

Project Final Evaluation

Job Description

Based: Central Asia (desired), other locations can also be considered

Reporting to: Regional director *with oversight of the IWPR MEL Manager*

Status: Consultant contract (remote, gmt +6 time zone)

Deadlines for submission of application: 30 June 2023

Background:

The Institute for War & Peace Reporting (IWPR) is an international non-profit organisation founded in 1991, with charitable status in the US, UK and the Netherlands. IWPR has worked in Central Asia since 1999 and has registered offices in Almaty, Bishkek and Dushanbe. IWPR supports media, civil society, democracy and governance, gender, and youth-focused projects in over 30 countries – promoting reliable information and responsible public debate and removing barriers to freedom of expression.

About the Project

The “Go Viral Network and Festival 2.0” is an IWPR’s project focused on enhancing regional connectivity, supporting economic development, and strengthening civil society in Central Asia by creating and sustaining deep partnerships among an emerging generation of innovative Central Asian thought leaders. The Project is supported by the U.S. Diplomatic Mission in Central Asia and implemented in partnership with the Institute for War and Peace Reporting in Central Asia.

Go Viral is currently finalising its second year of implementation and is delivering strong results. MEL plan, system and tools are already in place.

Project period: October 2021 - September 2023

Location: Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan

1. Objective of the consultancy: The Consultant is responsible for conducting the final external evaluation of the “Go Viral Network and Festival 2.0” project. The consultant will work closely with stakeholders to identify and define the key areas of focus for evaluation and provide clarity on what aspects of the project need to be assessed, and ensure that the evaluation is targeted and relevant. The evaluation should contribute to learning, and decision-making processes, enabling stakeholders to make informed decisions regarding the project’s continuation, scale-up, or replication.

Utilization focused evaluation: findings, learnings and recommendations should be reliable, understandable and “actionable” in full by intended users of the evaluation. Intended users are: project manager, project staff, donor, IWPR staff, partners, mentors, direct beneficiaries. Methodologies, deliverables and debriefing sessions should prioritise inclusive, users-friendly formats.

Complex changes, expected and unexpected: Special attention should be paid to uncovering the peculiarities of the changes in actions, relationships, policy or practice of both beneficiaries and external actors linked to the project activities. The nature of the changes in question may be positive or negative, intended or unintended.

Significance and context: The consultant is to provide a detailed account of the interconnection between the project and the larger observed social trends happening within the region. Results, challenges and recommendations for future programming should be outlined in the light of local and regional context mindful of factors that may limit or enhance impact and sustainability.

2. Tasks and responsibilities: The consultant(s) is expected to:

- 1) Study the relevant project documents (including, but not limited to the work plan, events’ evaluation sheets, content produced throughout the project life), review and revise the log frame and result matrix, and revise the indicators (both target and achieved) study project progress reports and annual and mid-year evaluations;
- 2) Suggest and conduct data capture activities to track the qualitative impact of the project (interviews with beneficiaries, focus-groups, evaluation of the content produced, etc.). *Collection of stories that exemplify/explain achievement or challenges is encouraged.*
- 3) Conduct evaluation of the project’s short-term and long-term impact towards the target groups/individuals. *Utilisation of rigorous methodologies like “outcomes harvesting” is encouraged.*
- 4) Compare the existing project progress against the established baseline. Outline trends of success baseline-target vs year achievements and overall achievement.
- 5) Identify new sources of verification that the project can use. As much as possible, use existing data sources embedded in existing systems. *Consider utilisation of [IWPR Stakeholders or/and Network Engagement indexes](#).*
- 6) Submit draft and final agreed deliverables
- 7) Debriefing and feedback session to support utilisation of the findings with project staff, Donors, partners and others as per previous agreement with Project Manager.

Reporting: A proposed full evaluation structure is outlined in the Annex 1. The final full evaluation report should provide with following information and analysis:

1. Outline the methodology with the key areas of focus including specific evaluation questions.
2. Overall assessment of the level of success of the project as per [DAC criteria](#): coherence, efficiency, impact, effectiveness, relevance, sustainability.

3. Outline key actionable recommendations for future programming in the light of current needs (national/regional context), project goal and project successes, good practices and lessons learned.
4. List of significant outcomes achieved, intended as observable changes in actions, relationships, policy or practice of both beneficiaries and external actors linked to the project activities, categorise them using existing and unplanned performance indicators, by DAC criteria and other relevant categories (e.g. gender, type of beneficiary, date etc).
5. Outline significance and relevance of each outcome in light of implementation context at national, regional and international level.
6. Outline contribution of the project for each outcome.
7. Beneficiaries reach: overview of beneficiaries reached directly and indirectly: number, type, gender, country and any other relevant disaggregation.
8. Outline significant challenges and/or negative changes that have limited or affected achievement of success, analyse effectiveness of mitigation strategies applied (if any) and level of impact of those challenges. Outline lessons learned for future implementation.
9. Track progress as per project performance matrix/M&E framework (baseline, targets and year by year progress).
10. Include visualisations (graphs/tables) and quotes as appropriate to support deeper understanding of evidence and analysis.

Deliverables:

- **Deliverable 1 Plan** Proposed plan and methodologies for the evaluation and case studies development, to be approved by the project manager.
- **Deliverable 2 Final evaluation report:** A full evaluation report, 20-25 pages max (excluding annexes). Content outlined in the section “reporting”.
- **Deliverable 3 Summary** Summary of the evaluation findings: 2 pages max with overview of overall achievements/performance and key actionable recommendations.
- **Deliverable 4 Evaluation dataset** A database (excel) with list of outcomes, significance, contribution and related categorization used for the analysis.

Optional but encouraged:

- **Deliverable 5 Case studies** Up to 3 case studies to support “scaling up of success”. Each case study should focus on a significant observable change/impact (outcome)

identified by the project manager and should outline which conditions (activities/behaviour/processes/stakeholders) enabled success to support replicability. Each case study should be 5 pages max.

- **Deliverable 6 Visualisations:** Set of visualisations (tables, graphs) with short explanations to be used separately from the report perhaps in presentations and website/social media.

3. Timeframe

The official start date is July 10, 2023

Activities/Deliverables	Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Week 5	Week 6	Week 7	Week 8
Launch meeting with IWPR staff	x							
Documents review	x							
Present revised methodology, including evaluation questions and workplan plan to IWPR		x						
Collect the data (in person and in virtual): harvest outcomes, stories of change through interviews, surveys etc		x	x	x				
Data analysis (participatory and/or independent as per methodology agreed)				x	x			
Draft report (deliverable 1)						x		
Draft summary evaluation, visualisation case studies, dataset (deliverables 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)							x	
Final report graphically designed (if applicable)								x

Qualifications

At least 3 years of experience in leading project evaluations.

- Significant experience in Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL)

- Methodologies, with particular expertise in Outcomes Harvesting
- Excellent virtual facilitation skills.
- Proven expertise in qualitative data analysis, quantitative/qualitative data management and data visualisations (graphs, dashboards).
- Proven spoken and written communication skills in English.
- Ability to attend online (Zoom) meetings, storytelling sessions, etc. in GMT+6 timezone
- Highly organised, analytical, adaptive and responsive to feedback and changes in direction when needed.
- Demonstrated commitment to freedom of speech values.
- Highly efficient and flexible approach to work, with ease in collaborating with others.
- Ability to work with limited supervision, as part of a small team and independently.

Annex 1. Proposed structure for final evaluation report

*Length: max **20 pages** excluding Annexes*

- 1) Title page and acknowledgement
- 2) Index
- 3) List of used terminology
- 4) Executive summary (major achievements, top 5 key actionable recommendations for future programming) (max 2 pages)
- 5) Evaluation methodology & limitations (0.5 page)
- 6) A brief analysis of the context and project goal: the conditions in which the project was launched, the main changes and challenges in the context, theory of change and goal of the project, duration (1 page)
- 7) Evaluation findings in the following sections (10-15 pages max)
 - > 7.1 Summary of findings with tables that outline the assessment for each DAC criteria (achieved, partially achieved, not achieved, surpassed).
 - > 7.2 Detailed evaluation for each DAC criteria: present overall results (state level of success/unsuccess as per target/goal) and outline key outcomes, description, significance, project contribution; progress in view of baseline and targets; include graphic visualisation and exemplificative quotes (or links to full stories/interviews) as appropriate.
 1. Impact (*includes beneficiaries reach data): WHAT DIFFERENCE DOES THE INTERVENTION MAKE?
 2. Effectiveness: IS THE INTERVENTION ACHIEVING ITS OBJECTIVES?
 3. Relevance: IS THE INTERVENTION DOING THE RIGHT THINGS?
 4. Sustainability: WILL THE BENEFITS LAST?
 5. Coherence: HOW WELL DOES THE INTERVENTION FIT?
 6. Efficiency: HOW WELL ARE RESOURCES BEING USED?
- 8) Lessons learned and good practices (2 pages)
 - > 8.1 Challenges&LL during implementation, to what extent these have impacted/limited project intervention, what have been the mitigations/adaptation measures put in place to what extent the mitigations were sufficient? What are our major learnings?
 - > 8.2 good practices: which good practice demonstrated success and is recommended to apply again in nex context or scale up?

More info: [OECD-DAC](#)

9) Actionable Recommendations for future programming for specific set of actors (1 page)

ANNEXES

- A. Case studies for “scaling up success” (deliverable 5)
- B. Evaluation methodology (what tools were used to evaluate the program. This can include
 - 1. study of reports, documents, M&E reports, desk research, focus group discussions with selected participants, interviews with experts, quantitative studies (small surveys on Survey Monkey, survey of a group of participants, case study, COM-B analysis, SWOT analysis, etc.)
- C. Updated project performance matrix (M&E plan) updated with year and overall results.
- D. Outcomes dataset (deliverable 6)
- E. List of people interviewed and documents consulted

Submit application: <https://iwpr.bamboohr.com/careers/348>