The Development Alternative, 2019-2022
Terms of Reference for Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning National Consultant, Uganda

1 Overview

INTRAC is seeking National Consultants with skills in Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) to support the Development Alternative, a new multi-country programme that works to strengthen youth-led civil society through youth leadership and an innovative accountability methodology. Consultants will be part of a global team, working closely with the implementing partner (Restless Development in Uganda), and INTRAC’s project team, based in Oxford, UK.

The programme is divided into two 18 month phases, with the first phase focusing on operationalising a youth-led accountability process. We are seeking consultants to support a Developmental Evaluation that will accompany this first phase.

2 Background

About INTRAC

INTRAC is a not-for-profit organisation. Our mission is to strengthen the effectiveness of civil society to challenge poverty and inequality, empowering people to gain greater control over their own future. For 25 years our expert consultants, trainers and researcher have been building the skills and knowledge of civil society organisations (CSOs) and influencing civil society policy and practice.

INTRAC provides high quality, contextualised and practical support to civil society through consultancy, training, research and learning. INTRAC is leading and coordinating the evaluation & learning activities, and supporting the Development Alternative to learn and innovate around its core approaches.

We are based in Oxford (UK), but we work globally through a network of independent development and/or civil society practitioners experienced in consulting, training and practice-oriented research.

About the Development Alternative

The Development Alternative is a Consortium led by Restless Development; other partners include Accountable Now, DoT Lebanon, Integrity Action, INTRAC, War Child and Y-Care. In Uganda, the implementing agency is Restless Development. It is funded by the UK Department for International Development (DFID) under its new Aid Connect mechanism, in the stream aimed at building civil society effectiveness. ¹

¹ For UK Aids Connect Terms of Reference on Civil Society Effectiveness, see: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5968a15f40f0b60a4400019c/Terms-of-Reference-Building-Civil-Society-Effectiveness.pdf
The Development Alternative wants to see a more effective civil society with the agency, power and accountability of youth and communities at its heart, achieving better results for people to access opportunities and resources and to fulfil their rights. It focusses on youth leadership – young people working for development of the whole community and living (livelihoods and decent work).

Planned outcomes of the programme are:

- Young people realise their agency to hold development actors to account and offer solutions.
- Youth civil society is transformed to increase organisations' impact, scale and credibility.
- Development actors improve how they work with young people, communities, and civil society.

The Consortium will implement and test a co-designed Model for Change, which is a youth-led, tech-enabled, community engagement approach. A group of youth volunteers will be trained to use the Development Check (a real-time mobile-based monitoring tool) to monitor delivery on commitments by development actors delivering livelihood programmes at the local level. Volunteers will also be trained and encouraged how to use community engagement and advocacy techniques to develop evidence to influence and identify possible solutions to local livelihoods issues.

The Consortium will also develop and implement a strategic approach to support youth civil society and support evidence-backed influencing to enable a shift of the current narrative and practice around young people’s role in development, and strategic partnerships to promote our model and influence others to use it.

Focus countries and time frame
The programme will work in eight countries in total over 2 phases. A third and final phase will focus on consolidating learning and evidence. In Uganda, the programme is being implemented in Karamoja and Kampala.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1 (Nov 2019 – Jan 2021)</th>
<th>Phase 2 (Feb 2021 – July 2022)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The programme will also work with youth civil society organisations in Iraq and Lebanon.
3 Scope of the requirement

The consultant will be part of an international team conducting a developmental evaluation over phase 1 of the programme.\(^2\) This differs from a standard formative or summative Evaluation in that the purpose is to help develop and refine the programme approach through evidence-based. We do not expect consultants to have been involved in a Developmental Evaluation before – but an openness to experimentation in M&E methods, ability to communicate complex issues in a clear way, and adaptability will be an asset. Phase 2 evaluation will be designed over the course of Phase 1, but will likely take a more traditional approach to assessing impact. See Annex A for more details on the requirement.

While the programme reports against a logical framework, reporting against this will be primarily the responsibility of the implementing partners, and not the focus of the Evaluation led by INTRAC.

Methodology

Over the course of 2020, we will use a small suite of methods to address key learning questions for around the Model for Change. The programme will adopt principles of action-research, integrating user feedback and learning into the programme design. We are still in the process of planning the evaluation design so the exact methodologies are to be finalised. The overarching learning questions are aligned to the two test cycles within Phase 1 (see Annex B for further information).

Test cycle A: Usability

*Overarching question 1: how and under what conditions can the Model for Change be operationalised?*

Possible methods:

- Outcome Mapping\(^3\)
- User journey analysis
- Political economy analysis

Test cycle B: Effectiveness

*Overarching question 2: what are the key factors to account for in scaling and evidencing the model?*

---


Possible methods:

- Outcome Mapping
- Participatory methods for assessing social value
- Case studies

There will be a strong focus on participatory and qualitative methods, as this will deliver insights that enable adaptation of the programme design. Focus group discussions with youth volunteers involved in the project.

It is important that we achieve consistency in our approaches across countries, but also contextualise tools to country and local contexts. For all data collection methods, INTRAC will design a basic meta-data template for consultants to complete, to capture the methodologies used by each of the consultants across the implementing countries. This will capture basic information about the methods used and any issues (limitations) encountered during data collection.

Deliverables

Deliverables will be designed and implemented with usability a priority. We anticipate that the developmental evaluation will produce 4-5 brief thematic reports throughout the year. These will feed into more formal learning moments:

- End of test cycle A review (focus on usability and adaptations to the Model for Change).
- End of test cycle B and end-of phase review (focus on effectiveness of the Model for Change and conditions for scale).

Timing and Budget

We estimate around 35 days of consultant time during phase 1, including 5 days working with the INTRAC team, and a further 25 over phase 2. All activities relate to implementation and testing of the Model for Change in Uganda during Test Cycle A and B of Phase 1 (Nov 2019 – Oct 2020). Phase 2 is conditional on agreement with the donor.

Consultants are asked to propose a daily rate.

Expenses will be refunded at cost by INTRAC. The consultant will be responsible for organising and paying for their own in-country travel expenses (budget agreed in advance). These will be refunded by INTRAC separately upon satisfactory production of receipts for all expenses incurred. Any international travel will be booked and paid for by INTRAC.

4 Consultants profile and required skills

We are seeking consultants who are able to work as part of an international team to deliver useful insights to improve and adapt the programme, as well as generate evidence around key results. We see the role as ideal for a mid-career consultant or development professional switching to consultancy. While expectations are high, you will be supported by a team, and we see this as a development opportunity for the right consultant.

Essential criteria

- At least 3 years’ experience in project or programme M&E
- Understanding and experience using of qualitative research methods
- Understanding of participatory methods and good facilitation skills
• Adaptability and willingness to try new research methods
• Analytical and critical thinking skills
• Fluency in written and spoken English
• Gender and cultural sensitivity
• Organised and able to work to deadlines
• Ability to communicate complex ideas in clear and accessible ways

Desirable criteria
• Bachelors’ degree in social development or related fields
• Experience working with young people or on youth leadership programmes
• Ability to work in Bantu and Karamojong
• Understanding of livelihoods sector in Uganda
• Understanding of user or human centred design

Application Process
Prospective Consultants should provide a CV, a one-page cover letter detailing their relevant skills and experience, and the contact details of two referees, preferably former clients. Consultants should indicate their daily fee rates in local currency and the equivalent in GBP (£) in the covering letter.

Applications should be submitted to research@intrac.org with the following in the subject line: Application Local MEL Consultant Uganda - The Development Alternative.

Application deadline: 12th November 2019

Applications will be considered on a rolling basis. Shortlisted consultants will be asked to supply an example of written work (e.g. consultancy report), and undertake a telephone (skype) interview. Please let us know if there are any periods when you would not be available for interview.
Annex A: Developmental Evaluation vs. Traditional Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional evaluation</th>
<th>Developmental evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose:</strong> Supports improvement, summative tests and accountability</td>
<td><strong>Purpose:</strong> Supports development of innovation and adaptation in dynamic environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roles &amp; relationships:</strong> Positioned as an outsider to assure independence and objectivity</td>
<td><strong>Roles &amp; relationships:</strong> Positioned as an internal team function integrated into the process of gathering and interpreting data, framing issues, surfaced and testing model developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountability:</strong> Focused on external authorities and funders based on explicit and pre-ordinate criteria</td>
<td><strong>Accountability:</strong> Centered on the innovators' values and commitment to make a difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Options:</strong> Rigorously options-focused; traditional research and disciplinary standards of quality dominate</td>
<td><strong>Options:</strong> Utilization focused; options are chosen in service to developmental use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measurement:</strong> Measure performance and success against pre-determined goals and SMART outcomes</td>
<td><strong>Measurement:</strong> Develops measures and tracking mechanisms quickly as outcomes emerge; measures can change during the evaluation as the process unfolds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation results:</strong> Detailed formal reports: validated best practices, generalizable across time and space. Can engender fear of failure</td>
<td><strong>Evaluation results:</strong> Rapid, real-time feedback; diverse, user-friendly forms of feedback. Evaluation aims to nurture learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complexity &amp; uncertainty:</strong> Evaluator tries to control design implementation and the evaluation process</td>
<td><strong>Complexity &amp; uncertainty:</strong> Learning to respond to lack of control; staying in touch with what's unfolding and responding accordingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standards:</strong> Methodological competence and commitment to rigor, independence, credibility with external authorities and funders; analytical and critical thinking</td>
<td><strong>Standards:</strong> Methodological flexibility; eclecticism, and adaptability; systems thinking; creative and critical thinking balanced; high tolerance for ambiguity; open and agile; teamwork and people skills; able to facilitate rigorous evidence-based perspectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex B: Learning agenda for Model for Change, Phase 1

In phase 1, the primary objective is to support the ongoing development and adaption of the Model for Change. It is also necessary to generate evidence required to support scaling-out in phase 2.

**Overarching question 1: how and under what conditions can the Model for Change be operationalised?**

What are the needs of different users (young people, communities, development actors)?

What degree of inputs are required to get the model working (VfM)

Does the model work as intended, for the intended users? What is the role of civil society in each context in supporting the Model for Change?

What are the strengths and weaknesses of the model and how can it be improved?

Is the model applicable to all users (gender, vulnerability, geography)?

**Overarching question 2: what are the key factors to account for in scaling and evidencing the model?**

Is the Model for Change evaluable?

What are the factors that need to be taken into account to adapt the model to new contexts?

What are the potential routes to scale?