



## Terms of Reference

**Mid-Term Review** For ‘Strengthening Equity, Access and Quality in Education (SEAQE2)’ Education Programme in Ethiopia, Myanmar, Somalia and South Sudan and the Education in Emergency programme in Upper Nile, South Sudan implemented by ADRA Norway. ADRA Norway is seeking proposals from relevant parties to take on the role of External Evaluator for the Mid-Term Review (MTR) in line with the below Terms of Reference.

### 1. Background

ADRA Norway is one of the leading international education development and humanitarian organisations in Norway. Through our work, we strive to achieve equality, dignity and freedom for all, irrespective of their religious, political, social, ethical or national background. ADRA Norway prioritises both humanitarian and long-term relief and development work. It has a strong interest in the field of education and fragility, and works to strengthen its approaches in the development-humanitarian-peace nexus.

ADRA Norway has an integrated approach to education, by means of “whole school approach” that involves students, teachers, parents, the community and the government working together to enable all children to access a quality and inclusive education in both fragile and longer term development settings. ADRA employs a rights-based approach where, through partnerships with children, women, their families, civil society and government, we uplift the voices of the excluded and marginalised to be heard on issues that affect them. This builds mutual understanding between the rights holders and the duty bearers and promotes the rights of vulnerable groups to fully participate in and benefit from their societies.

ADRA Norway is a member of the international ADRA network with over 130 locally governed country offices, eight regional offices and an international network office. ADRA Norway works in direct partnership with local ADRA partners in developing countries to act as a catalyst for change, inspiring, engaging and empowering people to strive together to overcome poverty and injustice, and managing the risks and impacts of disasters.

### 2. Project background / context

**Strengthening Equity, Access and Quality in Education (SEAQE2)** (2019-2023) is implemented by The Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA) Norway in partnership with ADRA offices in Somalia, South Sudan, Ethiopia and Myanmar with financial support from Norad. It is the second phase of the SEAQE programme, building on the successes and learning from SEAQE 1 (2013 – 2018).

The overall goal of the programme is that *all learners are equipped with the attitudes and skills that will help them access opportunities and achieve their fullest potential*. The objective is that *all learners, regardless of background, ability and gender, equitably access, engage and learn in inclusive educational institutions*. These include primary and secondary schools, non-formal education and Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) in project countries. Overall, SEAQE2 works with 70,450 students (50% girls). SEAQE2 promotes inclusive, gender-responsive education; facilitates healthy, safe and protective learning environments with appropriate

infrastructure, policies and action; strengthens effective teaching, learning and school management; engages students, families and communities as active participants in education; and builds civil society to hold government accountable for education systems, policies, practices and investment. Under SEAQE2, TVET has shifted from being supply-focused to demand-driven and competency-based programs, with close links with private sector. Cutting across SEAQE2 will be inclusion, gender equality, conflict sensitivity, resilience and child protection. Outcomes and outputs are described in the Annex 1. SEAQE2 Results Framework.

Education in Emergency (EiE) in Upper Nile, South Sudan (2020-2023) is implemented by ADRA Norway in partnership with ADRA South Sudan.

The main objective of the EiE Upper Nile program is that all learners, regardless of background, ability and gender, equitably access, engage in and learn in inclusive educational institutions. The program targets areas of Maiwut and Nasir of Upper Nile Upper Nile that, after years of disruption of education due to conflict, are seeing significant refugee and IDP returns despite continuing instability. The project, with a learner-focused and conflict-sensitivity approach, develops education pathways for the conflict affected children, girls, OOSC and CWD to access quality, relevant and inclusive education, addressing barriers for access to education and concentrating on quality, equity, inclusion, protection, psychosocial support and participation. The primary beneficiaries targeted by the project include 9,507 Conflict-affected children, 175 members of PTAs /SMCs, 450 parents, 228 Teachers, head teachers and other government and community representatives. Outcomes and outputs are described in the Annex 2. EiE Results Framework

### 3. Theory of change

In summary, reflecting the principles of inclusion and equity, schools, non-formal centres and TVET institutions will be accessible, welcoming to all children and seeking out marginalised children. Learner-focused pedagogical approaches will be implemented in healthy, safe and protective learning environments that encourage the participation of children, parents and the community. Better quality teaching should lead to an increase in learning for children in educational institutions. The increased likelihood of learning, and the increased inclusivity of educational institutions should begin to attract more learners to education, leading to an increase in enrolment rates. This should result in children who were previously excluded now gaining access, and more children staying in school and more youth having access to economic opportunities or further education. For the project's Theory of Change, please see Annex 3.

In theory, proposed interventions should move towards becoming sustainable through improved government spending on education resulting from advocacy and civil society led accountability initiatives. This will be supported by increasing levels of capacity in educational institutions, local government authorities and regional and national agencies. Civil society organisations (CSOs) will have built sufficient expertise to keep growing the capacity of communities to engage in education, beyond the end of SEAQE2. All of this can only happen if funding levels are sustained or increased, and if resources are targeted successfully at key areas of education.

### 4. Purpose/Objectives of the evaluation

The project is seeking to procure the services of an independent external evaluator to conduct a mid-term review of the project that is gender-sensitive and inclusive of learners with disabilities. The purpose of the mid-term review is to assess the progress and achievements of SEAQE2 and EiE to date against the stated project targets with a **focus** on strengthening and informing the remaining

period of the program. Particular attention will be paid to stakeholder's perspectives, with a focus on children, parents, teachers and education authorities.

The external Evaluation Team will provide an independent, rigorous evaluation and research function; however, the methodology and evaluation frameworks used will be designed in consultation with the ADRA Norway team.

The MTR will provide a clear picture of the issues affecting the learners, teachers and learning institutions in the four countries, and provide recommendations for strengthening and sustaining positive outcomes and identify areas where re-alignment is necessary. The evaluation should identify key learning to inform future policy and programming, specifically recognising the impact of national school closures associated with COVID-19 on educational development, physical, social and emotional safety and wellbeing and the approach the project has taken to mitigate the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the beneficiaries. More specifically this task will aim:

- To assess the relevance and efficacy of current interventions in SEAQE2 and EiE in terms of their contribution towards learners accessing, engaging, and learning in quality education.
- To understand how and how well the project adapted their design and implementation of activities in light of COVID-19, and particularly school closures, and the degree to which these activities achieved their desired effects, in particular what approaches can be taken forward in the program.
- To test the assumptions within and reflect on the continuing relevance of the Theory of Change for the remainder of the programme and provide recommendations for any amendments.
- To draw lessons from the process, design, implementation, successes and challenges of the project.
- To provide recommendations for strengthening and sustaining and increasing positive outcomes in the remaining period of the program.

The findings from the MTR will primarily be used by:

- ADRA Norway, project partners and stakeholders to understand the impact to date of the project and to inform programme level adaptations.
- the community, project partners and implementing country governments to inform their own support to beneficiaries and to support systemic change.
- ADRA Norway and partners to share learning and recommendations with the communities, schools and beneficiaries with whom the project works and ensure meaningful accountability to these stakeholder groups.
- ADRA Norway to demonstrate accountability for the funding received to Norad.
- The ADRA network, academic institutions and education networks to inform learning and wider policy debates concerning the education for marginalised children in these four countries.

## 5. Evaluation questions

The evaluation should include findings and recommendations based on the OECD DAC evaluation criteria<sup>1</sup> listed below. The evaluation questions have been set collaboratively by ADRA Norway and

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

country partners, but there will be an opportunity for them to be further refined and prioritized during the inception phase of the evaluation.

Evaluation criteria	Main evaluation questions and sub-questions for both SEAQE and EIE
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent are the objectives and design of the project, including the underlying theory of change, valid and are responding to the needs, priorities and policies of intended beneficiaries, partner organisations, stakeholders, and education systems.</li> <li>• To what extent do they remain responsive to the needs, priorities and policies of these groups when the context changed (COVID-19 or other shifts in context)</li> </ul> <p>Sub-questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How appropriate was the project’s response to the effects of the pandemic? From country to country? For those at most risk of drop out?</li> <li>• How could the most appropriate interventions that took place during COVID-19 be used or adapted moving forward. Are there any variations from country to country?</li> <li>• How well did the project address the barriers that children/youth face in school return/initial school access and what recommendations would the Evaluation Team make to address these for future in-country access and retention strategies?</li> <li>• How relevant were the distance learning interventions during school closures? What are the key factors that have supported or prevented children from accessing or benefitting from these interventions?</li> <li>• How have school closures affected marginalised groups of learners, including learners with disabilities, and has the project responded appropriately and correctly to this?</li> <li>• How has the project worked to protect children before and during pandemic related school closures? Has the project ensured that beneficiaries are not at risk of harm as a result of their involvement in the program (especially during the pandemic), and that communities, schools and beneficiaries are aware of relevant protection mechanisms and reporting channels?</li> <li>• Are there any changes or adjustments that should be made to a program to minimise negative impacts and maximise positive impacts on conflict.</li> </ul>
Coherence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent was the project consistent with and complementary to other interventions, practices and policies?</li> </ul> <p>Sub-questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent has the project been framed within national educational priorities and policies during the COVID-19 pandemic? Further, how has the project responded to the school-wide closures and worked with the government and relevant stakeholders to support return to school and retention of children, including those with disabilities, during the COVID-19 project response? In particular, how well has the project engaged parents, school community and the wider community in its school return and retention interventions?</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How far have the projects interventions (including during the pandemic) worked within schools and community level systems and structures to strengthen safeguarding and protection mechanisms, including reporting, monitoring and referral processes?</li> <li>• How effectively have strategic partnerships, especially those that address out-of-school-children, disability and inclusion, worked in country?</li> <li>• How the project has mainstreamed and incorporated good or best practice in gender, conflict sensitivity, Do-No-Harm principles, child protection and safeguarding.</li> </ul>
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent did the project deliver the intended results in an economical and timely manner?</li> <li>• Was the project managed efficiently? To what extent did the project adopt and apply 'adaptive management' practices?</li> </ul> <p>Sub questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were the teaching and learning activities and materials, designed to support the distance learning, and school return, used as planned? Were there variations from country to country?</li> <li>• Were the training materials and staff training efficiently delivered within the project interventions?</li> <li>• Was there a way to make better use of resources and training materials for teaching and learning, particularly during COVID-19? How could any future materials and their contextual training be used/improved for future in-country interventions?</li> <li>• How did ADRA Norway support partners during the COVID-19 pandemic?</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent were the objectives and intended results of the project achieved, including differential results across groups?</li> <li>• What were the major factors influencing the achievement on non-achievement of the objectives and intended results?</li> </ul> <p>Sub questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How successfully has the project supported and prepared learners, communities and teachers for the safe reopening of schools during the COVID-19 project response?</li> <li>• How effective were the distance learning interventions to support children's learning outcomes and in re-engaging in learning during/after the COVID-19 pandemic?</li> <li>• To what extent have partners, schools and school communities been able to actively address safeguarding and protection risks? This includes protecting children at most risk and addressing corporal punishment in school.</li> <li>• How are effective are approaches to teacher training? How is the regular training of teachers and head teachers through mentors working so far? Are there other approaches such as through teacher trainings institutions that are working and/or what could be done better?</li> </ul>
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent did the project generate or contribute to the generation of significant higher-level effects (social, environmental and economic), whether positive or negative, intended or unintended?</li> </ul> <p>Sub-questions:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How does technology (e-learning piloted in Myanmar) impact quality in education?</li> <li>• What impact has the project’s promotion of gender-sensitive, inclusive and child-centred pedagogical approaches (pre and post the Covid-19 project adaptations) had on children’s learning and on wider teaching practices within intervention schools?</li> <li>• Does the program avoid creating tensions within the community (between different ethnic groups or between different non-state actors within the area)?</li> </ul>
Sustainability <sup>2</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At this stage of implementation, how is the project working towards sustainability, where the net benefits (whether financial, economic, social and/or environmental) of the project will continue?</li> <li>• To what extent was the project successful in building sustainability within the enabling environment for change at the family, community, school and system levels?</li> <li>• What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability?</li> </ul> <p>Sub-questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have the projects COVID-19 response distance learning interventions provided a sustainable model which can be adapted for either blended learning, or to support children out of school?</li> <li>• Has the project’s pre and post COVID-19 response likely to have sustainable impact upon the professional development and teaching practices of the teachers and Head Teachers in intervention schools? Has there been any cascading of project pedagogic approaches and teaching and learning materials across the school’s wider educational community?</li> <li>• To what extent has the project integrated gender-transformative approaches, and how has this influenced behaviours and attitudes in schools and communities? What is the likelihood that changes in attitudes and behaviours relating to gender equity will be sustained beyond project end?</li> <li>• In what ways has the project’s approach to protection and safeguarding led to sustainable changes within the intervention schools?</li> </ul>

## 6. Scope of work, methodology and approach

Comprehensive data is needed to measure the impact of ADRA’s inputs in SEAQE2 and EiE. The MTR will utilise both qualitative and quantitative methods to collect data, ensuring in-depth analysis of status of objective, outcome and output indicators. Qualitative methods, primarily key informant interviews, direct observation of schools and learning spaces, and focus group discussions will be the main methods used by the Evaluation Team and partners to collect data for the assessment. Stakeholders include, among others, students, community members and leaders, PTA/SMCs, teachers and head teachers, education officials at relevant levels including school inspectors, ADRA partners and other local NGOs working in the area.

<sup>2</sup> Sustainability is about delivering and enabling long lasting empowerment for learners through education, for current and future generations, by working with learners, families, communities, schools and systems and creating enabling environments for change. For SEAQE2, sustainable change and impact should be embedded in the Theory of Change.

The Evaluation Team should ensure the MTR is conducted in a participatory manner and that the exercise enables participating staff to gain useful data collection and analysis skills. Children, SMCs and PTAs, education officials and authorities, ADRA, and other stakeholders should be meaningfully and fully involved in the survey. The Evaluation Team is expected to coordinate planning, data collector training, tool testing, data collection and analysis. The methodology to be proposed by the Evaluation Team in the technical proposal will be reviewed by ADRA Norway who will approve it prior to commencement. ADRA Norway recommends that data collection is conducted by the staff of implementing partners, to the extent possible. This should be included in the proposals by interested candidates.

At inception phase, the Evaluation Team will work with ADRA Norway to establish a shared set of priorities and approaches. Due to the complex and changing environment of school closures and access to communities as a result of COVID-19, there may be limited data collection opportunities (or possible restrictions on data collection).

Bidders are invited to take note of the following when outlining their proposed evaluation approach:

**Qualitative research:** Qualitative data is a crucial element of the evaluation and is expected to provide insights into why and how change has happened. We will expect the Evaluation Team to articulate a detailed qualitative methodology in their proposal, including how qualitative data will be fully integrated into the analysis.

**Using existing MEAL data:** The Evaluation Team will need to consider how they extract data relevant to answering the research questions from the data already captured across the monitoring, evaluation, accountability and learning (MEAL) tools and in target schools. The Evaluation Team will be expected to draw on existing project monitoring (which will be made available) to inform the MTR and should outline a broad approach to doing so in their submission. ADRA Norway will work with the successful Evaluation Partner to identify any new methods of data capture required.

**Measuring learning:** Learning remains a core outcome of the SEAQE2 project and a central focus of the evaluation. We expect that the evaluation team can collect data on math and literacy using ASER tests. This can be done by project staff or local enumerators that the ADRA partners will facilitate and pay independently from this task. However, in view of the COVID-19 pandemic, the Evaluation Team is not expected to assess learning outcomes by administering ASER tests to a statistically significant sample of children. Alternative approaches could be explored to demonstrating the project's impacts upon learners within a distance learning model and throughout a period of fragmented educational facilitation.

**Flexibility of approach:** ADRA Norway recognises the scope and methodology of the evaluation may be affected by the current COVID-19 pandemic and associated impacts. The successful Evaluation Partner will be expected to demonstrate flexibility and creativity in responding to the changing situation applying appropriate methods of data capture. As part of their proposal, applicants should demonstrate they have considered possible scenarios relating to the COVID-19 pandemic and how these might affect the evaluation design e.g. the implications of prolonged or repeated school closures, travel restrictions and physical distancing rules. They should outline how they would adapt their approach to take these into account, ensuring the safety of all participants remains paramount.

**Integrating gender-sensitive and participatory methods for working with marginalised children, and children living with disabilities:** The Evaluation Team should integrate methods tailored to

working with marginalised children and children with disabilities, including creative and participatory ways to engage beneficiaries in the process of gathering and interpreting data. The design and implementation of the MTR must adhere to ADRA Norway's safeguarding policies, policies on child protection and ethical standards in monitoring, evaluation, accountability and learning. Within the proposal, the Evaluation Team will need to clearly outline their approach to managing and reporting safeguarding risks, including suspected or actual cases of abuse.

**Responsibility of the project:**

1. To provide the project proposal, logframe, Theory of Change, MEAL Framework, other evaluations and reviews, reports and other relevant documents;
2. Overview of the project, list of communities and schools per district;
3. Contact list of key program staff available locally;
4. Support identifying suitable local enumerators if needed;
5. Support in setting up introductory meetings with relevant stakeholders and communities;
6. Data collection logistics support and constraints (school timings, holidays, testing schedules, access to respondent groups, etc.), as required;
7. Collaborative workshops with Evaluation Team to finalise evaluation questions and methodology;

**Responsibility of the External Evaluators:**

1. Submit a full list of contacts for all staff involved in the Evaluation Team during the inception meeting;
2. Describe the overall evaluation approach, prior evaluation reports and available datasets;
3. Collaborate with the project and Fund Manager to agree on final evaluation questions for the MTR;
4. Identify options for methodologies and possible tools for the agreed evaluation questions;
5. Design or modify tools where necessary, in consultation with the ADRA Norway MEAL staff and secure approval for all data collection tools;
6. Report any safeguarding or child protection concerns as soon as possible and within 24 hours to the ADRA Norway Safeguarding Focal Points;<sup>3</sup>
7. Perform child protection and safeguarding background checks on all their staff involved in evaluation activities, including contractors;
8. Submit (by email) to the ADRA Norway MEAL Specialist weekly progress reports during the evaluation period, summarising activities / tasks completed to date (% achieved), challenges and mitigation strategies, time spent, etc.;
9. Run analysis of the findings and produce reports which sufficiently explore and explain the results;
10. Develop and agree on a reporting structure and format with ADRA Norway, including early presentations of emerging findings and produce any other relevant dissemination materials, and share findings with the partners;
11. Review the project's self-reporting of achievements and progress towards lasting impact, including through the collection of evidence to triangulate the project's claims;
12. Conduct a thorough desk review, including examining available data from prior evaluations and from monitoring, from other country-specific reports and activities to inform tools, analysis, reporting.

For fieldwork, please note these may not all be appropriate based on the context at the time of data collection:

13. Contact the ADRA Norway MEAL Specialist on a daily basis during the fieldwork stage of the evaluation;

---

<sup>3</sup> Relevant contact details will be shared with the External Evaluator once appointed.

14. Recruit and train research assistants such as enumerators for the assessment;
15. Make own logistical arrangements to reach the selected schools and / or communities and organise interviews and ensure full logistical support for the entire exercise across all districts;
16. Ensure individual data collection reports outlining progress achieved and any challenges are completed by enumerators and that these are compiled into an overall data collection report

## 9. Country field visits

At the time of publication, ADRA Norway is currently advising against all international travel. We therefore expect the Evaluation Team to work with in-country partners who can access the communities we work with. The Evaluation Team must highlight in their approach how data collection will be undertaken within the following certain contexts: a) where all data collection is virtual (no in-person data collection is permitted) and b) where a combination of in-person data collection, virtual data collection and/or project data is used. We expect the Evaluation Team to clearly outline their responses to these scenarios and propose innovative data collection methods. We would expect the successful Evaluation Partner to demonstrate flexibility and creativity in adapting the evaluation approach as necessary to respond to existing circumstances, while ensuring that the evaluation fulfils the fundamental requirements of research questions and methodology requirements outlined above.

## 10. Ethics and risk management

**Research ethics plan:** Bidders are required to set out their approach to ensuring complete compliance with international good practice relating to research ethics and protocols, particularly with regards to safeguarding children and vulnerable groups (including girls and people with disabilities). Consideration should be given to:

- Administrative, technical and physical safeguards to protect the confidentiality of those participating in research;
- Safeguards for those conducting research;
- Do No Harm safeguards for children participating in research, including child-safe physical safeguards as well as emotional/psychosocial safeguards;
- Appropriate time allocated to engage with children participating in the research;
- Parental or caregiver consent concerning data collection from children or collation of data about children;
- Age- and ability-appropriate assent processes based on reasonable assumptions about comprehension for the ages of children and the disabilities they intend to involve in the research;
- Appropriate spaces and methodologies tailored in consideration of unique needs of girls and boys, including those with disabilities and for vulnerable adults;
- Appropriate language and communication for different ages and the disabilities of children involved in the research.

Ethical approval will need to be secured from ADRA Norway before data collection activities can commence. This will include the submission of complete research tools and protocols. Further information will be provided to the successful Evaluation Partner.

**Risk management plan:** It is important the successful Evaluation Partner has taken all reasonable measures to mitigate any potential risks to research participants and the delivery of the required

outputs for this evaluation. Therefore, the Evaluation Team should submit a comprehensive risk management plan covering:

- Specific safeguarding risks (for both children and adults) and mitigating strategies, including reference to the child protection policy and procedures that will be in place;
- Health and safety issues that may require significant duty of care precautions, with particular consideration paid to risks relating to COVID-19.

## 11. Planning and deliverables

The deadline for proposals is 27 August, 2021. It is expected a contractor will be selected on or before 3 September, 2021.

The successful contractor will provide the following deliverables against the following suggested timeline (to be agreed in the inception phase):

Item	Description	Timeframe
1	Inception report	Drafts: Final:
2	Tools, mapping of tools and available data to evaluation questions and logframe, sampling frame	Drafts: Final:
3	Fieldwork, including training of enumerators	
4	Presentation of emerging findings to ADRA Norway, proposed report outline submitted for feedback	
5	Evaluation report, including annexes	Drafts: Final:
6	Publishable summary of evaluation findings (targeted primarily for an external, strategic stakeholder, such as Norad or government in country)	Drafts: Final:

The draft and final evaluation report should be no longer than 50 pages, excluding the executive summary and annexes. The report should indicatively be structured as follows:

- Executive summary
- Introduction
- Description of the project, including the Theory of Change
- Overview of the evaluation approach, the MTR methodology and methods used, including limitations and challenges (detailed methodology to be provided in annex)
- Findings
- Conclusions and recommendations
- Annexes

All reports should be submitted in electronic form and should be submitted in English.

In addition to the above:

1. Applicants are required to provide a **detailed workplan** incorporating all relevant tasks and milestones of the MTR, from start to finish; they are also required to include in their detailed workplans the milestones set out below (please note final dates will be confirmed once evaluators are recruited and initial discussions are scoped with the Evaluation Team).
2. The Evaluation Team will be required to deliver a face-to-face and/or online **presentation** of the evaluation findings, as an integral part of the submission process. An

in-country presentation is desirable; however, an online interactive webinar may also be considered given the current context.

3. Other **communication materials** for dissemination are encouraged. The project is particularly interested in materials which will help us feed back to the beneficiaries and communities we work alongside, engaging stakeholders more widely. These will be agreed with the project team during the inception phase.
4. **Final Data Collection Tools** – The Evaluation Team and ADRA Norway will work collaboratively on all methods of data capture for the MTR. At the end of the evaluation, the Evaluation Team will be expected to return these tools to ADRA Norway, including a clean copy of all data collection tools developed and used in the study.
5. **Cleaned Data Set (including transcripts)** – The Evaluation Team will be expected to provide a fully ‘cleaned-up’ dataset for both the qualitative and quantitative aspects of the evaluation.

### 13. General guidelines, submission and selection criteria

A technical proposal and a financial proposal should be submitted in two separate PDF documents to with the subject line “Confidential proposal for MTR of SEAQE2 and EIE”.

The deadline for proposals is 27 August 2021, COB, Norwegian time to the following email addresses: [elidon.bardhi@adranorge.no](mailto:elidon.bardhi@adranorge.no) and [erik.eriksen@adranorge.no](mailto:erik.eriksen@adranorge.no). Questions can be asked throughout the pre-submission planning phase. Technical proposals should, as a minimum, include a section on:

- i. Background and contract management capacity of the evaluator
- ii. Understanding of the terms of reference
- iii. Proposed approach and methodology
- iv. Proposed methods and sampling
- v. Workplan including deliverables
- vi. Proposed team including roles and responsibilities and time-input allocation for each team members, as well as CVs of each member of the Evaluation Team (no more than 3 pages), detailing relevant skills and experience including any examples of published research
- vii. Quality Assurance plan that sets out the systems and processes for quality assuring the evaluation and research process and deliverables of the project from start to finish
- viii. Ethics and Child Safeguarding approaches: applicants are required to set out their approach to ensuring complete compliance with international good practice with regards to research ethics and protocols
- ix. Risk Management plan
- x. Relevant annexes that further substantiate the technical bid, including but not limited to:
  - a. Two examples of relevant previous work undertaken by the Evaluation Team (involving both quantitative and qualitative analysis);
  - b. References: Please provide two references who we may contact to discuss experiences of working with you

The currency of the financial proposal is in NOK, USD or EURO. Please assure that the technical proposal does not refer to any financial figures of the bid.

All eligible proposals will be assessed based on this Terms of Reference and awarded scores following objective technical criteria under four categories. The weighting for each criterion is given in brackets.

- A. Expertise of the firm or consultant (15%)
  - Minimum of 10 years of experience in conducting programmatic evaluations in the development sector.
  - Strong experience in education, gender and international development programme evaluations.
  - Experience with Norad funding is desirable.
  
- B. Proposed approach, methodology and workplan (30%)
  - The technical proposal should include and clearly articulate the approach, methodology and methods proposed for the evaluation.
  - The proposal should include a clear workplan with roles and responsibilities and allocation of days for different team members specified.
  
- C. Qualifications and experience of the Evaluation Team (35%)
  - All core team members should have at least an advanced university degree in education, international development or social sciences; or significant experience within the sector.
  - The team should have experience of:
    - The global discourse on SDGs, and education 2030 agenda.
    - Experience in evaluating programmes in the context of least developed country settings; the Evaluation Team should be able to demonstrate they have the appropriate language skills within their wider team to conduct the research required in the context.
    - Specialised thematic expertise on the subject matter evaluated, i.e. gender in education, quality in education, teacher development, safe learning environment, inclusive education.
    - Proficiency in English in the core team is mandatory. Proficiency in [national language(s) to be added by the project] in the wider team is an advantage.
    - Strong research capacity including rigorous quantitative and qualitative data collection, analysis and data visualisation skills.
    - Conducting research with children using interactive, child-friendly and participatory methodologies.
    - Conducting research with persons with disabilities, including children: experience with the Washington Group methodology would be particularly appreciated.
    - Conducting gender-sensitive research methods
    - Experience of alternative forms of impact assessment is desired
    - Strong interactive presentation and workshop facilitation skills
    - Strong English reporting skills
    - Strong communication, inter-personal, people and team management skills to facilitate a smooth process of the evaluation.
  - The team leader should have a minimum of 15 years of professional evaluation experience in programme/policy evaluation in education or international development, as well as oral and writing skills in English of the highest standard.
  - A gender balanced team of international and national experts is strongly desired.
  - Experts can only be part of one proposal for these terms of reference. Contractors can only submit one proposal

#### D. Pricing (20%)

The budget should include all costs, including travel and accommodation for visits (if permitted). In-country transport in the capital/major cities, where required and allowed, is to be budgeted for. Travel in-country to the field by SEAQE2 partners, where appropriate and within reason, is covered by ADRA Norway. The budget should provide details so that costs of expertise, travel and other expenses are visible. The costing should be done for the data collection scenarios described in Section 9 above.

The proposed payment schedule is:

- 20% at approval of inception report
- 40% at approval of draft evaluation report
- 40% at approval of final evaluation report

## Annexes

Annex 1: 2021 SEAQE2 Results Framework

Annex 2: 2021 EiE Results Framework

Annex 3: Theory of Change