

## Internal Midterm Evaluation

### Terms of Reference

<b>Project Title:</b>	Taking Action on Social Inclusion of Older People (TASIOP)
<b>Counties:</b>	Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia
<b>Project Number:</b>	Europe Aid 2015/370-287
<b>Name of Partners:</b>	Red Cross of Serbia, Albanian Association of Geriatrics and Gerontology, Association Humanost – Macedonia, Red Cross of Macedonia, Association OSMIJEH – Bosnia and Herzegovina, Red Cross of Montenegro, Österreichisches Rotes Kreuz

#### 1. Introduction/Background

The ageing of population is a prominent phenomenon across most of Europe. The effects of population ageing are different from country to country in terms of how the society accommodates to a changing demographic structure. However, commonly older people are excluded from decision-making processes at all levels and they have an image problem too. The three-year project *Taking Action on Social Inclusion of Older People* coordinated by the Red Cross of Serbia is supported by European Union through its IPA fund, the Austrian Red Cross as well as the Austrian Development Agency. It started in February 2016 in the Western Balkans, including the countries Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, North Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia and can be considered a regional effort to put older people's fate back in their hands, support them in being better included in their communities and discuss the topics of importance with decision makers and community leaders.

In order to achieve results, the **main goals** of the project are to

- **Strengthen and widen networks of civil society organisations** in Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, North Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia and to improve their ties to the communities and facilitate social inclusion of older people in local communities and the society across the region.
- **Encourage and support older people to take part in decision-making** processes related to ageing and older age at local and national levels through offering knowledge and transfer of good practices.
- **Change the public perception of older people** through engaging the public via targeted advocacy campaigns and working with the media on better understanding of the demographic realities and individual strengths, capacities and contributions of older people across a range of ages, geographic areas and social classes.

The **detailed results and outcomes** are summarized under section 2.1.1. Description of the project proposal (see Annex 3). Any changes to the initial project proposal have been documented in narrative and financial progress reports.

An **initial set of indicators** has been identified during the project development phase to monitor the achievement of these expected results and goals. It is documented in the **logical framework** matrix and the activity plan of the project document (see Annex 3).

The TASIOP project has **now completed the full implementation period**. All activities have been completed within the planned timeframe. During the last phase, a no-cost extension has been achieved prolonging the period of implementation from 36 to 40 months, with a new end of the project on 31 May 2019. From the implementing partners, this extension was mainly

applicable to Bosnia and Herzegovina, enabling the partner to compensate for lost time due to VAT-related bureaucracies and in order to properly complete the sub-granting activities in the country.

## 2. Evaluation Purpose

The purpose of this evaluation is to **analyse the design, progress and performance of the project** as compared to the project document, logframe indicators and situation analysis framework, in general.

This shall serve to **develop lessons learned and provide recommendations** for future activities and projects in this field.

The evaluation is a **process carried out by an external consultant, involving all project partners and project related stakeholders**, including national government, ministries, local government entities, media, public service providers and others, as defined by each national coordinator. The analysis within this evaluation shall, at all stages be carried out in cooperation and consultation with the main stakeholders.

## 3. Evaluation Objectives

The **general** objective of the evaluation is to identify and describe the project performance through presenting results (output, outcome), conclusions, lessons learnt and recommendations.

**Specifically** the evaluation aims to assess the project progress, relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability towards the set project goals, by drawing a focus on activities related to

- National CSO networks
- Civic education
- Sub-granting

As an **outcome** of this evaluation, it is expected to summarize the project achievements, performance and experiences, and recommend the most effective approaches and methodologies.

This will be particularly **relevant for** the project partners, the member organization of the national networks and the project management of the RC of Serbia in view of relevance, direction and improvement of their activities. The evaluation's outcomes will be used for the development of future projects. It will be relevant for networking, lobbying and relationship building with relevant future partners, stakeholders or donors, especially in the framework of further EU-supported initiatives in the region.

## 4. Subject and Focus

This review will focus on all five evaluation criteria, namely relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

The **first part of the analysis will focus on the overall project performance and efficiency** through measuring the validity of set indicators from the logical framework as well as the progress against the set indicators.

The second part of the analysis will specifically analyze the main focus of the project by measuring the relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the national CSO networks on social inclusion of older people.

**Target group for the evaluation:**

- Project partners and all national CSO networks including their members
- Relevant stakeholders as defined by the national project and network coordinators (e.g. relevant ministries related to social inclusion of older people, local and regional government entities, independent bodies (Ombudsman, Commissioner for Protection of Equality etc.), media, public service providers, older people, UN/UNFPA offices, other key international organizations, etc.)

**Geographical area:**

- The evaluation will take place in all five countries where the project is implemented.

5. Main Evaluation Questions

**Relevance:**

**Overall project performance and efficient use of resources**

- Are the expected results/outputs of the project consistent with the outcome, immediate impact and overall goal/impact?
- To what extent are the objectives of the project still valid for the partner country, the partner organization and the beneficiaries?
- Are the set indicators applicable for monitoring purposes and used by the project management?

**National CSO networks**

- Has the existence of the networks increased the awareness/**relevance** of social inclusion of older people in the country?

**Effectiveness**

**Overall project performance and efficient use of resources**

- To what extent has the project achieved its expected results/outcomes?
- To what extent has the project achieved its expected results/outputs?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the outcome(s)/expected results/outputs? (Also consider any which were possibly beyond the control of the project).
- Are there any strengths and weaknesses in terms of planning, management, implementation and monitoring observed?
- To what extent have all project stakeholders collaborated as planned?
- Did the project contribute to capacity building as planned?

**National CSO networks**

- Has the process of the mobilization of national CSO networks on social inclusion of older people been **effective**/successful in terms of creating active networks in each country (and at regional level)?

**Efficiency**

**Overall project performance and efficient use of resources**

- Was the project implemented in the most efficient way (time, personnel resources)? Have any issues emerged, if so which ones and why?
- Are the goals of the initiative achieved within the set timeframe and planned budgetary boundaries?

### National CSO networks

- Has the process of the mobilization of national CSO networks on social inclusion of older people been **efficient** in terms of using available resources from the project and the participating organizations?

### Impact

#### Overall project performance and efficient use of resources

- How many people in total have already benefited from the project/programme (immediate impact)?
- What exactly has changed in the lives of those people (immediate impact)?
- Which institutions have benefitted from the project/programme and how? What has changed for whom (immediate impact)?

#### National CSO networks

- Have the networks had an **impact** on the capacity-building of CSOs participating in the national network in general?
- Have the networks had an **impact** on improving the CSOs capacities to engage in policy- and decision-making processes concerning social inclusion of older people at national and regional level?
- Have the networks had an **impact** on improving the CSOs capacities to cooperating more closely with other actors in the field of social inclusion of older people?
- Have the networks had an **impact** on improving the CSOs capacities to encourage and support older people to take part in decision-making processes related to ageing and older age at local and national levels through offering knowledge and transfer of good practices?
- Have the networks had an **impact** on improving the CSOs capacities to influence a change in public perception of older people through engaging the public via targeted advocacy campaigns and working with the media on better understanding of the demographic realities and individual strengths, capacities and contributions of older people across a range of ages, geographic areas and social classes.

### Sustainability

#### Overall project performance and efficient use of resources

- To what extent will the benefits of the project/programme continue after the withdrawal of the donor?
- If the project/programme continues will it be integrated in local structures and/or funded by other sources?
- What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project/programme?
- What needs to be done and/or improved to ensure sustainability?

#### National CSO networks

- How is the **sustainability** of the networks measured and what is needed to increase probability of the continuation of the networks after phase out of the project?

## 6. Evaluation Approach and Methodology

The evaluation will be carried out according to evaluation standards of the AutRC (Annex 6) by an external **consultant, with support of the implementing partners, RCS and AutRC Headquarters** staff.

**Participation** of project stakeholders as defined by the national project coordinators in the evaluation should be maintained at all the times, reflecting opinions, expectations and vision about the contribution of the project towards the achievement of its objectives.

The evaluation/review consists of several phases as outlined under 7) Workplan.

For the different phases it is expected that data and information will be obtained through different methods such as: analysis of documents (e.g. project document, financial and narrative reports (internal and to the EC), evaluation reports of trainings and any other documents like minutes from partner meetings or Skype meetings, if relevant; Situation analysis; Internal mid-term review of the project), structured interviews, semi-structured interviews face-to face or by phone, group discussions, online-survey (if applicable), others.

All data collected needs to be disaggregated by sex.

As part of the analysis, it is expected that the consultant will present concrete recommendations which are addressed to the specific stakeholders.

## 7. Proposed Timeline

**Duration:** The internal evaluation will be carried out during a period of 1-2 months, in June-July 2019.

### Workplan:

What		Who	When
<u>Contract and Kick-off meeting</u>	Contract is signed and a discussion of the assignment takes place. First documents, including available data, are provided to the <b>consultant</b> .	RCS	31 May
<u>Desk Study</u>	The <b>consultant</b> studies all necessary project/programme documents; re-construct and analyse the intervention logic/programme theory and theory of change and its assumptions. Existing data needs to be analysed and interpreted.	The consultant	10 June
<u>Inception-Phase</u>	In the inception report the evaluators will describe the design of the evaluation and will elaborate on how data will be obtained and analysed. The use of a data collection planning worksheet or a similar tool is required. First interviews take place. Data triangulation and quality control are very important and need to be discussed in the inception report.	The consultant	17 June
<u>Field-phase</u>	The field trip will only take place upon official approval of the inception report by the contractor. Data needs to be gathered, analysed and interpreted. It is expected that the evaluation will include quantitative and qualitative data.	The consultant	7 July
<u>Presentation</u>	Presentation of key findings (feedback meeting) at the end of the field trip.	The consultant	12 July
<u>Final Draft Report</u>	Submission and presentation of final draft report, inclusion of comments from partners and contractor.	The consultant	19 July
<u>Final Report</u>	Submission of final report, <b>see reporting requirements under point 9).</b>	The consultant	31 July

## 8. Deliverables, Reports

The external consultant shall provide the RCS with the following deliverables:

- An inception report (10-15 pages without annexes)
- A final **draft evaluation report** for review and comments by all project partners (25-30 pages without annexes).
- A **final evaluation report** taking into consideration additional input on the draft report from all project partners (25-30 pages without annexes). Both reports shall be provided in the following format:
  - o Executive summary
  - o Purpose of the evaluation and the methodology applied
  - o The main findings based on the objectives and scope set out above.
  - o Lessons learned on operational and developmental levels based on the assessment of attainment of objectives and project indicators.
  - o Conclusions and recommendations for future projects.
  - o *Annexes to report:* ToR, Questionnaires, Guidelines for Focus Group discussions and other methodologies applied, List of people interviewed, List of documents reviewed, etc.

## 9. Evaluation Team & Qualifications

The evaluation process is carried out under the overall guidance of the **RCS** to coordinate all activities of the evaluation, provide information to the consultant, including the timing, budget, and quality of analysis.

**National project/network coordinators** in all partner countries will be closely cooperated with regarding

- Provision of local information and access to local stakeholders relevant for the evaluation.
- setting-up of the focus groups and discussions in cooperation with the consultants.
- provision of feedback from their own experiences in the project and towards the outcomes of the evaluation.

The external **consultants** to be recruited must have the following key qualifications:

- Relevant academic degree (master level) in social science
- A minimum of three years' experience and expertise in the field/sector of consultancy services and project/program evaluations
- Participated in at least two evaluations ideally in the relevant field in the last five years.
- Knowledge of the region for which the local consultant is hired.
- Knowledge of the local language is preferred.
- Experience and expertise in evaluating cross-cutting issues.
- Experience in social science research methods and proven analytical skills.
- Oral and written English skills (state other language too, if applicable)
- Sound MS Office and IT skills

For the candidates that fulfil the above listed requirements, the decision will be made based on the price.



## 10. Coordination/Responsibilities

### Project Coordinators

Albania:	Alban Yili: <a href="mailto:albanylli@yahoo.co.uk">albanylli@yahoo.co.uk</a>
Bosnia and Herzegovina:	Hamdija Kujundzic: <a href="mailto:osmijeh@bih.net.ba">osmijeh@bih.net.ba</a> or <a href="mailto:osmijeh@hotmail.com">osmijeh@hotmail.com</a>
Macedonia:	Ljupka Petkovska <a href="mailto:petkovska@redcross.org.mk">petkovska@redcross.org.mk</a>
Montenegro:	Igor Jokanovic <a href="mailto:igor.jokanovic@ckcg.co.me">igor.jokanovic@ckcg.co.me</a>
Serbia:	Milutin Vracevic <a href="mailto:milutin@redcross.org.rs">milutin@redcross.org.rs</a>

### Network Coordinators

Albania:	Gentiana Qirjako: <a href="mailto:gentaqirjako@gmail.com">gentaqirjako@gmail.com</a>
Bosnia and Herzegovina:	Vahida Huzerjovic: <a href="mailto:Vahida.Huzejrovic@filantropija.org/vahida_huzejrovic@t-2.net">Vahida.Huzejrovic@filantropija.org/vahida_huzejrovic@t-2.net</a>
Macedonia:	Sashko Jovanov <a href="mailto:sashejovanov@humanost.org.mk/sashejovanov@gmail.com">sashejovanov@humanost.org.mk/sashejovanov@gmail.com</a>
Montenegro:	Jelena Sofranac <a href="mailto:jelena.sofranac@ckcg.me">jelena.sofranac@ckcg.me</a>
Serbia:	Natasa Todorovic <a href="mailto:natasa@redcross.org.rs">natasa@redcross.org.rs</a>

## 11. Annexes

**Annex 1:** TASIOP mid-term review report

**Annex 2:** TASIOP Program document, Logical framework and Activity Plan

**Annex 3:** TASIOP Inception report

**Annex 4:** TASIOP First and second Interim reports to the EU

**Annex 5:** TASIOP List of CSOs in national networks

**Annex 6:** AutRC Evaluation Guideline