



Christian Council of Tanzania (CCT)

Terms of Reference

End of the Projects Evaluation

Background and Context

Tanzania continues to implement reforms aimed at strengthening democratic governance, human rights protection and inclusive citizen participation. The period leading to the 2024 Local Government Elections and the 2025 General Elections has highlighted the critical role of faith-based organizations in fostering social cohesion, mediating tensions and supporting transparent and peaceful electoral processes. Religious leaders, interfaith platforms and diocesan structures remain influential actors in community mobilization, civic engagement and local problem-solving.

Two complementary Bread for the World-supported interventions are implemented within this context: a) Church-Based Advocacy Work on Human Rights and Youth Empowerment II, and b) Civic Literacy and Election Observation. Although distinct, both projects contribute to strengthening democratic participation and increasing institutional responsiveness. The Church-Based project focuses on enabling decisions taken by system actors to reflect human rights standards through diocesan monitoring, structured advocacy (via National Advocacy Committee -NAC and National Technical Advocacy Committee -NTAC), and interfaith committee conflict resolution. It also includes a dedicated component on career guidance and counselling to support youth life planning and labour market readiness. The Civic Education project, on the other hand, aims to ensure that citizens and stakeholders take an active and informed part in the electoral processes, with strong emphasis on community facilitators, religious leaders, electoral literacy, and mediation of election-related conflicts.

The Christian Council of Tanzania (CCT), as one of the largest ecumenical bodies in the country, is a central implementing and coordinating partner for both projects. CCT brings together diverse Christian denominations and maintains extensive networks across dioceses, congregations, and community structures. Its long-standing work in human rights, peacebuilding, governance monitoring, and youth empowerment positions it as a credible actor in promoting civic engagement and influencing democratic norms. Through its coordination of NAC, collaboration with interfaith actors, and leadership in electoral awareness and conflict mitigation, CCT plays a strategic role in shaping the advocacy, community engagement, and institutional strengthening components of both projects. Its involvement ensures national reach, legitimacy in community mobilization, and technical depth in faith-driven governance dialogue.

Purpose of the Evaluation

The overall purpose of this evaluation is to generate credible, evidence-based insights into the performance, results and strategic contributions of the Church-Based Advocacy Work on Human Rights and Youth Empowerment II project (which ends in June 2026), and the Civic Literacy and Election Observation project (which ends in April 2026). The evaluation will assess the individual achievements of each project, while providing a combined analysis of their shared influence on governance systems and frameworks, community engagement structures and national stakeholders.

Specifically, the evaluation will:

- 1) determine the extent to which each project achieved its stated objectives and indicators;
- 2) assess the effectiveness and added value of shared structures (such as dioceses, religious leaders, interfaith committees and community facilitators) in promoting accountability, conflict mitigation and civic empowerment;
- 3) identify lessons, good practices and strategic opportunities to strengthen faith-based engagement in governance and electoral processes; and
- 4) The evaluation will explain and inform the most effective way to merge the identified strengths into one cohesive approach, and will provide actionable recommendations to guide future programming, strengthen institutional collaboration, and support effective policy engagement.

Scope of the Evaluation

a) Geographic, Programmatic and Institutional Scope

The evaluation covers the geographic and institutional footprint of the two projects, reflecting their national-level reach and engagement with faith-based structures, communities, and governance actors. Both projects operate across all 26 regions of Tanzania Mainland, using the CCT network, interfaith platforms, and community-based structures as delivery and coordination mechanisms.

- For the Church-Based Advocacy Work on Human Rights and Youth Empowerment II project, the evaluation will assess activities implemented through all 90 CCT member dioceses organised across 7 zones. It will further examine the performance of 31 Interfaith Committees (IFC/WIFC), the NAC, and the NTAC, along with targeted youth interventions implemented through 150 secondary schools and vocational training centres offering career guidance and counselling services. These structures engage a broad constituency of clergy, teachers, youth, women, community leaders and vulnerable groups.
- For the Civic Literacy and Election Observation project, the evaluation will cover multi-level implementation involving 500 Community Facilitators, 12 Master Trainers, regional and district interfaith bodies (CCT/TEC/BAKWATA), and national duty bearers including the National Electoral Commission (NEC), judiciary, law enforcement agencies, political parties and CSOs. Activities span civic education, electoral monitoring, community dialogue, conflict mitigation and post-election healing across wards, districts and regions.

Given the dual-project structure, the evaluation will assess how these networks of religious leaders, community facilitators, diocesan structures, interfaith committees, schools, youth

groups and public institutions contributed (individually and collectively) to the intended outcomes in human rights advocacy, democratic participation, conflict resolution, and youth empowerment.

In addition, the evaluation will assess the synergies between Church-Based Advocacy Work and Civic Literacy and Election Observation, focusing on whether and how the two projects:

- Mutually reinforce outcomes (e.g. advocacy strengthening civic education and political engagement, or civic literacy enhancing the effectiveness and legitimacy of advocacy); and
- Generated added value beyond parallel implementation, producing impacts greater than what either project could plausibly have achieved on its own.

b) Thematic scope

The evaluation will focus on the core thematic areas addressed by both projects, assessing areas of convergence as well as project-specific dimensions. The matrix below outlines the evaluative themes and variables that will guide data collection and analysis across both interventions.

Evaluation theme	Convergent evaluative variables (Apply to both projects)	Specific variable	
		Church-Based Project	Civic Education Project
1. Democratic Governance & Human Rights Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Influence on governance processes to promote human rights standards and inclusive, peaceful electoral processes. Effectiveness of faith-based actors in elevating issues to national/local authorities. Institutional responsiveness to advocacy and community-raised issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Verification of 5 cases showing NAC/NTAC influence on national legal reforms. Extent to which 70% of dioceses use monitoring findings for evidence-based advocacy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responsiveness to 8 issues of concern submitted to EMBs for resolution. Extent to which citizens became active and informed in electoral processes.
2. Strength & Functionality of Religious & Interfaith Structures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legitimacy, capacity, and operational consistency of RLs, IFC/WIFC, dioceses, CFs. Effectiveness of faith-based platforms in governance engagement and citizen support. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance of 31 IFC/WIFC teams in resolving 70% of documented GBV, land, inheritance, or interreligious conflicts. Institutionalisation and effective functioning of NAC/NTAC. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RLs' ability to mitigate electoral disputes Quality and uptake of RL services for healing election-related wounds (70% satisfaction).
3. Citizen Participation & Electoral Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent to which project activities enabled citizens (especially women and youth) to participate meaningfully in democratic and electoral processes. Link between faith-based mobilisation and improved participation outcomes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contribution of advocacy to a more rights-respecting governance environment enabling participation. Diocesan monitoring addressing local governance barriers indirectly affecting citizen participation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achievements against the 7% increase (women/youth) in nominations at LGA level and 4% at national level. Verification that 130 case studies show voter turnout above national average in intervention areas.
4. Conflict Mitigation & Dispute Resolution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Combined contributions of faith-based structures to preventing, managing, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effectiveness of IFC/WIFC teams in resolving 70% of documented conflicts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achievement of 70% amicable resolution of election-related conflicts.

	<p>and resolving conflicts -both social and electoral.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community perceptions of neutrality, trust, and fairness of mediating actors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contribution of conflict cases to informing national advocacy (criminal justice reform, GBV, interreligious harmony). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfaction of 70% of citizens/candidates who received post-election healing services.
5. Youth Empowerment & Life Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Youth empowerment and political consciousness (including how counselling is essential in trauma healing) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 150 schools established counselling structures; 5,000 graduates giving positive endorsement; and 70% satisfaction across students, counsellors, and head teachers. 	

Key guiding questions

Relevance

- 1) To what extent do the two projects address Tanzania's priority needs in governance, human rights and inclusive electoral participation?
- 2) How appropriate are the faith-based approaches (advocacy, civic education, interfaith mediation, youth support) for advancing these priorities?

Coherence

- 1) How coherent are the two projects with each other in terms of their design, target groups and use of shared faith-based structures?
- 2) To what extent do the interventions complement national reforms, EMB priorities, other CSOs as well as faith and interfaith initiatives?

Effectiveness

- 1) To what extent did each project achieve its stated objectives and indicators?
- 2) How effectively did delivery mechanisms (such as dioceses, RLs, IFC/WIFC and CFs) contribute to citizen participation, conflict mitigation and rights-based advocacy?
- 3) What meaningful changes are observable at community and institutional levels as a result of project interventions?

Efficiency

- 1) How well were the two projects implemented, considering the use of shared structures (dioceses, RLs, IFC/WIFC, CFs), resource allocation (staff, funds, time...), and the timeliness of planned activities across national, district and community levels?
- 2) How effective were the coordination and management arrangements between CCT, interfaith partners, dioceses, community facilitators and national institutions (e.g., NEC), and to what extent did these arrangements minimise duplication, streamline implementation, and optimise delivery?

Impact

- 1) To what extent have the projects contributed to improved compliance to human rights standards, strengthened democratic participation, and inclusive electoral processes?
- 2) What positive or unintended effects emerged at national, district or community levels?

Sustainability

- 1) How well were the phasing-in and phasing-out processes managed in each project, particularly in relation to partner engagement, capacity-building, transition planning, and the continuity of key structures and services after project completion?
- 2) To what extent are key structures and results (advocacy bodies, interfaith mechanisms, CF networks, and school-based career guidance) likely to be sustained after project completion?
- 3) What factors will most strongly enable or hinder long-term continuation or scale-up?

Evaluation design/methods

The evaluator is expected to propose the evaluation design (preferably a theory-based design) that is appropriate for assessing both the individual performance of each project and their combined contribution to democratic governance, human rights, citizen participation and

conflict mitigation. The methodology should integrate a mixed-methods approach, allowing for credible analysis of advocacy influence, institutional responsiveness and community-level change across national, diocesan, district and community structures. CCT expects the design to articulate how the evaluator will analyse contribution pathways across the two projects by starting with developing a harmonised Theory of Change/ Effect Chain. The methodology should be grounded in contribution-focused logic (e.g., contribution analysis, process tracing or outcome harvesting), supported by comparative analysis where relevant.

At a minimum, data collection should combine document and secondary data review, key informant interviews with national and sub-national actors (CCT, TEC, BAKWATA, NEC, judiciary, political parties, CCT members dioceses, RLs, IFC/WIFC, CFs, school counsellors), and focus group discussions with targeted community groups including women, youth and vulnerable populations engaged through civic education or conflict mitigation activities. The approach should also include verification of project-generated evidence (case studies, diocesan monitoring reports, conflict-resolution logs, CGC utilisation records), and site visits to a representative sample of dioceses, districts, schools and communities.

Process of the evaluation/time frame

The evaluator is expected to conduct a review of all project documentation, including but not limited to proposals, implementation plans, progress reports, monitoring data, and financial summaries. This desk review will enable the evaluator to gain a full understanding of the project logic, objectives, implementation approach, and contextual factors influencing performance. Based on this foundational analysis, the evaluator will design an appropriate methodological framework that aligns with the evaluation purpose and questions. This framework should incorporate a mixed-methods approach to enhance triangulation, strengthen data validity, and ensure that both qualitative and quantitative dimensions of project performance are captured. Furthermore, the review will enable evaluator to gain an understanding of the current project which will assist in provision of technical orientation to inform CCT's programmatic planning for the next project phase, with relevant planning and strategic documents made available for review. This orientation should be grounded in identified priority areas, including strengthening diocesan advocacy capacities, national-level advocacy, human resource development, career guidance and counseling, constitutional reform processes, and expanding youth education to reduce susceptibility to manipulation and unemployment, as well as other priorities informed by the prevailing socio-political context and national policy framework.

Following the methodology design, the evaluator will be responsible for conducting field data collection using technically sound tools and procedures. The evaluator will be expected to gather information from project staff, beneficiaries, community stakeholders, implementing partners, and relevant government authorities. Data collection methods may include surveys, key informant interviews, focus group discussions, direct observations, and verification of project outputs. The evaluator will ensure the accuracy, reliability, and completeness of the data collected, apply appropriate analytical techniques, and synthesize findings to produce an evidence-based assessment of the project's effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, and sustainability.

TIME-FRAME FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS

The evaluation is to be conducted for 39 working days within January and February 2026, based on the following milestones:

What	Due date	Responsibilities
Submission and presentation of the draft Inception	2 days after contract signed	Evaluator
Working session for reconstructing of a unified project pathways	5 days	consultant and the CCT Team
Submission of the final Inception Report	2 days after receiving feedback from the management team	Evaluator
Data Collection	10 days of field data collection	Evaluator and enumerators
Presentation of the initial findings from data collection	5 days after data collection	Evaluator
Submission and presentation of the first draft of the evaluation report	7 days after the presentation of initial findings	Evaluator
Draft report with incorporated feedback from CCT submitted to BftW for review	3 days after receiving feedback from CCT Management	CCT Team
Submission of the final report and evaluation brief	5 days after receiving feedback from BfdW	Evaluator

Expected products

Deliverables of end line evaluation should include the following:

- Inception report; this should include the following items; Understanding of the issues and questions raised in the ToR, Data sources; how to assess the questions in the ToR, Research methodology, including suggested sample and size, Schedule of activities and traveling (timeline), Proposal for a learning event/validation of evaluation findings, Detailed budget, appropriate validated draft data collection tools (e.g., methodological guidelines, group interview questions)
- Any suggested improvements to existing evaluation scope, as outlined in these terms of reference
- Presentation of preliminary findings before development final evaluation report.
- Draft evaluation report written in English; it should be accompanied with one (1) electronic file of the clean (final) qualitative and quantitative data collected.
- Final evaluation report; The final evaluation report should be jargon free, clear and simply written.
- Technical information should be included in appendices only during development of final report.
- Detailed analysis of project achievements (both qualitative and quantitative) by considering project objectives and indicators should always be backed up with relevant data, with reference to the data source.

- Recommendations should be specific and include relevant details for how they might be implemented.

Key qualifications of the evaluators

Sample:

- Proven ability to evaluate governance, human-rights advocacy, civic participation, electoral processes and institutional reforms, using theory-based and contribution-focused approaches.
- Demonstrated understanding of how community faith structures influence advocacy, conflict mitigation and community mobilization.
- Strong capability to assess and engage in politically sensitive environments, including electoral tensions, social conflict dynamics and community-level dispute resolution mechanisms.
- Ability to design and apply mixed methods approaches and triangulate evidence from complex, multi-level systems.
- Strong skills in engaging diverse stakeholders (national and sub-national levels) and synthesizing insights into clear, actionable recommendations.
- Post-graduate degree (Master's or higher) in governance, public policy, human rights, political science, development studies, or a related field.
- Minimum 10 years of professional experience conducting evaluations of governance, human rights, democracy, civic participation, or faith-based/social accountability interventions.

Content of the evaluators' offer

Interested evaluators are required to begin the application process by submitting an Expression of Interest (EOI) accompanied by the CV(s) of all proposed team members. Only applicants who successfully pass this initial stage will receive a formal invitation to submit a full offer.

Upon invitation, evaluators will be expected to submit a comprehensive offer containing the following:

- A detailed outline of the proposed evaluation procedure, demonstrating the planned approach and key steps
- A brief explanation and justification of the methods to be applied, including how cross-cutting issues relevant to the assignment will be integrated into the evaluation design.
- Financial Proposal

Financial proposal

A detailed financial proposal outlining the total estimated cost of the evaluation, including professional fees and all related expenses. The budget should clearly indicate ancillary costs such as transportation, accommodation, taxes, administrative fees, and any costs associated with conducting workshops or stakeholder engagements

Tax arrangements

CCT will deduct withholding tax from the consultancy fees and remit to the Tanzania Revenue Authority (TRA). This will be in conformity with the prevailing government rates, currently Withholding tax on service is 5% of the professional fee.

Selection criteria and submission procedure

The following is information about the selection criteria and their weighting;

Selection criteria	Weighting of the selection criteria in % ¹
Understanding of Project Context	30%
Quality of the technical offer (the concept proposed plays a particularly important role here)	25 %
Relevant Experience in Similar Projects	20%
Qualification of the evaluators	25 %
Total	100%

Management Arrangement

The Evaluator will report to 'Evaluation Steering Committee' composed of the CCT Senior Advisor- PMEL, General Secretary, Project Officers of relevant projects, Director for Advocacy and Development Programs.

The Senior Advisor- PMEL and Director for Advocacy and Development Programs will provide technical guidance on evaluation and ensure independent of evaluation process. The PME unit manage the evaluation and provide logistical support.

Applications should not exceed 10 pages and must be submitted electronically within 10 days from the date of issuance of this call for applications. Submissions should be sent to gs@cct.or.tz, with a copy to CCT PME via pmel@cct.or.tz and uriondeki@gmail.com.