

CIVIL SOCIETY EDUCATION FUND PROGRAMME (2016 – 2019) ENDLINE EVALUATION CONCEPT NOTE

1. Introduction

Founded in 1999, GCE is the largest movement of civil society organisations working to promote the human right to education. GCE membership comprises over 120 national coalitions, international and regional organisations advocating for quality public education for all. GCE members are from independent organisations united by the commitment to the human right to education, and to achieving change through the mobilisation of citizens and civil society. The civil society coalitions play a particular central role in fostering social accountability for the full delivery of SDG 4. The GCE Movement is a unique platform, merging and echoing education concerns from the countries facing greater development challenges in comparison to the more developed countries.

GCE's current strategic plan of 2019 – 2022 outlines four priority areas, namely 1) Education equality and non-discrimination; 2) Transformative education; 3) Education in emergencies and 4) Education financing. These priorities are recurrent themes that were also embedded in the GCE Strategic Plan of 2015-2019, and guided the direction and focus of the Movement.

In the ensuing paragraphs, this concept note provides an outline for the planned CSEF III Endline Evaluation, beginning with a brief overview of the CSEF programme and followed by a background to and objectives of the CSEF III programme, as well as MEL Strategy, the previous evaluations of the programme and the purpose of the end line evaluation. Also included here are some proposed evaluation questions, the management and contractual implications of the evaluation, timelines, as well as the recruitment process.

2. The Global Partnership for Education

Based in Washington D.C., the GPE was established in 2002 as the then-EFA Fast Track Initiative and, with its wide partner network that includes over 65 developing countries, donor agencies, international organisations, the private sector, teachers and civil society/NGO groups. GPE helps developing countries to develop and implement sound education plans and promotes dialogue amongst its partners around shared objectives and other key education sector related issues. GPE also operates from the premise that CSOs are critical in holding governments accountable for their role in education, and it is in this context that the GPE has supported the CSEF programme. GPE's vision and mission statements are as follows:

- **GPE vision statement:** “to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all.”

- **GPE's mission statement:** "to mobilize global and national efforts to contribute to the achievement of equitable, quality education and learning for all, through inclusive partnership, a focus on effective and efficient education systems and increased financing."

Also known as "GPE 2020", GPE's strategic plan for 2016-2020, includes the following three goals and five objectives:

- **GPE Goals**

- Goal 1: Improved and more equitable student learning outcomes through quality teaching and learning
- Goal 2: Increased equity, gender equality and inclusion for all in a full cycle of quality education, targeting the poorest and most marginalized, including by gender, disability, ethnicity and conflict or fragility
- Goal 3: Effective and efficient education systems delivering equitable and quality educational services for all

- **GPE Objectives**

- Objective 1: Strengthen education sector planning and policy implementation
- Objective 2: Support mutual accountability through effective and inclusive sector policy dialogue and monitoring
- Objective 3: GPE financing efficiently and effectively supports the implementation of sector plans focused on improved equity, efficiency and learning
- Objective 4: Mobilize more and better financing
- Objective 5: Build a stronger partnership

3. Background and Aim of the Civil Society Education Fund (CSEF)

The Civil Society Education Fund (CSEF) is a unique and ambitious programme that was launched and managed by the Global Campaign for Education (GCE) in 2009, in close collaboration with regional implementing partners and receives funding from the Global Partnership for Education (GPE). The aim of the CSEF programme is to provide support to citizens, in predominantly developing countries, as they engage in education sector policy, planning, budgeting and monitoring. It is founded on a shared understanding among key stakeholders that strong, broad-based and locally-driven civil society participation in these processes is crucial to delivering on national and international education goals and to holding their governments to account for commitments to education. As such, CSEF supports broad-based, democratic and representative national civil society education coalitions working towards achieving inclusive and equitable quality education and lifelong learning for all in 63 countries across Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean, the Middle East and Eastern Europe. CSEF gives grants to these coalitions to support their advocacy activities, provides capacity building and accompaniment support to strengthen planning, implementation and impact, and promotes cross-country learning and networking.

Through the programme, coalitions are further supported to carry out advocacy-oriented research and public awareness campaigning, and to share knowledge and learning from these activities within and

across regions, in order to coordinate messaging, learn best practices and improve political competencies relating to GPE and SDG 4 processes.

4. CSEF Programme Governance and Accountability Structure

CSEF is implemented by GCE through the coordinated efforts of a three-tiered structure, namely national coalitions, of which there are 63, four regional secretariats (RS), three regional financial management agencies and the Global Secretariat, which is located in Johannesburg, South Africa. These entities and their roles are described briefly below:

4.1. Global Level

As the managing entity for the CSEF programme, the Global Secretariat, which is situated at GCE in Johannesburg, South Africa, has the overall responsibility for the management and oversight of the CSEF programme and is ultimately accountable to the GPE Secretariat. Some of the responsibilities of GCE as a managing entity are:

Grant management and coordination: This includes liaison with GPE; coordinating strategic planning; managing monitoring, evaluation, quality control, and reporting; management of grants to regional level; coordination of overall programme implementation according to the global implementation plan; providing operational tools and support to ensure consistent quality of implementation across the regions; communicating with implementing partners about programme deadlines and requirements; and working with regional entities in each region to ensure smooth implementation and support on troubleshooting.

Programme coordination and support - facilitation of national-global linkages, capacity support and learning: These functions are separated from the grant management function within the GCE Secretariat, with the campaigns and communications, policy and learning staff at GCE focusing on implementation of global activities related to capacity-building and cross-country learning, as well as linkages between national and global level activities and processes; production and dissemination of relevant tools; production and sharing of information and good practice examples; creation of platforms for exchange; supporting national-level inputs and engagement in global processes; and coordination of global learning events.

Grant and Programme Oversight: The Global Oversight Committee (GOC) is responsible for the CSEF programme and strategic oversight; global financial decisions; arbitration of disputes between implementing partners; and resolution of any issues that cannot be resolved at regional level. The GOC is comprised of members whose organisations do not benefit from CSEF funding.

4.2. Regional level

The Global Secretariat works closely with **Regional Secretariats (RS's)** and **Regional Financial Management Agencies (RFMAs)** across the four regions to provide management and oversight. There is a clear separation between the strands of work around grant / financial management and programme support.

Regional Secretariats: The four Regional Secretariats, which were established by Regional Civil Society Networks with broad reach within their respective regions, coordinate CSEF programme implementation at a regional level. The Regional Secretariats act as the CSEF implementing agencies at

the regional level. Their responsibilities include: regional coordination and communication; national coalition accompaniment and technical support; management of information and exchange within the region; monitoring of national work and facilitation and oversight of reporting by National Coalitions; ensuring compliance with programme approaches and procedures and monitoring progress towards programme results and objectives within the region. The four regional secretariats are the following:

- The Africa Network Campaign for Education for All (ANCEFA) in Africa
- The Latin American Campaign for the Right to Education (CLADE) in Latin America and the Caribbean
- The Asia South Pacific Association for Basic and Adult Education (ASPBAE) in Asia and the Pacific
- The Arab Campaign for Education for All (ACEA) in the Middle East, North Africa and Eastern Europe.

Regional Financial Management Agencies: The RFMAs are responsible for fund management and technical capacity building: i) Oxfam-Ibis (CSEF Africa) and ii) ActionAid Americas (CSEF Latin America and the Caribbean)). In addition, the GCE Secretariat acts as an interim FMA for the Middle East, North Africa and Eastern Europe region and the Asia South Pacific. Each RFMA receives and disburses National Coalition grant funding (based on Regional Funding Committee allocation and tranche specification), reviews and reconciles national coalition quarterly financial reports (accounting for all income and expenses), leads Coalition grant closeout and liquidation, maintains all financial records for Coalition grants, and provides regional-level capacity-building support to Coalitions relating to financial management. FMAs maintain a distinct bank account for housing CSEF funds for Coalition grants in USD. To ensure sound financial management (i.e. segregation of duties and independent oversight), the FMA's role is played by an international civil society organisation with a strong reputation of financial management and transparency and which operates independently from the Regional Secretariat, National Coalitions and the Global Secretariat. Each FMA has a CSEF-funded accountant solely dedicated to management of the CSEF funds. This financial manager and key personnel of the FMA is recruited by the FMA, however the Global Secretariat is involved in all aspects of the recruitment process. The FMA will be held accountable to GCE in ensuring that it performs agreed tasks and meets the agreed outcomes. CSEF funding covers the salary costs for staff and expenses associated with fulfilment of FMA responsibilities (e.g. travel, communications, office maintenance costs and audit fees).

Regional Funding Committees (RFCs): These are charged with evaluating National Education Coalition proposals, deciding on proposal approval and level of funding, and making recommendations on capacity-building support.

4.3. National Coalition Level

The national education coalitions vary considerably in nature, from country to country and region to region, and reflect differences in membership, as well as in how they were established, their specific objectives, their ways of working and the external environment in which they operate. They are often (but not always) managed by a core Secretariat and overseen by a Board made up of elected member representatives, governed under a Constitution or similar document articulating the Coalition's mission, values and governance structure, registered in the country of operation and as such operating in accordance with National Laws and Regulations. National Coalitions that have not yet or cannot obtain formal registration in their country can be represented by a formally registered member organisation

that receives funds in trust based on a signed agreement between the Coalition and the member organisation.

5. Overview of the CSEF III Programme (2016-2018)

Having successfully implemented two phases of CSEF between 2012 and 2015, the GCE received funding to continue with the third three-year phase of CSEF, that is, from 2016 to 2018. Although Phase III was initially meant to end in 2018, GPE agreed to approve a one year costed extension of the CSEF III programme in early 2019, and this was primarily to ensure a smooth transition from CSEF III to a newly formulated version of the programme known as the Advocacy for Social Accountability (ASA) programme, which is meant to commence at the end of 2019 under a new Grant Agent. During this extension period, RS's and national coalitions will be continuing to implement the CSEF III programme until October 2019, in line with the agreed goal and objectives as outlined on the CSEF III Results Framework. In addition, GCE continues to provide programme implementation oversight and is the Grant Agent which oversees RS's and coalitions' programme implementation and close-out processes during the final quarter of the year 2019.

The CSEF III programme is designed to enhance collective advocacy on education and make a significant contribution towards the achievement of the education sustainable development goal (SDG4). The overall impact of the CSEF III programme is achieved through supporting diverse civil society coalitions across 63 countries to be better informed, and effectively engage in education related policy planning, budget formulation, monitoring and review as well as high level policy debates at community, local and national levels.

The overall goal of the CSEF III programme is to contribute to ***better informed national policy dialogue and strengthened government accountability to citizens for the achievement of equitable, inclusive and quality public education***. This aligns with the overall strategic goals of GPE for 2016-2020 which aim to achieve greater equity and inclusion, quality teaching and learning, and stronger educational systems. Furthermore, the CSEF III programme goal reinforces and contributes to GPE's objectives on effective and inclusive policy dialogue which encompasses both evidence-based monitoring, and stronger accountability.

The CSEF III programme has the following three objectives:

- **Objective 1:** To support effective civil society representation and engagement in education sector policy dialogue.
- **Objective 2:** To support active public outreach and citizen engagement in the generation/use of research and evidence on quality, equity, financing and education system reform.
- **Objective 3:** To ensure global and regional processes relating to GPE and SDG 4 better inform – and are better informed by – national and local civil society.

6. Transition to ASA

The new Advocacy and Social Accountability (ASA) programme will start in 2020, involving many changes for the Global Campaign for Education, at the national, regional and global level. As an immediate consequence of the transition to the new programme, ten (10) Coalitions previously supported by the CSEF programme will be ineligible for ASA funds in 2020. As part of the transition process, GCE plans to provide strategic transition support to ensure that these coalitions are minimally affected. Support initiatives will be developed for these Coalitions to enable them to attract other funders to ensure continuity after the CSEF programme. The rationale for this extra support activities stems from the fact that GCE wants to ensure that these members remain vibrant and active in the Movement and should continue engaging on education issues within their respective countries.

The transition from CSEF to ASA programme will not only impact National Coalitions. Both global and regional entities will be affected as the available resources under ASA are much lower as compared to what was available in the CSEF programme. This will mean that both global and regional entities will have to re-strategize on how they will support Coalitions but also undertake their own programmes. The Regional Secretariats will continue to support Coalitions in the implementation of their programmes and building their capacities as it was in the previous CSEF programme, but the funding available to enable them to undertake this work has been reduced significantly. It is important to note that all the RFMA functions will be fully absorbed by the Grant Agent within the ASA portfolio.

Similarly, the Global Secretariat role in the new ASA funding mechanism has been greatly reduced and refocused to movement building, developing of advocacy and campaign materials, global level advocacy and strengthening learning across the movement. At the same time, GCE adopted a new four (4) years strategic plan during the 6th World Assembly in November 2018 which specifies strategic areas of work for the Secretariat and the Movement. As a result, both the Global Secretariat and the Regional Secretariats will have to be reviewed and repositioned from a structural, processes and governance perspective in order to assess if they are fit for purpose to deliver their mandates as outlined in the GCE strategic plan and in the ASA Blueprint.

7. Background to the CSEF III Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Strategy

The CSEF III programme is built on a comprehensive theory of change and progress towards the achievement of its objectives is measured through a robust Results Framework and monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) strategy. The CSEF MEL strategy sets out arrangements for what information will be delivered by the CSEF programme, how, when and by whom to ensure specific areas of progress and intended results against the CSEF 2016 – 2018 programme Theory of Change and Results Framework can and will be tracked, measured and assessed. The MEL strategy is designed to contribute to meeting the CSEF's diverse information needs, including learning related to internal programme processes, support to coalitions and overall effectiveness, efficiency, results and impact. As the MEL strategy was designed to meet data needs for the three years of CSEF III implementation period (2016-2018); amendments have been made on the Results Framework to take into consideration of the costed extension's implementation and its contribution to the CSEF III objectives. The amendments were partially informed by the recommendations of the previous CSEF III programme evaluations which took place in 2017 (see next section), namely the internally-commissioned Mid-Term Review (MTR) and GPE-

commissioned external evaluation carried out by Oxford Policy Management (hereafter referred to as the OPM). Implementing partners were informed of these and were able to take these changes into consideration when planning their activities for 2019.

8. Previous CSEF III Evaluations

8.1. CSEF Mid Term Review

The MTR was conducted halfway into CSEF III, in 2017, by an external evaluation consulting firm that was selected and contracted by the Global Secretariat. It was designed as a formative assessment, with the primary purpose of providing the CSEF global management team and its implementing partners and stakeholders with greater insights into progress towards achieving the set objectives as well as the ability to position CSEF in the best way possible for overall programme effectiveness. The findings were shared with all relevant stakeholders and will be made available to the successful bidder of the end line evaluation.

8.2. GPE's CSEF Independent Evaluation

Around the same time as the MTR, the GPE commissioned an external evaluation of CSEF III. Although it also touched on aspects of programme progress and performance, the GPE had an additional focus which was to inform the strategic and operational integration of the CSEF programme into its planned successor, namely the ASA programme. The findings of the evaluation were later used to contribute to the design of the ASA mechanism. The findings of the OPM were also disseminated and will be made available to the successful end line evaluation contractor.

9. Purpose of CSEF III Endline Evaluation

The endline evaluation of CSEF III aims to serve multiple purposes which will ultimately seek to establish the success of the programme in the following manner;

- i. To critically reflect on the successes achieved through the third phase of the programme, compare to what was reportedly achieved at the mid-term point implementation and provide a review of the progress that has been made towards meeting the intended or/and unintended outcomes and consider how these have, in turn contributed towards the intended programme objectives.
- ii. Examine the relevance and validity of the programme objectives and Theory of Change (TOC), given the passing of time and priorities surrounding global education advocacy.
- iii. Following a similar approach with CSEF I and CSEF II programme endline evaluations, CSEF III evaluation also seeks to establish and document the extent at which the CSEF programme contributed to the objectives of GPE.
- iv. To provide valuable insights and lessons that can be used to position and enable the Movement to keep seeking ways of growing, mobilising resources to support the growth of the Movement and remaining relevant as an advocate for equal and equitable quality education for all, as well as social justice
- v. GCE also seeks to identify key learning aspects that contributed towards the strategic priorities

of GCE; allowing GCE and partners to think critically about the role that CSEF has played in terms of establishing, advancing and strengthening the Movement and the new role in the past four years of GCE as the Grant Agent.

- vi. The evaluation will also provide an opportunity to assess how GCE and its partners will be transitioning to the ASA funding mechanism. This process will involve evaluating the current global and regional secretariat structures, reviewing the role played by the Secretariats within the wider movement and its engagement with the Board. This also is to ensure that the Secretariats staff are fit for purpose and can support the delivery of the current strategic plan and their role within the ASA mechanism.

Furthermore, through formal and informal engagements with other GCE members (non CSEF), CSEF implementing partners, as well as bi-annual progress reports, there is strong evidence that supports the idea that the CSEF programme has added immense value to the GCE Movement, however, in the absence of asking the relevant questions and documenting and analysing the responses, as afforded through a formal evaluation process, the true extent of this value can easily be underestimated. From GCE's perspective, the latter will be of great significance since this was not the focus of either the MTR or the external evaluation, but the findings will inform the refinement of the GCE Theory of Change and have direct bearing on the focus of the GCE Movement going forward.

10. Scope of the Evaluation

As explained above, the focus of this evaluation will be to respond to questions that address areas that are of priority to the CSEF III Programme, the GPE, as well as GCE. Suggested questions by area of interest (and possibly using the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria) may include the following:

CSEF Stakeholder	CSEF Implem enters	GCE	Non-CSEF	GPE
Effectiveness				
▪ Assess whether and the extent to which the CSEF III programme achieved its outcomes and objectives.	✓	✓		✓
▪ Document successes and limitations, together with contributing factors of the CSEF programme from different perspectives of CSEF implementers, stakeholders and non-CSEF GCE members at all levels.	✓	✓	✓	✓
▪ Reflect on the role that national, regional and global key stakeholders have played in either supporting or hindering the achievement of intended results including contextual changes.	✓	✓		✓
▪ Reflect on the role of GCE within the CSEF programme but also its mandate as a leader in education advocacy on what worked well and what could have been done differently.	✓	✓	✓	✓
Impact				

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether and how the programme has contributed to and/or brought about the intended and/or unintended results and whether this is contributing (or has contributed) to the desired impact (or other unintended impacts). 	✓	✓	✓	✓
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the CSEF programme impact and influence from the perspectives of National Education Coalitions in relation to key national education policy processes and in the GPE country level processes where applicable. 	✓	✓		✓
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflect on the impact of CSEF in strengthening the Movement and contributions to its sustainability. 	✓	✓	✓	
Efficiency				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the CSEF III programme design, monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) strategy and the Theory of Change assumptions taking into consideration the developments and changes in the global education advocacy space, priorities of the GCE Movement and those of GPE. 	✓	✓	✓	✓
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate the current Global and Regional Secretariats structures, coordination and collaboration and provide recommendations on more efficient and economical operational manner to best deliver their roles in ASA. 	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sustainability				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the extent to which the CSEF partners and stakeholders have learned from the programme experiences, shared and used that learning. 	✓	✓		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the extent to which CSEF partners have gained ownership, capacity and resources to maintain and continue their commitment to delivering CSEF related objectives independent of CSEF resources. 	✓	✓		

11. Proposed Methodology for the CSEF III Endline Evaluation

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 methods are 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.

- A thorough document review of existing secondary sources including documents prepared during the preparation phase, documents and data gathered during the programme inception

phase, and documents and data gathered and documented during the implementation phase to date. Suggested documents which will be made available to the evaluation consultant for review include the following:

CSEF III Proposal; CSEF progress reports (2016 June – 2019 June); CSEF MEL strategy; CSEF online MEL system guidelines and system-generated reports; CSEF budgets; CSEF synthesis report and external evaluation report on CSEF phases I (2009 - 2012) and II (2013-2015); MTR report; GCE Strategic and Operational Plans (2015 -2019 and 2019 – 2022); GCE MEL Framework; OPM report; ASA Blueprint; ASA proposal.

- ii. Questionnaire/survey administered to all members to gather both qualitative and quantitative data
- iii. Members and key stakeholders telephonic/Skype and/or face-to-face interviews to be arranged to include
 - Members of the GCE Board including members of the Global Oversight Committee (GOC)
 - Members of the CSEF Regional Funding Committees
 - Staff of the CSEF Regional Secretariats and Financial Management Agencies and CSEF funded national coalitions
 - GCE staff and other non-CSEF GCE members
 - CSEF Funder (Global Partnership for Education)
 - A selection of campaigners working with similar mechanisms to the CSEF as well as other external stakeholders to be proposed by the evaluation team

The final end line evaluation report should describe the full approach taken and the rationale for the approach, making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

12. Timeframe and Deliverables

The proposed duration of the CSEF III Endline Evaluation, will be four and half months, starting towards the end of August 2019 with the desk review and development of an inception report, and ending in December 2019 with a final evaluation report. This takes into consideration the December holidays and decreasing availability of CSEF participants after the final quarter of the year due to CSEF III programme close-out obligations which will be taking place simultaneously with the ASA transition process. The table below provides an outline of the proposed time frame and deliverables:

No	Activity	Responsible	Deadline	Deliverable
Phase 1: Call for Proposals				
1	Posting of Call for Proposals	GCE	26/06/2019	Call for Proposals
2	Submission of Proposals	Applicants	24/07/2019	Proposals and budget
Phase 2: Candidate Screening and Recruitment				
3	Screening, selection and contraction of consultants/consulting firm	GCE	12/08/2019 to 27/08/2019	Interviews Signed Contract
Phase 3: Evaluation Inception				
4	Inception Meeting:	GCE	02/09/2019	Inception Meeting

	Face to face/virtual meeting with successful evaluation consultant/ firm to clarify expectations and related documents and materials			
5	Documents review/desk study and production of initial inception report	Evaluation Team	33/09/2019 to 18/09/2019	Draft inception report completed and submitted to GCE
6	Review and feedback on initial inception report	GCE	25/09/2019	GCE Feedback sent to Evaluation Team
7	Submission of final inception report	Evaluation Team	07/10/2019	Final inception report received by GCE
Phase 4: Data Collection and Analysis				
8	Evaluation data gathering	Evaluation Team	14/10/2019 to 01/11/2019	Data collection completed
9	Data analysis and finalisation	Evaluation Team	04/11/2019 to 15/11/2019	Data Analysis completed
Phase 5: Report Write-up and Submission				
10	Writing of first draft of evaluation report	Evaluation Team	15/11/2019 to 29/11/2019	1 st draft evaluation report shared with GCE
11	GCE prepares feedback and response to initial draft	GCE	29/11/2019 to 13/12/2019	GCE's feedback on draft report
12	Final evaluation report writing with feedback incorporated	Evaluation Team	13/12/2019 to 10/01/2020	Final evaluation report and data sets
13	GCE Management Evaluation Response	GCE	19/01/2020 to 24/01/2020	GCE Management response
14	Dissemination of Evaluation Report	GCE	31/01/2020	Final evaluation report

13. Budget and Contractual Arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation rests with the GCE Global Secretariat. GCE will contract the evaluation consultant firm and ensure the timely provision of all relevant documents and assist the consultancy to reach relevant stakeholders as appropriate (such as for any online survey). The selected consultant(s) will report to the Head of the CSEF Programme.

Upon signing of the evaluation contract, payments will be made within a day of delivering the milestones as outlined below:

- | | |
|---|------------------------------|
| (i) Signing of contract: | 30% of total contract amount |
| (ii) Against draft report: | 30% of total contract amount |
| (iii) Against final, GCE-approved report: | 40% of total contract amount |

In addition, GCE will directly arrange and cover the costs associated with any mutually agreed document translation requirements.

14. Proposal Preparation Guide

Proposals should be submitted electronically in English with the subject line “Proposal: Evaluation of the CSEF Programme 2016-2019 (your company/consortium or lead consultant’s name)” to consultants@campaignforeducation.org by **Friday 24 July 2019**. Proposals should comprise of the two separate following parts:

Part A: Technical and Administrative Proposal

- (i) A description of the 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);
- (ii) 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);
- (iii) The up-to-date Curricula Vitae (CV) for each of the expert(s) proposed to work on this assignment;
- (iv) Personnel inputs (including productive working person days without any reference to fees);
- (v) A signed Statement of Availability (Annex B) – signed by each of the expert(s) proposed;
- (vi) Two recently completed evaluation reports as examples of previous work, at least two of which must be the consultant team leader’s previous work.

Part B: Financial Proposal

- (i) A signed and initialled detailed Price Schedule which includes all fees and identified expenses;
- (ii) The consultant shall cover all costs related to this consultancy, including: transportation to targeted areas, printing materials, meals, accommodation and any other expenditure
- (iii) Both Technical and Financial Proposals must remain valid for sixty (60) days from the date of their submission to GCE by the consultants.

15. Assessment and Selection Process

The Evaluation Committee appointed by GCE, will jointly and separately assess the proposals taking into consideration whether the applications comply with the ToR and applying both the evaluation criteria and the scoring grid indicated below. The most favourable proposal shall be selected based on the best total value for GCE in terms of merit which is informed by both the technical proposal score and the financial proposal score. The following table how each of the two parts will contribute to form a maximum of one hundred (100) achievable points:

Part A: Technical Proposal	Part B: Financial Proposal
70 points	30 points

Assessment of Part A: Technical Proposal: The submissions will first be reviewed to verify the administrative compliance, and be assessed technically to be ranked against the Evaluation Criteria (see below). 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 assessment.

Category	Maximum Score
1. Understanding and interpretation of the terms of reference and the level of completeness of the proposal (submission of all required documents)	10
2. Proposed methodology and working approach	50
(a) <i>Presentation of methodology and sequence of activities is clear and the planning is logical</i>	10
(b) <i>Proposal reflects a feasible and sound methodology, considering the limitations and risks of each proposed tool/method</i>	15
(c) <i>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</i>	15
(d) <i>Timetable of activities is realistic and promises efficient / on time submission of deliverables</i>	10
3. Demonstrated previous experience in similar assessments and studies at National or International level	40
3.1 Team Leader	20
(a) <i>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</i>	6
(b) <i>Advanced university degree in the area of Education Policy, Education Financing and/or Education Planning and Evaluation or similar</i>	4
(c) <i>Excellent knowledge of quality education for all, including relevant policy related issues, and post 2015 education agendas in the global context</i>	4
(d) <i>Proficient knowledge of advocacy and campaign work with civil society, Ministries, Bi-lateral and Multi-lateral agencies and International Funding Agencies</i>	3
(e) <i>Planning, team leading, supervisory research and analysis skills for complex information.</i>	3
3.2 Team Members (complementary skills and experience)	20
(a) <i>Gender, language and geographic representation balance</i>	5
(b) <i>At least 10 years' (combined) experience in conducting evaluations of a similar scale, with expertise in qualitative and/or quantitative processes</i>	4
(c) <i>Education, gender and human rights expertise</i>	3
(d) <i>Policy and advocacy expertise</i>	3
(e) <i>Data synthesis and report writing experience and skills</i>	2
(f) <i>Strong oral and written communication skills</i>	2
(g) <i>Workshop /consultative meetings facilitation and organisation skills and experience</i>	1
Total Technical Proposal overall total score	100

Assessment of Part B: Financial Proposal: 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

$$\text{Financial proposal score} = \frac{(100 \times \text{lowest financial proposal})}{\text{number of financial proposal reviewed}}$$

Shortlisting and awarding of the contract: consulting firms/candidates with the top scores will be contacted for (virtual) interview and a maximum score of 25 points will be applied to the interview process. Candidates selected for interview will be contacted both by email or telephonically by 12 August 2019 to confirm the interview date and time. The consulting contract will be awarded to the firm/candidate(s) whose proposal submission plus interview score has obtained the highest final score, thus representing the most advantageous offer.