IDEAL Activity Final Evaluation
CONSULTANT SCOPE OF WORK

Hiring Organization: Save the Children
Location: Washington, DC
.

Background & Context

ACTIVITY TO BE EVALUATED:

The Implementer-Led Design, Evidence, Analysis and Learning (IDEAL) is an activity funded by USAID's Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance (BHA) that works to support the United States Government's goal of improving food and nutrition security among the world's most vulnerable households and communities. IDEAL addresses knowledge and capacity gaps expressed by the food and nutrition security implementing community to support them in the design and implementation of effective emergency and non-emergency food security activities.

IDEAL has three strategic objectives, which were updated in response to the Mid-Term Evaluation:

1. IPs Increase Use of Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) Practices for Decision Making;
2. IPs Increase Use of Adaptive Management Practices; and
3. IPs Increase Use of Humanitarian, Development, and Peace (HDP) Coherent Programming.

IDEAL contributes to improved quality and effectiveness of emergency and non-emergency food security activities, by providing learning opportunities and resources for implementers and by strengthening the dialogue between USAID and implementers to enhance guidelines. To address knowledge and capacity gaps in these technical areas, IDEAL connects with the implementing partners (IPs) through six pathways: (i) capacity strengthening (ii) peer-to-peer consultative learning, (iii) small grants (iv) stakeholder consultations and (v) knowledge sharing events, and (vi) the food security and nutrition network (FSN).

These pathways enable IPs to actively identify their own institutional strengths and capacity needs, and link with networks and resources so that emergency and development activities can be more evidence driven, more effectively implemented and more sustainable in impact.

IDEAL is led by Save the Children and implemented by a consortium[1] that includes Mercy Corps and TANGO International and supported by technical assistance contractor Acute Incite. Team leads and key technical advisors from the consortium make up IDEAL's Senior Management Team (SMT). A Program Advisory Committee (PAC), comprising IDEAL's SMT and key stakeholders from BHA and the IP community provide strategic guidance and executive support to IDEAL's leadership.

This Statement of Work (SoW) provides the framework for the final evaluation consultant. The purpose of the final evaluation is to assess the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness, sustainability, and performance of the IDEAL Activity. The evaluation will inform IDEAL and USAID/BHA of their ability to execute during the award and will help USAID with future solicitations.

The timeframe for the evaluation will be March – July 2024.

---

[1] The Kaizen Company was a consortium member until 2022.

Evaluation Design and Methods

OVERALL APPROACH

The final evaluation will be developed in line with the guidance and timelines in this SOW. The evaluation approach should ensure that the broad diversity of IDEAL stakeholders is reflected in the findings. Stakeholders include: Mission-based and HQ-based staff in BHA, implementing partners of BHA-funded food security activities, FSN Network participants, and the broader global food security community. Efforts should be made to also identify stakeholders who have engaged with IDEAL across the project's life. The selected Evaluation Consultants, along with the IDEAL Evaluation focal points, and the IDEAL SMT will jointly review the approach and scope of the evaluation, and finalize the key evaluation questions, overall approach, deliverables, and timelines. IDEAL's BHA management team will be consulted at key points in the process and provide feedback on the scope.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology will include a detailed review of existing sources of data on the IDEAL activity[2] as well as primary qualitative research with IDEAL stakeholders. The Evaluation Team will propose a detailed methodology aligned with IDEAL's Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and share this with IDEAL's management for approval prior to data collection. Findings from the desk review will inform the methods and tools utilized for primary qualitative data collection.

Objectives of the Evaluation

The specific objective for this Evaluation is to respond to the following evaluation questions:

EVALUATION QUESTIONS:

Relevance:
To what extent did IDEAL identify and meet the needs of the targeted stakeholders (BHA and IPs)?

Effectiveness:
To what extent did IDEAL meet its objectives:

> (1) IPs Increase Use of Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) Practices for Decision Making;

> (2) IPs Increase Use of Adaptive Management Practices; and

> (3) IPs Increase Use of Humanitarian, Development, and Peace (HDP) Coherent Programming.

To what extent did IDEAL improve practices on the part of IPs, improve the quality of IP's work, and improve coordination and collaboration among food security stakeholders?

Performance and efficiency:
What did IDEAL achieve, how many people were reached, what was the level of satisfaction from those who interacted with IDEAL, and how did this contribute to the IDEAL activity's outcomes?

What adaptations did IDEAL make in light of changing conditions, and what was their effect on IDEAL's performance?

Consider the following examples:

---

[2] **Sources of existing activity information include:** Original activity proposal; Mid-term Evaluation and management response; IDEAL products and deliverables (complete and incomplete); Year 1-5 Work Plans; Quarterly reports and dashboards to date; Year 1-5 Annual Reports; Monitoring and Evaluation Plans; Sustainability Plan; IDEAL Client Relationship Management Database; Results Framework; Data analytics from FSN Network website and YouTube; Activity/event/engagement evaluations, feedback, and after-action reviews; Pause & Reflect session documentation; Other internal and external documents as available or requested

- *COVID-19*
- *FFP/OFDA merger*
- *Changing contexts*
- *Responding to changed needs from IP community*
- *Others?*

Sustainability:

Which products, processes, and relationships established by/through IDEAL are likely to continue to have a sustainable impact (in terms of motivation, capacity, resources and linkages) beyond the grant period and which will receive continued support?

Consider the following examples:
- *E-learning opportunities*
- *Peer to peer community handovers*
- *Peer to peer learning and capacity strengthening*
- *FSN Network and document library*
- *Small grants and research products*
- *Changed practices*

IDEAL will work with the selected consultants to review and finalize the evaluation questions and define other key information that will be included in the evaluation.

Timeline, Activities, and Deliverables

Timeframe	Activity	Deliverable
March 1 – April 1	Inception phase, including determining team composition and member roles, develop detailed work plan for entire period Begin desk review of activity documents and preliminary key informant interviews (KIIs) to inform the research protocol	**Inception report** including: • Brief description of rationale and criteria used to establish team composition and roles • Detailed evaluation research protocol • Detailed workplan
March 1 – July 1	Biweekly Progress Report	Bi-weekly **progress report** (<2 pages) to IDEAL leadership, included as an annex in the final report
March 15 – May 1	Desk review	Review of activity documents and preliminary key informant interviews (KIIs) to inform the research protocol. Internal reporting on results of the desk review in regular update.
March 15 – June 1	Data collection, analysis, interpretation	**Presentation slide deck** of preliminary results (to IDEAL

		leadership and Activity BHA AOR) on key themes.
June 1	Draft final evaluation report writing	**Draft Final Evaluation Report**
June 1 – July 31	Final evaluation report writing and presentations	**Review, feedback, report and slide deck finalization, presentation of results** to IDEAL, IDEAL Consortium and BHA staff

Evaluation Report Content

The report will include:
- A concise Executive Summary
- Findings of the Evaluation Team within the themes indicated in the Evaluation Question
- Conclusions that present the broader applicability of the findings
- Recommendations, which will be a list of prioritized, clear, and actionable recommendations. These should be geared to informing the design and implementation of similar future initiatives. They should address issues to the benefit of the IDEAL management, BHA and its implementing partners and the global food security community.

Deliverables:

Inception report: This inception report will detail the evaluation process, finalize the agreed research questions, and finalize a timeline for the evaluation. The inception report will not exceed 10 pages.

Regular communication: The success of this evaluation will depend upon close coordination, information sharing, and regular updates. Accordingly, as a minimum requirement the IDEAL team asks that the consulting team prepare a very brief bi-weekly update of progress. This will be annexed in the final deliverable.

Presentation Slide Deck: Key findings to be shared as a slide deck for presentation to the final evaluation stakeholders.

Draft report: The draft report will be a complete draft of the final evaluation including all sections: Executive summary (stand-alone brief), key findings addressing the research questions, conclusions, and all annexes. This will be in final form and ready for review by IDEAL's SMT and BHA focal points. The draft report will not exceed 40 pages.

Final report: Incorporating comments, suggestions, and guidance after the review of the submitted draft report, the evaluation team will finalize a document that meets the requirements of the evaluation SOW and relevant USAID final evaluation guidelines. The final evaluation will be a clear, concise, evaluation of IDEAL, including a brief executive summary that can function as a stand-alone document. The final report will not exceed 40 pages excluding Annexes.

Presentation to IDEAL and BHA: In addition to the final evaluation brief, the consultants will prepare a presentation of the main findings that will be shared with IDEAL and separately shared with BHA to maximize the effectiveness of the final report.

Consultant Competencies

- Hands on experience leading evaluations of global support mechanisms for international development and emergency response activities
- Experience working on, implementing, and/or evaluating a global support mechanism for USAID/BHA
- Significant experience with evaluating USAID Food for Peace and/or USAID BHA food security programming
- Minimum of 5 years' organizational experience with evaluation design, implementation, and analysis of development and emergency programs, including those focused on providing, technical assistance, capacity building and coordination, etc.
- Technical expertise of evaluation methods, including both qualitative and quantitative approaches
- Experience with leading evaluations across multiple geographic areas, languages, and cultures including culturally sensitive research methods

Funding and Logistical Support

All funding and logistical support for the IDEAL final evaluation will be provided through IDEAL. Activities that will be covered include payment of team members; support for all expenses related to the evaluation; logistical support and limited distribution of the draft and final reports. A total of 80 full-time days' level of effort is expected for this evaluation.

Proposal Requirements

Total proposal must be less than 10 pages, excluding annexes/attachments.

Proposal must include the following:
- Description of the individual(s) and/or firm and their relevant experience
- Proposed approach (not a full methodology) and timeline
- Proposed team structure (and CVs of all team members attached)
- Budget (including a breakdown of expected LOE and cost per deliverable)

Please submit complete proposals to IDEAL_Activity@savechildren.org with the subject "*IDEAL Final Evaluation Proposal*" by January 19, 2024.