

May 05, 2011

Dear Sir/Madam,

Subject: **Request for Proposal**

1. The American Red Cross, Haiti Delegation hereby solicits your proposal for the provision of a ***Final evaluation of the Cash Assistance for School Fees Program***; as per the attached Terms of Reference (TOR) that includes the scope of work.
2. The Request for Proposal (RFP) consists of this letter of transmittal and the following enclosures:  
Enclosure 1: Specifications/TOR
3. Please note that this document is an RFP and not an invitation to bid. You should also note that the terms set forth in this RFP, the TOR (Enclosure 1) will form a part of any contract should the American Red Cross (ARC) accept your proposal.
4. It is anticipated that any contract or contracts entered into as a result of this RFP will be for a period of 6 weeks (approx. 30 working days), beginning June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2011.
5. This RFP does not commit the ARC to award a contract or to pay any costs incurred in the preparation or submission of proposals, or costs incurred in making necessary studies for the preparation thereof, or to procure or contract for services or supplies. The ARC reserves the right to reject any or all proposals received in response to this RFP and to negotiate with any of the proposers or other firms in any manner deemed to be in the best interest of the ARC. It also reserves the right to negotiate and award separate or multiple contracts for the elements covered by this RFP in any combination it may deem appropriate, in its sole discretion; modify or exclude any consideration, information or requirement contained in this RFP, and to add new considerations, information or requirements at any stage of the procurement process, including during negotiations with proposers.
6. Proposers must provide all requisite information and clearly and concisely respond to all points set out in this RFP. Any proposal which does not fully and comprehensively address this RFP will be rejected. However, unnecessarily elaborate brochures and other presentations beyond that sufficient to present a complete and effective proposal are not encouraged.
7. The normal terms of payment of the ARC are within 30 days of satisfactory delivery of goods or services and documents in apparent good order. Proposers must therefore clearly specify in their Proposal the payment terms being offered if different from these.
8. The agency/person is expected to submit a brief proposal (maximum 4-5 pages) for undertaking the study in English and submitted no later than May 20<sup>th</sup>, 2011.

A suggestive format for submission of the proposal is outlined as below –

**Introduction:** Brief introduction about the agency/person on conducting similar studies in Haiti or elsewhere.

**Proposed Methodology:** The proposal should clearly mention the proposed methodology to achieve the objective of the study in the given timeline. American Red Cross will provide the required number of enumerators (volunteers from Haitian Red Cross Society) for quantitative data collection (survey) and PDAs for data collection.

**Quality control mechanism:** Provide a section detailing the mechanism to ensure data quality by clearly specifying steps for data validation. This section may also include supervisory mechanism for data quality and the role of field editors.

**Detailed Budget:** This section should provide the estimated budget for the study. The details of the various line items as suggested below may be provided:

- Travel cost of key professional(s)
- Lodging cost of key professional(s)
- Local transportation cost
- Professional Fees (rate per day x number of days)
- Any other cost

Finally, a detailed CV of the professional(s) who will work on the evaluation must be submitted as annex.

9. Any proposals received after the stated opening time and date will be rejected.
10. Proposals must be sent to: [redcross\\_evaluation@yahoo.com](mailto:redcross_evaluation@yahoo.com) . Please use the following in the subject line of your email: “Consultant – Cash Assistance for School Fees Program”.
11. Proposals will be reviewed and evaluated by the ARC in accordance with the provisions of the ARC’s Procurement Policy as well as the considerations, information and requirements contained in this RFP. The evaluation procedure will consist of a formal, substantive and financial assessment of the proposals received. Price is an important factor; however, it is not the only consideration in evaluating responses to an RFP.
12. Your proposal shall remain valid and open for acceptance for a period of at least sixty (60) days from the closing date of May 20<sup>th</sup>, 2011, indicated above for receipts of proposals. Please indicate in your proposal that it will remain valid for this period.
13. Following submission of the proposals and final evaluation, the ARC will have the right to retain unsuccessful proposals. It is the proposer’s responsibility to identify any information of a confidential or proprietary nature contained in its proposal, so that it may be handled accordingly.

**Terms of Reference**

**Final evaluation of the Cash Assistance for School Fees Program**

**In Croix Des Prez neighborhood**

**05 May, 2011**

**I. Background**

The January 12, 2010 earthquake displaced an estimated 1.6 million people in Haiti. Most of the displaced live in camps and spontaneous settlements in the greater urban areas of Port-au-Prince. Following a Post-Disaster Needs Assessment conducted in March 2010, it was determined that parents were unanimously in favor of sending their children to school. The main issue holding them back was the lack of money to afford school fees and other related items. The combination of slow reconstruction of shelters and limited sources of income generation activities suggested that the situation was not likely to change in the foreseeable future. School attendance rates on Haiti were already among the lowest in the world, with literacy levels of just 52.9%.

Additionally, the Interim Haiti Recovery Commission's (IHRC) Strategic Plan of December 2010<sup>1</sup> lists education as one of its seven priority outcomes, targeting the provision of financial assistance in private schools for up to 500,000 children through October 2011. The program also aligns itself with the Government of Haiti's Action Plan that lists restarting of schools as a "major priority of the State", including the "guarantee with equity the return to school of all children" and the "provision of aid to all children attending existing school structures".<sup>2</sup>

Thus, the Cash Assistance for School Fees program attempts to bridge this gap by supporting families living in IDP camps in *Croix Desprez* to send their children to school, which should allow households to use funds set aside for education expenses to be used for other basic family needs.

The goal of this intervention is **to increase access to education for 4,000 children from earthquake-affected IDP households living in the neighborhood of Croix Desprez (Port-au-Prince)**. This goal will be achieved through the following component objective: 1) 4,000 children from earthquake affected IDP

---

<sup>1</sup> Strategic Plan for the Remainder of the IHRC's Mandate (Dec 2010), page 36.

<sup>2</sup> Action plan for National Recovery and Development of Haiti, Immediate Key Initiatives for the Future (March 2010)

households living in the neighborhood of Croix Desprez attend school from January 2011 to June 2011. Main activities include: (a) payment of school fees to participating schools and (b) distribution of a one-time cash grant to parents in order to support other school related costs.

## **II. Scope of work**

An external consultant is sought to lead the design, implementation, analysis and report-writing of a final evaluation of the Cash Assistance for School Fees program. The evaluation will draw on three main sources of information :

1. Project documentation
2. A post cash grant distribution survey of targeted households (2 weeks after distribution)
3. Qualitative data collection through focus group discussions, key informant interviews etc.)

The consultant will define the methodology and the work plan of the evaluation, both of which must be approved by the ARC, and is expected to work in coordination with the ARC delegates in Haiti throughout the evaluation process.

## **III. Objectives of the evaluation**

1. Assess the relevance, coverage, effectiveness, sustainability of outcomes and stakeholder perception and satisfaction of the Cash Assistance for School Fee Program. The assessment of relevance will consider the relevance of the objectives and the relevance of the design.
2. Identify lessons learned and provide recommendations for informing future ARC projects for this sector.

## **IV. Evaluation questions**

### **Relevance**

1. Was this program the most appropriate way to increase access to education for the target population? Were there other, more appropriate ways in which similar outcomes could have been achieved?
2. How did program design compare to programs implemented by other humanitarian actors or other Red Cross societies in the education sector and for the same/similar target population?
3. Are objectives and design still relevant for potential future phases of the program?

### **Coverage**

4. Were there any glaring inequities between program beneficiaries and other members of the surrounding community who were not included in the program? Would a different definition of intended beneficiaries have had different results?
5. Did beneficiary parents, in general or for specific groups (such as the elderly or disabled, for example), encounter any difficulties accessing the program?

### Results

6. Did the program achieve its intended outcomes? Were there any important unintended outcomes, either positive or negative?
7. What were the main reasons that determined whether intended outcomes were or were not achieved, and whether there were positive or negative unintended outcomes? Which were under ARC control and which not?
8. How did people in the community use the cash grant? What were the main reasons that determined how they used the cash grant?
9. Did the cash distribution affect, either positively or negatively, the security situation of households and of the community? If so, how?

### Effectiveness/Quality

10. Were activities implemented as planned? What were the main factors that contributed to whether activities resulted in intended outputs?
11. Were quality standards defined, and did activities achieve high levels of quality in implementation?
12. How effective or ineffective were the mechanisms used to distribute the school fee payments and the cash grants?

### Sustainability

13. How sustainable were the outcomes of the program? What are the main factors that affect, either positively or negatively, the sustainability of program outcomes?

### Stakeholder perception and satisfaction

14. Did the program affect, either positively or negatively, the way in which beneficiary parents and school directors perceive the Red Cross?
15. Were beneficiary parents' and school directors' opinion and/or satisfaction solicited and utilized throughout the program cycle?
16. Were beneficiary parents and school directors satisfied with how the program was designed, implemented and what the program achieved?

### **V. Expected activities**

Activities	Expected timeline
1. Desk review (project document, monitoring data, relevant secondary information etc.) and hold discussions with ARC program staff	June 01-04
2. Develop and submit methodology, sampling design, work plan and analysis plan for approval	June 06-08
3. Pre-test and finalize survey instruments (ARC has a draft instrument ready)	June 08
4. Train and supervise enumerators	June 09-11

5. Lead and supervise the collection of data	June 13-16
6. Develop instruments for qualitative data collection (FGD guide, Key informant interview etc.)	June 17
7. Data clean, analysis of survey results and possible modification of qualitative instruments	June 18-21
8. Submit report on preliminary survey results	June 21
9. Lead qualitative data collection	June 22-25
10. Submit draft report to ARC for comments	June 26-30
11. Receive ARC feedback on draft report	July 15
12. Finalize report	July 22

**VI. Deliverables**

<b>Deliverables</b>	<b>Expected deadline</b>
1. Methodology, sampling design, work plan and analysis plan	June 08
2. Finalized survey instruments	June 08
3. Instruments for qualitative evaluation (FGD guide, Key informant interview etc.)	June 17
4. Training agenda	June 08
5. Report on preliminary survey results	June 21
6. Draft report	June 30
7. Finalized report	July 22

**VII. Timeline**

Start date: June 01, 2011  
Duration: 6 weeks (approx. 30 working days)

**VIII. International standards**

Standard evaluation and survey methodologies and good practices utilized in the international humanitarian community should be applied. Such resources should include but are not limited to those promulgated by the Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance and the Organization for Economics Co-operation and Development.

## IX. Ethical Guidelines

It is expected that the evaluation will adhere to ethical guidelines as outlined in the American Evaluation Association's Guiding Principles for Evaluators. A summary of these guidelines is provided below, and a more detailed description can be found at [www.eval.org/Publications/GuidingPrinciplesPrintable.asp](http://www.eval.org/Publications/GuidingPrinciplesPrintable.asp).

- 1) **Informed Consent:** All participants are expected to provide informed consent following standard and pre-agreed upon consent protocols.
- 2) **Systematic Inquiry:** Evaluators conduct systematic, data-based inquiries.
- 3) **Competence:** Evaluators provide competent performance to stakeholders.
- 4) **Integrity/Honesty:** Evaluators display honesty and integrity in their own behavior, and attempt to ensure the honesty and integrity of the entire evaluation process.
- 5) **Respect for People:** Evaluators respect the security, dignity and self-worth of respondents, program participants, clients, and other evaluation stakeholders. It is expected that the evaluator will obtain the informed consent of participants to ensure that they can decide in a conscious, deliberate way whether they want to participate.
- 6) **Responsibilities for General and Public Welfare:** Evaluators articulate and take into account the diversity of general and public interests and values that may be related to the evaluation.

## X. Qualifications

The following are the expected qualifications of the consultant:

- Post graduate degree from a recognized institution relating to monitoring & evaluation, social research or survey methodologies
- Minimum 7 years relevant M&E experience in the development/NGO sector in developing countries
- Extensive professional experience in the design and implementation of project evaluations
- Demonstrated expertise in quantitative analysis and qualitative data collection and analysis
- Demonstrated experience in training of enumerators and in leading focus group discussions
- Experience of evaluating cash grant programs strongly preferred
- Professional work experience in Haiti preferred
- Fluency in English and French is required