

**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 2: Evaluation Matrix

| **CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS (from the ToR)** | **SUB-QUESTIONS AND INDICATORS** | **DATA SOURCES** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Evaluation questions** | **Sub-questions** | **Indicators** | **Documents** | **Stakeholders**[[1]](#footnote-1) |
| IOM­ | CFPs, Consult  | Experts, Partners  | Natl govt | Local auth | Comm + Youth |
| **Relevance** | To what extent were the project interventions relevant and appropriate in relation to national and international **legal and policy frameworks**? | What wasthe **theory of change**? Did it change during implementation? Any local theory of change for Tetovo or Debar? | Reconstruct theory of change from the project documents and from IOM staff understanding.  | Project documents; Donor reports | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| Do the staff and partners share a common **understanding of the theory of change**? | Comparison of theory of change as documented and as described by different stakeholders. |  | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| What are the relevant **frameworks** and national, regional, international priorities? How well does project align? Any gaps? | Assessment of frameworks, Perceptions of stakeholders  | National Strategy on PVE | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| Has the project responded to the needs of the **target beneficiaries**? | How were needs of target beneficiaries **assessed** in design and implementation? *National Coordinator and other NCCVECT members, Local authorities, Local community members, At-risk youth* | Assessments as documented and as described by stakeholders. | Project documents; Donor reports | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| What are the **needs** **and priorities** of the target beneficiaries? How well did the **align** with those needs? | Needs as documented and as described by stakeholders.  | Project documents; Donor reports | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Is the project aligned with and supportive of **IOM** national, regional, and/or global **strategies** and the Migration Governance Framework? | How well does the project align with IOM’s MiGOF and with IOM national, sub-regional, and regional strategies? IOM global guidance and priorities on PVE? | Assess alignment to documents, IOM staff perceptions  | Proposal; RO endorsement emailsMiGOF | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| To what extent were **gender** mainstreaming issues taken into account in design? | Does the proposal meet the **standards** laid out in the project handbook?  | Assessment using checklist items from IOM Project Handbook | Proposal | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Effectiveness** | To what extent were **gender**-based approaches integrated into the implementation of the project? | Did implementation and monitoring meet **standards** per IOM project handbook?  | Assessment using checklist items from IOM Project Handbook | Donor reports, Monitoring data  | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| What is **perception** of IOM staff, partners and beneficiaries?What are concrete **examples** of attention to gender during implementation?  | Perceptions of stakeholders, Examples of how gender-based approaches were used | Donor reports | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| To what extent were intended outputs and outcomes achieved in accordance with stated plans?  | Is the **results matrix** well designed to be able to measure the intended results? | Assessment of quality of the results matrix | Results matrix  | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| Is **monitoring data** available for all results? | Progress against indicators | Donor reports | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| Output 1.1: National research and **recommendations** on PVE on a community level in the targeted communities is distributed to national stakeholders | Number/percentage of stakeholders that **received** it | Donor reports | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| Perceptions of **quality** of report, Inclusion of all intended aspects | Assessment report, Donor reports | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Outcome 1: Technical working group on PVE ***designs PVE measures*** based on analytical and comprehensive data | Number/percentage of stakeholders that found it **useful** | Donor reports | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| **Examples** **of use** in designing PVE measures ‘based on analytical and comprehensive data’ |  | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| Output 2.1: **Psychologists** are capacitated to apply the IC thinking methodology | Number of psychologists provided with methodology and **trained** on it | Donor reports | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perceptions of the participants on their capacity improvement |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Number of psychologists that implemented MoviEQ workshops before the end of the project  | MoviEQ reports | X |  |  |  |  | X |
| Output 2.2: **Teachers, social workers and community leaders** capacitated to recognize and independently respond to VE signs, as well as replicate the capacity building activities in target community | Number of community members **participating** in the PVE workshops | Workshop reports summary; Donor reports | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of participants that **improved** capacities to recognize + independently respond to VE signs | Workshop reports summary | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Perceptions** of participants on their improved capacities to recognize + independently respond to VE signs |  |  |  |  |  |  | X |
| Percentage of participants that reported **proactively engaged** in structured discussion on VE by the end of the workshop | Workshop reports summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 2: Teachers, local school psychologists, social workers and community leaders are ***actively engaged*** in structured discussions about VE | Number of psychologists that implemented MoviEQ workshops since the end of the project Number and locations of workshops Other examples of engagement by psychologists, or reasons why not |  | X |  |  |  |  | X |
| Percentage of participants that report having discussed VE issues Examples of discussions of VE issues, successes and challenges | Workshop reports summary, Donor reports | X |  |  |  | X | x |
| Continued existence of a structured parent mechanism to discuss and seek assistance on VE related issuesOther examples of local coordination mechanisms | Donor reports | X |  |  |  | X | X |
| Objective:  | Progress in implementing PVE measures in **National Action Plan** |  | X |  |  | X |  |  |
| Percentage of **youth participants** that enhanced their IC Thinking (resilience and empathy) |  | X |  |  |  |  | X |
| Longer-term average results from similar PVE projects in the country |  | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of MoviEQ and other preventive activities for at-risk youth since the end of the projectNumber of at-risk youth in those MoviEQ or other activities  |  | X |  |  |  | X | X |
| To what extent did the project **adapt** to changing external conditions to ensure project outcomes? | Were there any external conditions that posed **challenges** to implementation?  | Challenges as documented or identified by stakeholders | Donor reports | X | X | X | X | X |  |
| **Mitigation** measures taken (substantive, operational, stakeholder cooperation)? | Mitigation as documented or identified by stakeholders | Donor reports | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| What are the major factors influencing the achievement of the project’s expected outcomes? | What are the key factors affecting design and implementation of PVE measures?* National stakeholders interest in community-based PVE approaches?
* Local stakeholders interest in recognizing and preventing VE?
* Partnership strategy and ownership?
* Other factors?
 |  | Donor reports | X |  | X | X |  |  |
| What are the key factors affecting the active engagement in structured discussions around VE?* Has social stigma and social norms prevented active involvement?
* Other factors?
 |  | Donor reports | X | X | X |  | X | X |
| **Efficiency** | Was the project management of the project appropriately carried out? | Team dynamics, internal communication, procedures, and roles – **PMan** | Described and documented roles, procedures and mechanisms | Proposal, Donor reports | X | X |  |  |  |  |
| External coordination and planning | Described and documented practices | Proposal, Donor reports | X |  | X | X | X |  |
| M&E tools – **PMon***Activity* and work planning?*Budget* monitoring?*Result* measurement? *Risk* management? | Review of M&E tools, reports, and practices used by the project team  | Monitoring tools; Monitoring data | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| How well were resources (funds, expertise, time) converted into results? | Staff and consultants (funded), leverage of other external (non-funded) assets like experts and partner support | Appropriateness of staff plans and budget, examples of leveraging assets | Proposal, budget, donor reports | X | X |  |  |  |  |
| Budget  | Assessment of spending per budget line, burn rate, any reallocations | Budget, donor reports | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| Activities | Timeliness and quality of activities | Proposal, Workplan, Donor reports | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| **Impact** | To what extent can long-term changes be observed (whether intended or unintended, positive or negative)? | What are the **most significant changes** that can be observed? For example:* National coordination, strategies
* PVE policy development
* PVE measures in more communities
* Continued delivery of PVE measures
* Local institutions and structures
* Individual-level changes in youth
 | Stakeholder perception of ‘most significant changes’ observed | Donor reports | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| What role did the **project** play in those changes? What are **other key factors**? | Contribution analysis based on stakeholder perceptions. |  | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Did the project take timely measures for mitigating any unplanned **negative impacts**? | Were the project team, beneficiaries and partners aware of any negative impacts? If so, what actions were taken in response? Or should be taken next time? | Stakeholder perception of any negative impacts observed and related mitigation measures | Donor reports | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| **Sustainability** | What are the major factors affecting sustainability, including any identified challenges faced by the implementing organization? | Did the project design incorporate any elements of sustainability? | Assessment of proposal according to criteria in IOM Project Handbook, IOM project staff perceptions | Proposal, Donor reports | X |  |  |  |  |  |
| What challenges related to sustainability arose during implementation, and what was the response? Was an exit strategy developed? Was any follow-up planned, including through other projects? | Stakeholder perceptions and examples of challenges, Evidence of exit strategy or follow-up | Donor reports | X | X |  |  |  |  |
| Are necessary structures, resources and processes in place to ensure that benefits generated by the project continue without external support? | What is the current situation, now that the project has ended? Have any aspects been sustained without external support?For example: trained local actors continuing work, further preventive actions or trainings, structures, etc. | Examples of continued benefits  | Donor reports | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| What are the key factors re sustainability? For example: funding, structures in place, political will, coordination, etc. | Stakeholder perceptions of key challenges and related factors | Donor reports | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| What would IOM and other stakeholders suggest for future projects – what appears to work, what should be done differently? | Stakeholder perception of good practices and lessons learned | Donor reports | X | X | X | X | X | X |

1. The stakeholders to be interviewed have been divided into X groups: **IOM** staff and consultants in the country, **HQ/RO** staff of IOM, **government** partners (MoI, CRM, MLEVSA, MoJ), **BP/RC** beneficiaries (trained border police and reception center staff), and **donor** (IDF). This will guide the identification of questions relevant to each group. Questions may be further refined for specific interviews (in the Interview Guides). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)