

Evaluation terms of reference: Mid-term evaluation of Integrity Action's Sida grant

Introduction

Integrity Action's goal is for societies in which all citizens can – and do – successfully demand integrity from the institutions they rely on.

Integrity Action is currently supported by a grant from the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida), which runs from Oct 2020 to Sep 2024. As part of this grant, Sida and Integrity Action are commissioning an independent mid-term evaluation to assess progress towards objectives and highlight important lessons and course corrections to influence the remainder of the grant support period.

The total available budget is £35,000 and we are aiming for the evaluation to commence in September 2022, and conclude in February 2023. The deadline for submitting proposals is 12th May 2022.

BACKGROUND	2
EVALUATION QUESTIONS AND PURPOSE	3
EVALUATION APPROACH, PRINCIPLES, AND RISKS	3
EXISTING DATA	4
BUDGET AND DELIVERABLES	5
APPLICATION DETAILS	6
ANNEX	7

Background and evaluation object

Integrity Action is a charity registered in England and Wales, and based in London. We help citizens to monitor the delivery of essential services, infrastructure, and development projects – and to solve the problems they find. We do this by partnering with a range of organisations in different countries, by producing research, learning, data and tools that can assist people pursuing similar goals, and by supporting and influencing organisations and institutions so that they are more inclusive and accountable to citizens.

Sida currently supports Integrity Action to implement its organisational strategy. This means Sida's four-year grant is not connected to a specific intervention or programme, but instead to Integrity Action's overall pursuit of its strategic objectives. Sida's support for Integrity Action is part of its [2018-22 strategy](#), and is linked to its objective "Reduced corruption and increased transparency and accountability".

Since 2021, Integrity Action has adopted an adaptive approach to its strategy, allowing it to adjust its approach to a changing context while keeping core elements of the strategy consistent. In practice, this means that each year the organisation has the opportunity to propose changes to the strategic objectives, with justification, which are then approved by the board of trustees.

The current strategic objectives, approved by the board in June 2021, are:

By 2023 Integrity Action will be at the forefront of demonstrating the transformational value of citizen-centred accountability (CCA) to sustainable development.

1. ACHIEVE

Achieve results for citizens that maximise quality, durability and inclusivity

We will:

- Work with partners to develop evidence driven, contextualised pathways for sustained and inclusive citizen-centred accountability¹
- Enable even the most marginalised citizens to act as monitors and benefit from monitoring
- Incentivise institutions to fix at least 50% of problems identified by citizens

2. AMPLIFY

Collaborate to amplify results, fuel further innovation and embed citizen-centred accountability

We will:

¹ We use the term citizen-centred accountability to refer to practices or approaches in which citizens provide feedback on projects and services they are entitled to and ultimately hold them to account based on the promises they make.

- Work with partners to sustain and scale up CCA approaches, testing them as we go and evidencing results
- Take learning and insights from collaborations, feed into future R&D, and share widely to stimulate improved CCA practice globally
- Be agile with tech developments to ensure the efficiency, accessibility and local adoption of tools

3. CONVINCING

Build a robust case for citizen-centred accountability to inspire its mainstreaming

- Lead on evidencing the economic, environmental and social case for citizen-centred accountability
- Build or support coalitions to call for the mainstreaming of citizen-centred accountability at the global level and within countries
- Convince influencers and institutions to demand citizen-centred accountability

Integrity Action currently tracks progress towards these objectives via a series of indicators (see Annex), and reports on these to Sida annually within a larger narrative report. Integrity Action's annual reports (available [here](#)) also record progress towards these objectives.

The primary activities Integrity Action carries out, with partners, in order to achieve these objectives are:

- Implementation of programmes in which citizens are enabled to monitor essential services and projects, generate evidence on their performance, and work constructively with duty-bearers to secure project/service improvements (see current/recent initiatives [here](#));
- Working with CSOs, service providers, development agencies and/or government institutions to develop or improve feedback and accountability mechanisms and processes;
- Sharing data and learning, as well as commissioned research, to help address important questions that preoccupy fields including transparency and accountability, and open government;
- Taking part in discussions, events, conferences to share learning and insights, support good practice, promote citizen-centred accountability, and encourage uptake of approaches like Integrity Action's.

The primary "target groups" and stakeholders that Integrity Action works with, in order to achieve these objectives, are:

- Civil society organisations (local, national and international) that have an overlapping goal of promoting integrity in the delivery of projects and services for citizens
- Citizens who take part in programmes that Integrity Action is involved in (though Integrity Action does not typically have direct relationships with those citizens – the relationship is usually with a civil society organisation based in the same location and partnering with Integrity Action)
- Researchers and practitioners in related fields (such as civic participation, social accountability, civic tech, open government)

- Figures within government who are trying to boost citizen participation and citizen-centred accountability
- Funders, including statutory funders and international foundations

There is further background on Integrity Action at our [website](#), including our [theory of change](#).

Evaluation questions and purpose

The questions that this evaluation needs to address are as follows:

1. What progress has Integrity Action made towards its strategic objectives, and to what extent is Integrity Action on course to achieve them by Sep 2024?
2. What relationships exist between progress achieved and activities carried out by Integrity Action? In particular, what contributions towards strategic progress have been made by:
 - a. "in-country added value", i.e. results achieved through Integrity Action's programmes and partnerships in specific countries²;
 - b. "global added value", i.e. results achieved on a wider scale than "in-country added value", such as through promotion of Integrity Action's methodology and research³?
3. Are Integrity Action's strategic objectives and specific activities appropriate in relation to the needs of its target groups? What should it stop, start, continue, or do differently?
4. To what extent is Integrity Action making, and perceived to be making, a positive, unique and/or complementary contribution to the fields it is connected to? Is it duplicating existing efforts, and if so where?

The findings of this evaluation will be used to improve Integrity Action's approach to achieving its strategic objectives and overall goal, and may be incorporated in future modifications or refinements of the objectives as part of our adaptive strategy approach. Findings will also be provided to Sida, for accountability and learning purposes. As well as this we will share the evaluation with our board, partners, and wider network.

Evaluation approach, principles, and risks

The evaluation questions above draw on the [OECD DAC evaluation criteria](#). In particular, Q1-2 relate to effectiveness and impact; Q3 relates to relevance; and Q4 relates to coherence with respect to work taking place in related fields. Sustainability is referenced within the strategic objectives themselves (for example, "durable" results), so this issue may also be addressed through these questions.

Integrity Action does not have a preferred methodology for this evaluation, although due to the nature of the questions we expect the most appropriate approaches to be theory-based. Applicants are free

² While this evaluation does not focus on specific programmes, results achieved through specific programmes may be important in relation to strategic progress.

³ Sida's 2018-22 strategy refers to "global added value" as follows: "The strategy primarily covers activities that have a global added value, of which cannot be attributed to a particular continent, region or country."

to propose any approaches provided they adhere to our *PICTURE* principles on quality evidence, appropriate practice, and responsible use (below).

The evaluation could involve data collection from one or more countries in which Integrity Action has been active during the Sida grant period, and this could be done via researchers based within these countries and/or travel to these countries. However, applicants are asked to remain mindful of budget limitations.

The countries where Integrity Action has had active partnerships since Oct 2020 are as follows:

- Kenya
- Tanzania
- Uganda
- Madagascar
- DR Congo (South Kivu)
- Ghana
- Nepal
- Palestine
- Afghanistan

Please note that Integrity Action only has a physical presence in the UK, and has worked with partner organisations in the above countries to implement programmes.

As mentioned above, Integrity Action understands *quality evidence* through its *PICTURE* principles, defining it as that which is:

1. **Precise.** Claims are not generalised, but are specific about their context and have findings disaggregated according to relevant social and demographic differences.
2. **Inclusive.** The perspectives of communities and other stakeholders are clearly represented in all evidence, with space given to divergent views.
3. **Credible.** The data and methodology accurately measures what it is intended to measure, with sample size and composition being in proportion to the conclusions sought.
4. **Triangulated.** Data is collected consistently from multiple sources, with tools to capture both quantitative and qualitative information.
5. **Useable.** Evidence is fit for purpose and responds to users' needs and timelines, with no data being collected unless there is a clear purpose or commitment to using it.
6. **Results-focused.** Evidence clearly demonstrates what (if any) changes have happened, and explores our contribution to these alongside the roles of other actors and factors.
7. **Ethically collected, analysed and used.** Quality evidence processes are ones that are *appropriate* and *responsible*, and that focus on improving the lives of participants.

As per the *E* of *PICTURE*, we view collection, analysis and use of quality evidence as an ethical issue, and the above principles set the framework for how we think about evaluation ethics. '*Appropriate*' and '*responsible*' practices around evidence are further defined in the Annex of this document. Our assessment framework for translating these principles into measurable criteria is available on request.

In addition to the above principles, the Annex also includes the ethical commitments that Integrity Action makes and to which successful candidates would be expected to commit. However, we understand that ethical practice can require more fluidity than just procedural compliance, and emergent issues are to be identified as they arise and will be managed by Integrity Action. Our policies on safeguarding and data protection are available at integrityaction.org/about/governance, and would be applied.

The COVID-19 pandemic will present ongoing challenges to any in-person data collection and applicants should explain how they plan to mitigate this where applicable.

Existing data

Integrity Action has commissioned multiple evaluations in recent years and evaluators will be welcome to draw on these. They include:

- An evaluation of the [SHINE programme](#), which supported secondary school students in five countries to promote integrity in their schools through citizen-led monitoring (published in 2022)
- An evaluation of the VOICE programme, which worked with citizens in Kwale, Kenya to monitor and promote accountability of public projects and services (soon to be completed)
- The [mid-term evaluation of Integrity Action's previous Sida grant](#) (published in 2019).

Evaluators will also be welcome to draw on data collected through our programmes by both Integrity Action and its partners, including case studies, quotes, survey results, data from our citizen monitoring application [DevelopmentCheck](#), operational records and communications trackers.

Budget and deliverables

The available budget for this assignment is £35,000. This is inclusive of all costs, including any professional fees, international travel, visas, in-country costs (including interpreters where appropriate), translation and printing of any materials, and all relevant taxes.

We expect the successful applicants to deliver:

- An inception report, at the end of the inception period
- A final evaluation report
- A brief, engaging evaluation summary document (as visual as possible, eg with icons/infographics)

The assignment should be carried out between September 2022 and February 2023, with the final output to be submitted by 20th February 2023.

Payment will be made in instalments, according to the following schedule:

1. 25% on approval of the inception report
2. 50% on presentation of the draft output and findings

3. 25% on approval of the final outputs

The following outline indicates when key milestones are expected (this is approximate and subject to revision).

Output / Activity	Date expected
Closing date for proposals	12 May 2022
Appointment of successful candidate	6 June 2022
Evaluation commences	5 Sep 2022
Inception report drafted and shared with Integrity Action	10 Oct 2022
Final inception report approved by Integrity Action	17 Oct 2022
Draft evaluation report submitted	30 Jan 2023
Final evaluation outputs submitted and approved	20 Feb 2023

Application details

Given the scope of work and time available, we anticipate that the successful applicant would involve a team; however, we do not rule out applications from individuals if they have a plan for addressing all the evaluation questions in the time available.

The following skills and experiences are essential criteria for applicants:

- Strong understanding of appropriate data collection methods, their benefits and limitations
- Experience in conducting and/or managing similar or comparable assignments
- Excellent facilitation and communication skills
- Ability to present inputs and findings in a clear, concise format while adding insights

Knowledge of the fields in which Integrity Action works would be beneficial (these include civic participation, open government, anti-corruption, civic tech). Applicants should have appropriate levels of both professional indemnity insurance and public liability insurance.

Interested parties should submit a proposal to Integrity Action, to include:

- A brief cover letter (no more than two pages) demonstrating how you or your team meets the essential criteria above
- An outline of your proposed methodology, including explanation of why it is suitable for this evaluation as well as any associated risks and proposed mitigations. This should be no more than three pages
- A draft work plan and summary budget. Please include the daily rates of all individuals involved and what role they each play within the team (if applicable)
- CVs for members of the team, with references available to be contacted



- Maximum two examples of previous work that demonstrates skills or experiences relevant to this assignment. These may be provided as links, or if unpublished then they may be attached and will be reviewed in confidence

Please send your complete proposals to derek.thorne@integrityaction.org by the deadline in the table above. Applications will be assessed against the relevance and appropriateness of their proposed approach to the evaluation questions and scope (55%), expertise and experience of the team (35%), and quality/coherence of the proposal's overall structure and use of budget (10%). Consideration will also be given to a proposal's value for money.

Please note that we will not be able to give feedback on unsuccessful applications.

Annex 1: Responsible use, appropriate practices, and Integrity Action's ethical commitments

Integrity Action's 'PICTURE' principles state that all data must be collected, analysed, and used *appropriately and responsibly*.

Appropriate practices mean that:

Our data is collected and quality-assured

- With the active and informed participation of affected communities, including those at risk of exclusion
- By teams with appropriate skills and characteristics to capture the voices of different groups
- Using justifiable methodologies, relevant to the purpose and context
- Using reliable tools, neutrally worded, that produce consistent and meaningful results
- In alignment with existing programme management and organisational needs, capacities, and timelines

Our data is analysed and reviewed

- Collectively, through ongoing dialogue with participants and other stakeholders to sense-check and validate conclusions
- Sensitively, with understanding of the local power dynamics and their importance
- Systematically, with clear logical links between data collected and conclusions reached
- Transparently, so that methods are protected from intended or unintended bias
- In comparison to other relevant data sources, such as through use of baselines to show whether a change has occurred

Responsible use means that:

Our evidence is presented and used

- In accordance with what was communicated and agreed with participants
- In accessible formats for all appropriate audiences, including consideration of language and literacy. One piece of evidence may need to be shared in multiple formats
- With acknowledgment given to everyone who contributed significantly (unless anonymity was requested), and with references provided for all sources used
- Without assumptions, especially regarding any unidentified changes or causal links between identified changes and the programme
- With aggregation of people avoided wherever possible, and with real case studies presenting the real stories of real individuals

Communication of our evidence is open about

- The tools and methodologies used to collect and analyse data, and any associated limitations
- The questions and audiences that drove the collection and analysis activity, and how the evidence responds to these needs

- The results and changes identified by the analysis, whether intended or unintended, negative or positive
- The sources of quotes or judgements, with any conflicting perspectives clearly presented and explored⁴
- The independence, or otherwise, of everyone involved in data collection, analysis and presentation; including explanation and justification of any potential bias

Integrity Action makes the further following commitments to ethical research and evaluation:

- We will respect the dignity, privacy, and agency of all who contribute to, or are affected by, our research. We will work within all international human rights conventions and covenants to which the UK is a signatory, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, as well as all relevant local and national laws.
- We will recognise the burdens and costs for all stakeholders in participating in our research, and will only conduct such activities when the benefits can reasonably be expected to outweigh the risks. This includes aiming for evidence of a sufficiently high quality that it can be used for its intended purpose.
- We will pursue objectivity, while recognising that all stakeholders will bring their own agendas. We will not use tools or methods designed to produce misleading results or misrepresent findings, and our communication of evidence will be clear about the roles of authors and participants. We will encourage and enable all stakeholders to follow appropriate procedures if they feel under pressure to provide inaccurate results.
- We will take reasonable precautions to ensure our design and application of tools, methods and methodologies do not cause harm to participants; such as stress, loss of dignity or self-esteem. This includes consideration of the extent to which methods or questions are intrusive or sensitive, and applies to the wellbeing of the data collectors as well data providers and subjects.

This requires consideration of local behaviours and norms, and the ways in which risk of harm may vary based on each individual's gender, age, disability, ethnicity, religion, marital status, social position, sexual orientation, level of education, physical and mental health, and more.

- We will maintain confidentiality of information, and store all records in line with our data protection policy. Identifiable data will not be shared or used without consent, but any publication of evidence will include publication of anonymised primary data alongside a description of the methodology to allow validation of findings.
- We will ensure voluntary participation in our research is based on informed consent, with each individual being accurately informed of the purpose and what the method involves – including their right to refuse or withdraw. Where feasible and appropriate, this information should be provided in advance (e.g. before potential participants have travelled to the venue). It also includes

⁴ This should not breach anonymity, but a reader should be able to distinguish between (for example) the views of a community member and those of a government official

providing participants with contact details should they later wish to make a complaint, withdraw their consent, or simply find out more about the activity.

In the case of children, informed consent should be obtained from both the child and their parent or guardian. In the case of vulnerable adults, a judgement should be made about their capacity to give consent; if it is deemed that such capacity does not exist then the individual's participation should be reconsidered, and only proceed if there is a justifiable purpose and with the informed consent of a guardian or next of kin.

Annex 2: Indicators used to track progress against strategic objectives

These indicators are presented in summary version to give a sense of what we are tracking.

Objective 1: ACHIEVE

- Change in behaviour among citizens (disaggregated by gender, disability, age)
- Change in behaviour among individual duty bearers
- % of current monitors who are female
- Fix Rate (% of problems captured through citizen monitoring, that are then fixed, as judged by citizen monitors concerned)
- New approaches developed which better satisfy sustainability and/or scale

Objective 2: AMPLIFY

- # "scale-up" partnerships (typically led by INGOs)
- # citizens involved in monitoring
- # countries where programmes are active
- Learning capability of Integrity Action
- % of monitors who find DevelopmentCheck easy-to-use (disaggregated by gender, disability, age)
- # Partners provided with guidance/mentoring to improve citizen-centred accountability (CCA) practice (with key details, e.g. size of population served if known)
- # Embedded CCA approaches that have been co-created/improved through IA input

Objective 3: CONVINCING

- # IA learning products, resources or approaches which are externally cited or used
- # sector influencers who promote or speak up for our approach
- # times we are showcased by external platforms with sector-wide visibility (incl news platforms and events)
- # institutions/organisations at global level (e.g. funders, DFIs, INGOs) changing their policies or practice towards more/improved CCA as a result of our advocacy efforts with others
- # institutions/organisations at national or local level (e.g. governments, service providers, national/local CSOs) changing their policies or practice towards more/improved CCA as a result of our advocacy efforts with others