

External Evaluation of the Mahatma Gandhi Institute of Education for Peace and Sustainable Development (MGIEP)

Terms of Reference

1. Introduction

This document outlines the Terms of Reference for an external evaluation of UNESCO's Mahatma Gandhi Institute for Education on Peace and Sustainable Development (MGIEP). The Institute is UNESCO's latest Category 1 Institute and is its first in the Asia-Pacific region. The evaluation will take place in mid-2017. This will enable UNESCO's Education sector to make any recommended adjustments to the Institute's planned work and/or structure in time to be able to incorporate them into the planning for the next programme and budget for the period 2018-2023.

2. Background

The Mahatma Gandhi Institute of Education for Peace and Sustainable Development (MGIEP) is UNESCO's Category 1 Institute established with the generous support of the Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD), Government of India in 2012. UNESCO MGIEP specialises in research, knowledge sharing and policy formulation in the area of education for peace, sustainability and global citizenship. It is the first of its kind in the Asia Pacific region and the youngest Category 1 Institute of UNESCO. In 2012, the Director-General of UNESCO, Ms. Irina Bokova, and the President of India, Mr. Pranab Mukherjee, launched the institute.

The operational agreement between UNESCO and MHRD was signed on 09 July 2012 at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris. As per the statutes of the Institute, the programme of work of MGIEP could not commence till the governing board of the institute was appointed. MGIEP's first governing board meeting was held in March 2014. The first Director of MGIEP was appointed in June 2014 and thereafter, the programme and administrative staff were gradually hired.

UNESCO MGIEP's strategy complements UNESCO's Medium-term strategy 2014-21 (37C/4)¹, the Secretary-General's Education for All initiative, and the targets presented in the **Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4**. This will equip future generations with the tools to lead change for a more peaceful and sustainable world. UNESCO MGIEP's objectives are based on the preamble of UNESCO's Constitution, which calls for the defenses for peace to be created in the minds of men and women. UNESCO's global education agenda lists among its priorities the

¹ UNESCO's Medium-term strategy 2014-21 (37C/4)
<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002278/227860e.pdf>

understanding of and respect for human rights; inclusion and equity; cultural diversity; fostering a desire and capacity for living together peacefully, which are essential for creating responsible citizens for a better future.



SDG 4: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all.

4.7: By 2030, ensure all learners acquire knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including among others through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship, and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture's contribution to sustainable development.

UNESCO MGIEP's mandate is focused on achieving the **Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) Target 4.7**, reflected in the implementation of 38C/5² Work Plan through the following Main Lines of Action (MLAs) and Expected Results (ERs):

UNESCO's 38C/5 Work Plan	UNESCO MGIEP Programme Categories
<p>MLA 2, ER 8:</p> <p>Peace and Human Rights ED - Member States integrate peace and human rights education components in education policies and practices</p>	Rethinking Curriculum
<p>MLA 2, ER 9:</p> <p>Capacities of Member States strengthened to integrate ESD into education and learning, and ESD strengthened in the international policy agenda.</p>	Innovations and Youth Enablers
<p>MLA 3, ER 11:</p> <p>The future education agenda and global education policies shaped, drawing on UNESCO's and other relevant research and foresight studies.</p>	Research and Futures

² UNESCO's Approved 38C/5 Programme and Budget 2016-17
<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002443/244305e.pdf>

3. Purpose and Use

The main purpose of this five-year evaluation [2012-17] is to assess the relevance and overall performance of the MGIEP.

Recalling Article 5 of the Operational Agreement which states “*The Director General and/or the Board shall initiate every five years an external evaluation of the activities carried out by the Institute in order to take the necessary decisions concerning its programmatic and regional focus and priorities to better respond to the needs of the Member States*”, the overall purpose of the evaluation is to assess the processes and achievements made to draw lessons for the implementation of second five-year operational agreement.

The evaluation is intended to be forward looking to capture effectively and provide information on the appropriateness, relevance, scale and to the extent possible the effects of MGIEP’s activities. Furthermore, it shall assess the functioning of the Institute, in terms of its management, governance, outreach and funding framework.

The lessons that will be drawn from this programme evaluation will focus on improving the modalities and quality of the implementation processes with a view to understanding what has worked, how, why and under what circumstances, and what needs to be improved. The outcomes of the evaluation shall feed into designing and implementing the next five-year operational agreement.

The evaluation will serve as a guide and reference document by UNESCO, MHRD and the Governing Board of the Institute to help strengthen the Institute in the implementation of its primary mandate.

4. Scope of Evaluation

The evaluation will focus on the last five years of operations, representing the period since the inauguration of the Institute in July 2012. The evaluation will take note of the processes that took place for the actual setting up of the Institute, Governing Board and finally the implementation of the activities approved by the Governing Board. The geographical scope is global with priority consideration of activities in the Asia-pacific region. The findings of the evaluation shall to the extent possible provide a baseline for assessing the evolution and implementation of the relevant recommendations.

4.1 Main Dimensions

The external evaluation should assist UNESCO’s Education Sector, the MHRD (GOI) and the MGIEP Governing Board by making evidence based recommendations focused on the following three main dimensions:

1. The positioning of MGIEP through its portfolio of activities in the overall landscape of SDG 4.7 with a view of MGIEP's comparative advantage and complementarity with other actors and stakeholders;
2. The adequacy of the geographical spread of activities to address the needs of Member States with a view to the implementation of SDG 4.7
3. The institutional setting of MGIEP in its configuration within UNESCO, including distribution of responsibilities and potential synergies, nature and quality of partnerships and agreements between headquarters, field offices, other relevant Category 1 institutes and Category 2 centers and other relevant partners;
4. The resource situation of the Institute (both financial and staffing) and its effect on performance (balance of regular programme versus extra budgetary resources, fundraising strategy)
5. Functional performance such as Institute management, governance and funding

4.2 Evaluation Questions

The following questions of the evaluation are indicative. The questions will be further refined in the evaluation's inception report. The evaluation shall assess in particular those questions that are identified of high priority and as possible provide answers to additional questions that might be deemed useful.

- A. Relevance of MGIEP's work in the implementation of SDG 4.7** (positioning within UNESCO and within the global education landscape, focus areas, relevant level of intervention and implementation modalities)
- i. Is the present portfolio of activities relevant to the Institute's mandate?
 - ii. Are the projects within the present portfolio designed in a manner that is scientifically rigorous, innovative and policy relevant?
 - iii. Have the projects benefitted from partnerships with like-minded organizations working towards the same goals and objectives?
 - iv. Do the projects contribute towards UNESCO's work programme and is there a logical framework or theory of change underlying the Institute's portfolio of projects?
 - v. What is the geographical scope of the Institute's projects and is this adequate for achieving its mission and mandate?
 - vi. Are the projects gender and youth sensitive?
 - vii. Are the projects regionally well distributed?

B. Efficiency in the Implementation (in terms of resources, organizational setting, distribution of roles and responsibilities)

- i. Is the management structure of the Institute adequate for the efficient implementation of its work programme? This involves financial and human resource management.
- ii. Is the staffing structure adequate for the implementation of the Institute's work programme?
- iii. Is the composition of the Governing Board adequate for the successful implementation of the work programme?
- iv. Are the lines of communication between the Institute and UNESCO education sector clear and relevant for the efficient implementation of the Institute's work programme?
- v. Are the lines of communication between the Institute and the Ministry of Human Resources and Development (MHRD) of the Government of India (GOI) clear and relevant for the smooth functioning of the Institute?
- vi. Have all clauses in the operational agreement and seat agreement been implemented?
- vii. Is the funding structure of the Institute stable and sustainable?

C. The partnerships and cooperation

- i. Are the partnerships between the Institute and external partners relevant, sufficient and adequate for the successful implementation of the work programme?
- ii. Has the institute engaged with field offices, regional offices and other category 1 institutes in the implementation of its work?
- iii. What is the scope and nature of the Institute's relationship with its partners and its relevance to its mandate and mission?
- iv. Is the Institute's communication and outreach strategy adequate and efficient in achieving its objectives?

Methodology

The evaluation will include the methodological elements mentioned below. The evaluation team will further refine these during the inception phase.

- Desk review of primary and secondary documents: Documents will include the seat agreement between UNESCO and the GOI, the first operational agreement between UNESCO and GOI, annual reports, Governing Board meeting reports, Executive Committee meeting reports, Institute reports to the General Conference of UNESCO, published papers, web-based

documentation, internal memorandums, project documents produced by MGIEP, and academic literature.

- Interviews with key informants, such as heads of NatComs in relevant countries, Governing Board members, Secretary of higher education in the MHRD, relevant staff members at UNESCO headquarters and heads of partner organizations working closely with MGIEP.
- The development and refining of a Theory of Change for MGIEP's work on SDG 4.7
- Questionnaires and surveys addressed to various groups of stakeholders who will be identified at the inception phase.
- One field visit to New Delhi, India.

Minimum requirements and information gathering

- The assignment corresponds to a maximum of up to 30 persons/day.
- It is recommended that the evaluation team or the individual consultant be composed of international team members or be international based respectively. The information gathering phase will include at a minimum:
 - A desk study of all relevant documentation including general MGIEP strategy and programme documents, monitoring and evaluation instruments and reports.
 - Interviews and consultations, via phone, email or in person, including online surveys, if relevant, of representatives of beneficiary countries, participants of trainings, participants in seminars, end-users etc.; representatives of donor countries or donor organizations or implementing partners at central and decentralized levels; key stakeholders from UNESCO Field Offices (Bangkok regional office);
 - A field visit to New Delhi, India;

5. Roles and Responsibilities

The evaluation will be managed by MGIEP with the support of the IOS evaluation team and the executive office of the UNESCO Education Sector (called the Core Group) and will be conducted by an independent external evaluation team or individual. The evaluators are expected to contribute specific expertise and knowledge of the areas covered by SDG 4.7 and in particular, education for sustainable development, education for peace and education for global citizenship. The evaluators are also expected to have relevant experience in evaluating

programmatic activities, networks, partnerships, governance and resource utilization. All reports will be produced in English.

Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)

A Reference Group will be set up to accompany and quality assure the evaluation process, and provide feedback on the Terms of Reference and the various deliverables (Inception Report, Stakeholder Workshop and Draft Evaluation Report). The Reference Group will include the following:

- 1) Director of MGIEP,
- 2) Representative of ED/EO and
- 3) Representative of IOS.

The Evaluation Reference Group will be advised by the following:

1. Representative from Governing Board - Chair or member of Executive Committee
2. Representative from IIEP – The Director
3. External expert in the field of education for peace, sustainable development and global citizenship.
4. Representative from the MHRD-GOI

Logistics

The external evaluator(s) will be responsible for his/her/their own logistics: office space, administrative and secretarial support, telecommunications, printing of documentation, etc. S/he/they will also be responsible for the execution of the data collection work plan, but MGIEP will facilitate this process to the extent possible by providing contact information such as email addresses. With regard to field visits, MGIEP will assist the evaluator(s) in providing documentation, setting up meetings and providing security clearance documents, etc. The evaluator(s) is/are responsible for all travel related costs, including transport to and from the airport and transport to and from interviews. The travel costs should be itemized in the financial proposal.

6. Evaluation Team and Resources

Qualifications

The consultant/s comprising the evaluation team should possess collectively the following mandatory qualifications and experience:

- Extensive knowledge of the education sector and in particular, areas covered by SDG 4.7
- Extensive knowledge in the science of learning and the use of evidence based research and policy

- Extensive knowledge of networks and in particular, youth networks working in the area of education for peace, sustainable development and global citizenship
- Experience in applying qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods, with a minimum of seven years' of professional experience for the lead expert (a minimum of five years' experience for the other team members) in programme and policy evaluation demonstrating a strong record in designing, conducting and leading evaluations. At least some of this experience will be in the education related area.
- Experience in gender and youth analysis and gender and youth in evaluation
- An advanced university degree with specialization in education, social sciences, educational policy, public policy or related fields
- Excellent language skills in English (oral communication and report writing)
- No previous involvement in the implementation of the activities under review

It is desirable that the evaluation team possess the following qualifications and characteristics:

- Knowledge of the SDGs
- Knowledge of the role of the UN and its programming
- Understanding and application of UN mandates in Human Rights and Gender Equality
- Experience with assignments for the UN
- Experience as an educator
- Experience with assignments focusing on multi-stakeholder partnerships, coordination and capacity building

Verification of these qualifications will be based on the provided curriculum vitae. Moreover, references, web links or electronic copies of the two or three examples of recently completed evaluation reports should be provided together with the technical proposal. Candidates are also encouraged to submit other references such as research papers or articles that demonstrate their familiarity with the subject under review. The recommended composition of the evaluation team is one senior and one junior evaluator. Under special circumstances, a single highly experienced evaluator might be considered.

7. Budget

The evaluation has a draft budget allowing for approximately 50 days of professional time, including travel. The external team members are expected to travel to New Delhi at least once to participate in a kick-off meeting during the inception phase, to develop and conduct a survey and conduct interviews during the data collection phase, hold a stakeholder workshop for discussing and validating findings and recommendations. Some of these tasks may be conducted through virtual meeting via skype or video conference.

8. Deliverables and Schedule

The evaluation is expected to commence in July 2017 and be concluded by September 2017. The indicative timetable of key activities and deliverables is shown below:

Activity / Deliverable	Timing
Procurement – Request for Proposals	Mid-June 2017
Selection of external evaluation team; contractual arrangements completed	End June 2017
Evaluation launch – entrance meeting in New Delhi	Beginning July 2017
Inception report	Mid July 2017
Data collection & analysis; field missions	Mid-July to mid-August 2017
Stakeholder workshop and draft evaluation report	Mid September 2017
Final Evaluation report	End September 2017

The Draft and Final Evaluation reports should be written in English and comprise no more than 50 pages, excluding annexes. It should be structured as follows:

- ✓ Executive summary (2-4 pages)
- ✓ Programme description and Intervention Logic
- ✓ Evaluation purpose
- ✓ Evaluation methodology (including challenges and limitations)

- ✓ Main Findings
- ✓ Lessons learned
- ✓ Recommendations and conclusions: Annexes including TOR, interview list, data collection instruments, key documents consulted.

Deadlines for Submission of Proposals

Technical and financial proposals attached in two separate files, with budgets should be submitted by 1200 midnight IST (New Delhi time) before 20th June 2017 to n.jahan@unesco.org with the subject line: “Confidential proposal for MGIEP Institute level External Evaluation”. All eligible technical proposals will be assessed on the basis of their responsiveness to the TOR. The proposals should include the following documents:

An up-to-date curriculum vitae;

- i. A statement indicating how their qualifications and experience make them suitable for the assignment;
- ii. An indication of the approach he/she would adopt to carry out the assignment, including any inputs that may be required from UNESCO MGIEP;
- iii. The overall cost of the assignment, expressed as an overall lump sum. Any travel and subsistence requirements should be indicated separately.
- iv. Time Schedule of the Assignment

The candidates will be granted scores following an objective technical criterion under four categories:

1. **Expertise of the firm or individual:** previous evaluations successfully implemented or conducted in support of capacity development in developing countries is required; a minimum of 7 years of international experience in programme/project evaluation and experience with the UN system are desirable;
2. **Proposed work plan and approach:** the technical proposal should include the work plan and approach intended for the evaluation. The proposal should include examples of previous evaluations of similar education related research Institutes.
3. **Qualifications and experience of the evaluation team:** for all members of

the team, at least an advanced university degree in education, international development, or specialized fields of education, social sciences, humanities, public policy or related areas is mandatory, as well as at least five years of working experience in evaluation.

4. **For the team leader:** extensive knowledge of development evaluation and 15+ years of professional experience in programme and policy evaluation in the area of education. Oral and writing skills in English to the highest standards.
5. In the case of an individual, the consultant must have extensive knowledge of development evaluation and 15+ years of professional experience in programme and policy evaluation in the area of education. Oral and writing skills in English to the highest standards.
6. **Pricing:** the estimated budget should include all costs, including travel and accommodation for visits to New Delhi and Paris. The budget should offer some details so that the costs of expertise and travel are visible.

Annex 1: Indicative List of Key documents to be consulted

- MGIEP Seat Agreement
- MGIEP Operational Agreement
- MGIEP Statutes
- MGIEP Rules of Procedure
- Governing board meeting reports
- Executive committee meeting reports
- Annual reports
- MGIEP Publications
- Internal relevant memorandums
- MGIEP website

UNESCO is committed to achieving workforce diversity in terms of gender, nationality and culture. Individuals from minority groups, indigenous groups and persons with disabilities are equally encouraged to apply.

For more information, please contact:

Ms. Nusrat JAHAN

Finance and Administrative Officer

UNESCO Mahatma Gandhi Institute of Education for Peace and Sustainable
Development (MGIEP)

35 Ferozshah Road, ICSSR Building, 1st Floor, New Delhi 110001, India

Ph: +91 11-2307 2356-60 (ext: 117)| email: n.jahan@unesco.org

Website: www.mgiep.unesco.org