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# Project Summary

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Type of study | Final external evaluation |
| Name of the project | Creative Arts for Shifting Power for Equality in Marginalized Communities of Georgia |
| Project Start and End dates | 1 July 2024 – 30 June 2025 |
| Project duration | One year |
| Project locations: | Georgia, Kakheti region, Akhmeta municipality, Pankisi Gorge |
| Thematic areas | Child Rights Governance |
| Donor | Svenska Institutet (SI) |
| Estimated beneficiaries | Women and girls of the Kist ethnic minority in Pankisi Gorge |
| Overall objective of the project | Ethnic minority women and girls in Pankisi Gorge are empowered by providing tailored learning opportunities in visual arts |

# Introduction

This evaluation is commissioned to assess the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, sustainability, and impact of the project "Creative Arts for Shifting Power for Equality in Marginalized Communities of Georgia." The project is funded by the Swedish Institute and implemented by Save the Children International. Tbilisi Photo Festival (TPF) functions as a creative service partner, delivering key programmatic components related to visual advocacy.

This evaluation will provide an independent review of project achievements, challenges, and long-term potential, ensuring alignment with donor priorities and sector best practices. The findings will inform future programming, organizational learning, and strategic decisions.

# Background and Context

The project, implemented by Save the Children Georgia in partnership with Save the Children Sweden and funded by the Swedish Institute, was designed to strengthen the role of ethnic minority women and girls in civic life through creative approaches. Tbilisi Photo Festival (TPF) served as a creative service provider responsible for designing and delivering visual storytelling capacity strengthening and other components.

The objective of the project is to contribute to more inclusive and equitable societies in Georgia by strengthening the role of ethnic minority women and girls, particularly from the Kist community in Pankisi Gorge, as rights holders, civic actors, and advocates through the use of creative visual storytelling, capacity development, and public engagement.

The project targets women and girls of the Kist ethnic minority in Pankisi Gorge, a remote and conservative region in Eastern Georgia. The Pankisi Women’s Council (PWC), a locally respected body of 15 women leaders, is the central agent of change. Through capacity building in creative advocacy, non-formal education, scholarship grants, a media campaign, and a study tour to Sweden, the project empowers PWC (10 current and prospective members) and local youth (at least 14 young people) to challenge gender norms and promote social inclusion. TPF, with its expertise in visual storytelling, is contracted to lead creative components. Though TPF is formally a service provider, its engagement has been comprehensive and equivalent to that of a project partner, involving content design, delivery, mentorship, and outreach activities.

The project was implemented in a period that affected civic space in Georgia. These dynamics may shape the sustainability and usability of creative advocacy tools developed through this initiative.

# Scope of Study

## Purpose, Objectives and Scope

The primary purpose of this evaluation is to analyze the extent to which the project achieved its intended objectives and to generate evidence-based recommendations for future initiatives. Specifically, the evaluation aims to:

* Assess the relevance and coherence of the project in addressing the needs of the target group.
* Measure the effectiveness & efficiency of project interventions, including their impact on beneficiaries.
* Determine the sustainability of project outcomes beyond the funding period.
* Examine stakeholder engagement and collaboration in project delivery.

**Scope:**

The evaluation will cover the full duration of project implementation, analyzing key interventions, partnerships, and measure outcomes.

The evaluator will assess:

* The degree to which activities were executed as planned and on schedule.
* Implementation of key project components: capacity building, educational program ("Fabrika of Images"), scholarship production grants, study tour in Sweden, and media campaign.
* The contribution of TPF as a creative service partner and the value of its engagement model, including whether the shift from "partner" to "service provider" had any implications for collaboration, visibility, or ownership.
* The empowerment outcomes for women and girls in terms of social participation and advocacy.
* The functionality and future role of the Jokolo Visual Education Centre (VEC).
* The effectiveness, reliability, and adaptability of monitoring and evaluation systems.
* Any key lessons or innovations that could inform future projects.
* Whether and how the Pankisi Women’s Council contributed to shaping project goals and direction, beyond participating in its activities.

The evaluation requires on-site visits to implementation areas in Eastern Georgia (Kakheti region) to engage with beneficiaries and stakeholders. Travel may include:

* Field visits to project sites for direct observations, FGDs, and KIIs.
* Virtual consultations with partners and donors where necessary.

## Key Study Questions

### Relevance and Coherence

* To what extent did the project align with Swedish Institute objectives and Save the Children’s mission?
* How well were the needs of PWC and other beneficiaries identified and addressed?
* Was the service provider model for TPF appropriate and effective in practice?

### Effectiveness

* Were all project activities implemented as planned?
* Did the training, education, and scholarship components result in measurable capacity development?
* Did the study tour influence advocacy skills or plans?
* How effective were the monitoring and data collection systems in informing implementation and adaptation?

### Impact

* How has the project influenced gender norms and social participation in project participants in Pankisi Gorge? What potential is there for amplifying the impact beyond direct participants of the project?
* What evidence exists of increased awareness and action on human rights through creative outputs?
* Has the project a potential to meaningfully shift perceptions or power dynamics related to gender and minority identity within the community?
* What worked, what didn’t, and why?

### Sustainability

* Are PWC and local youth likely to continue advocacy using visual arts post-project?
* Is the VEC operational and utilized?
* Are any partnerships or structures in place to ensure continuity?
* **Are the advocacy skills, tools, and approaches acquired by PWC and youth participants usable and adaptable in the current civic space context in Georgia?**
* **What risks or constraints may hinder their ability to apply these skills, and how can they be addressed?**
* **Are there strategies in place to support continued civic engagement while ensuring safety and social legitimacy?**

### Stakeholder Engagement

* Howe well were the PWC and community members involved in decision-making?
* To what extent were PWC members involved in shaping project activities and goals, beyond participating in them?
* How did the engagement with non-partner actors (e.g., media, local government) influence the outcomes (if any)?
* How effective was coordination between SC Sweden, SC Georgia, and TPF?
* Did the model of service provision by TPF influence ownership or collaboration dynamics?

## 4.3. Intended Audience and Use of the Study

Primary intended audience of the study are;

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Stakeholder** | **Further information** |
| Project donor | Swedish Institute – the findings of the study and knowledge sharing materials developed as byproducts of the Report will be presented to Swedish Institute to assess the compliance of the project with the standards of relevance, effectiveness, sustainability, impact and the level of stakeholder engagement outlined in the application for the funding of the project in question. |
| Primary implementing organisation | Save the Children Georgia Country Office, including Project Implementation Team, Advocacy and Communications Team; the PIO will be engaged in arranging logistics, agreeing on the final methodology for the study. |
| Implementing partners/Service Providers/Strategic Partners | Tbilisi Photo Festival, LLC – as the service provider comprised of the team members initially involved in the project as implementing partner team will not only benefit from the findings of the study, but will be an active contributors of their observations that affected the project. |
| Community groups | Pankisi Women Council as beneficiaries of the action and as an entity (registered CSO) with a potential to utilize the knowledge acquired through the process for planning/implementation of similar activities in the future |
| Beneficiaries | Children and adults involved in the program/project/s and the study |
| International development/humanitarian research community | Save the Children International Movement |

Moreover, the study will be shared with the following stakeholders:

**Save the Children International Sweden as a member office, including Project team and Program Development, as representatives of the member office in charge with liaising between the Donor Organization and the Implementing Office as well as Kakheti Regional Development Foundation, as our strategic partner whose presence on the ground ensures our unhampered access to and easy outreach within the region will also benefit from the findings of the study and other knowledge sharing materials.** The findings will be used for interested actors operating in Georgia (both national and international CSOs and entities engaged in project implementation as service providers) to inform them about the used model of adaptive programming. The findings may also inform further interventions of various national and international actors aimed at increasing civic participation and advocacy efforts of individuals through creative methodologies (such as photo stories, etc.)

# Study Methodology

## Study Design and Data Collection Methods

The evaluator is expected to use a mixed-method approach, combining qualitative and quantitative research techniques. This will include:

* Desk review of project documents, reports, and relevant secondary data.
* Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with project implementers, partners, and beneficiaries.
* Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) or other participatory group discussion methodology, with community members including children involved in the project.
* Survey beneficiaries to measure project outcome.
* Field visits to key project locations to observe results firsthand.

The methodology should ensure triangulation of data to enhance the validity and reliability of findings.

## Indicators and Results Framework

The evaluator will assess progress against the following indicators:

* Number of girls participating in the "Fabrika of Images" educational program (Target: 30)
* Number of artworks/projects produced via scholarshipdemonstrating a tangible outcome of creative expression for gender equality (Target: 20)
* PWC participation in study tour reflecting increased exposure and learning opportunities (Target: 80% of members)
* PWC participation in training by TPF (Target: 8 members)
* Increase in TPF’s social media followers post-project (Target: 10%)
* Number of national TV shows aired on project themes (Target: 4)
* Number of children mobilised in campaign activities (Target: 12)

*In addition, the Evaluator will be requested to measure the percentage of children and civil society actors supported by Save the Children International Georgia Country Office within this project reporting stronger capacities to engage around advancing and influencing respect for child rights.*

## Ethical Considerations

It is expected that this study will be:

* **Child participatory**. Where appropriate and safe, children should be supported to participate in the evaluation process beyond simply being respondents. Opportunities for collaborative participation could include involving children in determining success criteria against which the project could be evaluated, supporting children to collect some of the data required for the evaluation themselves, or involving children in the validation of findings. Any child participation, whether consultative, collaborative or child-led, must abide by the [9 Basic Requirements for meaningful and ethical child participation](https://resourcecentre.savethechildren.net/library/applying-9-basic-requirements-meaningful-and-ethical-child-participation-during-covid-19).
* **Inclusive**. Ensure that children from different ethnic, social and religious backgrounds have the chance to participate, as well as children with disabilities and children who may be excluded or discriminated against in their community.
* **Ethical**: The study must be guided by the following ethical considerations:
  + Safeguarding – demonstrating the highest standards of behaviour towards children and adults.
  + Sensitive – to child rights, gender, inclusion and cultural contexts.
  + Openness - of information given, to the highest possible degree to all involved parties.
  + Confidentiality and data protection - measures will be put in place to protect the identity of all participants and any other information that may put them or others at risk.[[1]](#footnote-2)
  + Public access - to the results when there are not special considerations against this
  + Broad participation - the relevant parties should be involved where possible.
  + Reliability and independence - the study should be conducted so that findings and conclusions are correct and trustworthy.

It is expected that:

* Data collection methods will be age and gender appropriate.
* Study activities will provide a safe, creative space where children feel that their thoughts and ideas are important.
* A risk assessment will be conducted that includes any risks related to children, young people’s, or adult’s participation.
* A referral mechanism will be in place in case any child safeguarding or protection issues arise.
* Informed consent will be used where possible.

# Study Management Expected Deliverables

**Study Tentative Timeline which should be conducted in April 30 – June 30 2025, with key deliverables in bold (in ENGLISH). The final timeline and deliverables will be agreed upon the inception phase.**

All documents are to be produced in MS Word format and provided electronically by email to the SC Project Coordinator. Copies of all PowerPoint presentations used to facilitate briefings for the project should also be provided to Save the Children in editable digital format.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| What | Who is responsible | By when |
| Inception report in line with the [provided template](https://savethechildren1.sharepoint.com/:f:/g/what/me/EvtNzatd2hlFgFZvAblFe98BeYqbxHcXg_CrZTLdP7Gp8Q?e=4dDyJ6) | Contractor | Within 2 weeks of contract signing |
| Review of inception report | SC team |  |
| Development of Data collection tools | Contractor |  |
| Ethics submission  Ethics submission (if applicable):  Should approval from a Human Research Ethics Committee be required, an ethics submission should include:   * study protocols (participant recruitment, data security and storage, consent and confidentiality etc.) * considerations for consulting with children and other vulnerable groups (if applicable) * participant information statement and consent forms   Final data collection tools (in the report language):   * Survey instrument | Contractor |  |
| Logistical arrangements | Contractor  SC team, TPF |  |
| Data collection and field visits | Contractor | Weeks 3-5 |
| Data management and analysis (coding, transcriptions, data cleaning, integration and analysis) | Contractor |  |
| First draft of the Final study report | Contractor | Week 7 |
| Review of first draft report | SC team, TPF |  |
| Final study report incorporating feedback from consultation on the Draft Study Report and submission of data and analyses | Contractor | Week 9 |
| Knowledge translation materials (PowerPoint presentation of Study findings  Evaluation Brief\*\*) | Contractor | Week 10 |

\*\* The Evaluation Brief is a 2-4 pages summary of the full report and will be created using the Save the Children [template](https://savethechildren1.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/PQIEL/Shared%20Documents/PQI%20KM/H.%20KML%20Tools%20%26%20Templates/KML%20Templates%20(English)/02.%20SCI%20Evaluation%20Brief%20Template.docx?d=w0b355e5f6f8b4eb3bc08b81445b2e962&csf=1&web=1&e=xMIIRR).

# Selection Criteria

Interested consultants will be required to submit an Expression of Interest in line with the provided template, which should demonstrate adherence to the following requirements.

### Understanding of Requirements and Experience

To be considered, the evaluator or company must have demonstrated skills, expertise and experience in:

* At least 7 years' experience in project evaluation, especially in gender, advocacy, or creative methodologies
* Proven experience working in similar geographic or cultural settings
* Awareness of child protection and ethical research standards
* Conducting ethical and inclusive studies involving children and child participatory techniques
* Conducting ethical and inclusive studies involving marginalised, deprived and/or vulnerable groups in culturally appropriate and sensitive ways
* Managing and coordinating a range of government, non-government, community groups and academic stakeholders
* Sound and proven experience in conducting evaluations based on OECD-DAC evaluation criteria, particularly utilisation and learning focused evaluations
* Extensive experience of theories of change and how they can be used to carry out evaluations
* Strong written and verbal skills in communicating technical and/ or complex findings to non-specialist audiences (especially report writing and presentation skills)
* A track record of open, collaborative working with clients

### Financial Proposal

Save the Children seeks value for money in its work. This does not necessarily mean "lowest cost", but quality of the service and reasonableness of the proposed costs. Proposals shall include personnel allocation (role / number of days / daily rates / taxes), as well as any other applicable costs.

# Schedule of Payment

The following payments will be made to the consultant using and agreed mode of payment.

* Upon approval of inception report and tools: [20%]
* Upon submission of First Draft study Report: [30%]
* Upon approval of final study report: [50%]

# HOW TO APPLY

Interested candidates must submit:

* Overview of the suggested methodology and timeline, maximum 2 pages
* Financial proposal including travel and logistics
* CV(s) of proposed evaluator(s)
* Two references with contact details

Applications must be submitted to Save the Children Georgia by April 20 via email: nato.gabashvili@savethechildren.org. Only shortlisted candidates will be contacted.

# Annex I

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Key Study Questions** | **Formative** | **Process** | **Outcome** | **Impact** | **Economic** |
| Acceptability and appropriateness | * Is the intended program/project acceptable to the local community and stakeholders? Will they be willing to participate and engage? * Is the intended program/project appropriate to this particular context? | **X** |  |  |  |  |
| Accountability | * How has the program/project approached accountability to children and the wider community? |  | **X** | **X** | **X** |  |
| Child participation | * How have the children, their needs, desires and suggested solutions, been consulted and accounted for in programme or project design and implementation? * How were children supported to meaningfully participate across the programme/project cycle? |  | **X** | **X** | **X** |  |
| Child rights programming | * How has the program/project design and implementation considered a child rights approach? |  | **X** | **X** |  |  |
| Safe programming | * Has the program been designed, planned, implemented and monitored to ensure it is safe for children and adults? * How has child safety been integrated into the program/project design and implementation of activities? What aspects of the program/project make children feel safe? * How has the program/project assessed the risks for children and do these risks still exist to date? Have they been reduced, controlled and managed by the minimising actions? Are there new risks? What further measures do we need to implement to reduce, remove and control these new emerging risks? |  | **X** | **X** |  |  |
| **Coherence\*** | * Does the intervention support beneficial synergies and linkages with other interventions carried out by Save the Children in the country/community? * Is the intervention consistent with the interventions of other actors in the same context, such as supporting complementarity, harmonization, and co-ordination with government and other relevant service providers? | **X** | **X** | **X** | **X** |  |
| Cost-benefit | * What was the cost of delivering outcomes / was it effective? * What was the return on investment (return on investment analysis)? * What was the ratio of costs to benefits (cost-benefit analysis)? |  |  |  |  | **X** |
| **Effectiveness\*** | * Did the program/project achieve its intended outcomes? * Are there any differences in outcomes achieved by different groups? * Were there any unintended outcomes? Both positive and negative. * Are the objectives of the program/project being achieved? * How big is the effectiveness or impact of the project compared to the objectives planned? |  |  | **X** | **X** |  |
| **Efficiency\*** | * Were objectives achieved on time? (and budget) * Were activities cost-efficient? (What was the cost of delivering outputs? How were cost drivers managed?) * Was the programme or project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives? |  | **X** | **X** |  | **X** |
| Equity and equality | * Did/does the intervention have an impact on inequality or discrimination? * Is there evidence that the intervention reduces inequality and discrimination for specific groups? * What mechanisms / factors contributed to this result? * How much does it cost to provide the program to the hardest to reach? |  |  | **X** | **X** | **X** |
| Fidelity | * Was the program/project implemented as intended (e.g. according to Common Approach model, as adapted to the context)? Why / why not? * Did implementation meet quality standards / best practice? * What were the barriers and facilitators to implementation? |  | **X** | **X** | **X** |  |
| **Impact\*** | * Does the program/project contribute to reaching higher level objectives (preferably, overall objective)? Why/ why not? * What is the impact or effect of the programme or project in proportion to the overall situation of the target group or those effected? * What was the effect of the intervention on the outcome for the beneficiary population? |  |  |  | **X** |  |
| Inclusion | * How did the program/project consider inclusion of vulnerable groups in the design and its implementation of activities? | **X** | **X** | **X** | **X** |  |
| Process | * How well did staff/partnerships work together? * How can implementation of the program be improved in terms of coordination? * Have MEAL activities been implemented as planned? Were they relevant and appropriate? How could they be improved? |  | **X** | **X** |  |  |
| Reach and uptake | * Did the program/project reach its intended target populations? Why/ why not? * What proportion of eligible/referred beneficiaries engaged in the program? * To what extent did beneficiaries access and complete the program? * How do children/families who accessed and completed the program differ from those who did not? * What were the barriers and facilitators to beneficiaries accessing/ completing the program? |  | **X** | **X** | **X** |  |
| **Relevance\*** | * Are we doing the right thing? Does the intervention respond to clearly identified needs and priorities of the project participants? Was the intervention appropriately adapted to the local context and target population? * How was learning and evidence was used throughout the program cycle to adapt and ensure the project remained relevant? * How important is the relevance or significance of the intervention regarding local and national requirements and priorities? * Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended impacts and effects? | **X** | **X** | **X** | **X** |  |
| Replicability and scale | * Are the evaluation findings generalizable to other contexts? * Will the project or programme work in a different context? * Is there evidence that the program/project will reach greater numbers of beneficiaries through the implementation of an approach at scale? * Can the program/project be scaled up at cost? And how much does it would cost? |  |  | **X** | **X** | **X** |
| Satisfaction and experience | * How satisfied were the program/project beneficiaries? * Did program beneficiaries feel the services they received were acceptable, appropriate, and suited to their needs? |  | **X** | **X** |  |  |
| **Sustainability\*** | * Are the positive effects or impacts sustainable? * How is the sustainability or permanence of the intervention and its effects to be assessed? |  |  | **X** | **X** |  |
| Gender sensitivity | * How has the program/project considered gender sensitivity both in the design and its implementation of activities? * Has the program/project incorporated different needs and accessibility of boys and girls, men and women, and non-binary individuals? * Has the program/project outcomes or results been equally represented? * What are the gender gaps that the program/project addressed and what remaining aspects need to be considered further? | **X** | **X** | **X** | **X** |  |

\*[OECD DAC Criteria](https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm)

1. If any Consultancy Service Provider, Freelancer or Contingent worker will have direct contact with children and/or vulnerable adults and/or beneficiaries and/or have access to any sensitive data on safeguarding and/or children and/or beneficiaries, it is the responsibility of the person receiving the consulting service to contact the local HR team and child safeguarding focal point to ensure vetting checks and on-boarding are conducted in line with statutory requirements, local policies and best practices guidance. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)