****

**Mid-term Project Evaluation: “Young Citizens of Armenia. Civic Education through Promotion of Social Innovation” Phase 2**

**Terms of Reference**

**Organizational context**

*KASA Swiss Humanitarian Foundation was founded in 1997 by a group of Armenian and Swiss singers who had arrived in Armenia for a concert. Since its foundation the organization has aimed to support the most underprivileged people in country. At the beginning the foundation focused its activities on providing support to the populations of the North of Armenia who had severely suffered as a result of the Earthquake of 1988. Meanwhile, it provided educational opportunities and tools for development being guided by the "Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day. Teach a man to fish, and you feed him for a lifetime" concept. Today, the Foundation has shifted its strategy from humanitarian assistance to sustainable development and aims at addressing the nowadays challenges of the Armenian society mainly through community development, youth empowerment, educational and training interventions for various target groups from rural communities to refugees arriving to Armenia. Our main focus since 2008 has been the design and implementation of various educational and youth work programmes promoting civil society development and the long-term harmonious development of the country.*

**1. EVALUATION PURPOSE**

This mid-term project evaluation is being arranged by KASA Foundation, in the frameworks of the project funded by Bread for the World. Bread for the World is a globally active development and relief agency of the Protestant Churches in Germany. In more than 90 countries all across the globe they empower the poor and marginalized to improve their living conditions. Key issues of their work are [food security](https://www.brot-fuer-die-welt.de/en/bread-for-the-world/our-topics/food-security/), the promotion of [health](https://www.brot-fuer-die-welt.de/en/bread-for-the-world/our-topics/health/) and [education](https://www.brot-fuer-die-welt.de/en/bread-for-the-world/our-topics/education/), the access to water, the strengthening of democracy, respecting [human rights](https://www.brot-fuer-die-welt.de/en/bread-for-the-world/our-topics/human-rights/), keeping [peace](https://www.brot-fuer-die-welt.de/en/bread-for-the-world/our-topics/just-peace/) and the integrity of creation.

The Revolution in 2018 granted general public with a strong sense of empowerment, it particularly expanded their opportunities of participation in decision- making processes, engagement methods, however, it continues to remain in the lines of street activism, reactive online communication. Young people who were in the heart of civil disobedience campaign gained substantial positive shift in the attitude and interest towards political and civic processes in the country. But in 2019 the euphoria of revolution was certainly gone, and doubts about the pace of change start to sprout. Structured dialogue was missing due to lack of mechanisms and skills from all stakeholders and the project aims to fill the skills gap. The devastating war in 2020 and to the date has madethepurpose of the project more than ever relevant, as the need for social and civic cohesion and consolidation is essential in the current reality. KASA’s project is called “Young Citizens of Armenia. Civic Education through Promotion of Social Innovation” Phase 2. It aims to contribute to a democratic culture in Armenia and an empowerment of youth in their engagement for community development.

The main purpose of mid-term evaluation is to review the implementation of the project Phase 2 since its inception. The mid-term review is geared towards promoting project performance improvement, accountability, learning and evidence-based decision making and management. In particular, the review will assess results achieved to date in comparison with the performance indicators. It will also draw lessons and make recommendations for enhancing project implementation and performance. The mid-term evaluation will determine the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the expected project outcomes. The Mid Term Review is intended to identify strengths and weaknesses as well as opportunities and risks of the project and develop recommendations for any necessary changes in the overall design and orientation of the project by evaluating the adequacy and effectiveness of its implementation and delivery of project outputs and outcomes to date. It will also provide an opportunity to assess early signs of project’s success or failure and propose the necessary adjustments needed to refocus the project.

**2. EVALUATION SCOPE AND CRITERIA**

The evaluation exercise shall cover all activities undertaken within the framework of the current project. The involvement of and impact on all target groups and beneficiaries should be considered as far as possible during the course of the evaluation. The review will assess results achieved to date against the indicators, assumptions, and risks specified in the Project Description. It will also extract lessons learned, diagnose and analyse issues and formulate a concrete and viable set of recommendations for enhancing project implementation and performance also feeding the next phases of the project. It will evaluate the efficiency of Project management, including the delivery of outputs and activities in terms of quality, quantity, timeliness and cost efficiency.

The evaluation should provide an assessment of the project against the following criteria:

1. **Relevance: Is the project doing the right things**
2. **Coherence: How well does the project fit?**
3. **Effectiveness: Is the project achieving its objectives?**
4. **Efficiency:** **How well are resources being used?**
5. **Overarching developmental impact: What difference does the project make?, Overall objective level, impact**
6. **Sustainability: Will the effects last? Project and overall objective level, Use of Output, Outcome and Impact**

**3. EVALUATION QUESTIONS**

In order to assess the project against the criteria above, the evaluation should answer the following questions:

1. **Relevance (Is the project doing the right things?)**
   1. To what extent are the project goals aligned with the needs of the target group?
   2. To what extent are the project objectives aligned with the needs of particularly disadvantaged or vulnerable target groups (possible differentiation by age, gender, ethnicity, etc.)?
   3. To what extent is the project design plausible, appropriate and realistic (in technical, organizational and financial terms)?
   4. To what extent was the project adapted to changing conditions that arose during implementation?
2. **Coherence ( How well does the project fit?)**
   1. To what extent does the project align with other (development policy) measures in a country, region or sector?
   2. To what extent is the project design and its implementation coordinated with the activities of other donors?
   3. To what extent is the project consistent with international and national norms and standards (such as human rights)?
   4. To what extent are existing systems and structures (of partners/other donors/international organizations) being used for the implementation of the activities?
   5. To what extent the project aligned with the organization strategic goals
3. **Effectiveness: Is the project achieving its objectives? (Project objective level, Use of Output or Outcome)** 
   1. To what extent have the project objectives been, or are expected to be, achieved?
   2. To what extent were or will the outputs of the project be achieved?
   3. To what extent did the activities or outputs contribute to the achievement of the project objectives? What factors were decisive for the achievement or non-achievement of the project objectives?
   4. To what extent did the project contribute to the achievement of the objectives among the direct target groups?
   5. How well were the recommendations of the previous evaluation used, and հow effective has the use of these recommendations been?
   6. What are the main identified strengths and weaknesses as well as opportunities and risks of the project so far and what are the recommendations for any necessary changes in the overall implementation and delivery of project outputs and outcomes to date
4. **Efficiency (How well are resources being used?)**
   1. To what extent were the project's inputs (financial, human and material resources) used economically in relation to the outputs produced (products, capital goods and services) (production efficiency)?
   2. To what extent were the outputs achieved on time and within the planned timeframe?
   3. To what extent could the project’s outputs have been increased through alternative use of inputs?
   4. To what extent is the relationship between inputs and outputs, achieved by the project, optimal (allocation efficiency)?
5. **Impact Overarching developmental impact (What difference does the project make?)**

**(Overall objective level, impact)**

* 1. To what extent can overarching intended/non-intended or positive/negative effects be identified or anticipated?
  2. What factors were decisive for the achievement, or non-achievement of the developmental impacts?
  3. To what extent did the project lead to structural or institutional changes?
  4. To what extent was the project exemplary and/or had a broad impact?

1. **Sustainability (Will the effects last?) (Project and overall objective level, Use of Output, Outcome and Impact)**
   1. To what extent are the positive effects of the project sustainable?
   2. To what extent has the project contributed to the target groups' ability and willingness to maintain the positive effects of the project over time?
   3. To what extent has the project contributed to strengthening the resilience of the target groups?
   4. What are the risks and what is the potential for the sustainable effectiveness of the project?

**The below evaluation grid for project success based on the OECD/DAC criteria has to be completed by the evaluator(s)**

**Evaluation grid for project evaluation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Very good/**  **Very high (1)** | **Good/**  **High (2)** | **Average (3)** | **Bad/**  **Low (4)** | **Very bad/**  **Very low (5)** | **N/A** |
| **Explanation of the rating** | The questions are positively evaluated. | The majority of the questions are positively evaluated. | The questions are partly positive and partly negatively evaluated. | The majority of the questions are negatively evaluated. | The questions are negatively evaluated. | No questions were evaluated on this OECD/DAC criterion. |
| **Relevance** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Coherence** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Effectiveness** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Efficiency** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Impact** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Sustainability** |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**4. METHODOLOGY**

The evaluator will employ a variety of data sources. A participatory methodology, with contributions from a wide range of stakeholders, should be employed as far as possible within the resources available.

A desk review of the relevant project documents, project reports, on-site reviews and/or on-line reviews and interviews with relevant stakeholders, as well as reports and evaluations of individual activities, should be undertaken. The evaluator will have access to all relevant reports, including mid-term and annual review reports, previous evaluation of the project. Materials on all individual activities, including evaluations by participants and KASA staff, will be made available.

**5. EVALUATION RESULTS**

The evaluator will be accountable for the following:

* **Support for internal evaluation.** Assessment and consultancy on fine-tuning of the existing internal evaluation tools/methods and set-up of an overall internal evaluation plan.
* **Drafting of an evaluation Report.** A detailed report including an executive summary of findings, detailed analysis of all evaluation questions and clear and practical recommendations for future programming.
* **Support in publication.** A brief publication to be created together with the team focusing mainly on the findings of impact assessment of the programme.

**6. TIME-FRAME FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS**

The following time schedule for the evaluation process is envisaged:

* Inception report։ end- June, 2024
* Draft final report: end-August, 2024
* Feedback on the draft report: mid-September, 2024
* Final report: end-September, 2024
* Publication: mid-October, 2024

**11. BIDDING PROCESS AND REQUIREMENTS**

Key qualifications of the evaluator (s):

* Research and data analysis skills
* Proficiency in evaluation methodology
* Contextual knowledge
* Command of written and oral English
* Appropriate social skills and experience with the target group
* Availability to conduct the evaluation within the given timeframe

Proposals should detail:

* a letter of motivation,
* an example of previous similar evaluations,
* a CV(s) including contact details of three references,
* an evaluation plan including the proposed methodology, schedule,
* a financial proposal including consultant’s daily rate and number of days committed to the evaluation.

Proposals should be submitted in electronic format to [**procurement@kasa.am**](mailto:procurement@kasa.am)by **12 noon** on **Sunday, 23th June 2024**.

The consultant/ consortium will be paid on lump sum basis based on submission of deliverables based on ToR, following an agreed schedule of work. The lump sum will include all necessary travel costs and per diem necessary to undertake the evaluation.