
Terms of Reference (ToR)

This is a reissue of a Call for Proposals, originally disseminated in mid-November 2014. The ToR has been slightly revised. Previous applicants are eligible and encouraged to review and resubmit their proposals.

1. Introduction: The Civil Society Education Fund and the Global Campaign for Education

The Civil Society Education Fund (CSEF) is a unique global programme that supports civil society engagement in education sector policy, planning and monitoring, through the collaboration of national, regional and international civil society partners. The programme is founded on a shared understanding among key stakeholders that strong, broad-based and locally-driven civil society participation – in education sector planning and policy development, monitoring of implementation and budgets, and promoting awareness and engagement of citizens in national education debates – is crucial to delivering on Education for All (EFA) and other national education goals.

The CSEF was initiated and is managed by the Global Campaign for Education (GCE) in close collaboration with regional partners (Arab Campaign for Education for All - ACEA, Africa Network Campaign for Education For All - ANCEFA, the Asia South Pacific Association for Basic and Adult Education - ASPBAE, the Latin American Campaign for the Right to Education - CLADE, ActionAid Americas, Education International Asia Pacific and Oxfam GB West Africa).

The CSEF 2013-2015 phase is funded by the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) through a grant of US$ 14.5m, and UNESCO fulfils the role of Supervising Entity and hence holds overall accountability to the GPE for the CSEF grant. In keeping with the planned phased programme approach, the 2013-2015 phase of the programme commenced in April 2013 with a three-months planning period, implementation from July 2013 and, following an agreed no-cost extension period, national coalition activities will be implemented until the end of March 2015.

2. Aim and Objectives of the CSEF Programme

The overall aim of the CSEF programme is to “contribute to the achievement of national education goals and Education for All by ensuring the effective participation of civil society organisations and citizens in education debates and sector planning and review”.

To achieve this aim, the CSEF provides core financing, technical assistance and capacity support, and opportunities for cross-country learning to civil society coalitions focused on education in developing countries across Africa, Asia Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean, the Middle East and Eastern Europe. As of October 2014, civil society structures in 54 countries had engaged in CSEF activities during this phase.

Through this support, the CSEF aims to build stronger, more consistent and more effective civil society engagement in education sector processes, with the following four programme objectives:

1 A previous phase of CSEF (2009-2012) was implemented by the Global Campaign for Education and partners, and funded through the Fast Track Initiative Education Program Development Fund (FTI EPDF). During 2012, bridge funding for continuation of CSEF activities was provided by AusAid, while the initial phase of CSEF was evaluated, and a further funding proposal for the present programme cycle was prepared. The evaluation report for the initial phase is available for review (see section 10 for a list of relevant documents).

2 Of the 54 countries, 28 are in the Africa region, 15 in Asia Pacific, five in Latin America and the Caribbean, and six in the Middle East and Eastern Europe.
1. **Policy participation:** Formal civil society participation in education sector policy and review processes and engagement with policy-makers and parliamentarians is strengthened and better recognised;

2. **Public awareness and coalition-building:** National education coalitions are actively strengthening grassroots capacity to access and participate in education sector debates, through building awareness, knowledge, skills and opening opportunities to participate;

3. **Quality research, monitoring and analysis:** Civil society research and analysis effectively contributes to national government plans, policies, financing and practices that better achieve the right to quality education for all and the six EFA goals, and;

4. **Cross-country learning and networks for change:** The CSEF programme builds the quality and impact of civil society engagement in the education sector through promoting partnerships, strengthening South-South collaboration, sharing learning, and facilitating impact on global processes.

It should be noted that in addition to the above, each of the coalitions have defined national level expected results that contribute to the global programme objectives and expected results.

### 3. Purpose and Use of the Independent CSEF Programme Evaluation

Programme evaluation is an integral part of the CSEF programme plan and learning, monitoring and evaluation framework (LMEF), and is considered an important tool for enhancing accountability, strategic management and learning. In this regard, the proposal of GCE to GPE in December 2012 spelt out clearly that an end of project evaluation will be carried out at project closing based on a TOR agreed between GCE and UNESCO.

As the current phase of the CSEF programme comes to its end, it is required that it is finalised with an independent evaluation in order to maximise learning from the programme and to find out and document to what extent the programme objectives, expected results and learning goals have been achieved.

As such, the emphasis of the evaluation is equally divided between the assessment dimension and the learning dimension. It is intended that this evaluation will influence and strengthen programme design of an anticipated next phase of the CSEF programme (2016-2018), directions of which have already started emerging in discussions between GPE, UNESCO and GCE. The evaluation shall provide evidence of the emerging impact of CSEF to support further access to funding and other forms of programme buy-in and support.

In addition, it is anticipated that the evaluation will:

3.1 Support reflection on achieved effectiveness (and the challenges involved) of the approaches adopted in the programme.

3.2 Provide evidence of the impact of our work to support further access to funding and other forms of programme buy-in and support.

3.3 Be both summative and formative, with a strong emphasis on drawing together lessons and recommendations to inform improvements and structural changes for a future CSEF 2016-2018. Thus, whilst being an end of programme summative evaluation, the drawn out lessons learnt, considerations and recommendations will inform future CSEF programme practice in a formative manner.

GCE is therefore seeking applications from suitably qualified and experienced consultants, consulting firms, or a consortium of consultants to form the evaluation team.
4. Scope of Work

4.1 Scope

To undertake a comprehensive and robust evaluation of the Civil Society Education Fund (CSEF) programme and its results encompassing the period of the approved CSEF 2013-2015 programme and therefore to cover the period from 27th April 2013 to the 31st of March 2015.

The evaluation should:

4.1.1 Identify the extent to which the CSEF programme as a whole has achieved its objectives and learning goals;

4.1.2 With reference to the programme logic / theory of change, assess whether and how the programme has contributed to and/or brought about the intended (or unintended) results and whether this is contributing (or has contributed) to the desired impact (or other unintended impacts);

4.1.3 Assess the extent to which the CSEF partners and stakeholders have learned from programme experiences, and shared and used that learning;

4.1.4 Measure the CSEF programme’s impact on the role and influence of National Education Coalitions in national education policy processes and in the GPE country level processes where applicable;

4.1.5 Assess capacity in terms of human resources of the CSEF programme, as well as the synergy and collaboration achieved with and between the partners of the CSEF programme;

4.1.6 Assess organisational performance – in relation to the relevance and effectiveness of the CSEF programme strategies on capacity building, participation, partnership, methodology, management, learning, monitoring and evaluation;

4.1.7 Review the effectiveness of structures and management of the programme including the role of Regional Secretariats (RSs), the Financial Management Agencies (FMAs), the Regional Funding Committees (RFCs), the GCE, the Global Oversight Committee (GOC);

4.1.8 Assess the cost effectiveness of the CSEF programme, including an assessment of the added value of the CSEF programme for regional partners and national education coalitions;

4.1.9 Provide recommendations and guidance to inform future programme phases, particularly in terms of refining the theory of change or intervention logic underlying the programme in order to support establishing causal links between the intervention and the expected results.

In geographical terms, activities of up to 60 civil society coalitions covered by the current programme phase will be included in the evaluation.

4.2 Key Areas of Learning Interest for the Evaluation

The evaluation should include but will not be limited to the following key research areas. More specific evaluation questions will be elaborated during the inception phase. The core areas to cover are:

4.2.1 Measuring achievements of Expected Results and Learning Goals according to the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework of CSEF;

4.2.2 Relevance, value addition and impact of the programme on the capacity of national coalitions, including an assessment of the appropriateness of funding levels;

4.2.3 A review of the programme structure and management, including relationships between different levels and implementing partners – what has worked and what has not, why and what improvements could be made and how?

4.2.4 The effectiveness of strategies of communication, learning and networking, mobilization, advocacy and policy change;

4.2.5 Exploring the sustainability of the programme results and outcomes – and the extent to which these are pointing towards long-term impact;

---

3 It is important to note that a proposal for a costed extension of the CSEF programme until December 2015 is currently in process, the outcomes of which will be known end February 2015.
In addition, the evaluation should also consider the following areas, which go beyond the original objectives of the Programme, but where GCE and partners are keen to evaluate the potential impact of the programme:

4.2.6 The extent to which the CSEF programme has contributed to **GPE strategic objectives** in relevant GPE-partner countries in which CSEF operates, vis:

- the development and implementation of education plans in fragile and conflict affected states;
- access, transition and completion of basic education for girls;
- increases in the number of children learning and demonstrating basic literacy and numeracy by Grade 3;
- improved teacher effectiveness and quality of education, and;
- changes in the volume, effectiveness, efficiency and equitable allocation of external and domestic financing and support to education.

4.2.7 The contribution to (i) national policy change (ii) the Local Education Groups, Education Sector Working Groups and Joint Sector Review processes of the relevant Ministries of Education, (iii) the development, monitoring and evaluation of Education Sector Plans, (iv) influencing national resource investment to the sector and, (v) promoting more efficient, transparent and accountable use of sector resources;

4.2.8 Programme impact on political and financial sustainability of coalitions, and;

4.2.9 The degree to which CSEF has addressed gender equality and human rights in programme implementation and, as far as possible, the contribution of the CSEF in impacting on gender equality and human rights.

5. **Methodology**

The evaluation will draw information from various sources. This will include a review of existing relevant documents, including but not limited to programme and coalition plans, as well as monitoring and assessment reports. A combination of participatory approaches including both external and internal assessments is considered appropriate – interviews and observation, surveys, case studies, collection and analysis of qualitative and quantitative data - involving partners, their constituencies, relevant stakeholders and programme staff.

The following schedule of methods is proposed as a minimum to ensure satisfactory involvement of all key stakeholders and a comprehensive synthesis of external reflections and insights from staff and partners involved in the programme. However, **applicants are expected to present a detailed methodology with suggestions on effective methods to add value to the evaluation, together with a clear justification for the proposed sampling.**

5.1 **Anticipated methods:**

5.1.1 A thorough document review of existing secondary sources including the full range of progress reports published over the years as well as key programme documents and key meeting/workshop reports and minutes etc. available at global, regional and national levels.

5.1.2 Questionnaire/survey administered to all coalitions to gather both qualitative and quantitative data.

5.1.3 Approximately 100 telephone/Skype and/or face-to-face interviews to be arranged to include:
- Members of the GCE Board including members of the GOC, members of the CSEF Regional Funding Committees
- GCE staff and staff of the CSEF Regional Secretariats and Financial Management Agencies and CSEF funded national coalitions
- Funders (GPE), Donors on the board of GPE
- Supervising Entity (UNESCO)
- Other Constituencies, Education International (EI), International Partners’ Group (IPG)
• Decision Makers (amongst them the LEG conveners, the GPE contracted Supervising and/or managing Entities, Ministries of Education, country offices of EFA convening agencies, as well as other external stakeholders to be proposed by the evaluation team)

• A selection of campaigners working with similar mechanisms to the CSEF

5.1.4 A comprehensive case study evaluation of a representative sample of at least 8 countries (4 from Africa, 2 from Asia and the Pacific, 1 from Latin America and 1 from the Middle East) through country visits and interviews with national stakeholders; leading to a minimum 8 extended National Evaluation case studies illustrating the added value of the national coalitions in education planning, implementation and tracking embedded in a framework of social accountability.

5.1.5 Face to face meetings with the Global CSEF Secretariat to be undertaken, thus at least 1 trip should be budgeted to Johannesburg where GCE and the Global CSEF Secretariat is based.

Whilst GCE will arrange translation of the final report – the evaluation team must arrange for translation/interpretation for survey responses and for telephone/Skype and face-to-face interviews. The CSEF programme currently works in French, Spanish, Portuguese, English and Arabic.

To support proposal preparations, an initial list of targeted Interview Partners, Survey Participants, Focus Group Participants is provided in the Annex A.

6. Expected Deliverables

6.1 Initial Inception Report: including proposed sampling and sampling rationale, a detailed work plan showing relevant activities, outline of proposed evaluation tools/instruments, limitations if any, description of outputs and indicators, as well as responsible persons and timeframes.

6.2 Final Inception Report: final methodology, sampling and tools/instruments following review of feedback on the initial report.

6.3 A Participatory Debriefing and Validation Workshop Plan, and Presentation (PPT): on the preliminary findings and recommendations of the evaluation.

6.4 Draft Evaluation Report: with Executive Summary, description of methodology and limitations, evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations.

6.5 Final Evaluation Report: incorporating valid feedback and including relevant appendices and submission of data sets, pictures/graphics, audio/visual recordings and any other relevant materials from the evaluation.

7. Timeline and Dissemination Plan

Contracting of external consultants for the evaluation is expected to be concluded by 31\textsuperscript{st} March 2015. The entire evaluation process is anticipated to be concluded between early April and early October 2015, with an indicative total of 90 productive consultant person days\textsuperscript{4}.

The starting date of the contract will be no more than ten (10) working days after the date (email, post office, or courier stamped date) the Contracting Organisation has sent the signed contract to the selected services provider.

The actual evaluation fieldwork mission activities should be carried out from mid-May to mid-July 2015, in accordance with the following indicative schedule:

---

\textsuperscript{4} 90 days is estimated. The total number of consultant days should align with the methodology proposed by bidders.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NR</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>REPOSTING OF CALLS FOR SUBMISSION TO POTENTIAL SERVICE PROVIDERS WITH SUBMISSION DEADLINE 16.02.2015</td>
<td>GCE and partners</td>
<td>2015/01/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SELECTION PANEL REVIEWS ALL INCOMING SUBMISSIONS AND DECIDES ON SHORTLIST</td>
<td>Selection Panel</td>
<td>2015/02/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SHORTLISTED CANDIDATES CONTACTED TO SCHEDULE INTERVIEW</td>
<td>GCE</td>
<td>2015/03/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SHORTLISTED POTENTIAL SERVICE PROVIDERS INTERVIEWED</td>
<td>Selection Panel</td>
<td>2015/03/04 to 2015/03/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CONTRACT WITH SUCCESSFUL BIDDER IS SIGNED</td>
<td>GCE Chair</td>
<td>2015/03/31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>DOCUMENTS REVIEW/DESKTOP STUDY AND PRODUCTION OF INITIAL INCEPTION REPORT</td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
<td>2015/04/01 to 2015/04/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DELIVERABLE 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial inception report submitted by 17 April 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>FEEDBACK ON INITIAL INCEPTION REPORT</td>
<td>Selection Panel</td>
<td>2015/05/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PRODUCTION OF FINAL INCEPTION REPORT</td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
<td>2015/05/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DELIVERABLE 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final inception report submitted by 15 May 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>EVALUATION DATA GATHERING</td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
<td>2015/05/18 to 2015/07/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>DATA ANALYSIS FINALISATION</td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
<td>2015/07/13 to 2015/07/31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>PRODUCTION OF PARTICIPATORY WORKSHOP PLAN AND PRESENTATION</td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
<td>2015/08/03 to 2015/08/07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DELIVERABLE 3
Participatory debriefing and validation workshop plan and presentation
14th August 2015 (date TBC)

12 WRITING FIRST DRAFT OF EVALUATION REPORT
Evaluation Team
2015/08/17 to 2015/08/31 August

DELIVERABLE 4
Draft evaluation report submitted by 31 August 2015

13 FEEDBACK ON DRAFT REPORT GATHERED FROM GCE, UNESCO AND GPE AND SUBMITTED TO EVALUATION TEAM
GCE
2015/09/01 to 2015/09/21 September

14 WRITING FINAL EVALUATION REPORT INCORPORATING VALID FEEDBACK
Evaluation Team
2015/09/22 to 2015/10/05 September

DELIVERABLE 5
Final evaluation report and submission of evaluation data sets and materials by no later than 05 October 2015

15 FINAL FULL VERSION OF REPORT IN ENGLISH IS SUBMITTED TO UNESCO/GPE AND OTHER KEY STAKEHOLDERS/ PARTNERS
GCE/ CSEF Programme Manager
2015/10/06 to 2015/10/12 October

8. Profile of the evaluation team

It is anticipated that the evaluation will be conducted by three to four consultants, one of them being the lead and taking ultimate responsibility for all outputs and deliverables. The successful bidder(s) should adhere to the following key principles:

8.1 An evaluation team combining demonstrable and complementary skills and experiences in results-based monitoring and evaluation, including in measuring advocacy and campaign impact, community accountability and empowerment, theory of change, complex, multi-country programme and finance management.

8.2 Have a strong track record in working with civil society and in promoting quality education for all in development contexts, including in fragile and/or conflict-affected states.

8.3 Gender and geographic balance to be respected in the evaluation team, which may not include any members with previous involvement in any of the activities under review.

8.4 Capacity to manage the evaluation process in the CSEF programme languages.

8.5 Before a contract is awarded the successful tenderer (and/or any subcontractors/ partners) will be required to provide a current tax clearance certificate valid for contract purposes.

8.6 The lead consultant is expected to have the following (mandatory):

- A strong and proven track record in conducting multi-country evaluations and in leading a team(s) of evaluators to conduct large programme evaluations which demand both quantitative and qualitative research skills.
- An advanced university degree, minimum Masters degree, desirable Doctorate level in the area of Education Policy, Education Financing and/or Education Planning and Evaluation or similar.
• Excellent knowledge of Education For All goals and priorities and post 2015 education agendas in the global context.
• Proficient knowledge of advocacy and campaign work with civil society, Ministries, Bi-lateral and Multi-lateral agencies and International Funding Agencies.
• Excellent planning, team leading, and supervisory research skills.
• Ability to research, analyse and present complex information.

In addition, the following attributes of the lead consultant are highly desirable:
• Substantial international experience in undertaking evaluations of quality education campaigns and programmes in collaboration with civil society movements, Ministries, Bi-lateral and Multi-lateral agencies and International Funding Agencies.
• Proven ability to deal with politically sensitive issues.
• Cultural awareness and sensitivity.
• High level of interpersonal and communication skills.
• Ability to establish and maintain strong and effective working relationships.

8.7 The support team shall collectively demonstrate the following knowledge/skills/experience:

Mandatory:
• Gender, language and geographic representation balance
• Expertise in qualitative and/or quantitative research processes
• Education expertise
• Gender and human rights expertise
• Policy and advocacy expertise
• Strong data synthesis and reporting skills
• Strong communication skills – both oral and written

Desirable:
• Participatory workshop/consultative meetings facilitation and organisation skills/experience.

9. Roles and Responsibilities

9.1 The consultants commissioned to undertake this evaluation will:

1. Conduct a desk based comprehensive documents review.
2. Develop and design the evaluation instruments and tools, including arranging translation as relevant.
3. Organise and conduct field visits (to the 8 case study countries across 4 regions) and virtual interviews to gather data.
4. Transcribe, translate and analyse qualitative and quantitative data.
5. Make presentations of findings and recommendations to GCE, UNESCO, GPE and CSEF staff and partners and gather feedback.
6. Develop and provide a draft evaluation report, including an executive summary, evaluation findings and tangible recommendations.
7. Based on feedback (in 6 above), provide and submit the final detailed report of no more than 70 pages.
8. Organise and submit data sets, pictures/graphics, audio/visual recordings and any other relevant materials generated and/or developed through the evaluation.

9.2 GCE will:

1. Provide background literature including programme documents, reports and other relevant data.
2. Provide a database of programme partners and stakeholders with contact details.
3. Pay consultancy fees and disbursements as per agreed payment schedule according to deliverables and output dates.
4. Monitor evaluation progress and quality as the evaluation process progresses.

9.3 Management of the process

The GCE Global Coordinator has ultimate responsibility for oversight of the evaluation mission. The day-to-day management of the evaluation will be the responsibility of the CSEF Global Programme Manager with the support of the CSEF global secretariat.

The lead consultant will have direct oversight of the evaluation team members.

10 Relevant documents available

In order to inform the potential evaluation consultants about developments of the CSEF programme, relevant documentation will be shared taking into account previous programme phases\(^5\) and comparing differences of impact and attribution over time to frame a bigger picture. The following initial list of documents are available:

http://www.campaignforeducation.org/en/resources
https://drive.google.com/folderview?id=0B9V5kYLpWlaCM2FzSMGRHZnIYTVU&usp=sharing

For more information on CSEF and GCE please visit the website www.campaignforeducation.org

11 Proposal Submission and Assessment Process

11.1 Proposal Submissions

Proposals should be submitted electronically in English with the subject line “Proposal: CSEF Evaluation 2013-2015 (your company/consortium or lead consultant’s name)”. Proposals should comprise two separate parts:

1. PART A: Technical and Administrative Proposal
2. PART B: Financial Proposal

PART A must contain the following items:

1. A Methodology demonstrating your understanding and analysis of the TOR and proposing how you intend to proceed to implement the services (including suggested sampling strategy and time table) (maximum 15 pages);
2. A brief biography of the team leader and each of the proposed evaluation team members, that clearly demonstrates their experience for the assignment and the competencies outlined in the Terms of Reference (maximum 4 pages);
3. The up-to-date Curricula Vitae (CV) for each of the expert(s) proposed to work on this assignment;
4. Personnel inputs (including productive working person days without any reference to fees);
5. A signed Statement of Availability (Annex B) – signed by each of the expert(s) proposed;
6. Three recently completed evaluation reports as examples of previous work, at least two of which must be the consultant team leader’s previous work.

\(^5\) The first phase of the CSEF programme 2011-2013 was evaluated independently. The evaluation report should be taken into account in the design of the forthcoming evaluation.
PART B must contain:

1. A signed and initialed detailed Price Schedule which includes all fees and identified expenses.

The submissions must reach the following address by 23:00 GMT on 16th February 2015: consultants@campaignforeducation.org and copied to louise@campaignforeducation.org

Late proposal tenders will not be accepted in any circumstances and will not be assessed. Timely delivery of submissions is the responsibility of tenderers and the Global Campaign for Education will not in any circumstances accept liability for late or unsuccessful delivery of proposal submissions.

11.2 Proposal enquiries

Requests for clarification should be made in writing and sent to: the CSEF M&E Officer, Louise Knight, Email: louise@campaignforeducation.org and copied to wolfgang@campaignforeducation.org

The deadline for requests for clarification is 10 days before the deadline for submission of tenders. The deadline for replies to queries by candidates is 5 days before the deadline for submission of tenders.

11.3 Proposal Assessments

TECHNICAL EVALUATION

Submitted tenders will be assessed in a closed session, not open to the public, by a Selection Panel technically qualified to evaluate the type of services concerned. The submissions will first be reviewed to verify the administrative compliance, and be assessed technically to be ranked against the Evaluation Criteria (see section 12). The acceptability threshold for technical proposals is set at a minimum score of 70 points out of 100 points. Technical proposals which do not reach this minimum score will not be considered for financial evaluation.

FINANCIAL EVALUATION

After establishing the technical scores, the Financial Proposals of technically qualified Candidates will be reviewed. The Financial Proposals will be evaluated on a maximum score of 100 points in the following manner:

- Financial score = (100 x lowest financial proposal) / financial proposal to be evaluated.

SHORTLISTING

Thereafter, a final score will be established for each technically qualified tender submissions by using the following weighting:

- 70/30, where the technical proposal = 70 and the financial proposal = 30.

Thereafter Candidates with the top 10 scores will be contacted for (virtual) interview and a maximum score of 25 points will be applied to the interview process.

Interviews will be held between 4th and 6th March 2015. Candidates selected for interview will be contacted on 2nd March 2015 to arrange the interview date and time.

CONTRACT AWARD

The Contract will be awarded to the Candidate(s) whose tender submission plus interview score has obtained the highest final score, thus representing the most advantageous offer.
### 12 Technical Selection Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation and Methodology</th>
<th>Maximum Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and interpretation of the terms of reference</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology and proposed approach for the evaluation</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(a) Presentation of methodology and sequence of activities is clear and the planning is logical</em></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(b) Proposal reflects a feasible and sound methodology, considering the limitations and risks of each proposed tool/method</em></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(c) Quality of samples of previous evaluation work relate to the subject of the current evaluation and align with methodology requirements as set in the TOR</em></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timetable of activities is realistic and promises efficient / on time submission of deliverables</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total score for organisation and methods</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experts Team Skills, Experience and Qualifications</th>
<th>(40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team Leader</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 8 years’ experience conducting multi-country evaluations and in leading a team(s) of evaluators to conduct large programme evaluations of a similar scale and scope</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced university degree in the area of Education Policy, Education Financing and/or Education Planning and Evaluation or similar</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent knowledge of quality education for all, including relevant policy related issues, and post 2015 education agendas in the global context</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient knowledge of advocacy and campaign work with civil society, Ministries, Bi-lateral and Multi-lateral agencies and International Funding Agencies.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, team leading, supervisory research and analysis skills for complex information.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team Members (complementary skills and experience)</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender, language and geographic representation balance</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 10 years’ (combined) experience in conducting evaluations of a similar scale, with expertise in qualitative and/or quantitative processes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, gender and human rights expertise</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and advocacy expertise</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data synthesis and report writing experience and skills</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong oral and written communication skills</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop /consultative meetings facilitation and organisation skills and experience</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total score for experts team</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall total score</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** The acceptability threshold for technical proposals is set at a minimum score of 70 points out of 100 points. Technical proposals which do not reach this minimum score will not be considered for financial evaluation.
## 13 Administrative Selection Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Documents requested</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technical and administrative proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PART A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Tender submission cover letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Methodology (including suggested sampling and time table)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Profiles/biographies of evaluation team members and their curricula vitae</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Schedule of personnel inputs (including productive working person days without any reference to fees)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Declarations of availability (signed by each expert)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Three samples of recent evaluation reports (at least two by the consultant team lead)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>PART B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Breakdown of prices (Price Schedule) (including all fees and identified expenses), signed by tenderer Lead</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Signed Disclosure Declaration</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tender submissions which fail to include the above relevant documents assigned with a * will be administratively non-compliant and will be automatically rejected.
Annex A – Indicative list of targeted Interview Partners, Survey Participants, Focus Group Participants (to be reviewed and finalised in the inception phase)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of empirical evidence collection tool</th>
<th>Stakeholder Category</th>
<th>Includes which countries</th>
<th>Data Collection Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>GCE Board members</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Structured Skype/telephonic Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
<td>Regional Secretariats, Regional Finance Management Agencies and Selected National Coalitions</td>
<td>All 4 regions</td>
<td>Face to Face in 4 Regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with National Education Coalitions (NEC)</td>
<td>NECs (field visits)</td>
<td>List: Africa 4 Asia 2 Latin America 1 ME and EE 1</td>
<td>Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Visits to Interview NECs, LEG representatives of the SE/ME, government reps</td>
<td>Separate Interviews, structured meetings</td>
<td>List: Africa 4 Asia 2 Latin America 1 ME and EE 1</td>
<td>Face to Face, Group sessions, LEG meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with National Education Coalitions</td>
<td>NECs (virtual engagements)</td>
<td>Representative sample</td>
<td>Structured Skype/telephonic Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>NECs</td>
<td>All 54</td>
<td>Survey Monkey or similar Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Regional and Global Structures, IPG</td>
<td>RS, RFMA, GCE-GOC, IPG, RFC, GPE</td>
<td>In total up to 14 structures</td>
<td>Survey Monkey or similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of national, regional and global reports; Audited FS; and other relevant documents</td>
<td>National coalitions; regional and global secretariats</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Desk Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews / FGD</td>
<td>GCE Global Management Team (with inclusion of Board members?)</td>
<td>Up to 8 interview partners in London/Johannesburg</td>
<td>Face to Face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>GPE and UNESCO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Skype/telephonic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex B: Statement of Eligibility

For the attention of: Global Campaign for Education
1st Floor, Block N
25 Sturdee Avenue
Rosebank, 2132
Johannesburg
South Africa


I/We, the undersigned, [insert name/s]…………………………………………………………, hereby state that the proposed named expert(s) listed below is/are available to carry out the services relating to the Terms of Reference mentioned above as from [insert start date]............. for the period initially envisaged in the proposal submitted. ⁶

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name of expert(s)</th>
<th>Title of post/position for this evaluation</th>
<th>Duration (work days/months)</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I/We understand that failure to make the named expert(s) listed above available for the performance of the services may lead to cancellation of the Contract.

Name, date and signature of representative of the Company

⁶ When the Tenderer is a firm or a consultancy, the signatory must be a duly authorised representative of the firm or consultancy.
Annex C: Disclosure Declaration

THIS DECLARATION MUST BE SUBMITTED BY ALL TENDERERS. WHERE THE TENDERER IS A CORPORATION OR CONSORTIUM OR PARTNERSHIP THE DECLARATION MUST BE COMPLETED BY A DULY AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE.

Name of Tenderer: ..................................................................................................................

Address: ..............................................................................................................................
..............................................................................................................................

I, [insert name], solemnly declare that I have been duly authorised to make this declaration by the Tenderer and I hereby certify as follows:

(1) The Tenderer has not been convicted of fraud, money laundering, corruption, or of being a member of a criminal organisation.

(2) The Tenderer is not bankrupt or subject to bankruptcy or analogous proceedings, or being wound up, its affairs are not being administered by a court, it has not entered into an arrangement with its creditors, it has not suspended its business activities nor is it in any analogous situation arising from a similar procedure under national laws and regulations.

(3) Neither the Tenderer, nor any of its directors or partners, has been convicted of an offence concerning professional conduct by a judgement which has the force of res judicata or been guilty of grave professional misconduct (proven by any means which the Contracting Organisation can demonstrate) in the course of its or their business.

(4) The Tenderer has fulfilled its obligations relating to the payment of taxes or social security contributions in its country of establishment or any other State in which the Tenderer is located.

(5) The Tenderer has not been guilty of serious misrepresentation or omission in providing information to a public buying agency, including the Contracting Organisation.

I further declare that the information provided above is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.

I understand that the provision of inaccurate or misleading information in this declaration may lead to the Tenderer being excluded from participation in this or future tenders.

This declaration is made for the benefit of the Global Campaign for Education, Johannesburg, South Africa.

SIGNATURE: ________________________________ DATE: ________________________________

NAME (PRINT): ________________________________ TEL: ________________________________

POSITION: _______________________________________________