

Terms of Reference for Project Evaluation

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Background | 2 |
| 2. Purpose of the Evaluation | 3 |
| 3. Objectives and Key Evaluation Questions..... | 4 |
| 3.2. Scope of the Evaluation..... | 4 |
| 4. Evaluation Design & Methodology | 5 |
| 4.1. Presentation of the Results..... | 6 |
| 5. Duration of the Evaluation..... | 6 |
| 6. Hired Firm’s Staffing Profile | 6 |
| 7. Organization, Roles and Responsibilities | 6 |
| 8. Plan for Dissemination and Learning | 7 |
| 9. Application Requirements..... | 7 |
| Annex I. Logical Framework | 8 |
| Annex II. Baseline Research Questions | 13 |

I. Background

Save the Children Turkey, in partnership with Yuva Association and Association of Migrant Rights and Social Cohesion, has been implementing a project entitled, “*Strengthened protection and wellbeing among refugee, youth and adults in Istanbul and Ankara*” starting from July 2018. The project will be closed out in the first quarter of 2020 (February for Ankara, and March for Istanbul fields). The project aims to strengthen protection and wellbeing among both host community and refugee children, youth and adults in Keçiören district of Ankara, and Avcılar and Ümraniye districts of Istanbul. These services are also being benefited by the refugee communities in the neighboring districts, particularly Altındağ in Ankara, and Esenyurt in Istanbul.

The implementation aimed to enhance the protection of vulnerable individual and groups (through e.g. access to information and legal guidance) and strengthen children’s protection from violence and abuse and their psychosocial wellbeing (through e.g. structured workshops for children and their caregivers). The project also aimed to strengthen community based structures through a multi-tiered awareness campaign on refugee rights, legal and social welfare system, available protection services, identification of risks, and link to relevant protection services through Individual Protection Assistance (IPA), case management, and referrals. Consequently, community based structures (i.e. child/youth led groups) were empowered to pursue their own awareness raising activities mainly focusing on protection issues.

It should be noted that several critical developments took place during the implementation, including but not limited to the earthquake in Istanbul, large number of households moving to Keçiören particularly from Altındağ, regulatory changes concerning SuTP’s registration, and change of the implementation style in Istanbul fields from partner implementation to direct implementation.

Specific Objective: Refugees, asylum seekers and host community members in Keçiören, Ümraniye and Avcılar municipalities have improved awareness of refugee rights and increased access to information, protection and psychosocial support services.

Specific Objective Indicators

- % of surveyed individuals that report enhanced knowledge on refugee rights, benefits, and procedural remedies to access them after benefitting from the Action (Target: 80%)
- # of individuals benefitting from services in Community centers (refugee/host, age and gender) (Target: 10,930)
- # of regular protection monitoring reports produced and trends analysis shared with relevant partners (Target: 28)

Result I: Refugees, asylum seekers, host communities and service providers in target municipalities have increased access to protection-focused information

Result I Indicators

- # of child and youth-led initiatives to raise awareness on refugee rights and responsibilities, (child) protection and other pertinent topics defined by the community members themselves (Target: 4)
- # of individuals (women, men, girls and boys where possible) trained on international protection, rights, services and available assistance (Target: 1,020)
- # of persons with increased/appropriate information on relevant rights and/or entitlements (Target: 4,905)

Result 2: Vulnerable girls, boys, women and men have increased access to individual protection assistance and services to enhance protection, wellbeing and resilience

Result 2 Indicators

- # of persons with protection needs identified and referred to relevant services (Target: 2,680)
- % of people accessing protection services satisfied with service provided (Target: 90%)
- # of people receiving capacity building on relevant child protection, child-focused PSS and resilience topics (Target: 40)
- # and % of boys and girls that indicate increased resilience resources and psychosocial wellbeing (Target: 80%)
- # of persons who receive an appropriate response (Target: 5,466)

Result 3: Formal and informal protection actors have access to information on protection risk and gaps in Istanbul and Ankara to inform intervention design and implementation

Result 3 Indicators

- # of protection monitoring reports produced (Target: 28)
- # of key protection actors in project locations reporting using the gender-sensitive Protection Risk and Gap Analysis to inform their programme design and implementation (Target:20)
- # of advocacy products produced and disseminated and/or number of meetings/events held (Target: 28)

2. Purpose of the Evaluation

This evaluation is expected to be a *baseline and end-of-project analysis of project and comparison groups*, and favors a quasi-experimental design. As part of the design, non-random project and comparison groups can be selected in line with the preferred quasi-experimental techniques.

- The results are expected to cover the differences at the beginning and the end of the project and while addressing the below specified key evaluation questions.
- The findings should cover the main causes of short-comings, elaborate on the positive and/or negative impact of the implementation while reflecting on the achieved targets/results against objectives.
- Determine to what extent the aimed impact was achieved, and to learn from the implementation strategies, processes and challenges encountered.
- It should be noted that the evaluation methodology has to account for SC's ethical considerations, particularly concerning child participation.

2.1.1. Integration of the end-line Study

As part of the evaluation, the research team is expected to collect end line data (See Annex II. Baseline Terms of Reference). SCI applied a mixed-methods approach at the baseline phase, thus, ideally the end line too should abide by the same methodology, while the tools can be revised in coordination with SCI.

The research team/supplier is expected to provide a methodological approach to the end line alongside the overall evaluation methodology in their technical proposal. If alterations are foreseen the limitations should be specified.

3. Objectives and Key Evaluation Questions

The evaluation design is expected to utilize the below DAC criteria as a bare minimum:

3.1.1. Relevance

- i. To what extent has the project reached the most vulnerable and at risk children?
- ii. To what extent has the project taken beneficiaries'/community initiatives' needs into account in design and implementation, in relation to age, gender, disability, and population groups?
 - i. How was the project adapted to meet different needs of the beneficiaries?
 - ii. Assess the scope of the Community Engagement Strategy.

3.1.2. Effectiveness

- iii. Assess to what extent was the objective achieved and determine the factors contributing in achievement and non-achievement.
- iv. On what basis was the beneficiary population and target groups selected?
 - i. Were there other demographic groups that could/should have been included?
- v. Assess the capacity building and supervision efforts, both as part of SCI's partnership approach and on-the-job learning.
- vi. Assess the shortcomings of the information management structure in place throughout the project
- vii. Assess the effectiveness of protection interventions (Individual Protection Assistance, Case Management, Referrals) particularly focusing on vulnerabilities and risks.
 - i. What was the impact of procedural and regulatory challenges?
 - ii. How were the identified protection gaps addressed during the implementation?

3.1.3. Impact

- viii. Assess the change/real difference the intervention made in the lives of the beneficiaries.
 - i. Assess the impact of the project via comparison between individuals who benefited from multiple types of services as part of integrated programming, versus those who received one-type of service.
 - ii. Assess the district level impact in relation to the baseline and endline data.

3.1.4. Sustainability

- ix. Will the changes caused by the project continue beyond the life cycle of the project?
- x. Has the project improved the awareness of stakeholders on protection principles, rights, and risks faced by the affected populations?
 - i. Have beneficiaries' capacity and awareness on rights, access to information and protection services improved as a result of this Action?

3.2. Scope of the Evaluation

The evaluation will cover the affected population, primary residing in Avcılar and Ümraniye districts of Istanbul, and Keçiören district of Ankara. Nevertheless, it should be noted that in both provinces, the project had a significant catchment area, particularly Esenyurt in Istanbul and Altındağ in Ankara, which should be integrated into the evaluation design.

The evaluation should be as inclusive as possible in reaching beneficiaries from different gender, age groups, vulnerabilities, as well as relevant stakeholders. Inclusion of children and youth is a must. The primary population groups targeted were Syrian beneficiaries in Istanbul, while Syrian, Iraqi, and Afghan beneficiaries were reached in Ankara.

4. Evaluation Design & Methodology

The evaluation will be conducted externally by an independent consultant/firm; the hired researcher/team member is expected to assume the role of team leader. Save the Children will facilitate access to the fields and partner organization, the contracted consultant/firm is expected to rely on their network and secure operational permissions from the authorities if large scale field work is proposed.

The evaluating firm is expected to draw the frame of the methodology for the evaluation, expand or restrict (with justification) the key evaluation questions. The consultant/firm should keep the below considerations in mind when submitting their design:

- All project materials will be provided for desk review. The initial methodology set can be revised following the desk research upon consultation with SC.
 - There is significant secondary data available for the research team/supplier to benefit from during the desk review, including but not limited to baseline data/report, a beneficiary database covering participation to activities on individual level, along with MHPSS Study, Protection Risk and Gap Analysis, Outcome and Impact Assessment Reports.
- Mixed methods approach is desired for this study. The quantitative aspect is expected to be limited to end line data collection, and to the tools used at the baseline phase which can be revised in line with the design proposed.
- Use of non-random control groups are desirable, and the evaluating consultant/firm should specify whether or not they will be including it in their design at their proposal. If included, the risk assessment needs to be approved by SC, particularly concerning the children and young people's participation.
- Qualitative sampling shall depend on the principal of saturation, hence fixed amount of FGDs and KIIs will not be favored, instead the firm/consultants are expected to submit a minimum and an evidence driven maximum number of FGDs/KIIs that may be conducted.
- Separate FGDs will be conducted for boys and girls, women and men. Given that the project focuses on protection, no exceptions will be allowed for FGD recruitment. The age breakdown should be in line with the project's focus/selection criteria. The firm is expected to submit all procedures with the tools at the end of the inception phase, however FGDs should be further disaggregated by the below criteria at a minimum.
 - Population group where different nationalities should not be put together unless it is desired for research purposes, justification is provided, and no conflict is foreseen in light of the content
 - Age difference among the FGD participants should not exceed 5 years of age
 - The evaluating firm should ensure that CSG risks are mitigated, where a staff member is present outside the room, or coordinate with the SCI/partner teams to have focal points for children who wish to leave or need PFA.
- Child friendly methodologies should be used in all child FGDs; interviews or surveys cannot be conducted with children.
- KIIs can be conducted with stakeholders, staff, community leaders, and hard to reach population groups.
- Children's wellbeing is paramount. It should be noted that as it is a protection project, data collection is open to unexpected disclosure or report of sensitive information. Accordingly, the consultant/firm's staff needs to be prepared to identify and intervene in case of disclosure during the evaluation, conduct internal referral where relevant, and abide by confidentiality principles.

Mandatory Child Safeguarding, Identification & Referral trainings will be provided by SCI prior to data collection.

- If the evaluating staff are not fluent in Arabic and/or Farsi, high quality interpretation should be arranged by the consultant/firm. Additional project staff or resources will not be dedicated to the evaluating team.
- Designated SCI staff will be conducting on-site monitoring during the evaluation, joining data collection at observation capacity.
- Field teams should consist of teams of two during the qualitative data collection, consisting of a woman and man if applicable. The research teams should be gender sensitive during the qualitative data collection, where the team should consist of women facilitating/note taking/translating in women's groups, and vice versa.

4.1. Presentation of the Results

The consultant/firm should provide an inception report following the review of the secondary sources provided by SC and before the field work, which articulates the evaluation design, and include the proposed methodology, sampling strategy, tools, team structure, and work plan. The field work will be being following the presentation of the inception report to the relevant Save the Children staff.

All complaints, any identified incidents or concerns of CGS, Code of Conduct, fraud shall be reported as identified in line with SCI policies.

The consultant firm is expected to submit all means of verification (i.e. interview outlines/notes, consent forms, FGD notes) together with the final report. The consultant firm shall not have exclusive copyright of the report or storing privilege concerning the collected data.

5. Duration of the Evaluation

The evaluating body will be selected in mid-January. The evaluation is expected to be completed in 40 work days inclusive of the inception period and reporting. The final report, including the integration of the feedback received from SC is expected to be submitted by mid-March.

6. Hired Firm's Staffing Profile

- University degree in a relevant field (i.e. social sciences, statistics, social work, psychology)
- The team must contain at least 1 social worker and 1 psychologist.
- The team must contain at least 1 staff member who has experience in conducting child FGDs through child friendly methodologies
- The team must be gender balanced
- Proven track record in conducting quality evaluations (preferably in protection sector)
- The team lead should have thorough knowledge of the implementation context/sites
- The team lead should have thorough knowledge of protection related regulations in Turkey
- Valid work permits to work in Turkey
- The research team should consist of staff fluent in Arabic, Farsi, English, and Turkish.

7. Organization, Roles and Responsibilities

SC staff will act as the advisory group during the evaluation process, and provide technical assistance (provision of the necessary documents and information, review of the evaluation design, methodology, tools). Practical assistance will not be provided (i.e. in-country travel, translation/interpretation, accommodation).

Save the children will facilitate the initial communication/coordination between the partner organization and the hired firm/consultants. However, the firm/consultants are expected to utilize their network in order to reach additional local authorities and/or other stakeholders.

8. Plan for Dissemination and Learning

The consultant/firm is expected validate the findings through validation meetings/sessions, and present to SC Turkey and partner organization teams at the end of the evaluation process. All additional activities concerning dissemination and learning will be undertaken by Save the Children.

9. Application Requirements

- Technical proposal (max. 4 pages) including the scope of work, tentative methodology, any revisions to the key evaluation questions, and tentative work plan.
- Financial proposal including a detailed budget breakdown of estimated costs (i.e. accommodation, plane tickets, translation).
- CV's and work permits (if applicable) of the staff who will take part in the evaluation

Annex I. Logical Framework

| Intervention Logic | Objectively Verifiable Indicators and Relevant Information | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---------------------|
| Specific Objective | Indicators | Target Value | Means of Verification | Assumptions & risks |
| Refugees, asylum seekers and host community members in Keçiören, Ümraniye and Avcılar municipalities have improved awareness of refugee rights and increased access to information, protection and psychosocial support services | % of surveyed individuals that report enhanced knowledge on refugee rights, benefits, and procedural remedies to access them after benefiting from the Action | 80 [disaggregated by nationality, population group (IP/ TP /unregistered/ host community), location (province, district, neighborhood), age and gender] Baseline: 0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Survey (post-activity <u>quarterly</u>) | |
| | # of individuals benefitting from services in Community Centers (3RP Protection, Indicator 2.2.1) | Total: 10.930 Istanbul:5.724 Ankara:5.206 [disaggregated by nationality, population group (IP/ TP /unregistered/ host community), location (province, district, neighborhood), age and gender] Baseline: 0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Records (activity records and attendance sheets) | |
| | # of regular protection monitoring reports produced and trends analysis shared with relevant partners (ECHO recommended standard indicator) | Total: 28 Istanbul: 14 Ankara: 14 [disaggregated by partner organization] | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protection monitoring reports Key stakeholder meeting records Attendance records | |
| Results | Indicators | Target Value | Means of Verification | Assumptions & risks |
| Result 1: Refugees, asylum seekers, host communities and service | # of persons with increased/appropriate information on relevant rights and/or entitlements | Total: 4.905 direct, 19240 indirect | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community engagement activity plans and reports Project progress reports | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| providers in target municipalities have increased access to protection-focused information | | Istanbul: 2.385 direct, 11.040 indirect Ankara: 2.520 direct, 8.200 indirect [disaggregated by nationality, population group (IP/ TP /unregistered/ host community), location (province, district, neighborhood), age and gender] Baseline: 303 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports from protection and counselling service, • Attendance records, • Photo/video documentation at larger events | |
| | # of child and youth-led initiatives to raise awareness on refugee rights and responsibilities, (child) protection and other pertinent topics defined by the community members themselves | Total: 4 [Ankara only] | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting minutes • Attendance records • Community engagement activity plans and reports | |
| | # of individuals (women, men, girls and boys where possible) trained on international protection, rights, services and available assistance (3RP Protection, Indicator 1.1.1) | Total: 1.020 Istanbul:420 Ankara:600 [disaggregated by nationality, population group (IP/ TP /unregistered/ host community), location (province, district, neighborhood), age and gender] Baseline: 0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance records • Training reports | |

Activities under Result 1

- 1.1 Develop a Community Engagement Strategy for each targeted location
- 1.2 Identification of available services in targeted municipalities
- 1.3 Identification and strengthening of community based mechanism in targeted municipalities
- 1.4 Design, translate and public information on refugee rights, entitlements, responsibilities and available services
- 1.5 Establish or empower existing helpdesks/first admission desks at the targeted Community Centers
- 1.6 Implement awareness raising sessions and mass awareness realizing events

| 1.7 Coordination meetings/Workshops with other service providers, including health, nutrition and livelihoods actors | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---------------------|
| Results | Indicators | Target Value | Means of Verification | Assumptions & risks |
| Result 2: Vulnerable girls, boys, women and men have increased access to individual protection assistance and services to enhance protection, wellbeing and resilience | # of persons who receive an appropriate response | Total: 5.466 direct, 24.200 indirect Istanbul: 2.870 direct, 13.000 indirect Ankara: 2596 direct, 11.200 indirect [disaggregated by nationality, population group (IP/ TP /unregistered/ host community), location (province, district, neighborhood), age and gender] Baseline:400 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Registration and consultation records for IPA and other protection services such as initial consultation and support to address complex protection concerns | |
| | (2.1) # of persons with protection needs identified and referred to relevant series (ECHO recommended standard indicator) | Total: 2.680 Istanbul: 1.560 Ankara: 1.120 [disaggregated by nationality, population group (IP/ TP /unregistered/ host community), location (province, district, neighborhood), age and gender] Baseline:386 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Referral records | |
| | % of people accessing protection services satisfied with service provided | 90 [disaggregated by nationality, population group (IP/ TP /unregistered/ host community), location (province, district, neighborhood), age and | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interview/surveys FGDs | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--------------------------------|
| | | gender, type of specialist vulnerability] | | |
| | # of people receiving capacity building on relevant child protection, child focused PSS and resilience topics | Total: 40 Istanbul: 20 Ankara: 20 [disaggregated by location (province, district, neighborhood), age and gender, training topic] | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance records | |
| | # and % of boys and girls that indicate increased resilience and psychosocial wellbeing | 80 [% of 350 children] [disaggregated by nationality, population group (IP/ TP /unregistered/ host community), location (province, district, neighborhood), age and gender] | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline/End line surveys • FGDs • Beneficiary follow up interviews • Quality Benchmark Assessment reports | |
| Activities under Result 2 | | | | |
| <p>2.1 Provision of IPA, including referral, information counseling, assistive services and material assistance, in accordance with the ECHO SoPs for IPA</p> <p>2.2 Provide resilience and protection-oriented activities for boys and girls 10-18 years, which also strengthen their psychosocial wellbeing</p> <p>2.3 Provide training and technical supervision to project staff on Structured PSS CR/YR Programs, facilitation skills, child protection; CP minimum standards; CP; child safe programming (incl. child safeguarding); child participation; and gender equality.</p> <p>2.4 Deliver trainings and workshops on refugee rights, protection and other topics requested by asylum seekers and refugees (Ankara only)</p> <p>2.5 Conduct study on the resilience and psychosocial wellbeing of Syrian children and youth living in Turkey</p> | | | | |
| Results | Indicators | Target Value | Means of Verification | Assumptions & risks |
| Result 3: Formal and informal protection actors have access to information on protection risk and gaps in Istanbul and Ankara to inform intervention design and implementation | # of protection monitoring reports produced (3RP Protection, Indicator 1.1.2) | Total: 28 Istanbul: 14 Ankara: 14 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection monitoring mission/visit monthly reports | |
| | # of key protection actors in project locations reporting using the gender sensitive Protection Risk and Gap Analysis to inform their programme design and implementation | Total: 20 Istanbul: 10 Ankara: 10 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey after dissemination of report | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | # of joint activities and meetings conducted with relevant government bodies to raise awareness on protection concerns and advocate for policy support and resource allocation | Total: 28 Istanbul: 14 Ankara: 14 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting minutes • Activity plans and reports | |
| Activities under Result 3 | | | | |
| <p>3.1 Conduct a Protection Risk and Gap Analysis, incorporating a gender analysis for Istanbul and Ankara targeted districts</p> <p>3.2 Conduct protection monitoring in the districts of operation</p> <p>3.3 Arrange for joint activities, meetings and trainings with relevant municipal and national government departments to raise awareness on protection concerns and advocate for policy support and resource allocation</p> <p>3.4 Facilitate the child-led photo project “Keçiören in the Eyes of a Child” to add a child perspective to protection risk and gap analysis</p> <p>3.5 Symposium on Child Rights</p> | | | | |

Annex II. Baseline Terms of Reference

I. Background

Save the Children Turkey, in partnership with Yuva Association and Association of Migrant Rights and Social Cohesion, will be implementing a 16-month project entitled, “*Strengthened protection and wellbeing among refugee, youth and adults in Istanbul and Ankara*” starting from July 2018. The project aims to strengthen protection and wellbeing among both host community and refugee children, youth and adults in Keçiören district of Ankara, and Avcılar and Ümraniye districts of Istanbul. These services are also being benefited by the refugee communities in the neighbouring districts.

The implementation aims to enhance the protection of vulnerable individual and groups (through e.g. access to information and legal guidance) and strengthen children’s protection from violence and abuse and their psychosocial wellbeing (through e.g. structured workshops for children and their caregivers). The project also aims to strengthen community based structures through a multi-tiered awareness campaign on refugee rights, legal and social welfare system, available protection services, identification of risks, and link to relevant protection services through Individual Protection Assistance (IPA). Consequently, community based structures (i.e. child/youth led groups) are empowered to pursue their own awareness raising activities mainly focused on protection issues. A concurrent branch of the implementation will be conducting on-going protection monitoring to inform relevant protection actors on the needs for complementary systems strengthening to enable the integration of protection services with existing local and national structures, as well as to improve the intervention design and implementation.

Specific Objective: Refugees, asylum seekers and host community members in Keçiören, Ümraniye and Avcılar municipalities have improved awareness of refugee rights and increased access to information, protection and psychosocial support services.

Main Indicators under the Specific Objective

- % of surveyed individuals that report enhanced knowledge on refugee rights, benefits, and procedural remedies to access them after benefitting from the Action (Target: 80%)
- # of individuals benefitting from services in Community centres (refugee/host, age and gender) (Target: 10,930)
- # of regular protection monitoring reports produced and trends analysis shared with relevant partners (Target: 28)

Result I: Refugees, asylum seekers, host communities and service providers in target municipalities have increased access to protection-focused information

Main Indicators under Result I

- # of child and youth-led initiatives to raise awareness on refugee rights and responsibilities, (child) protection and other pertinent topics defined by the community members themselves (Target: 4)
- # of individuals (women, men, girls and boys where possible) trained on international protection, rights, services and available assistance (Target: 1,020)
- # of persons with increased/appropriate information on relevant rights and/or entitlements (Target: 4,905)

Result 2: Vulnerable girls, boys, women and men have increased access to individual protection assistance and services to enhance protection, wellbeing and resilience

Main Indicators under Result 2

- # of persons with protection needs identified and referred to relevant services (Target: 2,680)
- % of people accessing protection services satisfied with service provided (Target: 90%)
- # of people receiving capacity building on relevant child protection, child-focused PSS and resilience topics (Target: 40)
- # and % of boys and girls that indicate increased resilience resources and psychosocial wellbeing (Target: 80%)
- # of persons who receive an appropriate response (Target: 5,466)

Result 3: Formal and informal protection actors have access to information on protection risk and gaps in Istanbul and Ankara to inform intervention design and implementation

Main Indicators under Result 3

- # of protection monitoring reports produced (Target: 28)
- # of key protection actors in project locations reporting using the gender-sensitive Protection Risk and Gap Analysis to inform their programme design and implementation (Target:20)
- # of advocacy products produced and disseminated and/or number of meetings/events held (Target: 28)

2. Purpose of the Baseline Assessment

In order to successfully measure the long-term effects and actual change/benefit achieved for the target population (refugee communities and host community), in cooperation with its local partners, SCI will be conducting an internal baseline study. The findings of the baseline will enable accurate measurement of the impact, shape the implementation of the action. In addition, the findings will inform the Protection Risks & Gap Analysis and the Community Engagement Strategy planned to be conducted under the grant.

The baseline assessment is expected to report on the following:

- I. Provide descriptive information to effectively measure intermediate/result level and specific objective level baseline, in line with the project's intervention logic.**
 - a. Profile the respondents through identified indicators, with safe and meaningful participation of the community.
 - i. Assess access to the community centres at the baseline phase in order to determine the expansion of reach at the end line.
 - I. Particularly inquire beneficiaries' access to protection services and capture the beneficiaries' current thoughts on the services provided.
 - b. Identification of individuals and groups who face challenges in accessing services, relevant information, focusing on protection-focused services in a descriptive manner.
 - i. Identify known service providers, information points, and/or assistance available in different forms at the implementation sites.
 - ii. Identify specific sectors to which access is limited, factors that prevent individuals and/or groups' access or participate in services and why (i.e. discrimination, physical access).
 - iii. Identify the existing ways of communication by service providers to reach out beneficiaries

1. Identify the preferred mode of communication by the beneficiaries
 - c. Determine the initial relationship between the partners and stakeholders, in order to reflect the impact of the production and dissemination of the protection monitoring reports' results at the end line.
- 2. Report on the realities on the ground and provide input on the actions taken by the communities.**
 - a. Highlight background factors (i.e. refugee/host community, neighbourhood dynamics) concerning the relationship between the individuals and groups, and service providers, with a particular focus on protection and child protection.
 - i. Gather preliminary information on the service providers that are known and communicated by the community.
 1. Identify which sectors the known actors are focusing on and elaborate on their reach to the community from the beneficiaries' point of view.
 2. Inform the Community Engagement Strategy through identifying the existence and role of the community networks and community leaders, along with their reach and inclusiveness.
 - a. Categorically inquire the priority topics identified by the community members on which awareness raising is essential (i.e. refugee rights, protection, child protection).
 - b. Identify whether there are any activities organized on these topics. If yes, were beneficiaries reached out and contributed to the activity (i.e. providing their input, expectations).
 - i. If yes, determine how the beneficiaries were reached.
 - b. Assess the prior knowledge of the community on protection, refugee rights, legal and social welfare system, and procedural remedies to access them.
 - i. Inquire prior trainings, awareness raising campaigns and other efforts took place in the implementation site.
 1. If informed, inquire the beneficiaries' thought on these activities, their usefulness, effectiveness, and satisfactoriness.
 - c. Identify ease and hardship factors which effect access to protection services.
 - i. Individual and groups' knowledge, attitudes and practices regarding where and how to access support to address their needs.
 - ii. Determine whether the beneficiaries are informed of any selection criteria which limit access for certain groups, and inquire their thoughts on the practice.
- 3. Identify new developments, emerging issues, an/or field level challenges which has potential to influence over/under achievements, all the more so, impact of the project either positively or negatively. This includes identification of specific risks to child safe programming.**
- 4. Recommendations for further research through a Protection Risk and Gap Analysis will subsequently be undertaken by Save the Children and partners.**

2.1. Duration of the Baseline Study

The baseline process is expected to begin on the week of 17th of September, and is estimated to take 30-35 work days from late September will early November 2018.

3. Methodology

Both primary and secondary sources of information will be used to generate credible evidence. Concerning primary data collection, mixed-methods will be employed, where data collection shall enable child participation and be gender sensitive. Concerning the latter, minimum expectations from SCI are ensuring equal representation of women and men, and provision of separate sessions for women and men.

In cooperation with its local partners, standardized tools for both qualitative and quantitative data collection will be developed, including key informant interview, focus group discussion questionnaires, and a baseline survey. Data collection will be a collective effort by SCI and its local partners' staff, including but not limited to staff who focus on MEAL, PSS, Protection, IPA, and translation/interpretation. SCI will be triangulating the already at hand data with the findings of qualitative and quantitative data collection, and validate the results in mid-November in all three locations.

3.1. Procedures

- Quantitative data will be collected digitally through Kobo Toolbox, with data access limitations to the dataset depending on the role of the staff.
- Designated SCI staff will conduct continuous on-site and off-site monitoring to ensure that Protection/Child Protection focal points are informed of identified individuals who are required to be referred timely, as well as data quality, accuracy, and cleanliness.
- Daily briefings will be held to inform the teams of any adjustments necessary or the developments that occur in the area (i.e. safety and security related updates, unavoidable edits within the questionnaire, reach of targets).
- The field teams will consist of pairs, where one of the members is required to be partner staff, whom may be accompanied by an external Arabic speaking interpreter. The number of teams will be determined in the first week, and if external support on interpretation is required, these staff will be hired prior to trainings.
- Prior to the field work, field teams will be trained on the critical function and presentation of consent forms, technical parameters of the questionnaire, data collection techniques, and child protection identification for necessary referrals.
- Recruitment of the beneficiaries will be done via Arabic speaking staff, who will contact the beneficiaries via their phone. Beneficiaries accessing services at the centre during the implementation of the baseline will also be welcome.

3.2. Sampling Strategy

Stratified sampling proportionate to the population size is deemed fit for the quantitative aspect of the research in line with the current limitations concerning the timeframe of the implementation and available human resource. The research will be conducted at 95% significance and 5% margin of error, which requires a sample size of 382.

Currently, province level data concerning Syrians under Temporary Protection (SuTP) is available to all actors in the field, however district level is not. Similarly, the number of individuals under IP, particularly outside of satellite cities is not available. Accordingly, the sample is drawn through the data provided by SCI's local partners, which estimates the number of refugees living under TP and IP in the implementation sites to be around 54,300. Syrians constitute the vast majority in Ümraniye and Avcılar districts, while they constitute half of the targeted population in Keçiören. In light of the collected information, the sample

is planned to reflect population distribution per district. It should be noted that host community was not included in the sample size calculation, however they could be included in the study depending on convenience of time and human resource.

| Implementing Partner | District | Estimated Number of ind. under TP | Estimated Number of ind. under IP | District Level Percentage Breakdown | Sample Proportion |
|---|--------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| Association of Migrant Rights and Social Cohesion | Keçiören, Ankara | ~ 9,000 | ~ 10,000 (Iraqi) ~ 1,000 (Afghan) | 36,8% [18% Iraqi, 17% Syrian, 1,8% Afghan] | 141 [Iraqi: 69, Syrian: 65, Afghan: 7] |
| Yuva Association | Avcılar, Istanbul | ~ 19,500 | N/A | 35,9% Syrian | 137 |
| Yuva Association | Ümraniye, Istanbul | ~ 14,800 | N/A | 27,3% Syrian | 104 |
| | Total: | ~ 43,300 | ~ 11,000 | 100% | 382 |

The qualitative aspect of the baseline is planned to cover child (9-12), youth (13-17), and adult (25+) FGDs in all districts of implementation. Separate FGD sessions will be arranged for girls, boys, women, and men. The age breakdown for adults group participants will not exceed 5 years of gap to minimize bias and limitation around beneficiary interaction and participation. Two to three staff members are expected to run the FGDs depending on the need for translation, other than which a facilitator and a note taker will be present. In total, 18 FGDs are planned (6 per location). In addition to the FGDs, key informant interviews are planned with each gender and age group, as well as partner staff who could provide insight to the activities delivered at the centres until this point. The number of KIIs is estimated to be between 15 to 20 including the partner staff.

3.3. Limitations

The baseline study is designed in light of the known limitations stated below. If encountered, further research bias will be underlined in the final report.

- Within the scope of this research, quantitative research will only take place at the Centres rather than in form of household visits due to regulations concerning outreach. Accordingly, the majority of the sample will consist of individuals who are already informed of the partners' presence in the area, or previous beneficiaries.
- It should be noted that while up to date province level data concerning Syrians under Temporary Protection is available to all actors, district based figures is not, hence the sample size depends on 2017 figures, including January and December.

4. Organizational Roles and Responsibilities

Save the Children staff will lead the process in their respective fields to coordinate the implementation of the baseline study, and provide both practical and technical assistance (i.e. facilitating FGDs, development of tools, training, review).