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**Final Evaluations**

Project/Programme Title: **INCLUSION** - Installing, Networking & Capacity Building through Legal counselling and Unified Strategic Interventions On Needs of People with Disabilities, Albania

Country: **Albania**

Project/Programme Number: **Caritas Project number 1720009**

**ADC-Contract 810814/2017**

Name of Partner Organisation: -

Contracting partner of Austrian

Development Agency: **Caritas Austria**

Implementing partner: **Caritas Albania**

**Introduction/Background**

Since 2008 Caritas Austria and Caritas Albania have been implementing projects - financed by Austrian Development Agency and funds of other donors - which contribute to the fulfilment of People with Disability (PwD)’s rights in Albania. Besides the improvement of social services for PwD and promoting their participation in cultural life, caregivers were supported and the co-operation with local stakeholders was sought. The project “Being Active - Without Barriers” was prepared in 2014 and built on results and activities of previous projects[[1]](#footnote-2) like “Valuable life – Valuably live” and “Equal Opportunities for the PwD in Albania”.

Findings of the evaluation were included in the project “INCLUSION - Installing, Networking & Capacity Building through Legal counselling and Unified Strategic Interventions On Needs of People with Disabilities, Albania” which have started in September 2017.

***Short description of project: “INCLUSION - Installing, Networking & Capacity Building through Legal counselling and Unified Strategic Interventions On Needs of People with Disabilities, Albania”.***

**The aim of the project** is to further provide services for PwD with a new focus on mediating PwD to public or private employers. The method of peer counseling will further be developed with the aim to become a new community-based services. Additional the implementation of the National Action Plan (2016 – 2020) will actively be supported. Within the project activities monitoring issues of the National Action Plan will be supported and an active participation in different groups (Focal groups) is planned. Thus cooperation with public authorities and other NGOs will be strengthened further.

**The project overall objective** is "To contribute to the implementation of the **Albanian National Action Plan 2016-2020** for people with disabilities (PwD), by **promoting and monitoring** the rights of PwD in a comprehensive, continuous and sustainable way and boosting self-representation."

**The specific objective** of the project aimed to improve the quality of live and increased self-representation for People with Disabilities (PwD) in Albania (Shkodra and Lezha) as well as increased knowledge of and stronger commitment to the National Action Plan’s goals and actions.

The targeted beneficiaries are people with disabilities in the three project targeted districts, Lezha, Lac and Vau i Dejes.

**PROJECT RESULTS**

**R1.** **PwD** in 3 regions of Albania have improved access to social services and benefited from **social** and **legal counseling** and **mediation** to **employers** and **administrations**.

**R2.** **Participation** and **self-representation** of PwD is boosted through higher involvement of PwD (peers) in the field of **counselling**, establishing **autonomous structures** for self-representation and promoting **local partnerships** between public and non-public entities.

**R3.** Authorities (Regional, national) Civil Society Organizations and individuals are **aware on goals** and planned activities of **the National Action Plan (2016-2010**) on PwD and **boosted their fulfillment.**

**R4.** Project staff and PwD are actively involved in steering and executing bodies of the National Action Plan (National Disability Council, Focal Points) and engaged in monitoring issues.

*Annex: Log frame, Project description*

**Purpose**

The purpose of the evaluation is to verify the achievement of the aims set out in the project description and to analyse the effects of the project.

The evaluation will primarily provide insights which will support the future development of social services for People with Disabilities in Albania (learning). Secondly it will be controlled if the proposed results were achieved in an efficient way (accountability).

**Objective**

The main objective of the evaluation is to assess the impact of the project on 3 levels:

* Impact at individual level
* Impact at institutional level
* Impact at society/community level

And present results (output, outcome), conclusions, lessons learnt and recommendations.

Under the relevant OECD DAC evaluation criteria (relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability) the evaluation/review team has to analyse the following points but only if the information is not yet available from previous evaluations/reviews:

* The design and coherence of the project/programme including the design of the log frame matrix/programme theory and present the underlying theory of change and its assumptions.
* The extent to which the project/programme has already achieved its objectives and results or is likely to achieve them, including the extent to which the life of the project/programme beneficiaries (women, men, girls, boys) has already been improved. Also, the extent to which supported institutions have already benefitted people.
* **The form for the results-assessment needs to be filled in by the evaluator as part of the reporting requirement. This is relevant for end term and mid-term evaluations/reviews.**
* The strengths and weaknesses in terms of planning, management, implementation and monitoring **(Question may be more applicable at mid-term)**
* The extent to which cross-cutting issues (gender and environment mainstreaming) were applied.

**Subject and Focus**

The topic of evaluation is to analyse the impact of the project activities (see below). The evaluation will take place at the areas of intervention Lezha, Lac and Vau i Dejes.

**Specific Evaluation Questions**[[2]](#footnote-3)

***Relevance***

To what extent are the objectives of the project/programme still valid for the partner country, the partner organization and the beneficiaries?

Are the expected results/outputs of the project/programme consistent with the outcome, immediate impact and overall goal/impact (as part of the analysis of the log frame matrix/programme theory and the presentation of the theory of change and its underlying assumptions)?

***Effectiveness***

* To what extent has the project/programme achieved its outcome(s).
* To what extent has the project/programme already achieved its expected results/outputs?
* What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the outcome(s)/expected results/outputs?
* Was the project/programme managed as planned? If not, what issues occurred and why?
* To what extent have all project/programme stakeholders collaborated as planned?
* If applicable, did the project/programme contribute to capacity building as planned?
* To what extent was gender mainstreaming included in the project/programme and to what extent were recommendations from the ADA gender-assessment considered and implemented?
* To what extent was environmental mainstreaming included in the project/programme and to what extent were recommendations from the ADA environment-assessment considered and implemented?
* To what extent were the social standards monitored by relevant partners? Have any issues emerged, if so which ones and why?

***Efficiency***

Was the project/programme implemented in the most efficient way (time, personnel resources)? Have any issues emerged, if so which ones and why?

***Impact***

The evaluation should provide information on the level of impact achieved on 3 levels:

* Impact at individual level
* Impact at institutional level
* Impact at society/community level

Key questions for the evaluation have been elaborated in a participative way.

**The key questions for the evaluation of impact at individual level:**

* Were the inputs and instruments/strategies identified, and were they realistic, appropriate and adequate to ensure the social inclusion of PwD in 3 project regions?
* What has changed for PwD so far in terms of self-determined live, participation and social inclusion?
* What has improved in terms of quality of life for PwD in 3 project regions related to: emotional well-being; physical well-being; interpersonal relationships; personal development and rights.
* How has changed the familiar environment during the project life? Caregivers and parents are aware on the rights of PwD and supporting the social inclusion process?

**The key questions for the evaluation of Impact at institutional level**:

* Local administration is aware about existing physical and environmental barriers, which prohibit the inclusion of PwD?
* Municipality/Local administration is planning budgeting and delivering of social care services in community for PwD? How sensitive are issues related to social inclusion of PwD for local administration?
* Are local authorities more accountable in front of PwD demands and needs? Which might be future interventions/projects to be carried out in order to fill in the gaps with reflection on effectiveness of planning-budgeting and delivering of services for PwD?

**The key questions for the evaluation of Impact at society/community level:**

* Are PwD more visible in community? Is the society accepting and approaching with dignity PwD?
* Are PwD considered as equal members of community by citizens? Have citizens changed behaviours and attitudes toward PwD?
* Is the community or society at all, more accountable and responsible related to the rights of PwD?
* Is the community giving the proper spaces and equal chances to PwD to be socially included?

**The key questions for the interview with ADA representative in Tirana:**

* To what extent has the project archived his expected results/outputs, through all activities implemented?
* Have been the managerial staff efficient of your donations and resources?
* Through your monitoring process, what you have identified as a strengthening and weak point of our implementing process?
* Which is your impact of peer counsellors, as newness in Albania?
* How do you feel about the visibility, is it in your expectations?
* Which are the major changes through your interventions at the national level in the disability field?

**Questions related to peer counselling:**

* How and how much are the counsellors involved?
* Are peer counsellors prepared to provide counselling?
* Which are the main challenges?
* How can the service be improved?
* How is going the peer counselling curricula?

***Sustainability***

* To what extent will the benefits of the project/programme continue after the withdrawal of the donor?
* If the project/programme continues will it be integrated in local structures and/or funded by other sources?
* What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project/programme?
* If applicable, what needs to be done and/or improved to ensure sustainability?

**Approach and Methods**

The evaluation/review consists of several phases:

Contract and Kick-off meeting: Contract is signed and a discussion of the assignment takes place. First documents, including available data, are provided to the evaluation team.

Desk Study: The evaluation/review team studies all necessary project/programme documents; re-construct and analyse the intervention logic/programme theory and theory of change and its assumptions. Existing data needs to be analysed and interpreted.

Data triangulation and quality control are very important and need to be discussed in the inception report.

The field trip will only take place upon official approval of the inception report by the contractor.

Field-phase: Data needs to be gathered, analysed and interpreted. It is expected that the evaluation will include quantitative and qualitative data disaggregated by gender.

Final Report: Submission of final report, **see reporting requirements under point 8.**

For the different phases it is expected that data and information will be obtained through different methods such as: analysis of documents, structured interviews, semi-structured interviews face-to face or by phone, group discussions, online-survey (if applicable), others.

All data collected needs to disaggregate by gender.

It is expected that the evaluation/review team will present concrete recommendations which are addressed to the specific stakeholders.

It is currently estimated that 10% to 20 % of beneficiaries and 7-10 stakeholder will be interviewed in the project areas (structured interviews and surveys).

The Guidelines for Project and Programme Evaluations developed by the Austrian Development Agency need to be considered throughout the entire evaluation process.

Also see: <http://www.entwicklung.at/fileadmin/user_upload/Dokumente/Evaluierung/Evaluierungs_Leitfaeden/EN_Leitfaden_Evaluierung.pdf>

**Timetable**

Optional: A total of **20 working days** is currently estimated for this assignment.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Action | Responsible | Date |
| Submission of bid (electronically) | Contractor |  |
| Contract signed and documents provided | Contract signed between 20working days and consultant |  |
| Kick-Off meeting | Meeting between contractor and consultant |  |
| Desk Study | Consultant |  |
| First interviews | Consultant |  |
| Field Visit, interviews etc. and feedback workshop | Consultant |  |
| Interviews with ADA representatives in Tirana | Project Manager and consultant |  |
| Submission of final evaluation report (hard copy and electronic copy) to contractor | Consultant |  |

**Key qualifications of evaluator**

* Academic degree
* A minimum of three years’ experience and expertise in the field/sector of evaluation and/or social policy and/or work with people with disabilities
* Evaluator has conducted at least three evaluations in the last five years ideally in the relevant field
* Experience in project cycle management
* Experience in social science methods
* Excellent oral and written English skills (state other language too, if applicable)
* Sound MS Office and IT skills

**The consultants must not have been involved in the design, implementation or monitoring of this project/programme.**

**Reports**

The consultants will submit the following reports:

* The final evaluation report (25-30 pages without annexes), the final executive summary **and the results-assessment form (part of the reporting requirement)**
* The report needs to be written in English.
* The executive summary should summarize key findings and recommendations (three to five pages) and needs to be submitted as part of the final report.

The quality of the reports will be judged according to the following criteria:

* Is the results-matrix format part of the report?
* Does the report contain a comprehensive and clear executive summary?
* Were the Terms of Reference fulfilled and is this reflected in the report?
* Is the report structured according to the OECD/DAC criteria?
* Are all evaluation questions answered?
* Are the methods and processes of the evaluation sufficiently documented in the evaluation report?
* Does the report describe and assess the intervention logic (e.g. log frame, program theory) and present/analyze a theory of change and its underlying assumptions?
* Are cross-cutting issues analyzed in the report?
* Are the conclusions and recommendations based on findings and are they clearly stated in the report?
* Does the report clearly differentiate between conclusions, lessons learnt and recommendations?
* Are the recommendations realistic and is it clearly expressed to whom the recommendations are addressed to?
* Were the most significant stakeholders involved consulted?
* Does the report present the information contained in a presentable and clearly arranged form?
* Is the report free from spelling mistakes and unclear linguistic formulations?
* Can the report be distributed in the delivered form?

**Co-Ordination/Responsibility**

Ms. Joana Luka Caritas Albania will be the contact person for this evaluation/review.

Contact details:

Mob:           [++ 355 69](tel:%2B%2B%20355%2068%20603%205986) 70 41 311

Tel:             ++ 355 (04) 22 300 88

Fax:             ++ 355 (04) 22 343 27

Email: [j.luka@caritasalbania.org](mailto:j.luka@caritasalbania.org)

Skype:       lukajoana

Address: Rr. “Don Bosko“ Nr 4, Tirana, Albania

Telephone: 00355 4 23 00 88

E-mail: [caritasalbania@caritas.icc-al.org](mailto:caritasalbania@caritas.icc-al.org)

**Annexes:**

Results-Assessment Form, to be filled in by the evaluation team

Others can be included

**Annex 1: Results-Assessment Form Final Project Evaluations/Reviews**

**This form has to be filled in electronically by the evaluator/reviewer. No evaluation report will be accepted without this form. The form has to be included at the beginning of the evaluation/review report.**

|  |
| --- |
| Title of project/programme (please, spell out): |
| Contract Period of project/programme: |
| ADC number of project/programme: |
| Name of project/programme partner: |
| Country and Region of project/programme : |
| Budget of this project/programme: |
| Name of evaluation company (spell out) and names of evaluators: |
| Date of completion of evaluation/review: |
| Please tick appropriate box:  Evaluation/review managed by ADA/ADC Coordination Office  Evaluation managed by project partner: |
| Please tick appropriate box:  a) Mid-Term Evaluation b) Final Evaluation c) Mid-Term Review d) Final Review  Others: please, specify: |
| **Project Outcome *(Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix):*** |
| **For Final Evaluation/Review[[3]](#footnote-4): Project Outcome: To what extent has the project already achieved its outcome(s) according to the Logframe Matrix? Please, tick appropriate box**  Outcome(s) was/were:   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Fully achieved: | Almost achieved: | Partially achieved: | Not achieved: |   **Please, also explain your assessment: What exactly was achieved and why? If not achieved, why not?** (Please, consider description of outcome and relevant indicators) |
| **Project Outputs: To what extent has the project already achieved its outputs[[4]](#footnote-5) according to the Logframe Matrix? Please, tick appropriate boxes**  **Output 1 *(Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix):***  Output was:   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Fully achieved: | Almost achieved: | Partially achieved: | Not achieved: |   **Please, explain your assessment:** (Please, consider description of output and relevant indicators)  **Output 2 *(Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix)*:**  Output 2 was:   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Fully achieved: | Almost achieved: | Partially achieved: | Not achieved: |   **Please, explain your assessment:** (Please, consider description of output and relevant indicators)  **Output 3 *(Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix):***  Output 3 was:   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Fully achieved: | Almost achieved: | Partially achieved: | Not achieved: |   **Please, explain your assessment:** (Please, consider description of output and relevant indicators)  **In case there are more than three Outputs please, state as above.** |
| **Impact/Beneficiaries:**  How many women, men, girls, boys and people in total have already benefited from this project directly and indirectly? Please, explain  What exactly has already changed in the lives of women, men, girls, boys and/or institutions from this project? Please, explain:  Which positive and/or negative effects/impacts in terms of gender can be possibly be attributed to the project? Please, explain:  If applicable, which institutions have benefitted from this project/programme and how? |
| **Mainstreaming cross-cutting issues:**  **Gender:** To what extent was gender mainstreaming included in the project? To what extent were the recommendations - if any- from the ADA internal gender-assessment considered and implemented?  **Environment:** To what extent was environmental mainstreaming included in the project? To what extent were the recommendations - if any- from the ADA internal environment-assessment considered and implemented?  Which positive and/or negative effects/impacts in terms of environment can be possibly be attributed to the project? Please, explain  **Social Standards:** To what extent were the social standards monitored by relevant partners? Have any issues emerged? Please, explain |
| **Overall/Other Comments:** |

1. Financed by Austrian Development Agency [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. For a review, please, focus your questions, also see the definition. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Please, only fill in in case this is a final project evaluation/review. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. In case there are more than three outputs, please, add them. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)