



## TERMS OF REFERENCE FINAL PROGRAMME EVALUATION

**Type of Contract:** Consultancy

**Based in:** KENYA

**Consulting days:** 1,5 months

**Application Deadline:** 1<sup>st</sup> December, 2014

### 1. Background

The multi-donor Fund for Gender Equality (FGE) of the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women) was launched in 2009 to fast-track commitments to gender equality focused on women's economic and political empowerment at local, national and regional levels. The Fund provides multi-year grants ranging from US \$200,000 – US \$1 million directly to women's organizations and governmental agencies in developing countries; it is dedicated to advancing the economic and political empowerment of women around the world. With generous support from the Governments of Spain, Norway, Mexico, the Netherlands, Germany and Switzerland, current grants stand to benefit nearly 18 million women, including by equipping them with leadership and financial skills, and by helping them secure decent jobs and social protection benefits.

The Fund provides grants on a competitive basis directly to government agencies and civil society organizations to transform legal commitments into tangible actions that have a positive impact on the lives of women and girls around the world. Its mandate seeks to further the Beijing Platform for Action, the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), Security Council Resolutions 1325 and 1820, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), and regional agreements such as the Protocol on the Rights of Women in Africa and the Belen do Para, among others.

Across these grants, the Fund advances two major inter-related programme priority areas:

- Grants awarded for **women's economic empowerment** seek to substantially increase women's access to and control over economic decision-making, land, labor, livelihoods and other means of production and social protections, especially for women in situations of marginalization.
- Programmes focused on **women's political empowerment** aim to increase women's political participation and good governance to ensure that decision-making processes are participatory, responsive, equitable and inclusive, increasing women's leadership and influence over decision-making in all spheres of life, and transforming gender equality policies into concrete systems for implementation to advance gender justice.

Since its launch in 2009, the Fund has delivered grants totaling US \$56.5 million to 96 grantee programmes in 72 countries. Awarded programmes reflect a range of interventions in commitments to gender equality laws and policies and embody unique combinations of strategies, partnerships and target beneficiaries.

### 2. Description of the Intervention

The programme entitled "To Strengthen governance and accountability of leadership in Kenya through quality and quantity of women's political participation" is an FGE-supported Implementation programme being undertaken in Kenya. It commenced on January, 2013 and is scheduled for completion on June, 2014. Its overall budget is USD 302,000.

In a continent full of patriarchic societies, Kenya is no exception: Ironically, Kenya although prides itself as East Africa's strongest economy and has modern, internationally networked institutions, its political space remains male dominated. Men mobilize local and ethnic loyalties, control and manipulate vast economic resources in election campaigns, and build networks and political alliances in order to gain power. Once in government offices, most male leaders are known to use their control over state institutions and decision-making and further amass power. The women constitute 52% of the population; in 2007-2013 only paltry 10% i.e. 22 out of 224 members were in parliament. The same trend was manifested in other areas of key leadership including in local government and provincial administration with 15% and 7.7% respectively. The Constitution (2010) has put in place several measures including affirmative action that enable women to participate in decision making. During concluded elections that took place on March 4<sup>th</sup>, 2013. The total numbers of elected women were 147(16 Members of Parliament, 47 Women representatives and 84 Members of the County Assembly). This pushed women representation at National and County Assembly to 19.8% and 34.5% respectively.

However with the entrenchment of the affirmative action into the Constitution and the defined cost of not electing a woman, there were a lot of expectations to have an increase in women elected into political leadership. However no woman was elected Governor or Senator. In addition, apart from the 47 Women Representatives, only 16 women were elected out of the 290 members of the National Assembly and only 84 women were elected as Members of the County Assemblies out of the 1,450 slots available. This shows that even with the legal measures in place, various socio-cultural, economic and political factors still hinder women to get into formal leadership positions. In order for the public to begin to appreciate the struggles women aspirants go through, the importance of having women in leadership and the role of the community in promoting and protecting women leadership, GROOTS Kenya (during the 1st year of project implementation) documented the vision, background and experiences of some of the women aspirants who vied in the March 2013 election.

Through the Champions for Transformative Leadership change an innovative approach to promote quality and quantity socio-political participation of grassroots women to take up leadership roles. During the last elections held in March, 2013 the number of Champions elected and nominated in political positions were: 1 woman nominated in Laikipia North Constituency, 1 woman elected County women Representative in Laikipia, 1 woman elected Member of County Assembly (MCA) in Kakamega, 5 women nominated Members of the County Assembly(MCA) in Laikipia, Kakamega and Kiambu.

This programme aims to influence good governance and accountability of the leadership in Kenya through increasing quality and quantity of women's political participation.

The programme has 4 key outcomes:

- Outcome 1: Enhanced capacity of communities particularly grassroots women to support women candidates vying for political leadership and create demand for good leadership.
  - Output 1.1: 25 taskforce committee strengthened their capacity to organize communities and manage and monitor women rights and affirmative action agenda during election process(both before and after) in all the target areas
  - Output 1.2: Knowledge and capacity of 1,000 women enhanced on all matters related to elections: election laws, roles and responsibilities of different players, election monitoring and reporting in each county and communities in the selected areas are aware of electoral GBV that is perpetrated against women and a critical mass of community members women are.
- Outcome 2: The number of women elected and nominated into political positions and appointed into devolved government structures increased by the end of the electioneering period.
  - Outputs 2.1: Grassroots women are aware of devolution and 2/3 gender principles provided in the current constitution and least 40 women are interested and willing to pursue elective and nominative positions.

- Outputs 2.2: Awareness created among devolved government officials on the importance and need to appoint women.
- Outputs 2.3: Branding and profiling of women candidates improved through mass media engagement, mentorship and image coaching.
- Outcome 3: Men's support to women leadership improved within political processes and development agenda during and after elections.
  - Outputs 3.1: Awareness and capacity of men on women rights agenda and requirement of law improved leading to the engagement of at least 600 men in each county providing direct and proactive support to women candidates during nomination, elections and after elections.
  - Outputs 3.2: Male perpetrated violence against women and women candidates (verbal, physical and social) during and after election reduced through well-coordinated teams of men from the elected communities.
- Outcome 4: The capacity of elected and nominated women strengthened to enable them to perform their duties in their positions and be able to influence both pro-gender and positive change within development agenda.
  - Outputs 4.1: Capacity strengthened of elected women candidates on the importance of delivering and being accountable to their campaigning promises and development agenda.
  - Output 4.2: 150 grassroots women in each county facilitated to engage with elected women and men in order to hold their leaders (both men and women) accountable to their elections manifestos and pledges, profiling, monitoring and evaluating the effective participation, achievement and challenges.

**Assumptions:**

The programme is being implemented by GROOTS Kenya in close cooperation with Association of Media Women in Kenya (AMWIK) and Africa Woman and Child Feature Services (AWCFS).

The management Structure of the Lead Organization consists of: The Director, Programs Coordinator and Finance Manager.

### **3. Purpose and Use of the Evaluation**

FGE was established as a bold investment in women's rights, testing a more focused and better-resourced modality for catalyzing and sustaining gender equality and efforts. Its founding Programme Document sets forth its mandate to track, assess, and widely share the lessons learned from this pioneering grant programme and to contribute to global know-how in the field of gender equality. Undertaking Strategic Final Evaluations of programmes are a vital piece of this mandate. The main purposes of a final evaluation are the following:

**Accountability:**

- Provide credible and reliable judgements on the programmes' results, including in the areas of programme design, implementation, impact on beneficiaries and partners, and overall results.
- Provide high quality assessments accessible to a wide range of audiences, including FGE donors, UN Women, women's rights and gender equality organizations, government agencies, peer multi-lateral agencies, and other actors.

**Learning:**

- Identify novel/unique approaches to catalyse processes toward the development of gender equality commitments.
- Identify particular approaches and methodologies that are effective in meaningfully and tangibly advancing women's economic and political empowerment.

**Improved evidence-based decision making:**

- Identify lessons learned from the experience of grantees in order to influence policy and practice at national, regional and global levels.

- Inform and strengthen UN Women’s planning and programming by providing evidence-based knowledge on what works, why and in what context.

Final evaluations are summative exercises that are oriented to gather data and information to measure the extent to which development results have been attained. However, the utility of the evaluation process and products should go far beyond what was said by programme stakeholders during the field visit or what the evaluation team wrote in the evaluation report.

The momentum created by the evaluations process (meetings with government, donors, beneficiaries, civil society, etc.) is the ideal opportunity to set an agenda for the future of the programme or some of their components (sustainability) through a Management Response. It is also an excellent platform to communicate lessons learnt and convey key messages on good practices, share products that can be replicated or scaled-up at the country and international level.

The evaluator will provide inputs for the Reference Group (*see section 7 for more information*) to design a complete dissemination plan of the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations with the aim of advocating for sustainability, scaling-up, or sharing good practices and lessons learnt at local, national or/and international level.

#### 4. Scope and Objectives of the Evaluation

The unit of analysis or object of study for this evaluation is the programme, understood to be the set of components, outcomes, outputs, activities and inputs that were detailed in the programme document and in associated modifications made during implementation. The **geographic area** of intervention evaluated is Kiambu, Laikipia and Kakamega Counties.

The **timeframe** of the evaluation will cover from the period of conceptualization and design to the moment when the evaluation is taking place.

The evaluation will assess:

1. To what extent the programme has contributed to solve the needs and problems identified in the design phase.
2. To what extent the programme was efficiently implemented and delivered quality outputs and outcomes, against what was originally planned or subsequently officially revised.
3. To what extent the programme has attained development results to the targeted population, beneficiaries, participants -whether individuals, communities, institutions, etc.-, therefore improving political eEmpowerment of women in Kenya (Kiambu, Laikipia and Kakamega Counties).

#### 5. Evaluation Criteria, Questions and Methodological Approach

Following the UN Women Evaluation Policy and United Nations Evaluation Group guidelines, evaluations are often organized around the standard OECD evaluation criteria, which are relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the programmes. Each evaluation must integrate gender and human-rights perspectives throughout each of these areas of analysis and within its methodology<sup>1</sup>. This is particularly important to understand and assess programmes addressing complex, intersectional issues in women’s rights.

---

<sup>1</sup> Please see [“Integrating human rights and gender equality in Evaluation: towards UNEG guidance”](#) (available in English, Spanish, French and Arabic)

The evaluation should be answering the following questions :

**Relevance:**

- Are the programme outcomes addressing identified rights and needs of the target group(s) in Kiambu County, Laikipia County and Kakamega County? How much does the programme contribute to shaping women's rights priorities? In Kiambu County, Laikipia County and Kakamega County.
- Do the activities address the problems identified? In Kiambu County, Laikipia County and Kakamega County
- What rights does the programme advance under CEDAW, the Millennium Development Goals and other international development commitments?
- Does the programme advance any of the international rights conventions and development commitments in Kiambu County, Laikipia County and Kakamega County i.e. CEDAW, the Millennium Development Goals
- Is the programme design articulated in a coherent structure? Is the definition of goal, outcomes and outputs clearly articulated? The programme design being implemented in Kiambu County, Laikipia County and Kakamega County is it articulated in a coherent structure. What about the definition of the goal, outcomes and outputs?

**Effectiveness:**

- To what extent is the programme design coherent with UN Women strategic plan and its priorities? What about UEWCA priorities and strategic planning?
  - Is the GROOTS Kenya programme design being implemented in Kiambu, Laikipia and Kakamega counties coherent with the UN Women strategic plan and UEWCA priorities?
- What has been the progress made towards achievement of the expected outcomes and expected results? What are the results achieved? What progress has been made of the expected outcomes and results?
  - Outline the results achieved in Kiambu County, Laikipia County and Kakamega County
- Were there any unexpected results /unintended effects (negative or positive)?
  - Where there any unintended results, whether positive or negative?
- What are the reasons for the achievement or non-achievement?
  - Are there any contributing factors that lead to achievement or non planning for the way forward in the on-going interventions of community organizing, movement building, influencing leadership and governance in Kiambu, Laikipia and Kakamega Counties?
- To what extent are the intended beneficiaries participating in and benefitting from the project?
  - How are the beneficiaries in Kiambu, Laikipia and Kakamega County participating or benefitting from the project.
- Does the programme have effective monitoring mechanisms in place to measure progress towards results?
  - What are the monitoring mechanisms in place to measure progress towards results?
- To what extent have the objectives been achieved, and do the intended and unintended benefits meet the needs of disadvantaged women?
  - Have the benefits been achieved in Kiambu, Laikipia and kakamega counties, are this benefits meeting the needs of the disadvantaged women?
- What are the changes produced by the programme on legal and policy frameworks at the national and regional level?
  - What changes have the programme produced on the legal and policy frameworks at the national and regional levels?
- To what extent have capacities of duty-bearers and rights-holders been strengthened as a result of the programme?
  - Have the capacities of the duty bearers and right holders been strengthened in Kiambu, Laikipia and Kakamega counties as a result of the programme.
- To what extent have capacities of gender equality advocates have been enhanced as a result of the programme?
- To what extent and in what ways did the programme contribute to the goals set by UN Women at the country and global levels?

**Efficiency:**

- Is the programme cost-effective, i.e. could the outcomes and expected results have been achieved at lower cost through adopting a different approach and/or using alternative delivery mechanisms?
  - To what extent have the programmes been cost effective, could the outcomes and expected results be achieved at a lower cost or adopting of a different approach/alternative delivery mechanism in Kiambu, Laikipia and Kakamega County?
- What measures have been taken during planning and implementation to ensure that resources were efficiently used?
  - Where any measures put in place in Kiambu, Laikipia and Kakamega Counties during the planning and implementation period to ensure the resources were efficiently used?
- Have the outputs been delivered in a timely manner?
  - Have the outputs been timely delivered in Kiambu, Laikipia and Kakamega counties?
- Have UN Women's organizational structure, managerial support and coordination mechanisms effectively supported the delivery of the programme?
- To what extent are the inputs and outputs equally distributed between different groups of women, and have the potentials of disadvantaged women (poor, racial, ethnic, sexual, ethnic, and disabled groups) been fully utilized to realize the outcomes? In Kiambu, Laikipia and Kakamega Counties.
- How does the programme utilize existing local capacities of right-bearers and duty-holders to achieve its outcomes?

**Sustainability:**

- What is the likelihood that the benefits from the programme will be maintained for a reasonably long period of time if the programme were to cease?
  - If the programme were to cease in Kiambu, Laikipia and Kakamega County what is the likelihood the benefits will be maintained for a reasonably long period of time?
- Is the programme supported by national/local institutions? Do these institutions demonstrate leadership commitment and technical capacity to continue to work with the programme or replicate it?
  - What is the role of the national/local institutions in demonstrating commitment and technical capacity to sustain the programme or replicate it in Kiambu, Laikipia and Kakamega County?
- Are requirements of national ownership satisfied?
- What operational capacity of grantees, also known as capacity resources, such as technology, finance, and staffing, has been strengthened?
- What adaptive or management capacities of grantees, such as learning, leadership, programme and process management, networking and linkages have been supported?
- Do grantees have the financial capacity to maintain the benefits from the programme?

**Impact<sup>2</sup>:**

- What are the intended and unintended, positive and negative, long term effects of the programme?
  - Does the programme have intended and unintended, positive and negative, long term effects in Kiambu, Laikipia and Kakamega counties?
- To what extent can the changes that have occurred as a result of the programme be identified and measured?
  - What changed that has occurred as a result of the programme in Kiambu, Laikipia and Kakamega County be identified and measured?
- To what extent can the identified changes be attributed to the programme? In Kiambu, Laikipia and Kakamega County

---

<sup>2</sup> Measuring impact is very difficult and may not be possible to do for many evaluations as it is very dependent on baseline information collected, when the project was initiated and ended, and the timing of the evaluation. Bearing this in mind, please keep only those questions that could be answered by the evaluation.

- What are the positive and negative changes produced directly or indirectly by the programme on the opportunities of different groups of women, and on the socioeconomic conditions of their localities?
- What is the evidence that the programme enabled the rights-holders to claim their rights more successfully and the duty-holders to perform their duties more efficiently?
- To which extent efforts have been successful to stop harmful and discriminatory practices against women?

The evaluation will use methods and techniques as determined by the specific needs of information, the availability of resources and the priorities of stakeholders<sup>3</sup>. The consultant is expected to identify and utilize a wide range of information sources for data collection (documents, filed information, institutional information systems, financial records, monitoring reports, past evaluations) and key informants (beneficiaries, staff, funders, experts, government officials and community groups).

The consultant is also expected to analyze all relevant information sources and use interview and focus group discussions as means to collect relevant data for the evaluation, using a **mixed-method approach** that can capture qualitative and quantitative dimensions. The methodology and techniques (such as a case study, sample survey, etc.) to be used in the evaluation should be described in detail in the inception report and in the final evaluation report and should be linked to each of the evaluation questions in the Evaluation Matrix. When applicable, a reference should be made regarding the criteria used to select the geographic areas of intervention that will be visited during the country mission.

The methods used should ensure the **involvement of the main stakeholders** of the programme. Rights holders and duty bearers should be involved in meetings, focus group discussions and consultations where they would take part actively in providing in-depth information about how the programme was implemented, what has been changed in their status and how the programme helped bring changes in their livelihoods. The evaluator will develop specific questionnaires pertinent to specific group of stakeholders and their needs and capacities (for example, illiteracy needs to be factored in, or language barriers). When appropriate, audiovisual techniques could be used to capture the different perspectives of the population involved and to illustrate the findings of the evaluation.

## 6. Management of the Evaluation

The consultant will be under contract with GROOTS Kenya who will manage the evaluation. The GROOTS Kenya will be responsible for selecting the evaluator(s) through applying a fair, transparent, and competitive process<sup>4</sup> and for ensuring that the evaluation process is conducted as stipulated, promoting and leading the evaluation design, coordinating and monitoring progress.

The evaluation consultant will be responsible for his/her own office space, administrative and secretarial support, telecommunications, and printing of documentation. The evaluation consultant will be also responsible for the implementation of all methodological tools such as surveys and questionnaires.

## 7. Reference Group and Stakeholder Participation

A Reference Group (RG) is meant to ensure an efficient, participatory and accountable evaluation process and facilitate the participation of stakeholders enhancing the use of the evaluation findings. It includes members from the programme organization (Lead and Co-lead organizations), relevant government and CSO stakeholders, UN Women Country Office and/or Regional Office and FGE Secretariat.

---

<sup>3</sup> For guidance on methods and how to incorporate a human rights and gender equality perspective please check [http://www.unifem.org/evaluation\\_manual/wp-content/uploads/2010/02/Evaluation-Methods-for-GE-HR-Responsive-Evaluation.pdf](http://www.unifem.org/evaluation_manual/wp-content/uploads/2010/02/Evaluation-Methods-for-GE-HR-Responsive-Evaluation.pdf)

<sup>4</sup> The Grantee will need to keep the Reference Group apprised of the methodology used to select the evaluator(s) and keep all documentation on file for reference (publication/dissemination of TOR, CV's/proposals received, minutes of meetings on decision to choose evaluator(s), etc.)

The role of the evaluation Reference Group will extend to all phases of the evaluation, including:

- Identifying information needs, customizing objectives and evaluation questions and delimiting the scope of the evaluation (TOR).
- Facilitating the participation of those involved in the evaluation design.
- Providing input on the evaluation planning documents.
- Facilitating the consultant’s access to all information and documentation relevant to the intervention, as well as to key actors and informants who should participate in interviews, focus groups or other information-gathering methods.
- Monitoring the quality of the process and the documents and reports that are generated, so as to enrich these with their input and ensure that they address their interests and needs for information about the intervention.
- Developing and implementing a management response according to the evaluation’s recommendations.
- Disseminating the results of the evaluation, especially among the organizations and entities within their interest group.

Please see the list of Reference group members in Annex I.

## 8. Evaluation Deliverables

The consultant is responsible for submitting the following deliverables:

Deliverable	Description	Tentative Date Due	Payment Schedule
<b>Inception Report</b>	<p>This report will be completed after initial desk review of program documents. It will be maximum 7 pages in length and will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction</li> <li>• Background to the evaluation: objectives and overall approach</li> <li>• Identification of evaluation scope</li> <li>• Main substantive and financial achievements of the programme</li> <li>• Description of evaluation methodology/methodological approach (including considerations for rights-based methodologies), data collection tools, data analysis methods, key informants, an Evaluation Questions Matrix, Work Plan and deliverables</li> <li>• Criteria to define the mission agenda, including “field visits”</li> </ul> <p>This report will be used as an initial point of agreement and understanding between the consultant and the evaluation manager and Reference Group.</p>	19 <sup>th</sup> December, 2014	20%
<b>PowerPoint presentation of preliminary findings to RG</b>	It will be presented after field work is completed.	20 <sup>th</sup> January, 2015	30%
<b>Final Evaluation Report:</b>	<p>It will be maximum 30 pages in length and will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cover Page</li> <li>• Executive summary (maximum 2 pages)</li> <li>• Programme description</li> <li>• Evaluation purpose and intended audience</li> </ul>	26 <sup>th</sup> February, 2015	50% paid after validation by Reference Group

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation methodology (including constraints and limitations on the study conducted)</li> <li>• Evaluation criteria and questions</li> <li>• Findings and Analysis</li> <li>• Conclusions</li> <li>• Recommendations (prioritized, structured and clear)</li> <li>• Lessons Learnt</li> <li>• Annexes, including interview list (without identifying names for the sake of confidentiality/anonymity) data collection instruments, key documents consulted, TOR, RG members, etc.</li> </ul> <p>An executive summary will include a brief description of the programme, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its intended audience, its methodology and its main findings, conclusions and recommendations. The Executive Summary should “stand alone” and will be translated to ensure access by all stakeholders if needed.</p> <p>A draft final report will be shared with the evaluation RG for final validation. The final report will be approved by the FGE Secretariat.</p>		
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

### 9. Evaluation Report Quality Standards (extract from UNEG standards)<sup>5</sup>

The following UNEG standards<sup>6</sup> should be taken into account when writing all evaluation reports:

- The **final report should be logically structured, containing evidence-based findings**, conclusions, lessons and recommendations and should be free of information that is not relevant to the overall analysis (S-3.16).
- **A reader of an evaluation report must be able to understand:** the purpose of the evaluation; exactly what was evaluated; how the evaluation was designed and conducted; what evidence was found; what conclusions were drawn; what recommendations were made; what lessons were distilled. (S-3.16)
- In all cases, evaluators should strive to **present results as clearly and simply as possible** so that clients and other stakeholders can easily understand the evaluation process and results. (S-3.16)
- **The level of participation of stakeholders in the evaluation** should be described, including the rationale for selecting that particular level. (S-4.10)
- **The programme being evaluated should be clearly described** (as short as possible while ensuring that all pertinent information is provided). It should include the purpose, logic model, expected results chain and intended impact, its implementation strategy and key assumptions. Additional important elements include: the importance, scope and scale of the programme; a description of the recipients/ intended beneficiaries and stakeholders; and budget figures. (S-4.3)
- The **role and contributions of the UN organizations and other stakeholders** to the programme being evaluated should be clearly described (who is involved, roles and contributions, participation, leadership). (S-4.4)
- **In presenting the findings, inputs, outputs, and outcomes/ impacts should be measured to the extent possible (or an appropriate rationale given as to why not).** The report should make a logical distinction in the **findings, showing the progression from implementation to results with an appropriate measurement** (use benchmarks when available) and analysis of the results chain (and unintended effects), or a rationale as to why an analysis of

<sup>5</sup> You may also find useful [guidance](#) on aspects to take into account in order to ensure a quality evaluation report at the MDG Achievement Fund website.

<sup>6</sup> See UNEG Guidance Document “[the UN System](#)”, UNEG/FN/Standards (2005).

results was not provided. Findings regarding inputs for the completion of activities or process achievements should be distinguished clearly from outputs, outcomes. (S-4.12)

- Additionally, reports should **not segregate findings by data source**. (S-4.12)
- **Conclusions need to be substantiated by findings** consistent with data collected and methodology, and represent insights into identification and/ or solutions of important problems or issues. (S-4.15)
- **Recommendations should be firmly based on evidence and analysis**, be relevant and realistic, with priorities for action made clear. (S-4.16)
- **Lessons, when presented, should be generalized beyond the immediate subject being evaluated** to indicate what wider relevance they might have. (S-4.17)

## 10. Required Skills

Education:

- A Masters or higher level degree in International Development or a similar field related to political and economic development, etc.

Work Experience:

- A minimum of 5 years' relevant experience undertaking evaluations is required.
- Substantive experience in evaluating similar development projects related to local development and political and economic empowerment of women.
- Substantive experience in evaluating projects with a strong gender focus is preferred.
- Experience working in Kenya is preferred.
- Experience working on gender, added value of expertise in undertaking gender-sensitive evaluations.

Language Requirements:

- Excellent English writing and communication skills are required.
- Working knowledge in Kiswahili would be an added advantage. Consultants without Kiswahili language skills are encouraged to partner with a local consultant.

## 11. Proposal

The consultant(s) is required to submit a proposal of maximum 3 pages, which must include the following items:

- Summary of consultant experience and background.
- List of the most relevant previous consulting projects completed, including a description of the projects and contact details for references.
- Brief summary of the proposed methodology for the evaluation, including the involvement of the Reference Group and other stakeholders during each step.
- Proposed process for disseminating the results of the evaluation.
- Team structure, roles and responsibilities and time allocation if applicable.

The following items should be included as attachments (not included in the page limit):

- Detailed work plan.
- CV for consultant, and other team members if applicable.
- At least **three sample reports** from previous consulting projects (all samples will be kept confidential) or links to website where reports can be retrieved (*highly recommended*).
- Detailed budget.

The budget must include all costs related to the following items:

- The consultant's time, and the time of any other team members (e.g. local consultant). The day rate for the consultant and all team members should be clearly specified.

- Transport costs, accommodation costs and per-diems for the consultant and any other team members to travel to/from Kenya and within Kenya.
- Communication costs, office costs, supplies and other materials.

The organization commissioning this evaluation has budgeted for the following items:

- Participation of beneficiaries in evaluation activities (e.g. transport and refreshment costs for focus group discussions).
- Participation of the Reference Group in evaluation activities (e.g. meeting costs).
- Translation costs of the full report and/or executive summary when this would facilitate dissemination among targeted population).
- Dissemination of the results of the evaluation to stakeholders on the basis of the evaluator's proposal and in agreement with the Reference Group.

## 12. Ethical Code of Conduct<sup>7</sup>:

The evaluation of the programme is to be carried out according to ethical principles and standards established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).

- **Anonymity and confidentiality.** The evaluation must respect the rights of individuals who provide information, ensuring their anonymity and confidentiality.
- **Responsibility.** The report must mention any dispute or difference of opinion that may have arisen among the consultants or between the consultant and the heads of the Programme in connection with the findings and/or recommendations. The team must corroborate all assertions, or disagreement with them noted.
- **Integrity.** The evaluator will be responsible for highlighting issues not specifically mentioned in the TOR, if this is needed to obtain a more complete analysis of the intervention.
- **Independence.** The consultant should ensure his or her independence from the intervention under review, and he or she must not be associated with its management or any element thereof.
- **Incidents.** If problems arise during the fieldwork, or at any other stage of the evaluation, they must be reported immediately to the manager of the evaluation. If this is not done, the existence of such problems may in no case be used to justify the failure to obtain the results stipulated in these terms of reference.
- **Validation of information.** The consultant will be responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the information collected while preparing the reports and will be ultimately responsible for the information presented in the evaluation report.
- **Intellectual property.** In handling information sources, the consultant shall respect the intellectual property rights of the institutions and communities that are under review.
- **Delivery of reports.** If delivery of the reports is delayed, or in the event that the quality of the reports delivered is clearly lower than what was agreed, the penalties stipulated in these terms of reference will be applicable.

**Proposals should be addressed to GROOTS Kenya, Esther Mwaura Muiro – The Director and emailed to [admin@grootskenya.org](mailto:admin@grootskenya.org) by 1<sup>st</sup> December, 2014 by 9 am**

<sup>7</sup>Please review <http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines>

## **ANNEX I**

### **Reference Group Members**

- 1) Esther Mwaura, GROOTS Kenya The Director
- 2) Fridah Githuku, GROOTS Kenya Finance & Administration Manager
- 3) Franziska Bouzon, GROOTS Kenya MnE Technical Advisor
- 4) Violet Shivutse, GROOTS Kenya Focal Point Kakamega County
- 5) Hellen Kamiri, GROOTS Kenya Focal Point Kiambu County
- 6) Winnrose Nyaguthi, GROOTS Kenya Focal Point Laikipia County
- 7) Jane Oteba, UN Women FGE focal point for Kenya
- 8) Ilena Paltzer, UN Women ESARO Regional Evaluation Analyst
- 9) Gaelle Démolis, UN Women FGE monitoring and reporting Specialist-Africa
- 10) Robert Simuyu, UN Women Kenya Team Leader-Governance
- 11) Isabella Amaista – Member of the County Assembly Kakamega County.
- 12) Dr. Waiganjo Minister of Agriculture Kiambu County.
- 13) Sarah Lokelel Member of the National Assembly –Laikipia County