

Terms of Reference (TOR)

Endline Evaluation

1. Background

7amleh – The Arab Center for the Advancement of Social Media has implemented a project titled: “Enhancing Protection of Youth Digital Rights”. The 37-month project aimed at strengthening digital security awareness, capacity, advocacy and lobbying, research, resilience, and safer digital practices among Palestinian youth in the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, and the Gaza Strip. The intervention was designed in response to the growing digital risks faced by Palestinian youth, including surveillance, online harassment, censorship, digital repression, account compromise, and other violations of digital rights, particularly under conditions of heightened political repression and war. The intervention has also addressed issues relating to the collapsing digital economy for Palestinians in Gaza, and the impact this has on restricting digital access and payment for Palestinian youth. Given the different implementation conditions and timelines across the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, and Gaza, the evaluation will apply a differentiated analytical approach and present findings by geographic area wherever feasible.

In August 2024, 7amleh completed a baseline assessment titled “Digital Security among Palestinian Youth: Threats and Challenges under War Conditions.” The baseline generated evidence on youth digital behaviors, knowledge gaps, perceptions of risk, and use of protection practices through a mixed-methods approach. This baseline, together with project monitoring data and the project results framework, provides the reference point for the endline evaluation.

Following implementation of the project, 7amleh seeks to commission an external endline evaluation to assess the project’s performance, assess indicative change against baseline findings and project indicators, draw lessons for future programming, support accountability, and inform decision-making on future programming, adaptation, and potential scaling.

2. Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation

The primary purpose of this assignment is to deliver an endline evaluation with a strong focus on outcome measurement, indicator performance, evidence-based learning, accountability and practical decision-making for future programming. The evaluation should assess the project as a whole, covering all major interventions and results areas defined in the approved project documents, and should prioritize outcome-level change against baseline findings and project indicators.

The evaluation will build on the existing baseline study, ensuring alignment with key indicators and selected questions to enable indicative comparison, while allowing for adaptations in sampling and data collection methods based on feasibility and context. Comparability with the baseline

should be pursued through alignment with key indicators, selected survey questions, and core outcome domains; however, the evaluation is not expected to replicate the baseline methodology in full where context and feasibility do not allow.

Any broader reflection on the digital security landscape may be included only insofar as it helps explain evaluation findings. It should not replace the core evaluation function of assessing project performance, results, and learning.

The endline evaluation shall specifically aim to:

- Measure changes in relevant knowledge, attitudes, practices, and resilience outcomes among the project's target groups against baseline findings and project indicators. The Consultant will define the approach to measuring change in knowledge, attitudes, practices, and resilience outcomes based on alignment with baseline indicators, selected survey questions, and triangulation of quantitative and qualitative data, enabling indicative comparison between baseline and endline findings.
- Comparison with baseline findings will be indicative rather than statistically representative, given differences in sampling and data collection conditions.
- Assess the extent to which the project achieved its intended outputs and outcomes and identify the contribution to the impact across all implemented activities.
- Evaluate project performance using OECD-DAC evaluation criteria, with particular attention to relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. While all OECD-DAC criteria should be addressed, the depth of analysis should be proportionate to data availability and feasibility, with particular emphasis on relevance, effectiveness, and outcome-level change. Key evaluation questions under each criterion shall be defined and refined during the inception phase and reflected in the evaluation matrix to ensure structured and consistent analysis.
-
- Identify factors that enabled or constrained results, including contextual, operational, and protection-related considerations.
- Assess how contextual developments, access constraints, protection risks and other factors influenced implementation, data collection, and results, and clearly identify the implications of these limitations for interpretation of findings.
- Generate practical, evidence-based recommendations to strengthen future digital security programming, MEAL design, and partner engagement, and prioritize them into short-term and medium-term actions that are feasible within the operational context.

3. Scope of the Evaluation

The evaluation will cover the full implementation period of the project and all core activities, outputs, and expected outcomes reflected in the project proposal, logframe/results framework, Theory of Change, monitoring records, and workplans. The logframe/results framework will serve

as the primary reference point for performance assessment, triangulated with the baseline study, project monitoring data, and the Theory of Change. The evaluation will cover both the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, and Gaza components and timelines, and will present differentiated analysis by geographic area wherever feasible. The evaluation should cover the project's target groups and geographic areas, with attention to appropriate disaggregation by gender, age group, disability, and geographic area wherever data allows.

The evaluation shall explicitly assess the quality, validity, consistency, and limitations of available monitoring data, particularly for outcome-level indicators, and identify any important data gaps affecting interpretation of findings.

The evaluation scope should include, at minimum:

- Assessment of the project's Theory of Change, pathways of change, and underlying assumptions, including whether these assumptions remained valid in the evolving context.
- Review of the project logic, implementation approach, and delivery of planned activities.
- Assessment of progress against baseline values, targets, and endline results for key indicators.
- Analysis of changes in participants' digital security knowledge, practices, confidence, and ability to identify and respond to digital threats.
- Examination of how context, access, and protection concerns influenced project implementation and results.
- Assessment of the likelihood that results, capacities, or practices will be sustained beyond the project period, including behavioral, institutional, network-based, and where relevant policy-level sustainability.
- The evaluation will prioritize assessment of outcome-level changes, while output-level results will be primarily assessed through desk review of existing monitoring data and project documentation.
- Where access constraints limit primary data collection, particularly in Gaza, the evaluation will rely on secondary data and/or remote methods where feasible, and findings will be interpreted accordingly.
- At minimum, the evaluation should assess progress against the project's key output and outcome indicators as defined in the approved logframe/results framework. The inception report should specify which indicators will be directly assessed through primary data collection, which will be assessed through secondary monitoring data, and any indicators that cannot be robustly assessed, with justification.

3.1 project impact and outcomes indicators

Impact:

Results: Palestinian youth rights respected, with increased awareness of their digital rights and online protection, and collaboration enhanced among civil society, youth advocates, the public, and policymakers leading to impactful policy changes.

Indicator:

Percentage of increase in the level of awareness among targeted beneficiaries regarding the protection of their digital rights.

Outcomes:

Results:

1. Primary challenges, threats, and opportunities faced by Palestinian youth across the West Bank, East Jerusalem, and Gaza Strip regarding the protection of their digital rights have been systematically identified and analysed.

Indicators:

Percentage of increase in the level of awareness among the public, human rights activists, and decision-makers regarding the challenges, threats, and opportunities faced by Palestinian youth in the digital space by the end of 2026.

2. Palestinian youth and relevant civil society organizations have been empowered through increased awareness and enhanced capacities in digital rights protection, strategic advocacy, and addressing violations of digital safety and security.

Indicators:

Percentage of increase in the level of capacity of youth and relevant civil society organizations to protect digital rights, evidenced by implementable tools, knowledge, and advocacy skills.

Intermediate outcomes:

- 1- Increased awareness among the general public, human rights activists, and decision-makers regarding the challenges, threats, and opportunities faced by Palestinian youth in the digital space.

Indicators:

Percentage of increased awareness among the public, human rights activists, and decision-makers regarding the challenges faced by Palestinian youth in the digital space.

- 2- Increased capacity among youth and educators regarding the importance of protecting digital rights for Palestinian youth, along with the provision of implementable tools and information to enhance their online safety.

Indicators:

Percentage of youth and educators demonstrating improved knowledge and skills in digital rights protection.

4. Evaluation Criteria and Key Questions

The evaluation shall be structured around the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria, with depth of analysis proportionate to available data and feasibility. The evaluation team, led by the consultant, may refine the sub-questions in the inception phase, but the final evaluation matrix must remain clearly anchored in the criteria below and aligned with the project's results framework. While all criteria should be covered, particular analytical emphasis is expected on relevance, effectiveness, and outcome-level change.

Criterion	Illustrative evaluation questions
Relevance	To what extent did the project respond to the priority digital security needs of different target groups of Palestinian youth, including differences by geography, gender, age, and disability where feasible, and remain appropriate in the evolving political and digital context?
Coherence	How well was the project aligned with 7amleh's broader programming, partner efforts, the existing evidence base, and, where relevant, other civil society, national, or donor interventions working on related issues?
Effectiveness	To what extent were the planned outputs and outcomes achieved? What measurable changes occurred in awareness, knowledge, practices, and capacity to prevent or respond to digital threats?

Efficiency	How efficiently were project resources, time, partnerships, and delivery mechanisms used to achieve results? Were there implementation bottlenecks or adaptations that affected performance, and what can be said about cost-effectiveness or value for money for major interventions where feasible?
Impact	What broader positive or unintended changes can reasonably be associated with the project at participant or community level, and what qualitative and quantitative evidence supports the project's contribution to the changes?
Sustainability	To what extent are the project's benefits, capacities, and safer digital practices likely to continue after project completion across behavioral, institutional, network-based, and relevant policy-level dimensions? What conditions support or threaten sustainability?

In addition to the OECD-DAC criteria, the evaluation should answer the following core endline questions linked to the project's outcome measurement. For clarity, these questions should be organized in the inception phase under themes including: change against baseline and indicators; differential results across target groups; drivers, barriers, and contextual factors; and human rights-based learning.

- What measurable changes occurred between baseline and endline in the indicators and outcome areas prioritized by the project?
- Which target groups experienced the strongest or weakest results, disaggregated by gender, age, geography including Gaza vs. the West Bank/East Jerusalem, and disability where feasible, and what explains these differences?
- What aspects of the project design and implementation appear to have contributed most to observed change?

- Which intended results were only partially achieved or not achieved, and to what extent were these gaps shaped by internal factors such as design, implementation, and resources, and by external or contextual factors?
- What lessons should be integrated into future project design, implementation, and MEAL systems?
- To what extent were key human rights-based approach principles such as participation, accountability, non-discrimination and inclusion systematically integrated into the project, and how did they influence implementation and results?

Not all criteria will require the same level of primary data collection, and some will be assessed primarily through document review and key informant perspectives.

5. Methodology and Approach

The evaluation shall use a mixed-methods design, but with a clear outcome-focused orientation. Quantitative evidence on change against baseline and project indicators will be used where feasible and reliable, while qualitative methods will complement and explain findings.

The methodology will align with the baseline study framework while adapting tools and sampling strategies to fit the available timeframe and operational context.

The proposed methodology should be credible, feasible, and proportionate to the available timeframe and resources. It should, at minimum, include the following components:

- Document review: review of the project proposal, logframe/results framework, baseline assessment, monitoring data, training and activity records, and other relevant internal documents.
- Data collection methods may include a combination of remote and in-person approaches depending on feasibility and context.
- Indicator-based quantitative component: an endline survey aligned with selected baseline indicators, complemented by analysis of existing project monitoring data, enabling indicative comparison where methodologically appropriate.
- Qualitative component: focus group discussions and/or key informant interviews with selected participants, partners, and other relevant stakeholders to explain observed changes, implementation experience, contextual factors, and remaining gaps.
- Comparative analysis: clear comparison between baseline and endline findings, including explanation of any methodological limitations affecting comparability. The analysis will focus on identifying indicative changes and patterns rather than establishing causal attribution.
- Triangulation and validation: systematic triangulation across data sources and presentation of preliminary findings to 7amleh for factual validation before finalization, without influencing the independent analysis of conclusions of the evaluation.

Triangulation should include cross-checking quantitative findings against qualitative evidence, monitoring records, and document review.

The sampling strategy will be defined in the inception phase by the consultant and will follow a purposive and/or indicative approach designed to ensure reasonable coverage of key target groups, intervention types, and geographic areas. The inception report must specify the proposed sample composition, rationale, minimum numbers by method, and planned disaggregation by gender, age, geography, and disability where feasible. The sample is not expected to replicate the baseline or achieve statistical representativeness, but it must be sufficient to support credible indicative comparison and triangulation.

Where methodologically feasible and proportionate, the evaluation team may propose a comparison approach, quasi-comparison, or other strategy to strengthen interpretation of observed change; however, a full control group is not mandatory.

Participant identification will be based on criteria defined in the evaluation design, with final selection and recruitment carried out by the consultant in coordination with 7amleh.

All data collection tools will be drafted by the consultant and reviewed and approved by the consultant in coordination with 7amleh before fieldwork starts. The methodology must also incorporate conflict-sensitive and protection-sensitive considerations appropriate to the Palestinian context and the subject matter of digital security, including ethical protocols such as informed consent, confidentiality, and safeguarding of participants' digital and personal security.

The depth of analysis across OECD-DAC criteria will be proportionate to available data, timeframe, and feasibility, with particular emphasis on effectiveness and outcome-level change.

6. Key Tasks and Responsibilities of the Evaluation Team

- Conduct a kick-off meeting with 7amleh to refine the evaluation scope, questions, and workplan.
- Review all relevant project documents and reconstruct the project logic/results chain as needed for evaluation purposes, ensuring alignment with the approved logframe and project design.
- Develop and submit an inception report, including the evaluation matrix, methodology, sampling plan, tools, workplan, and ethical considerations for review and approval prior to the start of data collection
- Ensure the collection and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data in line with the agreed methodology.
- Review the quality and completeness of available monitoring and indicator data, document major limitations, and explain how these limitations will be addressed analytically in the evaluation.

- Compare endline findings with baseline and project targets and assess results against the OECD-DAC criteria.
- Present preliminary findings and contribute to a validation/learning session with 7amleh and relevant stakeholders.
- Prepare and submit high-quality draft and final evaluation reports that are clear, evidence-based, well-structured, and include actionable recommendations aligned with the findings.

7. Expected Deliverables

The main output of this assignment is a final endline evaluation report, not a standalone research study with a primary focus on assessing project performance, results and learning. Deliverables should be practical, evidence-based, and directly usable for accountability, learning, and future programming.

The final report should clearly distinguish between findings, conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations, and should explicitly address project context, project logic and assumptions, methodology and limitations, analysis by evaluation criterion, and prioritized recommendations for practical uptake.

- Inception report, including refined evaluation questions, evaluation matrix, methodology, sampling strategy, data collection tools, detailed workplan, ethical/data protection protocol, and a brief assessment of anticipated risks, access constraints, and mitigation measures.
- Finalized data collection tools aligned with baseline indicators and the project results framework.
- Cleaned quantitative dataset and qualitative materials/notes, or another agreed documentation package sufficient for verification and handover, while ensuring confidentiality and data protection standards are respected.
- Preliminary findings presentation/debrief for 7amleh and relevant stakeholders, for factual validation and feedback without influencing the independence of the evaluation conclusions.
- Draft endline evaluation report with an executive summary, methodology, findings by OECD-DAC criterion, analysis of progress against indicators and baseline, a clear account of methodological, contextual, and data-related limitations and their implications for interpretation, conclusions, lessons learned, and actionable recommendations clearly supported by evidence and analysis.
- Final endline evaluation report incorporating feedback from 7amleh.
- Contribution to one learning and reflection workshop, including presentation of key findings (facilitation led by 7amleh).

- A concise presentation (e.g. PowerPoint) summarizing key findings, conclusions, and recommendations for use with stakeholders.

8. Reporting Format

The draft and final reports should be clear, concise, and structured for decision-making and grounded in robust and evidence-based analysis. At minimum, the report should include:

- Executive summary
- Introduction and project overview
- Evaluation purpose, scope, and limitations
- Methodology and sampling
- Findings organized by OECD-DAC criterion and by key outcome area
- Comparison with baseline results, targets, and other monitoring evidence
- Conclusions
- Lessons learned
- Practical recommendations, prioritized and actionable, and clearly linked to the evaluation findings.
- Annexes, including tools, evaluation matrix, and list of reviewed documents/interviewed stakeholders as appropriate, as well as any additional materials supporting transparency and verification of findings.

9. Timeline

The assignment is expected to be completed within a timeframe to be agreed with 7amleh, with an indicative duration of 8 weeks from contract signature, subject to feasibility of data collection and access constraints. A detailed timeline will be developed during the inception phase, covering the following phases:

- Inception and document review
- Tool development and approval
- Data collection
- Data analysis and preliminary debrief
- Draft reporting
- Validation, final reporting, and learning workshop

10. Management and Coordination

The evaluation will be conducted by the evaluation team under the overall supervision of 7amleh's project team and in coordination with the relevant MEAL focal point(s).

The consultant will be responsible for the overall technical quality, methodological rigor, and timely delivery of the evaluation.

The consultant will support implementation of data collection and initial analysis under the guidance of the consultant.

7amleh will provide access to project documentation, baseline materials, indicator tracking data, and will facilitate coordination with relevant stakeholders as needed.

Regular coordination meetings will be held at agreed milestones, including at minimum a kick-off meeting, an inception review meeting, a mid-process check-in if needed, and a preliminary findings validation meeting. 7amleh will provide consolidated feedback on key deliverables within an agreed timeframe during the inception phase.

11. Ethical Considerations and Data Protection

The evaluation must comply with high ethical standards and appropriate data protection measures, especially given the sensitive political and digital security context. The evaluation team shall ensure:

- Informed consent for all participants and age-appropriate consent/assent procedures where applicable, including additional safeguards for minors and vulnerable groups.
- Confidentiality, anonymity, and secure management of all data collected.
- Application of do-no-harm principles in tool design, recruitment, data collection, analysis, and reporting.
- Protection-sensitive handling of testimonies related to surveillance, harassment, repression, or other digital harms.
- Secure storage and transfer of digital files, with access limited to authorized personnel.

12. Evaluation team Qualifications

The team should demonstrate the following qualifications:

- Proven experience in evaluation, MEAL, or applied research, including endline or final evaluations for donor-funded projects, preferably in similar sectors or contexts.
- Demonstrated ability to apply OECD-DAC criteria and conduct outcome-focused mixed-methods evaluations.
- Strong experience in quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis, including comparative analysis against baseline or indicator frameworks.
- Solid understanding of the Palestinian political, social, and digital context.
- Prior experience in digital rights, digital security, youth programming, civic space, or human rights is a strong asset.
- For team applications, a balanced combination of expertise in evaluation, MEAL, and thematic knowledge is expected.
- Excellent analytical and report-writing skills in English and/or Arabic.