

When is a community “disaster ready”?

ToR #1: A meta evaluation of ISD community-based disaster preparedness evaluations Terms of Reference

1. Background

The work of the International Services Department (ISD) at the American Red Cross (AmRC) is guided by the vision to help vulnerable people and communities around the world prepare for, respond to, and recover from disasters and humanitarian crises through mobilizing the power of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement. As part of the disaster management cycle, AmRC’s preparedness work aims to prepare vulnerable communities around the world to respond to disasters more effectively and reduce their risks. In alignment with the strategic priorities of operating national societies, AmRC currently supports preparedness programming in seven priority countries in Latin America and Asia Pacific: Bangladesh, Indonesia, Myanmar, Nepal, Vietnam, Honduras and El Salvador and additionally in recovery countries transitioning to focus on preparedness: Haiti, Nepal and Philippines.

AmRC routinely conducts evaluations at the project level of its Disaster Preparedness programs. However, it has not examined common themes and broader learnings across project level evaluations since the Tsunami Relief Program closed in 2011. Therefore, the department proposes to conduct a meta-evaluation of its long-term community disaster preparedness programs that have been conducted in the 2012-2018 time period. Approximately 25 project level evaluations were conducted during this period and would be included in the meta evaluation analysis. The terms of reference for this meta evaluation is adapted from the Terms of Reference for the 2011 TRP DP meta evaluation and asks specific evaluation questions that meet the learning needs of the department today.

2. Research Overview

2.1. Purpose

This research is composed of two related pieces of work:

- Consultancy #1: Meta-evaluation of American Red Cross disaster preparedness evaluations. The Meta-evaluation will map out lessons from past American Red Cross evaluations, by first assessing the quality and reliability of the findings, to then identify common themes and learnings related to the process towards “disaster ready communities”;
- Consultancy #2: Identification of “Key actions” based on a desk review of past evaluations (as determined by Consultancy #1) and broader industry learning, to outline the key components of a “disaster-ready community”. This consultancy is more action oriented and should lead to recommendations on enhancing future American Red Cross preparedness programming.

Both consultancies are guided by a common goal: **determine what key actions make a community “disaster-ready”**. In other words, based on past experience and on industry-wide good practice, how should the American Red Cross define success in its “disaster-ready community” model?

Both consultancies will aim to provide insights into the conceptual and operational frame and components of preparedness programs that can be replicated and scaled up for a greater impact, with the findings of the first consultancy (looking at internal lessons) feeding into the broader review of the second consultancy (looking at industry-

wide practices). Both consultancies will also help identify knowledge gaps and provide recommendations on how to enhance the effectiveness of preparedness programs.

2.2. Objectives

The objectives of the meta-evaluation of American Red Cross preparedness evaluations are:

- a) To document the overall trends across American Red Cross preparedness evaluations and document any outliers (positive or negative) and the factors leading to unexpected outcomes.
- b) To identify the key activities that have proven most effective in achieving the desired community-level change in American Red Cross activities.
- c) To map the exit criteria and indicators that were used across past American Red Cross evaluations;
- d) Capture lessons for what has worked well and what should be done differently in different contexts (i.e rural, semi-urban, urban; different hazard contexts; different socio-economic contexts; etc.).
- e) To identify knowledge gaps in existing documentation.

2.3. Meta-Evaluation Questions

Guiding questions for the research include:

- a) Overall trends:
 - a.1. What trends can be identified across past American Red Cross preparedness initiatives?
- b) Key activities:
 - b.1. What approaches, methodologies and activities proved to be most successful in terms of replicability and scalability?
 - b.2. What were the gaps identified and were they addresses in subsequent programs? [did we learn?]
 - b.3. What components of preparedness and risk reduction programming have demonstrated success in making communities ‘disaster ready’?
 - b.4. What is the right level of effort that the American Red Cross should invest to make a community “disaster-ready”?
- c) Sustainability:
 - c.1. What do past evaluations tell us about the exit criteria and indicators to leave a community? (i.e. that a community is “disaster ready” and we can responsibly exit); this evaluation question should be addressed to the extent possible that the topic was addressed in past evaluations.
- d) Contextualization:
 - d.1. How do contexts affect the success of past American Red Cross preparedness interventions?
 - d.2. Were there any common enabling factors supporting effectiveness of community DP programming across different contexts and countries? Conversely, any context based barriers to effective programming?
- e) Gaps:
 - e.1. What other topic around preparedness programming should be explored further in future evaluations?
 - e.2. What methods could be applied to future evaluations to address evaluation questions on sustainability and exit, as well as replicability and scalability?

2.4. Methods

1. **Adapting an AmRC evaluation quality scorecard:** AmRC has already developed a score card to measure the level of quality of the evaluation for use in a recent meta-evaluation. The consultant will adapt the scorecard for use

in this study, with a focus on identifying if sufficient, valid and rigorous evidence is made available in the evaluation report to render it useful in the meta-analysis

2. **Conduct a scoring exercise for the community disaster preparedness evaluations conducted over the past five years:** The consultant will review the approximately 25 evaluations conducted of DP programming in the 2012-2018 period and use the scoring tool to determine which evaluations provide evidence and findings that are of the quality and relevance to the meta evaluation to be included in the scope of document review.
3. **Review and code the selected evaluation reports according to the evaluation questions:** The consultant will use a qualitative analysis software such as NVivo or Dedoose to code the selected reports guided by the evaluation questions.
4. **Conduct qualitative analysis and prepare a meta evaluation report:** The consultant will conduct qualitative analysis to identify common themes and lessons across reports as well as identify outliers that provide insight into learning of AmRC’s experience in DP programming and compile a concise but comprehensive report.

2.5. Timeline and Consulting Days

Activity	Consulting Days
Consult with MEL Advisor, Adapt score card and collect body of evidence	2
Review approximately 25 DP reports from past 8 years and score for quality	5
Code and analyze DP reports guided by evaluation questions	14
Prepare draft report	3
Revise draft report based on ISD staff comments and prepare final report	1
Total	25

Timeline: June-July 2019; total 25 days

2.6. Deliverables

- 1) Inception report
- 2) Community Disaster Preparedness quality evaluation score card ranking of past AmRC evaluations
- 3) Community Disaster Preparedness meta evaluation report

3. Reporting Relationship

The contractor will report to Kristin Helz, MEL Advisor, who is the designated evaluation manager. An advisory group will be established with one representative from each of the ISD regions.

4. Required Qualifications

We are looking for a consultant or a consulting team with technical experience in international humanitarian work and evaluation.

- Professional monitoring and evaluation experience of international humanitarian and development programs with at least ten years’ experience
- Experience in community disaster preparedness programs
- Demonstrated experience in conducting Meta Evaluation

- Demonstrated experience in qualitative data collection and analysis; experience in use of a qualitative analysis software such as NVivo or Dedoose.
- Demonstrated experience in outcome based qualitative methodologies.
- Technical expertise in disaster preparedness and community engagement.
- Familiarity with the Red Cross/Red Crescent movement desirable
- Fluency in English required.

5. Application and Selection Details

Application Material

The proposal should include the following items. Please note that incomplete proposals will not be considered

1. **Detailed CVs** of all professionals who will work on the evaluation. If there is more than one consultant on the proposed evaluation team, please attach a table describing the level of effort (in number of days) of each team member in each of the evaluation activities.
2. **Writing Sample:** Please provide one sample of a Meta evaluation written or co-written by consultant.
3. **Budget** including personnel costs (daily rate per consultant), travel and other expenses, administrative costs
4. **One-page summary of proposed method for meta evaluation**

6. Application procedure

Email applications to gdpc@redcross.org with cc Omar.Abou-Samra@redcross.org with the subject line “*Meta-evaluation of disaster-ready communities – [Name of consultant or company]*”. All application material should be attached in zip folder. Short-listed candidates will be contacted for an interview.

Submission deadline: 22 July 2019 @ 17:00 EDT (Washington DC time zone).