussels, Search works to support constructive conflict resolution and inclusive decision-making in 49 countries and implement projects in 39 countries in Europe, Asia, the Middle East and Africa. We have worked in Sierra Leone since 2000, producing innovative radio and television programmes that have contributed to opening the space for dialogue on critical and sensitive social and political issues in the country. We have expertise in strategic communication, reinforcing the government’s and international community’s efforts on key campaigns, including governance reform, food security, environment, education, health, elections and decentralization.

1.1 The Project

- SFCG is leading the implementation and management of a 20 months DFID funded electoral cycle support with a goal of ‘creating the conditions for free, fair and peaceful elections in Sierra Leone’. This project started on 1st December 2016 and will end on 31st July 2018. In support of achieving the goal, the project seeks to achieve the following specific objectives:

   1. Increase the availability of quality and reliable information on democratic rights and responsibilities to citizens, including marginalized segments of the population (youth, women and girls, PWD);
   2. Increase the participation of women in the electoral process; and
   3. Increase the capacities of key stakeholders, including institutions and elections-related agencies, as well as civil society groups, to support the delivery of free, fair and peaceful elections.

To this effect, the project targets the 14 districts in Sierra Leone through direct engagement (trainings, media, capacity-building and community outreach activities) targeting 500,000 citizens as direct beneficiaries, including at least 50% youth, women and PWDs, as well as key institutions, decision-makers, political parties and candidates. The project seeks to indirectly reach a minimum of two million (2,000,000) Sierra Leoneans (approximately 70% of the voting population), mostly via its media programmes designed and broadcast nationwide through Search’s and IRN’s extensive network of over 40 community and national partner radio stations across the country, including some of the most hard-to-reach communities in Sierra Leone.

The project started in December 2016 and ends on the 31st July 2018. Since then, over 90% of proposed project activities have been implemented, including project start-up (human resources, logistics and
management set up) and capacity strengthening for Consortium downstream partners. Other key project thematic activities implemented include:

- the Consortium’s public policy dialogue series (including KAP1 and 2, the Citizens Manifesto, the PWD Agenda, the Presidential Debate and other engagements);
- civic mobilization and voter education (including the mobilization of Women, First Time Voters and PWDs through numerous civic and education campaign – including the week of citizens engagement);
- civil society mobilization electoral trust and integrity promotion (including observation of various phases and stages of the electoral process);
- and the promotion of peace and non-violent electoral process (including violence mitigation training, national and constituency dialogue session).

2. Project Result Chain/Theory of Change – Goal, outcome, output analysis

The project has a nation-wide coverage articulated through the use of media to reach out to the target beneficiaries. This approach is anchored on a theory of change which suggest that Sierra Leoneans (men, women, young people and persons with disabilities) can better be represented in public policy decision making processes, make informed decisions about national governance and the development of their communities, and break the barriers that limit their effective participation in public life when they are adequately informed of their democratic rights, responsibilities and privileges.

The overall goal of this intervention is to ‘To create the conditions for free, fair and peaceful elections in Sierra Leone’ by promoting civil society engagement, capacity development for electoral management bodies (EMBs) and civil society organizations, and support the gathering and dissemination of quality information on governance and political participation that provides voice and constructive dialogue between citizens and their political leaders on key public policy issues as articulated in the expected project results below:

ER1.1: Voters are ready, able and willing to participate in elections Results
ER1.2: Citizens are aware of their democratic rights and responsibilities, particularly marginalized groups
ER 1.3: Citizens are informed about key policy issues surrounding the elections, and are more likely to vote on the basis of those issues
ER 1.4: Reduced risk of political violence and systems in place to manage election-related conflicts
ER 2.2: Newly-elected female officials, understand and are able to execute their roles and responsibilities effectively
ER 2.3: All electoral activities are gender-sensitive, including through the contribution of women to administrative, oversight and security arrangements for elections
ER 3.1: CSO are equipped to observe the electoral cycle including pre and post elections, as well as polling and tallying
ER 3.2: Increased public awareness/transparency of the electoral cycle
ER 3.3: Data is available to inform regular conflict analysis and to monitor changing voter behaviours and attitudes over time.
ER 3.4: Data is available to monitor changing voter behaviors and attitude over time

2.1 Project Partners: (including implementing partners and other key stakeholders)

The project is implemented by a Consortium of five Sierra Leonean civil society organizations: National Elections Watch (NEW), Campaign for Good Governance (CGG), Independent Radio Network (IRN), Institute for Governance Reform (GR), 50/50 Group - and two international organizations – Search for Common Ground (Search) and Westminster Foundation for Democracy (WFD), with Search for Common Ground as the prime partner. Other key stakeholders both in activity implementation and as part of the end of project evaluation are the UK Aid through DFID – Sierra Leone (the project donor), Elections Management Bodies (the National Elections Commission and the Political Parties
Registration Commission), security agencies (such as the Police and the Office of National Security), Media institutions (print and electronics), the Sierra Leone Union on Disability Issues (SLUDI), the Sierra Leone Parliament and civil society organizations across the country.

3. The Final Evaluation

The project has been implemented for 18 months since its commencement in December 2016. This is a mandatory final project evaluation required by the project donor – UKaid through DFID Sierra Leone – for the purposes of assessing the effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, sustainability and impact of the civil society support project to the 2017/18 electoral cycle in Sierra Leone.

3.1 Scope

The evaluation will cover the entire project duration, from December 2016 to July 2018. Within this period, the evaluation will assess project outcomes at all levels: including all result areas, Consortium partners, beneficiaries and project stakeholders. The evaluation will in particular seek to assess the impact and relevance of the project’s intervention on the participation of young people, women and person with disabilities in the electoral process and the impact of project activities on the outcome of the 2018 general elections. The evaluation will assess the project management and activity implementation with a view to addressing the results achieved, the partnerships established, as well as issues of capacity and approach development for Consortium partners and civil society organization. The evaluation will also dept into establishing best practice for future engagement.

3.2 Objectives

The objectives of the evaluation are summarized below:

a. To evaluate the project in terms of its effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, with a priority on assessing the project expected results, objectives and overall goal;
b. To identify key lessons and potential practices for learning;
c. To identify potential areas for civil society advocacy and donor collaboration in the governance process in post-elections Sierra Leone;
d. To assess the challenge, best practice and document the outcome for future processes.

3.3 Evaluation Questions

The evaluation will be guided by the following questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Mandatory Evaluation Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  | Effectiveness       | 1. How appropriate were the management process in supporting delivery of project expected results?  
2. To what extent did the Project’s M&E mechanism contribute in meeting project results?  
3. How effective were the strategies and tools used in the implementation of the project?  
4. To what extent were the intended project goal, outcomes and outputs achieved and how?  
5. To what extent did the project reach the targeted beneficiaries at the project goal and outcome levels? How many beneficiaries have been reached?  
6. To what extent has this project generated positive (or negative) changes in the political participation of young people, women and persons with disability. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td>1. Was the project relevant to the identified needs of the target beneficiaries and the context?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Were the project inputs and strategy (including its assumptions and theory of change) realistic,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appropriate and adequate to achieve the results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. To what extent do achieved results (project goal, outcomes and outputs) continue to be relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to the needs of Young people, PWDs and Women in Sierra Leone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency</strong></td>
<td>1. How far the results achieved did justify the cost incurred - were the resources effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>utilized?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Did project activities overlap and duplicate other similar interventions (funded nationally and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or by other donors? Are there more efficient ways and methods of delivering more and better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>results (outputs and outcomes) with the available inputs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Could a different approach have produced better results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. How efficient and timely has this project been implemented and managed in accordance with the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project proposal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>1. Are there any plans and or strategies to sustain the gains made in youth, PWD and women’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>empowerment in public life after the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. How effective were the exit strategies, and approaches to phase out assistance provided by the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>project including support to public policy dialogue?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. What are the key factors/areas that will require additional support/attention in order to improve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prospects of sustainability of the project outcomes and the potential for replication of this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>approach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. What are the recommendations for similar support in future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
<td>1. What are the unintended consequences as a result of the project activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Are there any significant changes in the context as a result of the project intervention?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning and Replicability</strong></td>
<td>1. What are some of the key lessons learned at a result of this project that can be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shared and replicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. What are the recommendations for similar for future interventions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4 Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation will be guided by the Search’s Institutional Learning Team principles and shall be responsible for the overall direction of the evaluation.

The evaluation will combine qualitative and quantitative data collection and evaluation techniques using the following methods:

- **Desk-base review**: The evaluation will review relevant project documents and content produced before and during project implementation including the project proposal, annual and quarterly work plans, project progress reports, annual project reports, public policy documents (such as the Citizens Manifesto and the PWD agenda etc.) and other documents produced by or associated with the project.
✓ **Interviews with Project stakeholders/partners**: In addition to the desk review, the evaluation will also conduct interviews key project stakeholder (particularly Consortium members) using a structured methodology developed by the consultant in collaboration with the DME team.

✓ **Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)**: A set of KIIs will also be conducted with selected relevant key informants and institutions (a list of key informants and institutions such as EMBs, DFID, the security sector etc., will be agreed between the evaluator and the project SMT).

✓ **Focus Group Discussions**: Data will also be collected using focus groups discussion with project beneficiaries and other project stakeholders using a pre-designed focus group discussion guide.

✓ **Survey**: Where applicable, sample survey will be conducted in select locations to gauge the perception of the population about the outcome and impact of the project.

### 3.5 Evaluation Timeline

The evaluation is expected to start in the last week of July 2018 and will last for 30 working days including fieldwork/interviews and report writing and submission.

#### 4. Evaluation Deliverables and Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inception Report</td>
<td>This must define the scope of the work with a proposed work plan and evaluation questionnaires to be submitted 5 days following the official commencement of the evaluation. The inception report will provide the Consortium, its donor and other key stakeholders the opportunity to ascertain that the evaluator(s) share the same understanding about the evaluation objectives. The inception report should detail the evaluators’ understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods; proposed sources of data; and data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product. Before accepted to become the guide for the evaluation, the inception report must be discussed and agreed with the SMT members of the Consortium and DFID.</td>
<td>25 – 31, July 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fieldwork Preparation</td>
<td>Training of enumerators, testing of tools and final validation</td>
<td>6 – 7th August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td>Briefing, deployment of enumerators, data collection and post field work debriefing</td>
<td>8 – 18th August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Presentation of Data</td>
<td>Lead Consultant to present to the Search an analysed summary of field data before the writing the first draft report. This will allow for review, questioning and field follow up and cross validation.</td>
<td>19-20 August 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Draft Evaluation Report</td>
<td>The evaluator(s) must submit draft report for review and comments by all parties involved after analysis of the field data. The report needs to adhere to the structure and minimum evaluation report writing requirements of Search for Common Ground ILT Unit. Both the Consortium’s</td>
<td>27th August 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SMT members and DFID and other stakeholders in the evaluation must review the draft evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria.

| 6 | **Final Report** | This will be submitted 7-10 days after receiving comments from the project SMT and DFID. The content and structure of the final analytical report with findings, recommendations and lessons learnt covering the scope of the evaluation should meet the requirements of for Search for Common Ground ILT and DM&E departments and must include the following:
- Executive summary (1-2 pages),
- Introduction (1 page),
- Description of the evaluation methodology (6 pages),
- Situational analysis with regard to the outcome, outputs, and partnership strategy (6-7 pages),
- Analysis of opportunities to provide guidance for future programming (3-4 pages),
- Key findings, including best practices and lessons learned (4-5 pages),
- Conclusions and recommendations (4-5 pages).
- Appendices: Charts, terms of reference, field visits, people interviewed, documents reviewed | 5th September 2018 |

---

5. **Management and logistics**

The Lead Consultant report to Search for Common Ground’s Country Director who will not have control over the professional work of the evaluators. The Consortium DM&E Coordinator with support from Search’s Regional DME Specialist will provide technical guidance for the evaluation to ensure the independence of the evaluation process, and that Search’s independent evaluation policy is followed. Search will provide logistical support to the evaluation team not included in their budget.

6. **Required Qualifications and Expertise for Lead Evaluator/Entity**

The Evaluator shall have the following expertise and qualification:

- At least Master’s degree in Public Policy, International Development, Development Economics/Planning, Economics, International Relations/ Diplomacy or any other relevant university degree;
- Extensive expertise, knowledge, and experience in the field of aid effectiveness and aid management process related issues, including governance and electoral support programmes and management in developing countries – especially in the Mano River Basin demonstrated by evaluation previously performed;
- Experience of project formulation and evaluation and practical experience of end of project evaluation in Sierra Leone or in similar context; At least 10 years of experience in working with international organizations and donors, evaluating
projects with multiple partners with complex implementation modalities; and
specifically, experience in the evaluation of DFID funded projects;
o Excellent written and verbal Communication skills is English;
o Experience in local Sierra Leonean language including Krio will be and added
advantage.

Offers will be evaluated on these criteria as well as the quality of the technical offer
(proposed methodology, capacity to mobilise qualified personnel in the field, etc.) and the
soundness of the financial offer.

7. Mode of Application:

Interested, qualified and experienced person, group of persons or firms must submit an Expression
of Interest dossier by 21st June 2018 to sierraleone-job@sfcg.org or in a sealed envelope outlining
availability in line with the approximate timeline. The cover letter should be addressed to: The
Country Director, Search for Common Ground, 9 D Jamboria Drive, Tengbeh Town, Freetown.

The expression of interest should contain: (a) a technical offer and (b) a financial offer, comprising:

A. Technical offer:

✓ Up to date CV of the lead consultant/evaluator (showing education and expertise).
✓ Technical proposition detailing proposed methodology and resources needed (max 3
pages).
✓ An example of a report from similar work which demonstrates evidence of the skills
and experience required and a list of past evaluation produced by the lead
consultant/evaluator.

B. Financial offer:

✓ A list of all expenses expected to be incurred by the consultant including a daily rate.