

ACID SURVIVORS FOUNDATION

Terms of Reference for Media Campaign Evaluation

This document describes the proposed approach for the evaluation of the Media Campaign, the purpose and scope of the evaluation as well as the evaluation methodology, timeframe and budget.

Type of evaluation	Impact Survey
Expected evaluation methodologies	Quantitative and qualitative methodologies
Number of evaluators	One lead evaluator with (optional) one assistant <i>(one person can apply for the position, or a team of two persons can apply together for both positions)</i>
Expected start/end dates, number of work days	Expected start date: 16 th January, 2017 Expected work days for lead evaluator: 23 days Expected end date: 14 th February 2017
Deadline for receiving applications	10 th January 2017, 17:00 PST

1. Description of the campaign to be evaluated

Background and objectives of the action

Between October 2013 and December 2015, DFID provided funds through an Accountable Grant titled '**Tackling acid and burn violence in Pakistan**', through its CHASE (Conflict, Humanitarian and Security) department to Acid Survivors Foundation Pakistan and Burns Violence Survivors Nepal to strengthen services and support available for survivors of acid and burns violence in Nepal and Pakistan and to prevent further attacks.

Through this project the UK Government aimed to contribute to a reduction of violence against women and girls and contribute to DFID's strategic aims by:

- Working at community-level to improve responses to acid and burns violence and challenge harmful attitudes and behaviours;
- Building the evidence base of what works (and why) in tackling acid and burns violence through rigorous monitoring and evaluation of interventions in Nepal and Pakistan and sharing approaches and lessons learned more widely with other organisations working to address acid and burns violence including, governments, DFID country offices and the broader international development and women's rights community;
- Testing a jointly developed theory of change for tackling acid and burns violence so that ASTI and its partners could plan for effective intervention strategies in the future and strengthen the links between their contributions and the eventual changes in the lives of survivors;

ACID SURVIVORS FOUNDATION

DFID's Business Plan (2012-2015) identified violence against women and girls (VAWG) as a priority and committed to preventing VAWG.

Campaign objectives:

- **Overall Expected Outcome:** Increased response to and prevention of acid and burns violence

- **Specific Expected Outcome Indicator:**

Increased number of people in target communities demonstrating awareness of causes and consequences of acid and burns violence resulting in increased percentage of survivors who reach hospital within 24 hours of an attack

- **Expected Output:**

Increased awareness of the causes of and appropriate responses to acid and burns violence at community, national and global level

- **Assumption made for Expected Output:**

(1) Government and community members do not obstruct and rather support ASF's actions to spread information that mitigates/prevents acid and burns violence.

(2) Target communities translate their knowledge about responses to acid and burns violence into action.

Core principles of the campaign:

The campaign draws on the strengths and resources of its partner organizations through the following core principles:

- **Inclusive** – open to anyone that supports the campaign's vision and would like to join
- **Open source** - The campaign products assets are open for everyone to use
- **Focus** on stakeholders, popular mobilization and public engagement

Scope and reach of the action:

Description of Media Campaign Activities:

Prevention and awareness campaign

An emergency response campaign was conducted at district level (Muzaffargarh, Multan, Vehari, Lodhran, Bahawalpur, Sukkur) around the passage of the comprehensive acid and burn crime bill.

Production of 3000 posters

3000 posters were distributed (dissemination in southern Punjab and northern Sindh, supported by MOVs)

The posters were disseminated in target communities.

Radio campaign in south Punjab, ICT, KPK

ASF worked with a leading media house hired after competitive recruitment procedures for conceptualization, designing and airing of public service message on 2 radio channels, targeting people from the south Punjab, ICT and KPK.

ACID SURVIVORS FOUNDATION

Focus group discussions

ASF's social mobilizer conducted focus group discussions in the field with 10 participants per session to sensitize community members about the cause and consequences of acid and burns violence.

Structure of the campaign

1.3. Structure of the campaign

Structurally, the campaign worked through a committee open to all participants, which was the main decision making body of the campaign with following responsibilities:

- Decide on the campaign's structure
- Agree on the key messages and goals of the campaign
- Encourage engagement/provide initiation for participants
- Activate team as well as holding them to account on key deliverables along the lines of the TORs

2. Purpose and scope of the evaluation

2.1. Purpose of the evaluation

The main purpose of the evaluation is to provide a comprehensive assessment of the impact of the media campaign and to offer recommendations that could inform the design and delivery of similar themed campaigns in future.

2.2. Objectives of the evaluation

- Assess and describe the results and effectiveness of the campaign – intended and unintended, positive and negative, as well as the major factors that influenced results
- Draw lessons learned and provide recommendations for future campaigns and CSO coordination mechanisms

2.3. Audience of the evaluation

The main audience of the evaluation includes the ASF staff, community based organisations, state women machineries, donors, partners and future lead of similar campaigns.

2.4. Coverage of the evaluation

The evaluation is intended to cover all media campaign related completed activities in all targeted geographic areas.

2.5. Evaluation criteria and questions

The following non exhaustive criteria will be used in the evaluation. A further explanation of the criteria to be used and the methodology to assess the campaign will be required in the evaluation proposal.

Criteria	Main evaluation questions	Sub-questions
----------	---------------------------	---------------

ACID SURVIVORS FOUNDATION

Effectiveness	1. How well have campaign activities been planned and implemented?	<p>1.1. How well have activities been planned? Have the planning mechanism and procedures been effective for the future delivery of campaign activities?</p> <p>1.2. Have activities been implemented as planned? Have unforeseen activities been implemented?</p> <p>1.3. Have the implementation mechanism and procedures been effective to deliver the intended campaign activities? If not, what are the gaps?</p> <p>1.4. Were the campaign principles and procedures or protocols in place and were they followed in the implementation of activities?</p> <p>1.5. How effective were the structures at local and national level, what drove participation at these levels, and is it sustainable?</p>	
Outcomes	2. Has the campaign achieved its intended outcomes?	<p>2.1. Has the campaign achieved its key objectives and intended outcomes?</p> <p>2.2. Do the beneficiary population perceive that the expected results have been achieved? Do the participating organizations perceive that the expected results have been achieved?</p> <p>2.3. Has there been coordination and increased collaboration between the different actors involved in the implementation of the campaign? Has the coalition strengthened civil society capacity, especially in the South Punjab?</p> <p>2.4. Has the campaign contributed to any important unintended outcomes, either positive or negative?</p> <p>2.5. Have the interventions/campaigns amplified local issues at regional or global level?</p> <p>2.6. Can we link any relevant policy change with active citizen participation/campaigning?</p> <p>2.7. How far has it helped achieve your individual organisational outcomes?</p>	

ACID SURVIVORS FOUNDATION

Criteria	Main evaluation questions	Sub-questions
Relevance	3. How appropriate was the campaign design?	<p>3.1. Was the design of campaign interventions the most appropriate way to achieve intended outcomes? Were there other, more efficient or cost effective ways in which similar outcomes could have been achieved?</p> <p>3.2. How relevant were the overall campaign goal and objectives given the campaign's structure & capacity at the moment of project design and implementation?</p> <p>3.3. How appropriate was the campaign messaging to meet the project's goal and objectives?</p> <p>3.4. Were external factors properly considered? How flexibly the various levels of management adapted to ensure that the results would achieve their purpose?</p> <p>3.5. Are there recommendations and good practices in global campaigning identified by the project that would be useful for the beneficiary population and to the participating organizations and future CSO coordination mechanism?</p>

Criteria	Main evaluation questions	Sub-questions
Efficiency	4. How efficiently was the campaign structure at managing the project?	<p>4.1. How efficiently and timely were campaign activities implemented?</p> <p>4.2. Did the participating organizations and the local partners have enough capacity for the implementation of the campaign?</p> <p>4.3. How successful was the campaign in building a bigger, stronger movement at local and national levels?</p> <p>4.4. How far the costs of the activities were justified by the benefits?</p> <p>4.5. How was the quality of day-to-day management?</p> <p>4.6. Was the system of monitoring appropriate, accurate and followed up?</p>

ACID SURVIVORS FOUNDATION

Criteria	Main evaluation questions	Sub-questions
Partnership	5. What effect has the project had on the partnership between participating organizations?	<p>5.1. Has the project contributed to strengthening the partnership among participating organizations? If so, how and if not, why?</p> <p>5.2. Were the different governing bodies of the campaign clear on their roles and responsibilities? What should have been done further to strengthen this aspect?</p> <p>5.3. What experience did partners have working with each other – both in terms of opportunities and challenges?</p> <p>5.4. What approach would be the best to further promote partnership and strengthen the role of governing bodies in projects design and implementation?</p> <p>5.5. To what extent were the governing bodies of the campaign planning and delivering the campaign activities in coordination with the other organisation's members, and how could that coordination have been improved?</p>
Coordination and Coverage	6. How well did the actual campaign coverage compare to expectations and identified needs?	<p>6.1. Did the campaign reach the intended or targeted beneficiaries as per plan?</p> <p>6.2. Did the campaign engage the intended partners and stakeholders? If not, why didn't all expected partners participate in the campaign? Did the process, implementation or other practices of the campaign contribute?</p> <p>6.3. Were the monitoring and reporting mechanisms clear?</p> <p>6.4. How well did participating organizations coordinate with each other to maximize resources and ensure coverage in the same geographic areas?</p> <p>6.5. How did the coalition attempt to reach the most vulnerable?</p> <p>6.6. How did the coalition tackle internal challenges (coordination, resourcing, divergence of interests, etc.)? And what learning mechanisms were set up to integrate lessons learned?</p>

ACID SURVIVORS FOUNDATION

Beneficiary participation and satisfaction	7. How satisfied were beneficiaries and participating organizations with the campaign?	<p>7.1. In what ways did partners participate in the design and implementation of the campaign?</p> <p>7.2. In what ways did beneficiaries participate in the design and implementation of the campaign? (e.g. vulnerable populations, children & youth groups, etc.)</p> <p>7.3. How satisfied were participating organizations and beneficiaries with project design, implementation and results?</p> <p>7.4. How effectively has the coalition adapted its approach and activities to fragile contexts?</p>
Criteria	Main evaluation questions	Sub-questions
Sustainability and Replicability	8. How sustainable and replicable is the project model?	<p>8.1. What has been the degree of participation and ownership of objectives and achievements of the campaign by participating organizations during the phases of identification, formulation and implementation?</p> <p>8.2. Has there been support and participation of the involved organizations? Was the intervention relevant to national and local partners, and their respective national and thematic agendas? And to what extent have interventions helped amplify local issues at regional and global levels?</p> <p>8.3. Did the project respect local socio-cultural factors? Have local resources been used properly?</p> <p>8.4. If there have been changes, whether intended or unintended, how well-accepted were the changes both by the target group and by others?</p> <p>8.5. Did the organizations have the capacity to assume their commitments to the project? Have there been institutional strengthening that could facilitate replicable initiatives? Will the organizations involved continue to engage in the processes?</p>

ACID SURVIVORS FOUNDATION

		<p>8.6. What were the main benefits to participate in the campaign? Do organisations/stakeholders value the need to pursue a similar coalition during the implementation of the SDGs?</p> <p>8.7. What are the coalition's follow-up plans?</p>	
Lessons learned	9. What can we learn from this campaign that would help inform future campaigns and/or global CSO coordination mechanisms?	<p>9.1. What are the lessons learned in terms of campaign implementation, coordination, stakeholder engagement, and monitoring?</p> <p>9.2. What are the key challenges to successful campaign implementation and how can they be improved upon or adjusted moving forward?</p> <p>9.3. What are the best practices that can be incorporated in campaign implementation and CSO coordination mechanisms?</p>	

3. Scope of work and Evaluation design

3.1. Methodology

The evaluation will be conducted using a range of methodologies below which can be further refined on the basis of the outcomes of a briefing session hosted by the steering committee. The

ACID SURVIVORS FOUNDATION

following is a list of methodologies that are considered applicable; the list, however, should not be considered definitive and contractors are free to propose other methodologies.

1. Desk review of key project documents

2. **Literature search and review of material** on the environment in which the project operates, as well as from past campaigns for overall background information and comparison regarding how the campaign performed versus past similar efforts
3. **Review of existing data on the campaign** (overall actions taken, monitoring reports of mobilization activities, registration & distribution lists, grant reports, etc.). The evaluation team should plan on utilizing the existing data being collected and triangulate the data gathered from various sources.
4. **Interviews with key campaign stakeholders** – including but not limited to: Campaign Committee members, participating organizations, state apparels, acid survivors, etc...
5. **Focus group discussions with key campaign stakeholders** (e.g. Managers, Committee members, local CSOs)
6. **Other participatory approaches**, such as case studies, “stories of change” or “most significant change”

3.2. Expected activities and key deliverables

Activities	Number of days	Expected timeline	Deliverables
1. Desk review and literature search	3	January, 16-18	
2. Develop and finalize inception report, with feedback & approval of Evaluation Steering Committee	3	January 19-23	Inception report
3. Develop data collection tools	2	January 24-25	Finalized data collection tools
4. Planning interviews & field work	1	January 26	
5. Interviews, potential site visits and field work (*assessing the need and cost-effectiveness of field visits vs. skype interviews and surveys)	4	January 27-31	
6. Preparation and presentation of preliminary findings to Evaluation Steering Committee	2	February, 1-2	

ACID SURVIVORS FOUNDATION

7. Submission of 1 st draft report to Evaluation Steering Committee for comments	4	February, 3-8	Draft report
8. Submission of 2 nd draft report to Evaluation Steering Committee after incorporating comments	2	February 9-10	Consolidated report
9. Submission of final report after incorporating final comments	2	February, 13-14	Final report (with properly filed/archived copies of transcripts of all work documents, e.g. field notes)
Total expected work days:	23 days		

3.3. Discussion of inception report

Prior to conducting the evaluation, the Lead Evaluator will prepare and submit an inception report to the Evaluation Committee, detailing the methodologies and work plan of the evaluation. The inception report will be discussed with the Evaluation Steering Committee and will be subject to approval prior to the start of field activities.

3.4. Reporting and presentation of findings

The key deliverable will be the written report in English, along with a two-page summary of key evaluation results. The report will be no more than 25 pages, consisting of:

- **An executive summary:** A tightly-drafted, to-the-point and free-standing. It should focus on the key purpose or issues of the evaluation, outline the main points of the analysis, and clearly indicate the main conclusions, lessons learned and specific recommendations. Cross-references should be made to the corresponding page or paragraph numbers in the main text.
- **Evaluation report.**
- **Annexes** – including: o Terms of reference for the evaluation;

All confidential information shall be presented in a separate annex.

3.5. Reporting relationship

The lead evaluator will report to Mohammad Khan, ED, ASF, Islamabad, Pakistan.

3.7. International standards & Presentation of evidence

Standard evaluation and survey methodologies and good practices utilized in the international monitoring and evaluation community should be applied. Such resources should include but are not limited to those promulgated by the Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. In particular, all findings and conclusions should be based on evidence which is presented in the evaluation report

5. Required qualifications

RFP for Selection of Consultant/firm for Procurement of Impact Study

PO Box 419, Islamabad – Pakistan
Email: info@asfpakistan.org - www.asfpakistan.org

ACID SURVIVORS FOUNDATION

The following are the desired qualifications of the Lead Evaluator:

1. Degree in international development or relevant field from recognized university
2. Demonstrated experience in leading evaluations of global campaigns and/or projects/programs focusing on international development
3. Demonstrated professional experience in media campaigns and/or projects/programs focusing on international development
4. Demonstrated experience in qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis
5. Demonstrated experience in leading focus group discussions and conducting interviews of wide range of stakeholders
6. Previous exposure to and solid understanding of the issues surrounding sustainable development, social justice and climate change
7. Experience of working in an organization/network with multi-country operations
8. Cultural sensitivity and ability to respect and work well with people from different backgrounds and disciplines
9. Political awareness and ability to handle sensitive issues with diplomacy in many different settings
10. Strong analytical thinker and skilled writer in English and Urdu
11. Additional fluency in Urdu and/or Pushto highly recommended

The following are the desired qualifications of the **Local Assistant** (if applying as a team):

1. Bachelor or Master degree in international development or relevant field from a recognized university
2. Demonstrated past experience in working projects/programs focusing on international development or on campaigns with non-government organizations
3. Demonstrated experience in conducting rapid rural appraisals using focus group discussions, key informant interviews of beneficiaries, project staff and other stakeholders
4. Past experience in participating in independent external evaluations of projects focusing on international development or climate change highly desirable.
5. Additional fluency in local languages highly recommended.

6. Application and selection details

6.1. Application schedule

Event	Date	Time
Terms of Reference (TOR) Issuance	1 st January, 17	Not Applicable
Proposals Due	10 th January, 17	17:00 PST
Follow-up Interviews with Perspective Candidates	11-12 th January, 17	NA

RFP for Selection of Consultant/firm for Procurement of Impact Study

PO Box 419, Islamabad – Pakistan
Email: info@asfpakistan.org - www.asfpakistan.org

ACID SURVIVORS FOUNDATION

Contract Executed	13 th January, 17	NA
-------------------	------------------------------	----

6.2. Application materials

Each Proposal must clearly define the scope of services proposed by the Offer or in enough detail to allow the Evaluation Steering Committee to perform a proper evaluation of the TOR applicants. The proposal should include the following ten items. Please note that any proposal which does not contain all ten items will be rejected.

- A. **Understanding of Project Specifications.** This is a statement that the Offeror has examined and understands the specifications and requirements set forth in this TOR.
- B. **A One-page Summary of Experience.** This summary of experience should be no more than one page and aim at illustrating past work on programs that are comparable in character to the work required by this TOR.
- C. **A Project Proposal** that highlights the Offeror's detailed plan to conduct this evaluation, provides suggestions how the Offeror would proceed with this evaluation project, and stresses key considerations the Offeror would see arising from a project of this nature. (3 pages maximum)
- D. **Detailed CVs** of all professionals who will work on the evaluation. If there is more than one consultant on the proposed team, please attach a table describing the level of effort (in number of hours) of each team member in each of the evaluation activities.
- E. **Work sample** exemplifying the consultant's expertise with similar evaluation projects, and providing recommendations for similar projects in similar fields. (provide 2-3 work samples)
- F. **Professional references.** Please provide two or three references of work accomplished by the Offeror that are comparable in character to the work required by this TOR. Each reference must include the following:
 - Client/with address
 - Contact name and telephone number
 - Dates of contract
 - A brief narrative description of the contract (no more than one short paragraph).
- G. **Pricing.** Each proposal must contain a pricing structure that offers the best value for this evaluation project.
 - Firm Fixed Pricing
 - Cost estimates with itemization for large segments of work
 - Must list the proposed hourly rate to complete this project in PKR.

ACID SURVIVORS FOUNDATION

- H. **Availability, ability to meet fixed deadlines and expected number of hours** to complete the proposed scope of work.
- I. **Validity of Proposal.** This is a statement that the Proposal will be valid for a minimum period of ninety (90) days following the Deadline.
- J. **Offeror's Legal Status.** This is a statement describing the Offeror's legal status, e.g., sole proprietorship, partnership, or corporation, and state of incorporation.

Note that each Offeror must detail any assumptions it makes in preparing and providing the Proposal, including but not limited to the pricing.

Each Proposal received will be evaluated with respect to the proposed approach to the requirements, quality programs and backup production systems in place, experience, reliability, and reputation of the Offeror, price, and any other factor required.

6.3. Application procedures

Interested candidates should send their applications to ED, ASF, at info@asfpakistan.org **no later than 10th January 2017, 17:00 PST**. Please put the following in the subject line: "Application for MEDIA CAMPAIGN-evaluation."

A complete application will be one with all materials listed above in one email through one folder. The title of this folder should be the last name of the Lead Evaluator.

Application received after the deadline and incomplete applications will not be accepted.

6.4. Deadline for applications

All applications should be emailed at info@asfpakistan.org **no later than 10th January, 2017, 17:00 PST**.