

## C4D: Document management processes and agreements

### What is it?

A number of documents (such as Terms of Reference (ToR), Request for Proposal (RFP) and/or Scope of Work) need to be created as part of the management of research, evaluations and studies. Such documents provide guidance, and they are particularly important when commissioning external evaluators. The documents state the roles, resources, and responsibilities of the researchers or evaluators and the scope of the study or evaluation.

### General information

The BetterEvaluation Rainbow framework includes good [resources on creating these documents](#). There is also a [GeneraTOR tool](#) developed as part of the Steps for Planning and Managing an Evaluation to generate a TOR. In addition, the [UNEG Quality Checklist](#) is a useful guide for UN agencies from the United Nations Evaluation Group, which includes a checklist for developing a good quality evaluation ToR or inception report. These pages are recommended background reading before considering methods to apply to C4D.

### Applying the C4D Principles

#### Learning-based

Recruiting consultants with expertise in both C4D and the specific program area can be challenging. Consider what kinds of expertise are required, what kinds are desirable, and what kinds are easily translatable from similar fields and approaches. Also consider whether capacity building and mentoring partnerships can be incorporated to fill gaps. See also [Decide who will conduct the research/evaluation](#) (or other study or monitoring).

#### Accountable

Transparent and thorough record-keeping of management processes and agreements is supports accountability to all stakeholders in RM&E processes.

#### Realistic

Pay attention to the description of the Scope of Work and make sure it matches the funding available. Experienced consultants can see (and will avoid) Terms of References that ask too much within too little time and without adequate resources. Use the [Determine and secure resources](#) task to make sure the resources available match the scope and consider cheaper methods.

### Recommended options and adaptations for documenting

# management processes and agreements in C4D

## General options

- [Determine and secure resources](#)

Identify what resources (time, money, expertise, equipment, etc.) will be needed and available for the evaluation. Consider both internal resources (e.g. staff time) and external resources (e.g. participants' time to attend meetings to provide feedback).

- These methods include:

- [Expression of interest](#)

An expression of interest (EoI) is a way for an organisation to publish its intention to appoint an evaluation team to conduct an evaluation of a specific project or program.

- [Request for proposal \(RFP\)](#)

A Request for Proposal (RFP) is a formal request for evaluators to prepare a response to a planned evaluation and are generally used to select the final evaluator for the evaluation.

- [Scope of work](#)

A Scope of Work (SOW) is a plan for conducting an evaluation which outlines the work that is to be performed by the evaluation team.

- [Terms of reference](#)

A Terms of Reference (ToR) document provides an important overview of what is expected in an evaluation.

- [Contractual agreement](#)

A formal contract is needed to engage an external evaluator and a written agreement covering similar issues can also be used to document agreements about an internal evaluator.

- [Memorandum of understanding](#)

A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) outlines an agreement between two collaborating bodies in order to identify the working relationships and guidelines that exist between them.

## Examples

- There are many examples of C4D-related Expressions of Interests, Request for Proposals and Terms of References. Below are two:
- [Final Evaluation for “Communicating for Peace in South Sudan: A Social and Behaviour](#)

## [Change Communication Initiative](#)

This TOR, created by Search for Common Ground, gives a comprehensive and well-structured overview for a fairly standard type of evaluation. The document includes:

The context The intervention summary (see Develop initial description) Goals (see Decide purpose) Audience (see Identify primary intended users) The key questions (see Specify the key evaluation questions and with criteria (see Determine what 'success' looks like) Some guidance on the suggested sample selection (see Sample) and methods (see Collect and or retrieve data (methods)) Expectations and deliverables Logistical support Timeframe Budget (see Determine and secure resources) Requirements of the evaluator (see Decide who will conduct the evaluation) Ethical and qualities standards (see Define ethical and quality evaluation standards) Instructions for applicants.

- [Terms of reference for an action research approach to evaluation of She Can project - ActionAid](#)

This is an example of a TOR for an evaluation more in keeping with the C4D Evaluation Framework. Although the term 'C4D' is not used in this TOR, the activities include campaigns, mobilisation, coalition building, and women's groups and school clubs: all relevant to C4D. The approach to be used as outlined in this TOR is a theory-based evaluation using some action research.

The approach and the TOR are consistent with the C4D Evaluation Framework in the following ways:

- **Complex:** the use of the phased process allows for an adaptive approach. The first phase includes limited data collection to inform monitoring and learning strategies, followed by a second phase with six-monthly data collection and review activities, and a third and final phase that includes a theory-based evaluation to unpack change processes.
- **Learning-based:** building on the phased, adaptive, and learning-based process above where findings are built into the change theory and implementation over time, the users (specified on page 9) are the program staff and partners who will use the findings to improve implementation, the 'beneficiaries' who will use it to better understand effective strategies for change, and DFID who are interested from a policy point of view.
- **Participatory:** this TOR is an example of how an external evaluator can work with program staff to undertake evaluation. The description on pages 5-6 show clearly the way the consultant is expected to work in partnership with program teams and other stakeholders, and the governance structures outlined on page 9 point to the inclusion of stakeholders and partners.
- **Realistic:** The TOR directly addresses this by stating that the evaluation design must be proportionate to the scale and scope of the project, and should seek to minimise the burden on project and partner field staff in particular' (page 8). Further, although the consultancy will last approximately 3 years over four countries, the budget is relatively modest at \$100,000, accounting for the fact that it is not a full-time consultancy.
- **Critical:** The TOR states that the evaluation design must give 'due consideration to the involvement of project participants at all stages, and must seek to give primacy to the views and voices of people living in poverty, particularly women and girls'.