

**Annexes to the Evaluation Report: Ex-post internal evaluation of the project “Community-based Approach to Support Youth in a Targeted Municipality” (CS.0936)**

Annex 1: Evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR)

**Terms of Reference**

# FINAL INTERNAL EVALUATION FOR COMMUNITY-BASED APPROACH TO SUPPORT YOUTH IN A TARGETED MUNICIPALITY

**Commissioned by***: IOM Skopje*

**Evaluation context**

The IOM Mission in Skopje was established in 1999 with the purpose to assist the country in the implementation of the Stabilization and Association Agreement, with particular emphasis on migration management. Since then, IOM Skopje activities have expanded to address a variety of pressing migration related issues including trafficking in human beings, technical cooperation and institutional capacity building in the field of migration, voluntary return and reintegration programmes, economic stabilization programmes, activities related to preventing of violent extremism etc. IOM’s strategy takes into consideration the EU membership process and the need for progressive alignment with the EU migration acquis as one of the main driving elements of its activities.

IOM’s primary objective in Skopje is to act in full partnership with the Government and national and international partners in order to work towards strengthened and harmonized standards in all key migration-related areas.

The **objective** of this project was to contribute to prevention of further spread of violent extremism through capacitating the institutional stakeholders to directly engage with local communities and build their resilience against extremist influences and ongoing recruitment. The project uses an institution-oriented approach capacitating the psychologists, social workers and teachers to target, through preventive activities, youth who are genuinely at risk of radicalization and, potentially, violent extremism.

* **Outcome 1:** Technical working group on PVE designs PVE measures based on analytical and comprehensive data
* ***Output 1.1:*** National research and recommendations on PVE on a community level in the targeted communities is distributed to national stakeholders
* **Outcome 2:** Teachers, local school psychologists, social workers and community leaders are actively engaged in structured discussions about VE
* ***Output 2.1:*** Psychologists are capacitated to apply the IC thinking methodology
* ***Output 2.2:*** Teachers, social workers and community leaders capacitated to recognize and independently respond to VE signs, as well as to replicate the capacity building activities in target community.

**Evaluation purpose**

The donor, the IOM Development Fund (IDF) decided to conduct the internal ex-post evaluation of the project, which according to IDF guidance on evaluation should be carried out 6 to 12 months after the end of the project.

The evaluation is being conducted for use by the IDF, to get familiar with good practices, evaluate the project impact and accordingly assess value for money for the results it has funded and for IOM staff supporting similar projects by sharing lessons learned and good practices.

**Evaluation scope**

This evaluation will cover the entire project implementation period, from 01 January to 31 December 2018. It will also cover the entire geographic coverage, with the field visit taking place in Skopje and Tetovo, where all the main stakeholders are located.

**Evaluation criteria**

Given the above stated purposes, this evaluation will emphasize mainly impact and sustainability, with some attention also to relevance and effectiveness, and more limited attention to efficiency. Attention to gender is integrated into the list of questions below, and should also be taken into account by the Evaluator.

**Evaluation questions**

*Relevance*

* To what extent are the project interventions relevant and appropriate in relation to national and international legal and policy frameworks?
* Has the project responded to the needs of the target beneficiaries?
* Is the project aligned with and supportive of IOM national, regional, and/or global strategies and the Migration Governance Framework?
* To what extent were gender mainstreaming issues taken into account in design?

*Effectiveness*

* To what extent were gender-based approaches integrated into the implementation of the project?
* To what extent were intended outputs and outcomes achieved in accordance with stated plans?
* To what extent did the project adapt to changing external conditions to ensure project outcomes?
* What are the major factors influencing the achievement of the project’s expected outcomes?

*Efficiency*

* Was the project management of the project appropriately carried out?
* How well were the resources (funds, expertise, and time) converted into results?

*Impact*

* To what extent can long-term changes be observed (whether intended or unintended, positive or negative)?
* Did the project take timely measures for mitigating any unplanned negative impacts?

*Sustainability*

* What are the major factors affecting sustainability, including any identified challenges faced by the implementing organization?
* Are necessary structures, resources and processes in place to ensure that benefits generated by the project continue without external support?

**Evaluation methodology**

The methodology will involve a combination of desk review and in-depth interviews to gather and triangulate with data from beneficiaries (secondary quantitative data, to be provided to the evaluator). Specifically, the following methodology is proposed, to be revised as needed during the inception phase:

* Review and synthesize project documents, including reports, and other relevant documentation (home-based, desk study);
* Meet/talk to the relevant IOM staff, beneficiaries, and assess implementation of the project and its effects through in-depth interviews;
* Collect and analyse key findings, make informed and analysis-based conclusions and develop recommendations (home-based);
* Produce final evaluation deliverables in English language (home-based).

The evaluation data should be disaggregated to the extent possible by gender, age, and other categories of social vulnerability. The evaluation must follow the IOM Data Protection Principles, UNEG norms and standards for evaluations, and relevant ethical guidelines.

**Evaluation deliverables**

The Evaluator should provide the following deliverables as part of this evaluation:

* **Evaluation Matrix** to demonstrate the Evaluators’ understanding of the ToR and outline data collection and analysis plans (including an indicative list of interviewees), to be completed and reviewed with the Project Manager prior to the field visit
* **Draft Evaluation Report to be** submitted **for review by the Project Manager**
* **Final Evaluation Report** in professional English language, incorporating feedbacks complied by the Project Manager from IOM and others involved in the review of the report

The minimum report content requirement is as follows:

* Cover page, list of acronyms
* **Table of contents**
* **Executive summary**
* **Methodology**
* **Findings**
* **Conclusions**
* **Recommendations in order of priority**
* **Annexes (itinerary, people met, question guides, etc.)**
* **Two-page Evaluation Brief** following the IOM guidance and template, to provide a summary of key findings, conclusions and recommendations for easy sharing with IOM staff, donor, partners, and other stakeholders.

**Evaluation workplan**

**The evaluation visit is planned to start in November 2019. A precise timeline will be established with the selected internal evaluator, and will consist of the following stages:**

1. Planning and Desk Research Phase: 1-8 November 2019

In the desk research Phase, the relevant project documents should be reviewed: the Project proposal, the contract, the relevant guidelines, reports.

**Deliverable**: The evaluator will prepare a detailed evaluation matrix with an indicative list of interviewees.

1. Field Phase: 12-14 November 2019

The evaluator will carry out the assessment **(3 working days in North Macedonia).** The data will be collected according to the following methods and the Evaluation sheet will serve to compile the data:

* **Briefing meeting** with project management staff at the beginning of the Field Phase;
* **In-depth interview** with beneficiaries;
* **Debrief** with project management at end of Field Phase (in person, or if needed remotely within a few days of returning to duty station).

**Deliverable**: The evaluator will present findings, conclusions and recommendations in the **Draft Evaluation Report writing (to be submitted by two months after the visit)**

1. Synthesis Phase: by 16-January 2020. **This phase is mainly devoted to the development and submission of the final evaluation report and two-page brief (to be submitted by two months after the visit).**

**Deliverable:** A the end of thesynthesis phase a final report will be delivered.

*The Evaluator will be responsible for:*

* Preparing for and carrying out data collection and analysis and delivering the products outlined above. The Evaluator will be responsible for leading the process and compiling the draft of each product. Further coordination details will be decided by the evaluator, with guidance from the Regional M&E Officer who will act as a remote coach during the evaluation process following the established internal guidelines for coaching internal evaluators.
* Providing periodic feedback as needed to the Project Manager on progress and any challenges faced.
* Providing a debrief at the end of the field visit (in country or a few days after the field visit) to present on the initial findings and tentative conclusions. This will allow for any obvious oversights, misinterpretations, or information gaps to be identified and addressed before the evaluator begins drafting the full report.

*The Project Manager will be responsible for:*

* Providing evaluators with timely access to all relevant project documents, and facilitating the initial preparations including identifying relevant stakeholders and organizing the agenda.
* Arranging field visit logistics, including arranging meetings, transportation, and external interpretation services as needed.
* Managing the evaluation process including feedback and comments to the inception report and draft evaluation report and helping to address any issues or challenges flagged by the evaluator.