



Reg. No: 2006/023739/08

## Terms of Reference

### Summative Evaluation of the United Nations Trust Fund (UNTF) Safe at Home, Safe in Relationships project

Deadline for submissions:

6 April 2023

<p><b>Cape Town Office</b> 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Sir Lowry Studios 95 Sir Lowry Road Cape Town 8001 P.O. Box 3126, Cape Town, 8001 Tel: +27 21 4237088 . Fax. +27 21 424 5645</p>	<p><b>Johannesburg Office</b> Stevenson Building 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, 62 Juta Street Braamfontein 2017 P.O. Box 31166. Braamfontein 2017 Tel. +27 11 339 3589. Fax. +27 11 339 6503</p>	<p><b>Butterworth, Eastern Cape Office</b> Lilitha Guest Lodge &amp; Conferencing 20 Robinson Street Butterworth 4980 Tel. +27 74 491 0381</p>	<p><b>Gugulethu Wellness Centre</b> Gugulethu Clinic Corner of NY1 &amp; NY3 Gugulethu 7750 Tel.+27 21 633 3140</p>	<p><b>Uganda Office</b> Plot 154, Muteesa II Road Ntinda, Kampala Uganda</p>	<p><b>Zambia Office</b> 191B Chindo Rd, Kabulonga, Lusaka, Zambia</p>	<p><b>Cameroon Office</b> Checkpoint- Molyko Buea South West Region of Cameroon Tel. +237 233 334360</p>
---	--	--	---	--	---	--

[www.genderjustice.org.za](http://www.genderjustice.org.za) · [info@genderjustice.org.za](mailto:info@genderjustice.org.za)

#### Board Members

Karabo van Heerden (Chairperson) · Felicita Hikuam (Deputy Chairperson) · Edmore Nyanhongo (Treasurer) · Deprose Muchena · Zanele Mdlekeza · Mmapaseka Steve Letsike · Heather van Niekerk (Ex-Officio) · Bafana Khumalo (Ex-Officio)

VAT Reg: 4410231288

## Terms of Reference Summary

### Project Overview

The United Nations Trust Fund (UNTF) Safe at Home, Safe in Relationships is a multi-partner, multi-country project that has been implemented since January 2020 and will end in May 2023. The project, led by Sonke Gender Justice (Sonke) has been implemented across South Africa and eSwatini in partnership with SWAGGA and Mosaic. The project's overall goal is for women and girls living in these three project sites, and Southern Africa more broadly, to experience safer, more equitable, and respectful relationships with their male partners and community members. The project aimed to achieve its goals by providing capacity building to individuals, including women and girls, men and boys, and community members around harmful social and cultural norms, and their linkage to Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) through gender transformation workshops, community outreach events, and the strengthening of referral networks and IPV legislation and policy.

### Purpose of this Consultancy

Sonke seeks to recruit the services of a consultant to conduct an evaluation of the Safe at Home, Safe in Relationships project. The summative evaluation is aimed assessing the following.

- Assess the performance of the project against its intended objectives and impact over the period January 2020- May 2023
- Determine whether the planned objectives and targets were achieved,
- Whether the project reached the intended beneficiaries and the factors which directly and indirectly resulted in this achievement or lack thereof.
- Assess the effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, impacts and sustainability of the project and consider efficient use of resources and external factors which affect primary and secondary beneficiaries.
- Make recommendations which will inform future projects and interventions and outline best practices.

### Time schedule:

The estimated duration of the summative evaluation is 4 months, starting 3 April 2023 and ending 31 July 2023 when the final report will be submitted. Within the first 2 weeks of the consultancy, the consultant is expected to produce an Inception Report, including a detailed work plan and methodology. The consultant is expected to convey the main findings and recommendations in a meeting with Sonke and partner staff before finalization of the report.

**Budget:** ZAR 300 000

### How to apply

Should you wish to apply, please send as five separate documents to Nombulelo Mazwi by **COB 6 April 2023**. If selected, **induction will start on 14 April 2023**.

Email: [Nombulelo@genderjustice.org.za](mailto:Nombulelo@genderjustice.org.za)

- Brief 1-1.5-page cover letter citing your relevant expertise for the consultancy.
- Detailed CV including examples of similar evaluations completed (4 pages maximum)
- Detailed quotation
- Short proposal including work plan and budget.
- Example of similar work completed.

## Contents

1. Background and context .....	4
1.1. Background and context of the project .....	4
1.2. Description of the project .....	5
1.3. Strategy and Theory of Change/Results chain .....	6
2. Purpose of the evaluation .....	7
3. Evaluation Objectives and scope.....	7
3.1. Scope of evaluation.....	7
3.2. Objectives of the evaluation .....	8
4. Evaluation questions and criteria.....	8
5. Evaluation design and methodology.....	9
5.1. Proposed evaluation design .....	9
5.2. Data sources .....	10
5.3. Proposed data collection methods and analysis .....	10
5.4. Proposed sampling methods.....	10
5.5. Field Visits .....	11
5.6. Level of Stakeholder engagement.....	11
6. Evaluation ethics .....	11
7. Key deliverables of the evaluator and timeframe .....	12
7. Evaluation team composition .....	12
Roles and responsibilities.....	12
Required Competencies.....	12
8. Management Arrangements of the evaluation.....	13
9. Timeline of the entire evaluation process.....	13
10. Budget.....	14

## 1. Background and context

### 1.1. Background and context of the project

Violence against women and girls (VAWG) is prominent in Southern Africa, with research suggesting that the adherence to rigid gender norms and harmful masculinities, as well as government inaction and poor implementation of existing laws and policies, are key drivers for men's use of violence. At the time of the inception of this project, Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) was the most common type of violence and the leading cause of death among women in South Africa. Femicide was seven times the global average, with 56% of all women murdered being killed by their male intimate partner, and one out of every two women experiencing IPV in their lifetime. In eSwatini, intolerant attitudes contribute to violence with 33% of men and 39% of women reporting that the use of violence is acceptable among intimate partners.

Sonke is a South African-based non-profit organization working throughout Africa through the primary assertion that women and men, girls and boys, and people in their gender diversity, can work together to resist patriarchy, advocate for gender justice, and achieve gender transformation. Sonke, as project lead, has been working in partnership with MOSAIC and SWAGGAA to implement the three-year UNTF Safe at Home, Safe in Relationships project across South Africa and eSwatini. While Sonke has focused its interventions on Gauteng; Mosaic and SWAGAA have implemented the project in the Western Cape and eSwatini respectively. The overall goal is for women and girls living in these three project sites to experience safer, more equitable, and more respectful relationships with their male partners and community members.

The project aims to:

- Provide capacity building to individuals and communities to understand harmful gender norms and their linkage to violence.
- Challenge inequitable ideas about manhood and undo the long-ingrained beliefs and experiences about masculinity, gender, and sexuality to identify equitable norms that can prevent VAWG, promote women's human rights.
- The project also focuses on increasing women's rights literacy and civil society advocacy and activism aimed at promoting access to justice for victims and survivors of IPV and holding the governments of South Africa and eSwatini accountable for their obligations and commitments in IPV prevention and response.

The project started on 1 January 2020 and is scheduled to end May 2023. The Covid19 pandemic affected implementation of the project by halting and delaying service deliveries due to Lockdown restrictions.

## 1.2. Description of the project

Organization	Sonke Gender Justice
Title of the project	Safe at Home, Safe in Relationships
Project duration	January 2020- May 2023
Geographical areas	South Africa and eSwatini
Specific forms of violence addressed by the project	The forms of violence addressed in this project included Intimate partner violence, Physical violence, Sexual violence, Psychological and Emotional violence, Economic violence, and Femicide
Main objectives of the project	<p>Objective 1: To improve community driven implementation of IPV prevention initiatives in eSwatini and South Africa</p> <p>Objective 2: To increase the capacity and influence of civil society to hold governments, institutions, and the judiciary accountable for IPV prevention and response.</p> <p>Objective 3: To improve the capacity to implement and monitor and evaluate interventions of Women’s rights groups and CBOs on IPV prevention and response.</p> <p>Objective 4: To institutionally strengthen Sonke, SWAGAA and MOSAIC to sustainably respond to the COVID-19 pandemic and other crises while maintaining or adapting existing interventions to EAW/G with a focus on the most vulnerable women and girls.</p>
Description of targeted primary and secondary beneficiaries	<p>The primary beneficiaries targeted under the project were 12 000 women and girls; 2000 of which are women and girls living with disabilities; and 2000 of which are women and girls who were survivors of violence.</p> <p>The secondary beneficiaries included men and/or boys (5000), members of community-based groups (600), Government officials (400), Journalists/Media (100).</p>
Key partners involved in the project	<p>UN Women</p> <p>Sonke Gender Justice</p> <p>MOSAIC Training Services and Healing Centre for Women</p> <p>Swaziland Action Group Against Abuse (SWAGGA)</p>

### 1.3. Strategy and Theory of Change/Results chain

**Project Goal:** Women and girls living in the three project sites will experience safer, more equitable, and respectful relationships with their male partners and community members by the project end date.

#### Project Outcomes and outputs

- Outcome 1: Improved community-driven implementation of IPV prevention initiatives in eSwatini and South Africa
  - Output 1.1: Partners have increased access to the resources and tools needed to implement gender transformative programming that addresses women's rights and IPV prevention.
  - Output 1.2: Individuals, including women and girls, men and boys, and religious and community leaders, have increased understanding and knowledge of harmful social and cultural norms and their linkage to IPV.
  - Output 1.3: Communities have increased awareness of issues related to IPV, rights, services, and opportunities to mobilize for change (active citizenship).
- Outcome 2: Civil society has increased capacity and influence to hold governments, institutions, and the judiciary accountable for IPV prevention and response.
  - Output 2.1: The effectiveness and adequacy of the services rendered to the public as mandated by IPV.
  - Output 2.2: A stronger referral network exists in each project site for women and girls, including those with disabilities, to access multi-sectoral IPV support services.
  - Output 2.3: IPV legislation, policy and implementation gaps, bottlenecks, and failures identified and reported on.
  - Output 2.4: Increased opportunities for civil society to influence policy processes.
- Outcome 3: Women's rights groups and CBOs have improved their capacity to implement, monitor and evaluate their interventions for IPV prevention and response.
  - Output 3.1: Contribution to the evidence base of project partners' socio-ecological approach to IPV prevention.
  - Output 3.2: An effective and efficient platform for learning and exchange is created.
  - Output 3.3: The institutional and programmatic capacity of partners is strengthened.
- Outcome 4: Sonke, SWAGAA, and MOSAIC are institutionally strengthened to sustainably respond to the COVID-19 pandemic and other crises while maintaining or adapting existing interventions to EAW/G with a focus on the most vulnerable women and girls.
  - Output 4.1: Sonke, SWAGAA, and MOSAIC have put in place mechanisms to improve institutional resilience to crises including COVID-19, that ensure the stability of projects and sustainability of the organization[s] in the longer term.
  - Output 4.2: Sonke, SWAGAA, and MOSAIC have improved knowledge, skills and capacities to maintain or adapt EAW/G interventions and reach the most vulnerable women and girls while responding to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic or other crises.

## 2. Purpose of the evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the performance of the project against its intended impact and objectives. The evaluation should determine whether the planned objectives and targets were achieved and what factors resulted in this achievement or lack thereof. Consultants will be required to:

- Assess the effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, impacts, and sustainability of the intervention regarding changes in beliefs, attitudes, and new knowledge among individuals, including women and girls, men and boys, and religious and community leaders through the gender transformation workshops. The evaluation should consider external factors which affect the mentioned individuals' drivers for change and also note any unintended changes.
- Assess whether the project has reached its intended beneficiaries and the effective and efficient use of project resources.
- Document the best practices and lessons learned and provide recommendations for any future interventions.

The results of the evaluation will be used by Sonke, SWAGGA, and Mosaic to identify challenges, lessons learned, opportunities, strengths, and weaknesses from the partnership and provide specific recommendations for the next steps. The findings contribute to a broader evidence base related to IPV and will be used to inform future programming, specifically workshop content and engagements, intervention methodology, best practices, and advocacy for IPV.

## 3. Evaluation Objectives and scope

### 3.1. Scope of evaluation

#### Time Frame

This is an end term evaluation exercise, and it will therefore cover the entire duration of the project starting in January 2020 up to May 2023. The entire evaluation process must be completed within 4 months.

#### Geographical coverage

The evaluation will be undertaken across all 3 project sites across Diepkloof and Cape Town in South Africa, and the Manzini region of eSwatini.

#### Target Groups

This evaluation targets the primary and secondary beneficiaries as well as broader stakeholders listed in preceding sections of these ToR.

### 3.2. Objectives of the evaluation

The specific objectives of the final evaluation are:

**To evaluate the entire project through** 1 January 2020 – May 2023 against the effectiveness, relevance, efficiency, sustainability, knowledge generation, and impact criteria, as well as the cross-cutting gender equality and human rights criteria (defined below);

**To identify key lessons and promising or emerging good practices** in the field of ending violence against women and girls, for learning purposes.

**To assess the effectiveness and impact of the partnership between Mosaic, Sonke, and SWAGGA** in achieving the intended outcomes and impact of the evaluation. This should review the influence of collaboration and role assignment across the organizations on the intended activities and outcomes

## 4. Evaluation questions and criteria

Evaluation Criteria	Mandatory Evaluation Question
Effectiveness	<p>To what extent were the intended project goal, outcomes, and outputs (project results) achieved, and how?</p> <p>To what extent was the Partnership between SWAGGA, Mosaic, and Sonke effective in achieving project results?</p> <p>To what extent did the project reach its intended beneficiaries?</p>
Relevance	To what extent do the achieved results (project goal, outcomes, and outputs) continue to be relevant to the needs of women and girls?
Efficiency	To what extent was the project efficiently and cost-effectively implemented?
Sustainability	To what extent will the achieved results, especially any positive changes in the lives of women and girls (project goal level), be sustained after this project ends?
Impact	<p>To what extent has the project contributed to ending violence against women and gender inequality and/or promoting women’s empowerment (both intended and unintended impact)?</p> <p>To what extent did the project influence the behavior of male partners and community in relation to</p>

	violence against women, gender equality/and or women’s empowerment across the three sites?
<b>Knowledge generation</b>	To what extent has the project generated knowledge, promising or emerging practices in the field of EAW/G that should be documented and shared with other practitioners?
<b>Gender Equality and Human Rights</b>	<p>Cross-cutting criteria: the evaluation should consider the extent to which human rights based and gender responsive approaches have been incorporated throughout the project and to what extent.</p> <p><i>Ensure that the evaluation approach and methods of data collection are gender responsive (e.g. women and girls must feel safe to share information).The evaluation data must be disaggregated by sex and other social criteria of importance to the project’s subject.</i></p>

## 5. Evaluation design and methodology

### 5.1. Proposed evaluation design

The suggested evaluation approach is Collaborative Outcomes Reporting. Multiple lines of evidence, both quantitative and qualitative should be used to provide a credible, reliable, and useful performance story. Program staff, beneficiaries and relevant stakeholders should be engaged in contribution analysis. As discussed, the evaluation approach should also be gender responsive.

See below the 6-step developed by Jess Dart:

1. Scoping: an inception/planning workshop is held. In this workshop the program logic is clarified, existing data is identified, and evaluation questions developed.
2. Data trawl. Can include both primary and secondary data sources. Generally, a data trawl of existing evidence is undertaken. Program staff may be enlisted to help with the collation of data.
3. Social inquiry. Social inquiry can include any form of data gathering- qualitative or quantitative. If qualitative, volunteers who are given a short training session in interviewing and an interview guide can conduct interviews. This is a very effective way to involve staff in the data where there is sufficient enthusiasm around the process. Otherwise, consultants or the evaluation managers conduct all or a proportion of the interviews. In many COR examples, the Most Significant Change (MSC) technique is used at some point in the social inquiry process as a way of capturing stories of change, both expected and unexpected.
4. Data analysis and integration. Quantitative and qualitative data can be analyzed together according to the outcomes in the program logic. A “results chart” is often used to integrate different sets and types of data.
5. Outcomes panel. People with relevant scientific, technical, or sectoral knowledge are brought together and presented with a range of evidence compiled in step 4. They are then asked to assess the contribution

of the intervention towards goals given the available knowledge and to explore rival hypotheses that could explain the data. It can be substituted for a citizen's jury.

6. Summit workshop. At a large workshop key findings and recommendations are synthesized, and examples of changes are identified and added (using material from MSC if available, and MSC processes to select the most significant stories). The summit should involve broad participation of key stakeholders such as program staff and community members.

*An alternative approach can be proposed, ensuring that it includes both quantitative and qualitative data analysis and is participatory in its approach. Relevant stakeholders should be engaged to ensure comprehensive understanding of intended and unintended results. Multiple lines of evidence should be used to validate results. The proposed methodology must include a document review, inception workshop, reflection and feedback sessions with key stakeholders.*

## 5.2. Data sources

Both primary and secondary data sources should be used, the proposed data sources include but should not be limited to:

- Desk review on VAWG with a focus on IPV: relevant project documents and secondary data sources such as the projects results framework, work plan, budget, annual reports, and Internal monitoring, program, and financial reports.
- Quantitative data to be collected through a representative survey.
- Qualitative data to be collected through focus groups discussions and/or key informant interviews.

## 5.3. Proposed data collection methods and analysis

Both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods should be used through a combination of field visits, desk studies (reviewing project documents, annual progress reports and other relevant evaluation documentation), and additional primary data collection required. Online data collection for quantitative data collection is preferred, evaluators can make use of tools such as Google forms or Survey Monkey. Where required online qualitative data collection can take place via telephone, Microsoft teams, Zoom, Skype etc. All qualitative data must be recorded and transcribed accordingly to ensure data quality. Data analysis should be conducted on Stata, SPSS or any other relevant software. Additional follow-up field visits should take place to fill in any knowledge gaps and further validate findings.

## 5.4. Proposed sampling methods

The proposed sample size for primary beneficiaries is 600 – 5% of the population, this should be proportional across sites and beneficiary type. Further an additional 375 men and/or boys should be sampled and 60 other secondary beneficiaries consisting of community-based groups, government officials, and journalists/media should be sampled.

Both primary and secondary beneficiaries should be selected via stratified random sampling/proportional random sampling considering beneficiary type, geographic area and any other key defining factor decided by the evaluator.

Additional qualitative data collection with Sonke, Mosaic and SWAGGA project managers and program staff, including Sonke senior management should also take place as proposed by the evaluators.

## 5.5. Field Visits

Field visits should be conducted across all 3 project sites, Diepkloof and Cape Town in South Africa, and the Manzini region of eSwatini. Qualitative data collection should take place with beneficiaries and program staff across each site.

## 5.6. Level of Stakeholder engagement

The evaluators should engage with key project stakeholders namely government institutions such as the Department of Social Development, relevant Community based organizations, Women's groups, community leaders, local GBV partners, Faith based organizations and leaders, and local government authority.

## 6. Evaluation ethics

In preparing the proposal the evaluator/s must put in place specific safeguards and protocols to protect the safety (both physical and psychological) of respondents and those collecting the data as well as to prevent harm. Members of the evaluation team should understand and be sensitive to the political, socio economic, historical and cultural context across sites where data collection occurs and ensure the rights of the individual are protected and participation in the evaluation does not result in further violation of their rights. **The evaluator/s must have a plan in place to:**

- Protect the rights of respondents, including privacy and confidentiality in line with the POPI Act provisions.
- Elaborate on how informed consent will be obtained and to ensure that the names of individuals consulted during data collection will not be made public.
- If the project involves children (under 18 years old) the evaluator/s must consider additional risks and the need for parental consent.
- The evaluator/s must be trained in collecting sensitive information and specifically data relating to violence against women and select any members of the evaluation team on these issues.
- Data collection tools must be designed in a way that is culturally appropriate and does not create distress for respondents.
- Data collection visits should be organized at the appropriate time and place to minimize risk to respondents.
- The interviewer or data collector must be able to provide information on how individuals in situations of risk can seek support (referrals to organizations that can provide counseling support, for example)
- Evaluators must adhere to the Protection of Personal Information Act (POPI Act) and ensure that confidentiality of individuals and data collection is preserved.

## 7. Key deliverables of the evaluator and timeframe

No.	Deliverable	Deadline
1	Evaluation Inception Report	By 28 April 2023
2	Draft Evaluation Report	By 29 June 2023
3	Final Evaluation Report	By 31 July 2023

## 7. Evaluation team composition

### Roles and responsibilities

The lead and co lead evaluator will be responsible for undertaking the evaluation from start to finish and for managing the evaluation team under the supervision of evaluation task manager from Sonke Gender Justice for the data collection and analysis, as well as report drafting and finalization in English.

### Required Competencies

#### Team lead and co lead:

- Evaluation experience at least 10 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.
- Experience with program design and theory of change, gender-responsive evaluation, participatory approaches, and stakeholder engagement.
- Specific evaluation experiences in the areas of ending violence against women and girls.
- Experience in collecting and analysing quantitative and qualitative data as well as data visualization.
- 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 a report that can be used.
- 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.
- Regional/Country experience and knowledge: in-depth knowledge of country South Africa and Eswatini is required.
- Language proficiency: fluency in English; good command of local language such as isiXhosa and siSwati are desirable.

## 8. Management Arrangements of the evaluation

The overall evaluation will be managed by Sonke’s Research Monitoring Evaluation and Learning (RMEL) manager with support of the Sonke RMEL unit. Evaluators will liaise with the Sonke RMEL unit and program staff for relevant project documentation and clarification, assistance in liaising and connecting with relevant stakeholders and primary and secondary beneficiaries. The Sonke RMEL unit manager will also set up feedback/check-in sessions to discuss any further support or clarification required.

## 9. Timeline of the entire evaluation process

Stage of Evaluation	Key Task	Responsible	Number of working days required	Timeframe
Inception stage	Briefings of evaluators to orient the evaluators	Evaluation Task Manager	10 working days	First week
	Desk review of key documents	Evaluator/s		First week
	Finalizing the evaluation design and methods	Evaluator/s		Second week
	Submit draft Inception report	Evaluator/s		28 April 2023
	Review Inception Report and provide feedback	Evaluation Task Manager, Stakeholder Group and UNTF	5 working days	5 May 2023
	Incorporating comments and revising the inception report	Evaluator/s	5 working days	12 May 2023
	Submitting final version of inception report	Evaluator/s		
	Review final Inception Report and approve	Evaluation Task Manager, Stakeholder Group and UNTF	5 working days	19 May 2023
Data collection and analysis stage	Desk research	Evaluator/s	5 working days	26 May 2023
	In-country technical mission for data collection (visits to the field, interviews, questionnaires, etc.)	Evaluator/s	3 weeks	15 June 2023
Synthesis and reporting stage	Analysis and interpretation of findings	Evaluator/s	2 weeks	29 June 2023
	Preparing a first draft report	Evaluator/s		
	Review of the draft report with key stakeholders for quality assurance	Evaluation Task Manager, Stakeholder Group and UNTF	6 working days	10 July
	Consolidate comments from all the groups and submit the consolidated comments to evaluation team	Evaluation Task Manger		
	Incorporating comments and preparing second draft evaluation report	Evaluation Team		

	Final review and approval of report	Evaluation Manager, Stakeholder and UNTF	Task Group	5 working days	25 July 2023
	Final edits and submission of the final report	Evaluator/s		4 working days	31 July 2023

## 10. Budget

The total budget for the evaluation is R300 000 which includes all travel costs for the evaluation team.