



Evaluation Terms of Reference

Endline: Theology of Disaster Resilience in a Changing Climate

September 2021

Reports to:	UnitingWorld
Locations:	Fiji, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, Papua New Guinea
Timeframe:	Final report to be submitted by 30 th March 2022
Duration:	Between 25 and 35 days of work within the time frame
Evaluation Type:	Endline
Evaluation Logistics:	Preferred: Contract a Lead Consultant (Evaluation Specialist) who can form and coordinate in-country evaluators, through existing networks. Alternative: Contract a Lead Consultant who will coordinate and manage the evaluation and in-country evaluators (separately contracted).

1. Background and context

The CAN DO (Church Agencies Network – Disaster Operations) consortium was formed in 2016 in the interests of collaboration and coordination in the humanitarian sector to enhance community resilience to disaster and conflict. The consortium consists of the following members: Act for Peace (AfP); The Adventist Development and Relief Agency Australia (ADRA); The Anglican Board of Mission (ABM); Anglican Overseas Aid (AOA); Australian Lutheran World Service (ALWS); Transform Aid International (TAI); UnitingWorld (UW); and Caritas Australia (CA). In addition to building emergency response capacity the consortium also seeks to work with Partners to increase capacity in disaster risk reduction and management.

CAN DO is a partner in the Disaster Ready project, funded by the Australian Humanitarian Partnership (AHP), and has received USD 40 million over 4.5 years of funding for disaster Reduction program work in the Pacific region in its 'Disaster Ready' component. The **Theology of Disaster Resilience in a Changing Climate (TDRCC)** is a small part of the Disaster Ready project, which focuses on building capacity to manage disaster risk in the four Pacific Countries of PNG, Fiji, Vanuatu and Solomon Islands. UnitingWorld is the technical lead in this area.

UnitingWorld is the global partnerships arm of the Uniting Church in Australia and has been a member of CAN DO since its inception. UnitingWorld drives collaboration with the global church, addressing the causes and consequences of poverty, injustice and violence. Theological resourcing to address these issues, drawing on the skills and knowledge of Pacifika theologians, has been UnitingWorld's strength, and why it plays a technical lead role in guiding theological resourcing within CAN DO.

As part of the TDRCC program, baseline surveys were conducted in Fiji, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu with church leaders, communities and other stakeholders by independent consultant Alice Banfield. The purpose of the baseline surveys was to provide data to inform the Theology of Disaster Risk Management (as it was then called) and to test the assumption that theological beliefs underpin people’s responses to natural disasters, climate change and the environment.

In August 2018 a group of Pasifika theologians met, and drew from the baseline survey results to develop a suite of theological resources ([framework paper and bible studies](#)) in response to the questions of why natural disasters happen, of where and whether God is present in suffering, and our relationship with God within Creation. Since the resources were launched at the first Training of Trainers workshop in Vanuatu, August 2019, country teams in Fiji, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu and Papua New Guinea have been sharing and contextualising these resources amongst churches. Translations into Bislama and Fijian and posters addressing questions on COVID-19 further contextualised the resources. Theological Coordinators and Disaster Ready Coordinators in the 4 countries have organised further training, gathered communities of practice within each country and reached out to Heads of Churches for endorsement. In Fiji and Vanuatu, under the Safe n Redi Program, National Campaigns promoting a theological basis for inclusion during disaster were planned and launched.

In 2019 a grant was received to work with a specialist to develop a Monitoring Evaluation and Learning Approach (MELA). Later in 2019 additional funding was obtained through PPF2 to strengthen the monitoring of the project through a series of Reflection and Learning Workshops.

Monitoring Evaluation and Learning Approach

Uniting World together with the CAN DO Coordination Unit and other CAN DO members have worked together on a comprehensive Monitoring Evaluation and Learning Approach (MELA). This articulates five high level program outcomes and demonstrates the way in which it relates to other project and donor M&E frameworks. Project Outcomes are included below and a high level illustration of the alignment with other M&E frameworks is included in Appendix 1: Mapping Outcome Statements across TDRCC. Further, specific Outcomes for Disaster Ready and Safe n Redi are also included in this document.

Project Outcomes:

- Theological understanding of DRM is **embedded into the culture** of each church
- Theology of DRM **removes belief barriers** and **motivates increased community participation** in disaster preparedness and response activities.
- Theological understanding of DRM **motivates inclusion** of women, people with disabilities, youth, children and sexual and gender minorities, in disaster preparedness and response activities and addresses barriers to inclusion
- Theological language and justifications for engagement with DRM are utilised for **effective collaboration and communication** between Church/community disaster committees, government and NGOs
- Theology of DRM is **endorsed, and related positional and policy statements** are adopted by Churches

2. Purpose of the Evaluation

This evaluation is both for learning (summative), and to feed into future design (formative):

- Measure progress towards Project Outcomes
- Understand if the program is doing what it set out to do
- Determine lessons learnt at country and regional levels – the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and challenges
- Make recommendations for changes in approach for the re-design of Disaster Ready 2.

3. Primary intended users and uses

Those who will learn from this evaluation are:

- CAN DO and its member agencies
- Implementing partners
- Church Leaders, key theologians, and church DRR personnel
- Civil society such as national disability organisations (VDPA), women's networks, Crisis centres etc
- AHP partners such as World Vision, Save the Children, CARE, Oxfam and Plan.
- National Government Disaster Management Offices and other relevant Ministries
- Ecumenical partners such as the Pacific Conference of Churches (PCC), Fiji Council of Churches (FCC), Papua New Guinea Council of Churches (PNGCC), Solomon Islands Christian Association (SICA), Vanuatu Christian Council (VCC)
- Australian Humanitarian Partnership (AHP) as donor
- Academic institutions

4. Key Evaluation Questions

- To what extent has the project progressed towards outcomes?
- To what extent / in what ways has the TDRCC (and its resources) been shared across mainline churches and communities? - this gets at the 'ripple effect'
- To what extent / in what ways have churches (church bodies & communities) changed their practices in disaster resilience & response, as a result of engaging in the TDRCC content?
- To what extent / in what ways have the content and resources been locally owned, developed and contextualised? And what has been the result of these efforts?
- What should the project focus on in the next phase of the project design?

5. Scope

This evaluation will be conducted at a regional level, drawing on insights from 4 countries, likely engaging sub-contracted evaluation consultants in each country to work with teams to draw out information to feed into a regional report.

This evaluation will cover activities and changes since the first Training of Trainers workshop held in Vanuatu in August 2019. The evaluation will cover objectives of and activities conducted under Disaster Ready, Safe n Redi and Safe n Redi 2.

Stakeholders include Theological Coordinators, Disaster Ready Coordinators, theologians, ecumenical bodies, government ministries, theological colleges, DFAT at post etc.

The reports produced as part of this work will be owned collectively by the members of CAN DO and their church partners.

Initial data collection and desk review will take place in October 2021. Further data collection in the 4 countries will be during November 2021 and February 2022 with presentation of initial findings 28th February and final report due 30th March 2022. See timeline below for more detail.

6. Methodology and Approach

This evaluation will be culturally appropriate, participatory, and mostly qualitative with a focus on sense-making approaches. https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/events/dabbling_in_data

The consultant is responsible for designing the appropriate evaluation methodology in consultation with program staff. However, we propose utilising an additional consultant for each country to gather data and speak in that language.

One suggestion is to conduct the evaluation in two stages. After conducting a desk review of the existing data and documents, hold an initial regional workshop where the Plan and Methodology is shared with key personnel from the 4 participating countries and further data collected. Then field visits by evaluators in each country conducting KII, surveys etc, followed by a final regional sense-making workshop.

In general we would expect the following data collection methods could be used:

- Desk Review of relevant project documentation, including methodology used in the baseline
- Collaborative planning and design (consultant will lead development of Evaluation Plan). An initial regional workshop could be arranged where country teams contribute initial data and confirm the plan and share the tools.
- Key informant interviews with personnel identified by In-country teams (could be Heads of Churches, key personnel such as General Secretary of the Ecumenical body, Theological resource people from each participating church etc)
- Focus group discussions with project participants
- Field surveys (Online surveys could be included to gather a greater breadth of data quickly, but this methodology is not as personal. Better to be face to face)
- Methods that look at changes in Knowledge, Attitudes and Practice (KAP)
- Follow up of participants by phone and in person – data can be provided by In-country teams
- Regional symposium / sense-making workshop to validate survey responses (this was conducted in the baseline, and would be conducted via zoom this time)
- Talanoa where appropriate for collecting experiences, learnings
- Story telling / Most Significant Change (MSC) to match tools used

7. Professional experience and expertise required for the evaluator/evaluation team

- Extensive experience designing, conducting, and analysing quantitative and qualitative evaluations within the Pacific context.
- Demonstrated ability to lead a remote evaluation team and produce high quality work (both written reports and presentations) within the given timeframe.
- Demonstrated experience in the humanitarian sector or related fields, with a strong understanding of disaster preparedness, resilience and response, preferably in the Pacific.
- Exemplary cross-cultural communication skills, cultural awareness and considerable knowledge of the Pacific context and cultures, including an understanding of Christian belief systems and the way in which the Church informs community life in the Pacific.
- Qualifications in the humanitarian, development or social research fields are strongly desired.
- Experience working with multi-stakeholder, complex regional, multi-national programs.

- Willingness to provide copies of a valid Working with Children Check (or equivalent) where available and National Police Check conducted within the last 12 months for all countries of citizenship and for each country in which the individual has lived for 12 months or longer over the past five years.
- Willingness to sign and comply with UnitingWorld’s Code of Conduct and Protection and Safeguarding Policy and the partner organisation’s Safeguarding Policy and Code of Conduct, where applicable.
- Willingness to ensure that in-country evaluators also understand, sign, and comply with UnitingWorld’s Code of Conduct and Safeguarding Policy and the partner organisation’s Safeguarding Policy and Code of Conduct, where applicable.
- Pasifika and ATSI people encouraged to apply

In country teams

- PNG: Caritas Australia and the Church Partnership Program
- Solomon Islands: Anglican Overseas Aid and the Solomon Islands Christian Association
- Fiji: ADRA Australia, ADRA Fiji, the Fiji Council of Churches, AHP Fiji Coordinator
- Vanuatu: ACT for Peace and the Vanuatu Christian Council

8. Roles and responsibilities

Who	Responsibilities
Lead Evaluator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Managing/coordinating the evaluation team in each of the program countries - Responsible for effective teamwork and coordination of all the activities within the team - Responsible for the implementation of the evaluation plan, managing the progress and monitor milestones - Delivering high-quality deliverables as specified in the terms of reference and the contract - Keeping the UnitingWorld IPM informed of the progress at key milestones outlined in the timeline - Ensuring the evaluation is conducted to appropriate professional standards - Where the Lead evaluator has own local in-country teams, managing the contracting of local In-country evaluators
In-country Evaluators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Working closely with respective in-country team - Responsible for the finalisation of the activities plan and field trip schedules - Conducting evaluation information collection activities as outlined in the evaluation plan - Working with program stakeholders in a way that maximises their contribution to and learning from the evaluation - Keeping the lead evaluator informed of progress - Keeping the in-country team informed of progress - Ensuring the evaluation is conducted to appropriate professional standards
In-country teams:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Participate in sense-making workshops - Assist in logistical arrangements for Endline data collection

Theological Coordinators and Disaster Ready Coordinators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify a contact person to liaise with In-country evaluator - Arrange for evaluator to meet with key personnel to conduct surveys and interviews - Providing in-country evaluator (or the lead evaluator) with existing data and assist with data collection from stakeholders - Coordinating with UnitingWorld International Program Manager in support of the evaluation - Review of methodology, data collection tools and the final report
UnitingWorld International Program Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - UnitingWorld liaison with the evaluation team throughout the evaluation - Managing the evaluation contract and budget, including monitoring project deliverables - Coordinating with in-country teams in support of the evaluation with logistics - Review of methodology, data collection tools and the final report - Coordinating with in-country evaluation liaisons in support of the evaluation with logistics - Review of methodology, data collection tools and the final report
UnitingWorld Associate Director	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Approval of Evaluation terms of reference - Approval of Evaluation Contract - Approval of Evaluation Plan - Approval of Evaluation report
CAN DO Coordination Unit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Work in collaboration with all stakeholders - Support coordination across other CAN DO members - Participate in Sense-making workshops and reviewing key documents

9. Deliverables

We expect the consultant/s to produce:

- A detailed evaluation plan (after consultation) incl methodology and budget
- A Presentation demonstrating early findings
- A One pager summary / brochure
- Draft Report/s for the 4 countries
- Final report including:
 - o Table of contents, figures, tables
 - o Executive Summary
 - o Acronyms
 - o Introduction
 - o Methodology
 - o Analysis and findings including lessons learnt
 - o Stories of Change and quotes from respondents
 - o Conclusions for each objective
 - o Recommendations for future projects
 - o Pictures report

10. Timetable

Activity	Who	When
Draft Evaluation Plan / TOR developed	UnitingWorld	Mid September 2021
Consultation with partners	UnitingWorld	Mid September 2021
Final Evaluation TOR	UnitingWorld	28 th September
Recruitment of Consultant/s	UnitingWorld	18 th October 2021
Final Evaluation Plan including sub-contracted consultants in place and methodology agreed	Lead Consultant	30 th October 2021
Initial workshop with in-country teams	Lead Consultant, sub consultants and In-country teams	1 st November 2021
Data collection in 4 countries	Lead Consultant, sub consultants and in-country teams	November 2021 and February 2022
Sense making workshop with in country teams	Lead Consultant, sub consultants and in-country teams	26 th February 2022
Presentation of initial findings	Lead Consultant	28 th February 2022
Final Endline Report/s	Lead Consultant	30 th March 2022

11. Budget

AUD\$35,000 max

12. Existing Data and Background documents

- Baseline – reports for 4 countries
- Baseline survey questions and methodology
- TDRCC – the Framework Paper and Bible Studies
- MELA – the resources and program outcomes
- Reflection and Learning Workshop Reports – 1 & 2
- Mapping Outcomes Statements (see Appendix 1)

13. How to apply

Interested candidates should submit their interest before 18/10/21 to Mia Berry, at miab@unitingworld.org.au For any enquiries, contact Aletia Dundas on 0426 040 614.

Pasifika and ATSI people encouraged to apply.

Appendix: Mapping Outcome Statements Across TDRCC, Disaster Ready, Baseline & Evaluation

#	TDRCC Project Outcomes	Alignment with Disaster Ready Objectives & Outcomes (from Sub-Design) (need to check if numbering is correct)	Baseline Questions	Evaluation Questions	Indicators
1	<p>A theological understanding of DRM is embedded in the culture of each church and removes belief barriers and motivates increased community participation in disaster preparedness and response activities.</p>	<p>DR Objective 1: Communities are better prepared for rapid and slow onset disasters.</p> <p>DR Outcome 1.1: Communities understand likely hazards and risks and have knowledge, skills and resources to manage these.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are current beliefs relating to disaster? • Are beliefs impacting how people act in relation to disaster preparedness and response? • Have beliefs empowered response to disaster? 	<p>EQ-1: How has people's understanding of disaster risk, and steps they can take to minimize it, changed over the project?</p> <p>EQ-2: How has peoples' beliefs relating to key areas of TDRM changed over the project?</p> <p>EQ-3: How have these changes in belief impacted actions?</p>	<p>Outcome Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individuals, communities and churches identify <i>sustained</i> changes in belief/belief barriers as a result of engagement with theological content. • Examples of individuals, communities and churches taking actions in disaster risk reduction and management (and attributing these actions to changes in belief). <p>Output Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # and type of activities where the TDRCC is shared. • # of people and specific groups who have engaged with the TDRCC.

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of the ripple effect/that TDRCC TOTs are resulting in further 'organic' engagement with the core content. Individuals, communities and churches identify changes in belief barriers after trainings.
2	<p>A theological understanding of DRM motivates inclusion of women, people with disabilities, youth and children in disaster preparedness and response activities and addresses barriers to inclusion.</p>	<p>DR Objective 2: The rights and needs of women, people with disabilities, youth and children are being met in disaster preparedness and response at all levels.</p> <p>DR Outcome 2.3: All community members, including men and boys, faith leaders and other community leaders, and government staff address the barriers that prevent women, people with disabilities, youth and children from having their rights and needs met in disaster</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do Christian beliefs impact the inclusion of women, people with disabilities, youth and children in disaster preparedness and response? 	<p>EQ-13: How are men, boys, church leaders, chiefs and government staff working with women, people with disabilities, youth and children to address negative driver of exclusion?</p> <p>EQ-14: What are they key negative drivers of exclusion?</p> <p>EQ-17: How have beliefs about the role of women, people with disabilities, youth and children changed due to the theology of DRM?</p> <p>EQ-18: How have changes in beliefs impacted women, people with disabilities, youth and children's involvement in disaster preparedness activities.</p> <p>DR-M: Examples of men and boys, church leaders and other community leaders, and government staff</p>	<p>Outcome Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examples of increased inclusion initiatives (gender, disability, other vulnerable groups) in DRR & DRM resulting from changes in belief. <p>Output Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individuals, communities and churches identify changes in belief barriers after trainings. Examples of inclusion and collaboration in project delivery (eg. Collaboration with DPOs and engagement with women and youth delivery of project activities).

		preparedness and response.		addressing barriers to inclusion in disaster preparedness and response.	
4	Theological language and justifications for engagement with DRM are utilised for effective collaboration and communication between Church/community disaster committees, government and NGOs.	<p>DR Objective 3: Government, NGOs, the private sector and communities coordinate more effectively for inclusive disaster preparedness and response.</p> <p>DR Outcome 3.4: Improved two-way communications between communities and government for preparedness, early warnings, disaster impact and response.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are beliefs impacting how people act in relation to disaster preparedness and response? • Have beliefs empowered response to disaster? 	EQ-29: Has theological language and justifications been utilised by government, NGOs and private sector in communication.	<p>Outcome Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of collaboration between churches/church agencies in disaster preparedness activities. • Examples of collaboration and coordination among churches/church agencies and disaster response (eg. Representation on national humanitarian clusters). • Examples of the TDRCC being used in other Disaster Ready activities. <p>Output Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAN DO with Pacific Church partners have developed a theology of DRM to support Church leadership and increase community awareness of the relationship between faith and DRM.

5	<p>Theology of DRM is endorsed and related positional and policy statements are adopted by Churches.</p>	<p>DR Objective 4: National NGOs and faith-based organisations have more influence and capacity in the country humanitarian system.</p> <p>DR Outcome 4.2: National NGOs and faith-based organisations have improved organisational capacity for disaster preparedness and response, including policies, processes, equipment and distribution systems.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What existing church resources or statements already exist relating to disaster preparedness and response and are they utilised? 	<p>EQ-29: Has theological language and justifications been utilised by government, NGOs and private sector in communication.</p> <p>EQ-40: How many Churches have endorsed the Theology of DRM?</p> <p>EQ-41: How many Churches have adopted positional or policy statements on DRM?</p>	<p>Outcome Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A <p>Output Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A
---	---	---	--	--	--