

Terms of Reference for External Evaluation

1. Background and Context

1.1. Description of the project

Project “Deinstitutionalize and End Violence against Women with Disabilities in Custodial Institutions” has been implemented by Mental Disability Rights Initiative of Serbia MDRI-S and it is funded by United Nations Trust fund to End Violence against Women, and Disability Rights International. Mental Disability Rights Initiative Serbia (MDRI-S) was founded in 2008 as an advocacy non-profit organization with the aim of protecting the human rights and promoting full participation of persons with mental disabilities. MDRI-S focuses on equal recognition of persons with mental disabilities before the law, deinstitutionalization and community living.

The project duration is two years (from January 2016 to January 2018). The project is in its final implementing phase.

The project has a national scope and it is implemented in Serbia. It addresses violence perpetrated or condoned by the State, namely custodial violence, forced sterilization/pregnancy/abortion and generally violence that women with mental disabilities in residential and psychiatric institutions in Serbia survive.

Primary beneficiaries of the project are women and girls with disabilities (100), especially those with intellectual, cognitive, and psychosocial disabilities of very low socio-economic status who reside in residential and psychiatric institutions (in urban and rural areas) in the Republic of Serbia. Secondary beneficiaries are 40 civil society organizations (Disabled Persons Organizations – DPOs, mainstream human rights organizations, service providers, women’s organizations), social workers, Government officials (decision-makers, policy implementers), and Parliamentarians.

Strategies used for project implementation are advocacy in preventing violence, creating and enhancing multisectoral referral systems for improving service delivery, supporting implementation of multisectoral policies and national action plans, conducting research, data collection, and analysis for strengthening institutional responses.

The project aims to improve mechanisms and measures to end violence against women in custodial institutions and ensure that measures target intersectional discrimination. The expected project results are that women with disabilities in custodial institutions are better protected from violence, throughout raised awareness about the scope and forms of violence perpetrated against them, formulated policy responses, improved legislation and policies,

and improved services to women survivors of violence by incorporating gender- and disability-specific measures.

The project applies human rights approach, social inclusion principles, observations on intersectional discrimination, and analysis of multiple disparities facing women with disabilities in custodial institutions.

1.2. Strategy and Theory of Change

The project takes strong advocacy approach in all aspects, and it focuses on advocacy and empowering primary beneficiaries in the area of prevention of violence through changing attitudes and knowledge. In order to support change of attitudes and improved community and institutional responses, the project includes improvement of service delivery by building partnerships. In addition, the project supports implementation of multisector policies in the areas of prevention of gender- and disability-specific violence and discrimination by monitoring the implementation, conducting research and advocacy activities.

The fundamental approach is based on human rights of women with disabilities by exploring and reacting to intersectional discrimination and cross-cutting issues. The project explores multiple disparities facing women with disabilities in custodial institutions, namely violence (and risk of violence) on the grounds of gender, age, locality (e.g. difference between community living and institutionalization). The research included desk research of the current legislative and policy framework, international standards and obligations, existing services, and best practice examples (at the national and international level). The second part of the research included focus groups and in-depth interviews with women with disabilities who live in custodial institutions or have a history of institutionalization. The research applies qualitative approach (including life stories) and participative methodology. The findings are presented in two publications.

Simultaneously, advocacy team worked on awareness-raising and advocacy activities, including distributing policy brief, holding meetings with relevant stakeholders, sending written submissions to international human rights treaty bodies and employing available advocacy venues. Capacity-building of primary and secondary beneficiaries included four trainings for service providers, one training for members of the National preventive mechanism for torture (NPM), and workshops with women with disabilities. Capacity-building methodology is based on adult-learning and peer support approach with the use of different instruments, such as discussions, presentations, workshops, individual work, work in pairs, etc.

Primary beneficiaries – women with disabilities – have been involved throughout the whole project implementation in order to empower them for further actions, but also to ensure

participation, legitimacy and accountability of advocacy objectives. Overall, the advocacy activities are framed throughout 'agenda setting' theory within the theory of change. Current political, social, and economic circumstances in Serbia create opportunities for at least two streams of policy processes.

1.3. Geographic Context

The project has a national scope and it has been implemented in the Republic of Serbia.

1.4. Total resources allocated for the intervention

Estimated total project budget is USD 131,874, while the funding from the UN Trust Fund to End Violence against Women is USD 105,630.

1.5. Key partners

There are no official partners to the project, but key partners are Protector of Citizens (National preventive mechanism for torture), organizations supporting persons with disabilities (especially supported living service), and self-advocacy groups of persons with disabilities. MDRI-S cooperated with different independent experts and consultants in gender-based violence, rights of women with disabilities, and with civil society organizations working on these issues in Serbia.

2. Purpose of the evaluation

This is a mandatory final project evaluation required by UN Trust Fund to End Violence against Women. It is also final evaluation of the MDRI-S program to deinstitutionalize and end violence against women with disabilities in custodial institutions in Serbia.

The evaluation results will be used by the UN Trust Fund to End violence against Women to assess the overall impact of the project. In addition, it will be used by MDRI-S management team in understanding the achieved outcomes, positive effects and aspects, and negative circumstances or side-effects. It will be used for planning the continuation of the program to deinstitutionalize and end violence against women with disabilities in custodial institutions in Serbia.

Evaluation results will support MDRI-S team in designing further activities and programs based on perspectives of primary and secondary beneficiaries. The project team will decide on strategy for advocacy and capacity building activities, especially in designing new training programs for women and disabilities and service providers.

3. Evaluation objectives and scope

3.1. Scope of Evaluation

Evaluation needs to cover the entire project duration (from January 2016 to January 2018). It is focused on activities and impact in the region of Serbia, but takes in account effects and success of international partnerships and international advocacy actions and their effects on the national program.

This evaluation needs to cover the target primary and secondary beneficiaries as well as broader stakeholders, including key partners (Protector of Citizens/NPM, service providers of supported living) and selected external consultants/experts that took part in the project.

3.2. Objectives of Evaluation

The overall objectives of the evaluation are to:

- a) evaluate the entire project in terms of effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, sustainability and impact, with a strong focus on assessing the results at the outcome and project goals;
- b) generate key lessons and identify promising practices for learning;
- c) identify prospective innovative approaches and strategies to end violence against women with disabilities in custodial institutions in Serbia.

4. Evaluation Question

The key questions that need to be answered by this evaluation include the following divided into five categories of analysis. The five overall evaluation criteria – relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact - will be applied for this evaluation.

Evaluation criteria	Mandatory evaluation questions
Effectiveness	1) To what extent were the intended project goal, outcomes and outputs achieved and how? 2) To what extent did the project reach the targeted beneficiaries at the project goal and outcome levels? How many beneficiaries have been reached? 3) To what extent has this project generated positive changes in the lives of targeted (and untargeted) women and girls in relation to the specific forms of violence addressed by this project? Why? What are the key changes in the lives of those women and/or girls? Please describe those changes. 4) What internal and external factors contributed to the achievement and/or failure of the intended project goal, outcomes and outputs? How?

	<p>5) To what extent was the project successful in advocating for legal or policy change? Explain why.</p> <p>6) To what extent was the project successful in motivating service providers to widen their programs and support women with disabilities?</p>
Relevance	<p>1) To what extent was the project strategy and activities implemented relevant in responding to the needs of women and girls with disabilities in custodial institutions?</p> <p>2) To what extent do achieved results (project goal, outcomes and outputs) continue to be relevant to the needs of women and girls with disabilities in custodial institutions?</p>
Efficiency	How efficiently and timely has this project been implemented and managed in accordance with the Project Document?
Sustainability	How are the achieved results, especially the positive changes generated by the project in the lives of women and girls at the project goal level, going to be sustained after this project ends?
Impact	What are the unintended consequences (positive and negative) resulted from the project?
Knowledge Generation	<p>1) What are the key lessons learned that can be shared with other practitioners on Ending Violence against Women and Girls?</p> <p>2) Are there any promising practices? If yes, what are they and how can these promising practices be replicated in other projects and/or in other countries that have similar interventions?</p>

5. Evaluation Methodology

Evaluation methodology should involve process and outcome evaluation design adjusted for small grant. Process design includes evaluation of inputs for activities to achieve outputs that should all lead to widening the evaluation to include outcome design (evaluating short, medium-term outcomes of the project). For process evaluation, MDRI-S team collected program documents and information to what extent and how consistently the program has been implemented. For process evaluation, the selected evaluator will have to:

- Review program documents and records;
- Review administrative data;

After identifying thematic necessities together with project team and relevant stakeholders, selected evaluator will conduct interviews and focus groups with the project team, primary

beneficiaries, secondary beneficiaries (at least one person/institution from each group). The analysis includes confirmation of findings across different sources (triangulation).

Outcome evaluation should identify the results and effects of a program, and measure program beneficiaries' changes in knowledge, attitude(s), and/or behavior(s) that result from a program.

MDRI-S team will provide selected evaluator(s) with following data sources:

- Results of pre- and post-training questionnaires for service providers who attended the training (4 trainings, one combined report);
- Results of pre- and post-training questionnaires for members of the National preventive mechanism for torture who participated at the training (one training, one report);
- Results/reports on individual interviews with primary beneficiaries (13 interviews, one combined report);
- Data collected from survey for service providers implemented at the beginning of the project, and follow-up report on selected service-providers implemented in the project final phase;
- Documents review (to which extent national legislation/policies are in line with Convention on Elimination of Discrimination Against Women and Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities).

This is just an overall approach and method for conducting the evaluation, data sources and tools that should yield the most reliable and valid answers to the evaluation questions. Final decisions about the specific design and methods for the evaluation will emerge from the consultations among the project team, the evaluator, and key stakeholders to meet the evaluation purpose and objectives and answers the evaluation questions.

6. Evaluation Ethics

For interviewing primary beneficiaries of the project, evaluator have to consult and use Ethics and Safety document developed by MDRI-S for interviewing women with disabilities in custodial institutions. This document will be provided to the evaluator by the organization.

The evaluation must be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation' <http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines>

It is imperative for the evaluator(s) to:

- Guarantee the safety of respondents and the research team.
- Apply protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of respondents.

- Ensure compliance with legal codes governing areas such as provisions to collect and report data, particularly permissions needed to interview or obtain information about children and youth.
- Store securely the collected information.

The evaluator(s) must consult with the relevant documents as relevant prior to development and finalization of data collection methods and instruments. The key documents include (but not limited to) the following:

- World Health Organization (2003). *Putting Women First: Ethical and Safety Recommendations for Research on Domestic Violence Against Women*. www.who.int/gender/documents/violence/who_fch_gwh_01.1/en/index.html
- Jewkes, R., E. Dartnall and Y. Sikweyiya (2012). *Ethical and Safety Recommendations for Research on the Perpetration of Sexual Violence*. Sexual Violence Research Initiative. Pretoria, South Africa, Medical Research Council. Available from www.svri.org/EthicalRecommendations.pdf
- Researching violence against women: A practical guide for researchers and activists November 2005; http://www.path.org/publications/files/GBV_rvaw_complete.pdf
- World Health Organization (WHO), 'Ethical and safety recommendations for researching documenting and monitoring sexual violence in emergencies' 2007, http://www.who.int/gender/documents/OMS_Ethics&Safety10Aug07.pdf

7. Key Deliverables of evaluators and timeframe

This section describes the key products the evaluation team will be accountable for producing and submitting to the grantee organization.

	Deliverables	Description of expected deliverables	Timeline
1	Evaluation inception report (in Serbian language)	Proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection/analysis procedures. The inception report must include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product.	15 January 2018
2	Draft Evaluation Report (in Serbian language)	Evaluators must submit draft report for review and comments by all parties involved. The report needs to meet the minimum requirements specified in the annex of TOR.	15 February 2018

		The grantee and key stakeholders in the evaluation must review the draft evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria.	
3	Final Evaluation Report (in English language)	Relevant comments from key stakeholders must be well integrated in the final version, and the final report must meet the minimum requirements specified in the annex of TOR. The final report must be disseminated widely to the relevant stakeholders and the general public.	26 February 2018

8. Evaluation team composition and required competencies

8.1. Roles and responsibilities of evaluator

For conducting final project evaluation, MDRI-S seeks for one **national evaluator**.

He/she will be responsible for undertaking the evaluation from start to finish and for managing the evaluation process under the supervision of evaluation task manager from the MDRI-S, for the data collection and analysis, as well as report drafting and finalization in English language.

8.2. Required competencies

To be selected, evaluator should fulfil the following requirements and have the following competencies and experience:

- Evaluation experience of at least five years in conducting external evaluations, with mixed-methods evaluation skills and having flexibility in using non-traditional and innovative evaluation methods;
- Expertise in gender and human-rights based approaches to evaluation and issues of violence against women and girls with the focus on women and girls with disabilities;
- Specific evaluation experiences in the areas of ending violence against women and girls;
- Experience in collecting and analyzing quantitative and qualitative data;
- In-depth knowledge of gender equality and women’s empowerment;
- A strong commitment to delivering timely and high-quality results, i.e. credible evaluation and its report;
- A strong team leadership and management track record, as well as interpersonal and communication skills to help ensure that the evaluation is understood and used;

- Good communication skills and ability to communicate with various stakeholders and to express concisely and clearly ideas and concepts;
- Country experience and knowledge: in-depth knowledge of social protection system, protection of gender-based violence in residential institutions in Serbia is required;
- Language proficiency: Serbian language and fluency in English language.

9. Management arrangements

Name of group	Roles and responsibilities	Actual name of staff responsible
Evaluator	External evaluators/consultants to conduct an external evaluation based on the contractual agreement and the Terms of Reference, and under the day-to-day supervision of the Evaluation Task Manager.	External evaluator
Evaluation Task Manager	<p>Managing the entire evaluation process under the overall guidance of the senior management, to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lead the development and finalization of the evaluation TOR in consultation with key stakeholders and the senior management; • manage the recruitment of the external evaluators; • lead the collection of the key documents and data to be share with the evaluator at the beginning of the inception stage; • liaise and coordinate with the evaluator, the reference group, the commissioning organization and the advisory group throughout the process to ensure effective communication and collaboration; • provide administrative and substantive technical support to the evaluator and work closely with the evaluator throughout the evaluation; • lead the dissemination of the report and follow-up activities after finalization of the report 	<p>Biljana Janjic, Project Manager Maja Popovic, Project Assistant from MDRI-S</p>

Commissioning organization	Senior management of the organization who commissions the evaluation (grantee) – responsible for: 1) allocating adequate human and financial resources for the evaluation; 2) guiding the evaluation manager; 3) preparing responses to the recommendations generated by the evaluation.	Members of the management board of MDRI-S Dragana Ciric Milovanovic, Executive director Masa Pavlovic, Financial and administrative coordinator Snezana Lazarevic, Board member
Reference group	Primary and secondary beneficiaries, partners and stakeholders of the project who provide necessary information to the evaluator and to reviews the draft report for quality assurance;	Women with disabilities Service providers Protector of citizens (NPM) Civil society organizations Policy-makers (government officials and member(s) of the Parliament) External experts/consultants Final number and structure will be agreed at the beginning of the evaluation process
Advisory group	Focal point from the UN Women Regional Office and the UN Trust Fund Portfolio Manager to review and comment on the draft TOR and the draft report for quality assurance and provide technical support if needed.	Jelena Milovanovic, UN Women Regional Office Serbia Vesna Jaric, UN Trust Fund Portfolio Manager

10. Timeline of the entire evaluation process

This section lists and describes all tasks and deliverables for which evaluator(s) or the evaluation team will be responsible and accountable, as well as those involving the commissioning office, indicating for each the due date or time-frame (e.g., work plan, agreements, briefings, draft report, final report), as well as who is responsible for its completion.

Stage of evaluation	Key tasks	Responsible	Number of working days required	Timeframe
Preparation stage	Preparing and finalizing ToR with key stakeholders	Commissioning organization and evaluation task manager	10	1/09/2017 to 1/10/2017
	Compiling key documents and existing data		7	1/10/2017 to 1/11/2017
	Recruitment of external evaluator		3	1/11/2017 to 1/12/2017
Inception stage	Briefings of evaluator, orienting evaluator	Evaluation task manager	2	1/12/2017 to 01/01/2018
	Desk review of key documents	Evaluator	2	1/12/2017 to 01/01/2018
	Finalizing evaluation design and methods	Evaluator	1	1/12/2017 to 01/01/2018
	Preparing an inception report	Evaluator	2	1/12/2017 to 01/01/2018
	Review Inception report and provide feedback	Evaluation task manager, Reference group, Advisory Group	8	2/01/2018 to 10/01/2018
	Submitting final version of Inception report	Evaluator		15/01/2018
Data collection and analysis stage	Desk research	Evaluator	2	15/01/2018 to 05/02/2018
	In-country technical mission for data collection	Evaluator	4	15/01/2018 to 05/02/2018
Synthesis and reporting stage	Analysis and interpretation of findings	Evaluator	2	
	Preparing a draft report	Evaluator	3	15/02/2018
	Review of the draft report with key stakeholders for quality assurance	Evaluation task manager, Reference group, Commissioning organization Board, Advisory group	5	20/02/2018
	Consolidate comments and submit the consolidated comments to evaluator	Evaluation task manager	2	22/02/2018
	Incorporating comments and revising the evaluation report	Evaluator	2	22/02/2018 to 26/02/2018
	Submission of the final report	Evaluator		26/02/2018

	Final review and approval of report	Evaluation task manager, Reference group, Commissioning organization Board, Advisory group	2	28/02/2018
Dissemination and follow-up	Publishing and distributing the final report	Commissioning organization led by evaluation manager	5	01/03/2018 to 01/04/2018
	Prepare management responses to the key recommendations of the report	Commissioning organization led by evaluation manager	5	01/03/2018 to 01/04/2018
	Organize learning events (to discuss key findings and recommendations, use the findings for planning of following year)	Commissioning organization	7	01/04/2018 to 01/05/2018

11. Budget

The total budget for this assignment for the evaluator is USD 2,800 (gross), namely USD 1,500 for collection and analysis of monitoring data / review meetings with primary and secondary beneficiaries, and USD 1,300 for final evaluation report. MDRI-S and Evaluation Task Manager will provide premises and technical support in the evaluation process.

12. Application and selection procedure

Interested expert should send her/his cover letter and CV by **20 November 2017** at email addresses mdri.serbia@gmail.com and bjanjic@driadvocacy.org. Short-listed experts will be contacted during November, and the final decision will be made on **27 November 2017**.