

Amendment to Request for Proposal

Amendment number: 1

Reference Request for Proposal Number: RFP-CATALYZE-Edu-2021-087

Amendment effective date: 23 February 2021

Description of Amendment:

1. This amendment serves to correct a typo on page 1: Cover Page. The Subject RFP # that read "RFP-CATALYZE-Edu-2020-087" in the original RFP has been modified to say "RFP-CATALYZE-Edu-**2021**-087".
2. This amendment serves to correct a typo on page 1: Cover Page. The Questions Deadline that read "Wednesday, February 26, 2021 at 12:00pm in the original RFP has been modified to say "**Friday**, February 26, 2021 at 12:00pm".

Request for Proposal (RFP)

Subject RFP #:	RFP-CATALYZE-Edu-2021-087
RFP Issue Date:	February 16, 2021
Terms of Reference / Specifications:	Independent Performance Evaluation of CATALYZE EduFinance Activities
Project	CATALYZE Innovative Blended Finance
The Company	Palladium International, LLC
Country of Performance	Global
Closing Date and Time	March 12, 2021
Questions Deadline	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accepted at catalyze.procurements@thepalladiumgroup.com by Friday, February 26, 2021 at 12:00pm <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Bidders' Conference	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A
Details for Submission	Submissions will be accepted: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Electronically: email to catalyze.procurements@thepalladiumgroup.com
Offer Validity Period	3 months after submission

Thank you for your interest in the above procurement. As implementer for the CATALYZE Innovative Blended Finance Project funded by United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Palladium invites you to submit a proposal for the statement of objectives attached in Annex A. Your proposal must be valid for the Validity Period.

Please email your notice of intention to submit a proposal by the Questions Deadline. Answers to questions shall be distributed to all offerors that have indicated an intention to submit a proposal by the deadline.

Please submit your proposal in accordance with the Details for Submission above by the Closing Date and Time. This RFP in no way obligates Palladium to award a contract nor does it commit Palladium to pay any cost incurred in the preparation and submission of a proposal. Palladium bears no responsibility for data errors resulting from transmission or conversion processes.

Yours sincerely,

CATALYZE Procurement Team

Terms and conditions

1. Proposal Conditions

By submitting a proposal, potential suppliers are bound by these terms and conditions. Potential suppliers must submit offers with all details provided in English and with prices quoted in a single currency.

2. Proposal Lodgement

The Company may grant extensions to the Closing Time at its discretion. The Company will not consider any quotes received after the Closing Time specified in the RFP unless the Company determines to do so otherwise at its sole discretion.

3. Evaluation

The Company may review all proposal to confirm compliance with this RFP and to determine the best proposal in the circumstances.

4. Alterations

The Company may decline to consider a proposal in which there are alterations, erasures, illegibility, ambiguity or incomplete details.

5. The Company's Rights

The Company may, at its discretion, discontinue the RFP; decline to accept any proposal; terminate, extend or vary its selection process; decline to issue any contract; seek information or negotiate with any potential supplier that has not been invited to submit a proposal; satisfy its requirement separately from the RFP process; terminate negotiations at any time and commence negotiations with any other potential supplier; evaluate proposals as the Company sees appropriate (including with reference to information provided by the prospective supplier or from a third party); and negotiate with any one or more potential suppliers.

6. Amendments and Queries

The Company may amend, or clarify any aspect of the RFP prior to the RFP Closing Time by issuing an amendment to the RFP in the same manner as the original RFP was distributed. Such amendments or clarifications will, as far as is practicable be issued simultaneously to all parties.

Any queries regarding this RFP should be directed to the Contact Person identified on the cover page of this RFP.

7. Clarification

The Company may, at any time prior to execution of a contract, seek clarification or additional information from, and enter into discussions and negotiations with, any or all potential suppliers in relation to their proposals. In doing so, the Company will not allow any potential supplier to substantially tailor or amend their proposal.

8. Confidentiality

In their proposal, potential suppliers must identify any aspects of their proposal that they consider should be kept confidential, with reasons. Potential suppliers should note that the Company will only agree to treat information as confidential in cases that it considers appropriate. In the absence of such an agreement, potential suppliers acknowledge that the Company has the right to disclose the information contained in their proposal.

The potential supplier acknowledges that in the course of this RFP, it may become acquainted with or have access to the Company's Confidential Information (including the existence and terms of this RFP and the TOR). It agrees to maintain the confidence of the Confidential Information and to prevent its unauthorised disclosure to any other person. If the potential supplier is required to disclose Confidential Information due to a relevant law or legal proceedings, it will provide reasonable notice of such disclosure to the Company. The parties agree that this obligation applies during the RFP and after the completion of the process.

9. Alternatives

Potential suppliers may submit proposals for alternative methods of addressing the Company's requirement described in the RFP where the option to do so was stated in the RFP or agreed in writing with the Company prior to the RFP Closing Time. Potential suppliers are responsible for providing a sufficient level of detail about the alternative solution to enable its evaluation.

10. Reference Material

If the RFP references any other materials including, but not limited to, reports, plans, drawings, samples or other reference material, the potential supplier is responsible for obtaining the referenced material and considering it in framing their proposal. And provide it to the Company upon request.

11. Price/Cost Basis

Prices or costs quoted must show the tax exclusive price, the tax component and the tax inclusive price.

The contract price, which must include any and all taxes, supplier charges and costs, will be the maximum price payable by the Company for the Goods and/or Services.

12. Financial information

If requested by the Company, potential suppliers must be able to demonstrate their financial stability and ability to remain viable as a provider of the Goods and/or Services over the term of any agreement.

If requested by the Company, the potential supplier must promptly provide the Company with such information or documentation as the Company reasonably requires in order to evaluate the potential supplier's financial stability.

13. Referees

The Company reserves the right to contact the potential supplier's referees, or any other person, directly and without notifying the potential supplier.

14. Conflict of interest

Potential suppliers must notify the Company immediately if any actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest arises (a perceived conflict of interest is one in which a reasonable person would think that the person's judgement and/or actions are likely to be compromised, whether due to a financial or personal interest (including those of family members) in the procurement or the Company).

15. Inconsistencies

If there is inconsistency between any of the parts of the RFP the following order of precedence shall apply:

- (a) these Terms and Conditions;
- (b) the first page of this RFP; and
- (c) the Schedule

so that the provision in the higher ranked document will prevail to the extent of the inconsistency.

16. Collusion and Unlawful Inducements

Potential suppliers and their officers, employees, agents and advisors must not engage in any collusive, anti-competitive conduct or any other similar conduct with any other potential supplier or person or quote any unlawful inducements in relation to their proposal or the RFP process.

Potential suppliers must disclose where proposals have been compiled with the assistance of current or former the Company employees (within the previous 9 months and who was substantially involved in the design, preparation, appraisal, review, and or daily management of this activity) and should note that this may exclude their proposal from consideration.

Potential suppliers warrant that they have not provided or offered any payment, gift, item, hospitality or any other benefit to the Company, its employees, consultants, agents, subcontractors (or any other person involved in the decision-making process relating to this RFP) which could give rise to a perception of bribery or corruption in relation to the RFP or any other dealings between the parties.

17. Jurisdiction

This RFP shall be subject to the laws of the District of Columbia, United States of America. The language of the arbitration will be English.

The Potential Supplier and the Company will use their best efforts to settle amicably any dispute, controversy, or claim arising out of, or relating to this RFP or the breach, termination, or invalidity thereof. If no agreeable settlement can be found, any dispute, controversy, or claim arising out of or relating to this RFP or the breach, termination, or invalidity thereof, shall be settled by mediation through the American Arbitration Association by filing a request for mediation with the AAA and the other party. The Parties will be bound by any arbitration award rendered as a result of such arbitration as the final adjudication of any such dispute.

Company Information

Palladium is a global leader in the design, development and delivery of Positive Impact — the intentional creation of enduring social and economic value. We work with corporations, governments, foundations, investors, communities and civil society to formulate strategies and implement solutions that generate lasting social, environmental and financial benefits.

Project Background

The CATALYZE Blended Finance Mechanism is a \$250 Million, 8-year contract (5-year base period, with a single 3 year option period) which uses a facilitated partnership model to craft solutions to crowd in \$2 Billion in blended finance (i.e. blended concessional and commercial finance) to USAID partner countries and initiatives. CATALYZE allows USAID Bureaus and Missions to efficiently deploy investment facilitation solutions that respond to the needs of specific sectors, issues, and geographies. The project can work in any development sector and region.

The first USAID Bureau to buy-in to CATALYZE was the Bureau for Economic Growth, Education and Environment (E3) which led to the creation of the CATALYZE EduFinance mechanism. The aim of this mechanism is to improve the educational and learning outcomes in disadvantaged children and youth by mobilizing private capital for the non-state education sector. Under this mechanism, USAID is funding public-private sector partnerships (PPPs) and private sector activities in several countries (hereafter called “EduFinance activities”). Independent evaluations will be conducted of these EduFinance activities in order to determine if the goals and intermediate results have been met.

Local ownership of the evaluation process and use of results will be an important objective of each evaluation. All evaluations will accordingly be designed and conducted in consultation and collaboration with local stakeholders and will focus on a set of overarching and locally relevant evaluation questions.

Findings of the evaluations will be used to strengthen implementation and support adaptive management and learning of EduFinance activities and inform future activity design. In addition, the evaluations will be shared with key stakeholders, such as Congress and the EduFinance Community of Practice, in order to expand the body of evidence about Private Sector Engagement (PSE) initiatives strengthening development outcomes.

Purpose

The purpose of this RFP is to identify a qualified organization, or a consortium of organizations to conduct an independent performance evaluation of CATALYZE EduFinance activities as described in the evaluation statement of work (Annex A).

Type of Contract

Palladium intends to issue an IDIQ umbrella mechanism to at least one offeror. Cost Proposals submitted as part of this RFP response will be used to establish and justify the life of project, IDIQ ceiling. At the time of Task Order award, the IDIQ holder(s) will be asked to submit an updated technical and cost proposal, within the IDIQ ceiling, which reflect the SOW of the Task Order. Task Order(s) will be awarded to the best value bidder.

Anticipated Contract Period of Performance

May 2021 - September 2024. The ceiling of this contract is **USD \$2,500,000.00**.

Place of Performance

The activities to be performed under this contract will take place in the following countries: Democratic Republic of Congo, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, South Africa, and Zambia.

Instructions to Offerors

Separate technical and cost proposals must be submitted by email no later than the time and date specified on the cover page. All cost-related information (including but not limited to, narrative, budget total, and rate details) should be included in the cost proposal and should not be included in the technical proposal.

1. Technical Proposal

Offerors must submit one Technical Proposal of no more than twenty pages, single-spaced (20 - excluding cover page (1) and annexes) directly to Palladium. Offerors should not copy anyone outside their organizations on submission email. The proposal must be submitted in accordance with the instructions (items a-c) below. The proposal should demonstrate, at a minimum, how offerors will conduct a performance evaluation in each of the following countries: DRC, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, South Africa, and Zambia.

Offers should provide detailed examples of performance evaluations previously completed in these countries, or similar settings. CATALYZE EduFinance is interested in offerors' experience evaluating learning outcomes for primary and/or early childhood development. Where possible, please demonstrate prior use of the EGRA or ASER methodologies, or a comparable methodology.

The proposal must be submitted in Microsoft Word or unlocked PDF using Times New Roman, font size 11, and must include page numbers and the proposal title. The following components of the technical proposal should be included:

(a) **Cover Page** (max. 1 page):

1. Firm name, contact information, and address
2. Type of company or organization
3. DUNS Number (Company must have a DUNS number or obtain one within 5 days of being notified of selection)
4. Proposal contact person including name, phone number, and email address
5. Signature of authorized representative of the company

(b) **Body of the Proposal** – this section should include a description of the offeror's prior evaluation experience; a narrative detailing an evaluation strategy for EduFinance activities in DRC, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, South Africa, and Zambia, using the evaluation details found in Annex A; and a description of how the proposed strategy will lead to evidence-based responses to the Evaluation Questions listed in Annex A, Table 1.

The proposal should indicate (max. 20 pages):

- a. Concise title of proposed activity
- b. Description of offeror's prior evaluation experience, including: experience conducting comparable evaluations, experience conducting evaluations in DRC, Kenya, Rwanda, South Africa, Tanzania, and Zambia, and any other capability assertions relevant to the offeror's ability to complete the evaluations
- c. Description of offeror's evaluation strategy to conduct performance evaluations of Edufinance activities in DRC, Kenya, Rwanda, South Africa, Tanzania, and Zambia.

Evaluation design should include:

- i. The methodology that will be used to get the answers for every core evaluation question
- ii. Sampling plan*, including power analysis
- iii. Data analysis plan
- iv. Ethics clearance plan
- v. Draft data collection methods and instruments or their main features*
- vi. Known limitations of the evaluation design
- vii. Report writing and dissemination plan

**Please note, at the time of this RFP release, sampling and methodology details are not final. For evaluation workplan and proposal design purposes, please use the illustrative sample size and methodological details below. Proposed evaluation strategies should reflect these illustrative details.*

1. **Sample size:** we aim to cover 100 schools per country and 50 schools per unit of analysis, 30 students per school, 15 students per class in each.

- 1.1. Zambia – 50 (urban), 50 (rural)
- 1.2. South Africa – 50 (Johannesburg/Cape Town/Pretoria), 50 (peri-urban/rural)
- 1.3. DRC – 50 (Kinshasa), 50 (Goma/Lubumbashi/Kisuvu)
- 1.4. Rwanda – 50 (Kigali), 50 (peri-urban/rural)
- 1.5. Kenya – 50 (Nairobi), 50 (Mombasa/Kisumu/Kakamega/Nyeri)
- 1.6. Tanzania – 50 (Dar es Salaam), 50 (peri-urban/rural)

2. **Tools:** ASER or EGRA preferred, but other comparable assessment tools also permissible. *(Note: it is preferable, but not required, to use the same assessment methodology across all countries)*

- d. Description of how the proposed evaluation strategy will lead to evidence-based responses to the Evaluation Questions listed in Annex A, Table 1. Offerors' knowledge of and/or prior experience working in the local contexts should be indicated, as it relates to the offeror's ability to collect, manage, and analyse data in response to the specific Evaluation Questions for each country (specified in Column 3).
- e. Team Profile: Team Lead, Profiles for Key Staff, Organizational Chart (please see Section 10. Evaluation Team Competencies found in Annex A)

- (c) **Supporting Documentation** – this documentation should be submitted as an Annex to the Body of the Proposal:
 - a. Workplan/ activity timeline for the life of project, capturing the main evaluation activities as described in the evaluation strategy; team makeup for each evaluation activity
 - b. Copy of a report demonstrating offeror's previous evaluation experience (redactions accepted)

2. Cost Proposal

Offerors must submit two separate elements of the Cost Proposal:

- (a) **Detailed Budget** – in Excel (unlocked), breaking out all costs associated with the completion of this work. The budget should be organized by country and should include all cost elements (described below) to complete the work in DRC, Kenya, Rwanda, South Africa, Tanzania, and Zambia. Please provide costs at the Unit Level to conduct the work in each country. Because the sampling details are still under development, offeror's Unit costs (and not lump sums) to conduct this work are imperative.

Cost elements to incorporate may include, but are not limited to: labor hours, travel/ transport (as appropriate and with flexibility, in light of COVID-19), materials to conduct the activity, communication costs, indirect rates (with justification documentation/ substantiation), and any applicable taxes or fees. Budgets are expected to be highly detailed and should not include lump sums.

Where applicable, USG-approved rate cards are strongly encouraged to be submitted. All taxes or fees must be disaggregated. Offerors must be prepared to submit cost reasonableness and justification documentation, rationalizing proposed costs against current market rates in each country.

Please see **Attachment 1** on the CATALYZE Procurement website for a sample budget template, which details the expectations for Unit Level cost breakdown. Offerors are strongly encouraged to utilize this template.

- (b) **Budget Narrative** – in Word/PDF, describing all cost assumptions and providing brief explanations of the necessity and utility of all budget items. Offerors should indicate the reasonableness of all item costs by briefly comparing the proposed unit prices to local market rates.

Key requirements in the Cost Proposal:

- (a) Detailed Budget in Microsoft Excel with all formulas visible (unlocked)
- (b) Accompanying Budget Narrative in Microsoft Word/PDF with all cost assumptions and explanations
- (c) Budget in USD
- (d) All prices are to be inclusive of relevant taxes (please disaggregate)
- (e) Separate unit cost and number of units (Unit Level budget items and accompanying narrative description)
- (f) Budget ceiling for this activity of USD \$2,500,000.00

Submission of Offers

Electronic proposals must be submitted by sending one email, with full Technical Proposal (1x) and full Cost Proposal (2x) as attachments, and with the RFP number in the subject line. The RFP number can be found on the cover page.

Offers received past the deadline stated on the cover page will be deemed non-responsive and will not be considered for award.

Evaluation and Award Process

Proposals will be evaluated using a best value trade off methodology. This is a three-stage process.

(1) The first set of criteria is graded on a pass/fail basis. Offerors must meet the following minimum eligibility qualification criteria and provide supporting documentation:

	Requirement	Supporting Documentation
(a)	Agree to the terms of working with CATALYZE. The forms do not need to be submitted with the proposal. The forms will be shared with the selected contractor and must be completed/acknowledged before final selection.	Due diligence form Code of Conduct form Business Ethics Environmental policy acknowledgement
(b)	Active DUNS number	Provide the DUNS number or proof of applying for the DUNS number
(c)	Must be a registered, legal entity	Copy of certificate or articles and memorandum of associate
(c)	Must not have any active exclusions from the working with the US government (www.sam.gov), the UN (Sanctions List), or the US Department of the Treasury Office of Foreign Asset Control	N/A – Palladium will conduct a search of these databases as part of the due diligence process
(d)	Company must not be a foreign government-controlled organization	Due diligence form
(e)	Company must not have controlling interest held by a government, government agency, or agent thereof	Due diligence form

(2) If these minimum criteria are met, the offer’s technical proposal will be evaluated as follows:

	Evaluation Component	Evaluation Criteria	Points
A	Technical Approach of the Evaluation – demonstrate an effective and innovative approach and strategy to achieve results through data collection methodology and approach to analysis and reporting.	<p><i>Methodology & Sampling Strategy</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Alignment with the RFP criteria, namely use of ASER or EGRA), or a comparable methodology; and a robust justification and substantiation for the selected methodology (<i>Note: it is preferable but not required to use the same methodology across different countries</i>) Outline of a data analysis plan <p><i>Work Plan</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed timeline and LOE required to meet the objectives of this scope of work Identification of potential challenges with evaluation execution and concrete steps to address them <p><i>Quality Control Plan</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Description of quality assurance/ control methods during each phase of evaluation 	30
B	Institutional & Management Capacity – demonstrate institutional and technical ability to manage data collection and analysis.	<p><i>Institutional Capacity</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of organizational capacity to meet the needs of this scope of work including, but not limited to, relevant organizational core competencies, existing geographical reach/ experience, dedicated units to data analysis, quality control, research, and human capital 	20
C	Team Composition – propose a team of experts and demonstrate their respective qualifications.	<p><i>Evaluation & Regional Engagement Experience</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal of a robust team with sufficient experience to complete a multi-country, multi-stage impact evaluation; demonstration of local language capacity in the countries of interest is a plus Demonstration of the MEL skills and experiences of the proposed team members including qualifications in, but not limited to, data strategy & management; data collection using mixed methods; data entry, and analysis; study and survey design; enumeration and report writing 	15

D	<p>Past Performance – provide examples of past performance in conducting comparable evaluations</p>	<p><i>Relevant Geographic & Sector Experience</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organizational experience working in the education and/or finance sectors Organizational experience in education-specific research or MEL, especially in the countries of interest <p><i>Survey & Evaluation Experience</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organizational experience conducting surveys or evaluations with large sample sizes Organizational experience conducting multi-country surveys or evaluations, including description of data analysis conducted – please be specific on methods and levels of analysis <p><i>International Partner Experience</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organizational experience working with USAID, country governments, especially ministries of education, or other relevant donor or government partners 	15
E	<p>Price – offer of a reasonable and justifiable total price, comprised of reasonable and justifiable costs, to complete the scope of work</p>	<p><i>Cost Proposal</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submission of a detailed budget, identifying unit prices to complete the work, as described in section 2. Cost Proposal of this RFP Submission of a detailed budget narrative, describing the necessity and inclusion of each budget item and providing rate justification where applicable, as described in section 2. Cost Proposal of this RFP Proposal within the USD \$2.5M ceiling for this activity 	20
TOTAL			100

(3) The offeror's **Cost Proposal** will be evaluated for:

- Adherence to specifications and key requirements listed in Section 2. Cost Proposal of this RFP
- Realism and reasonableness of the unit costs in the detailed budget
- Demonstration of budget item necessity and utility, in the budget narrative
- Realism and reasonableness of the proposed total price, relative to the work to be performed
- Detailed budget elements reflect a clear understanding of the work to be performed, including consistency with the workplan and technical proposal
- Best value in relation to the Technical Proposal
- Compliance with USAID cost principles (Non-profit entities – Cost Principles in 2 CFR 200 Subpart E or for-profit entities – Cost Principles in FAR Part 31)

Palladium reserves the right to award under this solicitation without further negotiations. The offerors are encouraged to offer their best terms and prices with the original submission.

PROCUREMENT INTEGRITY AND ETHICS

It is Palladium's Policy that no gifts of any kind and of any value be exchanged between vendors/contractors and Palladium personnel. Discovery of the same will be grounds for disqualification of the vendor/contractor from participation in any Palladium's procurements and may result in disciplinary actions against Palladium personnel involved in such discovered transactions.

Resulting Award

This RFP in no way obligates Palladium to award a contract. Palladium may opt to select multiple offers in response to this RFP.

Any contract/purchase order resulting from this solicitation must be signed by both parties in order to be considered valid and in force. All costs associated with, but not limited to, production, preparation and/or delivery of goods or services, including deliveries, accepted by Palladium staff, without a fully executed (signed by both parties) contract/purchase order, are at the vendor's risk only. Palladium shall not pay for any costs, without limitation, associated with production, preparation or delivery of goods and/or services under this or any other contract/purchase order, which has not been signed by both parties.

If your proposal is successful, you will be required to enter into the Company's standard contract for the types of goods or services being provided. In the provision of the Goods and Services, you will be required to comply with the Company's policies, including (without limitation) its Business Partner Code of Conduct and any relevant client terms and conditions. Potential suppliers must also comply with the Company's Business Partner Code of Conduct in the submission of any proposals pursuant to this RFP.

If you are bidding as part of a joint venture, partnership or similar, please make this clear in your submission. Likewise, if you propose to subcontract any part of the goods or services provision, then disclose this fact within your submission. The Company may require additional information from you and approval for subcontracting will not be automatic as subcontractors will be subject to Palladium's Due Diligence process.

Attachments

Please review the additional documentation and proposed contracts terms and conditions which should be given consideration when preparing your proposal. By submitting your bid you will certify that that you are in agreement with the contract terms and conditions as included in this solicitation and that all prices include all aspects of the required compliance with the terms and conditions of the proposed contract.

Palladium Business Partner Code of Conduct and Child Protection Guidelines can be downloaded in full at: <http://www.thepalladiumgroup.com/policies> or request through email from catalyze.procurement@thepalladiumgroup.com

Annex A: Statement of Work – Independent Performance Evaluation of CATALYZE EduFinance Activities

1. Purpose of the Evaluation

CATALYZE is an 8-year USAID contract managed by Palladium that aims to facilitate public-private partnerships to crowd in \$2 billion in blended finance to USAID partner countries. The project can work in any development sector and region. The first USAID Bureau to buy-in to CATALYZE was the Bureau for Economic Growth, Education and Environment (E3) which led to the creation of the CATALYZE EduFinance mechanism. The aim of this mechanism is to improve the educational and learning outcomes in disadvantaged children and youth by mobilizing private capital for the non-state education sector. Under this mechanism, USAID is funding public-private sector partnerships (PPPs) and private sector activities in several countries (hereafter called “EduFinance activities”). Independent evaluations will be conducted of these EduFinance activities in order to determine if the goals and intermediate results have been met.

Local ownership of the evaluation process and use of results will be an important objective of each evaluation. All evaluations will accordingly be designed and conducted in consultation and collaboration with local stakeholders and will focus on a set of overarching and locally relevant evaluation questions.

Findings of the evaluations will be used to strengthen implementation and support adaptive management and learning of EduFinance activities and inform future activity design. In addition, the synthesis of the evaluations will be shared with key stakeholders, such as Congress and the EduFinance Community of Practice, in order to expand the body of evidence about Private Sector Engagement (PSE) initiatives strengthening development outcomes.

2. Background

2.1. Description of Problem & Context

Sub-Saharan Africa has the lowest levels of access to education and learning outcomes in the world.¹

Government departments responsible for providing quality education for children and youth face complex and daunting challenges, including difficult choices about how to use scarce financial resources. Education systems are already strained and demographic changes – such as growing youth populations and urbanization – make facing these challenges increasingly urgent, putting further pressure on governments, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa. Small and growing businesses (SGBs)² in the education sector, including non-state schools, have proliferated and shown some promise in filling gaps in the education sector that are not met by governments.

¹ “The Business of Education in Africa,” Caerus Capital, Ferreira and Featherston, 2016 at <https://edafricareport.caeruscapiital.co/thebusinessofeducationinafrica.pdf>.

² Small and Growing Businesses (SGBs) are defined by the Aspen Network of Development Entrepreneurs (ANDE) as commercially viable businesses with five to 250 employees that have significant potential, and ambition, for growth. SGBs differ from the more traditional characterization of small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in two fundamental ways. First, SGBs are different from livelihood-sustaining small businesses, which start small and are designed to stay that way. Second, unlike many medium-sized companies, SGBs often lack access to the financial and knowledge resources required for growth. For more information, see: <http://www.whysgbs.org/>.

Enrollment in private schools accordingly continues to grow – particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa, where one in five students currently attend non-state schools³. In large markets, thousands of non-state schools have emerged, and while large, international chains frequently attract attention, many non-state schools are community and/or faith-based or low-cost, private schools that are single-sited and locally owned and operated.

Many private school entrepreneurs, however, face barriers to entry and scale, including lack of access to finance, limited capabilities (e.g., skills shortages in the workforce), information gaps⁴, and other challenges in the entrepreneurial ecosystem (e.g., long gestation periods and high fragmentation).⁵ These barriers limit their ability to demonstrate the potential for viability, sustainability, and scaling.

While there is a tremendous financing gap, with stagnant donor funding for education, an important and innovative solution is to address this gap through domestic resource mobilization and expanded private sector investment.

The education sector has not benefited from an infusion of private sector capital, expertise, and ingenuity like other sectors have. ⁶ USAID seeks to mobilize a variety of new partners and stakeholders to engage the private sector⁷ in education through the CATALYZE EduFinance mechanism. This approach aligns with USAID’s commitment to supporting partner countries on their Journey to Self-Reliance⁸ through the Agency priority of Financing Self-Reliance⁹.

USAID’s work with the private sector is designed to support existing local systems, markets, and institutions as important and credible partners to increase the provision and improve the quality and affordability of education.

2.2. Description of the Activity to be Evaluated & Theory of Change

The goal of the Catalyze EduFinance mechanism is to improve and sustain learning outcomes of disadvantaged children and youth. This will be accomplished by achieving the following intermediate results:

- **IR 1:** Increased public and private sector resources for low-fee, non-state schools (pre-primary, primary and secondary) and/or training centers.
- **IR 2:** Increased equitable access to low-fee, non-state schools (pre-primary, primary and secondary) and/or training centers
- **IR 3:** Improved quality of education in non-state schools (pre-primary, primary and secondary) and/or training centers
- **IR 4:** Strengthened government and non-state education sector enabling environment.

The theory of change is as follows: By developing private sector partnerships that strengthen the entrepreneurial ecosystem for education and support innovations in education financing and service delivery, USAID will mobilize

³ “The Business of Education in Africa,” Caerus Capital, Ferreira and Featherston, 2016, <https://edaficareport.caeruscapiatal.co/thebusinessofeducationinafrica.pdf>.

⁴ Information gaps are large in the private education sector, ranging from the lack of market assessments that identifies the country level market opportunities and challenges for investors to information gaps for parents to know from objective measures why one non-state school is better than the other. Governments also are not aware of how many non-state schools exist and who they are serving.

⁵ “The Business of Education in Africa,” Caerus Capital, Ferreira and Featherston, <https://edaficareport.caeruscapiatal.co/thebusinessofeducationinafrica.pdf>.

⁶ <https://www.edu-links.org/resources/blended-finance-non-state-education-sector>

⁷ https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1865/USAIDPSEPolicy_ExecutiveSummary.pdf

⁸ <https://www.usaid.gov/selfreliance>

⁹ https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1868/FSR_Fact_Sheet_10_10_2019.pdf

investment in the education sector, increase access to quality education, and improve learning outcomes for disadvantaged children and youth.

Under this mechanism, public-private partnerships and private sector activities will be undertaken in multiple countries that will stimulate financing and innovation in the education sector while also advancing the priorities of USAID's 2018 Education Policy of improving access to quality education for disadvantaged learners from poor households.

While the partnerships will bring different individual theories of change, geographies of implementation, target beneficiaries, and specific outputs and outcomes, all partnerships are striving to improve access and learning outcomes for disadvantaged learners and to improve the overall financial and education ecosystem for non-state education providers.

2.3. Activity Monitoring, Evaluation & Learning Plan

Each EduFinance activity will have its own Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning plan (AMELP) in accordance with the Mission's expectations and reporting requirements. These MEL plans will describe the performance monitoring indicators that will be tracked, how data will be collected, managed and reported and how learning will be captured. Activities will select from a list of EduFinance Topline Performance Monitoring Indicators (see Table 1: Evaluation Sub-Questions on Effectiveness) and identify additional, custom indicators as appropriate and/or required by the Mission.

3. Evaluation Scope

EduFinance activities have been approved in DRC, Kenya, Rwanda, South Africa, Tanzania, and Zambia. All activities are expected to mobilize capital for the non-state education sector, but they may differ in terms of the type of education level that they are focusing on, and the source and capital structure of the private capital mobilized. For example, the EduFinance activity in South Africa aims to increase access to non-state Early Childhood Development (ECD) programs while the partnership in Zambia is focusing on improving learning outcomes of children attending non-state primary schools. Evaluation of these CATALYZE EduFinance activities will be conducted externally, i.e., by a subcontractor who is not directly involved in implementing the activity, as described in this Statement of Work.

4. Evaluation Questions

The evaluations will address several core questions regarding the relevance, effectiveness, scalability, sustainability and gender-awareness of the respective EduFinance activity. The evaluation subcontractor may also be requested to address additional, locally relevant questions identified by local stakeholders, including the USAID mission and implementing partners.

4.1. Relevance & Appropriateness

Question 1a: To what extent was the partnership model (including implementation approaches, strategies, and business models) adopted by the CATALYZE EduFinance activity relevant to the needs of the target populations and aligned with the USAID and host country's finance and education sector priorities?

Question 1b: To what extent did the activity adapt its implementation approach to keep it relevant in the face of changes in operating environment and what kind of lessons were learned that can be applied to implementation of future programs?

4.2. Effectiveness

Question 2: To what extent did the EduFinance activity meet its stated objectives, and what lessons could be learned on the effectiveness of the partnership model deployed by the project?

To answer this question, the evaluation will determine if the activity met or is on track to meet its stated targets across all components and identify unintended results and key parameters that may have influenced activity outcomes. The evaluation will assess if the activity employed an analysis-driven and consultative approach and how it addressed constraints with appropriate interventions.

Table 1 lists the evaluation questions for each intermediate result (IR), the EduFinance topline indicators that will be measured to answer the question, and the EduFinance activities aiming to achieve the IR. The evaluations do not necessarily have to answer all of these questions nor will all the indicators in the matrix be measured. Instead, the specific evaluation questions and indicator will be determined during the stakeholder consultation (see “Evaluation Process”) and will depend on the activity’s objectives, availability of resources and stakeholder priorities.

Once the evaluation question has been selected, stakeholders will determine which EduFinance topline indicators will be measured. Most of these indicators are USAID standard indicators, which follow a specific protocol as described in Performance Indicator Reference Sheets (PIRS).¹⁰ The contractor will be required to follow the methodology outlined in the PIRS and should accordingly review each carefully.

Data disaggregation of the indicators will be critical. Sex and socio-economic status of beneficiaries are required variables while other disaggregates like disability status¹¹ and other context-specific variables may also be requested.

Table 1: Evaluation Sub-Questions on Effectiveness (Question 2)

Project Objective and Evaluation Question	EduFinance Topline Indicators required as applicable	CATALYZE EduFinance Activities
Goal: To improve and sustain learning outcomes of disadvantaged children and youth		
2a. To what extent has school readiness for children attending non-state pre-primary schools changed as a result of the CATALYZE EduFinance activity?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percent of pre-primary learners with improved school readiness (USAID Supp-1) 	Kenya, Rwanda, South Africa, Tanzania
2b. To what extent have learning outcomes of primary and secondary school students attending non-state educational facilities changed as a result of the CATALYZE EduFinance activity?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percent of learners targeted for USG-assistance who attain a minimum grade-level in reading at the end of grade 2 (USAID ES1-1) Percent of learners targeted for USG assistance who attain minimum grade-level proficiency in reading at the end of primary school (USAID ES1-2) Percent of learners targeted for USG assistance with an increase in at least one 	DRC, Kenya, Rwanda, South Africa, Tanzania, and Zambia

¹⁰ <https://www.edu-links.org/indicators>

¹¹ USAID provides guidance for how to collect data on disability of youth populations (<https://www.edu-links.org/learning/how-collect-data-disability>).

	<p>proficiency level in reading at the end of grade 2 (USAID ES 1-48)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percent of learners targeted for USG assistance who completed primary education • Percent of secondary school students passing end-of-year exams in alignment with national requirements 	
2c. To what extent have learning and/or vocational skills of youth changed as a result of the CATALYZE EduFinance activity?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percent of individuals who transition to further education or training following participation in USG-assisted programs (USAID ES1-46) • Percent of individuals with improved reading skills following participation in USG-assisted youth programs (USAID ES1-54) • Percent of individuals with improved soft skills following participation in USG-assisted workforce development programs (USAID EG.6-13) 	Rwanda
2d. To what extent have earnings and/or employment opportunities for youth participating in USG-assisted workforce development programs changed as a result of the CATALYZE EduFinance activity?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average percent change in earnings following participation in USG-assisted workforce development programs (USAID EG.6-11) • Percent of individuals with new employment following participation in USG assisted workforce development programs (USAID EG6-12) 	Rwanda
IR 1: Increased public and private sector resources for low-fee, non-state schools and/or training centers.		
2e. To what extent was capital mobilized for low-fee, non-state schools and/or training centers?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount (in USD) of new investment mobilized for non-state education enterprises¹² • Number of private sector firms that have improved management practices or technologies as a result of USG assistance (USAID EG5.2-2) • Percent of total loan portfolio at risk¹³USD sales of firms receiving USG-funded assistance (USAID EG5-1) 	DRC, Kenya, Rwanda, South Africa, Tanzania, and Zambia
2f. What financial models contributed to the scalability and/or the sustainability of serving the disadvantaged children in non-state schools?		
IR 2: Improved equitable access to low-fee, non-state schools and/or training centers		
2g. To what extent has equitable access to low-fee, non-state schools (pre-primary, primary, secondary and vocational training) changed, in particular for disadvantaged learners?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of learners in pre-primary schools or equivalent non-school settings reached with USG assistance (USAID ES1-53) • Number of learners in primary schools or equivalent non-school based settings 	DRC, Kenya, Rwanda, South Africa, Tanzania, and Zambia

¹² Disaggregated by source of capital mobilization, i.e., public-sector (international/national), private sector (international/national).

¹³ This indicator is defined as the portion of the loan portfolio affected by delinquency as a percentage of the total loan portfolio. It is calculated by dividing the outstanding balance of all loans with arrears over 30 days by the outstanding gross loan portfolio.

	<p>reached with USG assistance (USAID ED1-3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of learners in secondary schools or equivalent non-school based settings reached with USG assistance (USAID ES1-4) 	
IR 3: Improved quality of education in non-state schools and/or training centers		
<p>2h. How did the activity contribute towards improving the quality of education and what evidence is there for this?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EduFinance activities may vary by the type of strategies they use to improve the quality of education. For this reason, the EduFinance Topline Indicators do not include indicators for measuring IR3. Activities will, instead, develop custom indicators and, if available, standard indicators where available. For example, activities that train teachers in classroom instructions may track the USAID standard indicator Supp-10 “Percent of teachers providing quality classroom instruction with USG support”. 	<p>DRC, Kenya, Rwanda, South Africa, Tanzania, and Zambia</p>
IR 4: Strengthened enabling environment for improved education.		
<p>2i. To what extent was the activity’s enabling environment assistance aligned with the host country’s finance and education sector priorities?</p> <p>2j. To what extent did the enabling environment assistance contribute to the achievement of the activity’s objectives?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education system strengthened: policy reform (narrative indicator, USAID ES Supp-15) Percent of USG-assisted organizations with improved performance (USAID CBLD-9) 	<p>DRC, Kenya, Rwanda, South Africa, Tanzania, and Zambia</p>

As part of the effectiveness evaluation question, the contractor will attempt to compute cost-efficiency and cost-effectiveness of EduFinance activities, using output and outcome data from evaluations and cost data from partners. The methodology for this analysis will be developed jointly with the USAID cost measurement team.

4.3. Scalability & Sustainability

Question 3a: To what extent are the benefits (outcomes and impacts) of project interventions likely to continue once the project assistance is formally concluded?

The evaluation should assess whether a realistic and practical sustainability plan is in place from the outset of the activity, and to what extent such a plan has been effectively implemented for the continuity of the activities. The quality of the sustainability plan should also be reviewed and if the plan took the financial, institutional capacity and local political context into account.

The evaluation should also identify what was successful and what was unsuccessful in the handover of continuing activities to relevant stakeholders, such as private sector actors and federal and provincial government policymakers.

The evaluation will also assess how effectively adaptive management was utilized with regards to the sustainability implementation plan. For example, how well did the plan adapt to the current context? Was there a good monitoring system in place? In addition, the evaluation should identify the opportunities and challenges that were faced by partners in the life of the project to effectively implement a sustainability plan that was relevant to the context and timeframe.

Question 3b: To what extent did the activity take into consideration key areas of scale?

According to the Brookings Institution’s Toolkit, *Millions Learning: Scaling Up Quality Education in Developing Countries*¹⁴, a pilot activity must take several factors into account in order to go to scale, namely (1) design, (2) delivery, (3) finance, and (4) enabling environment. The *MSI Scaling Up Framework*¹⁵ also describes how scaling-up should take place, including (1) designing for scale, (2) establishing pre-conditions for scale and (3) managing the scale-up process. The evaluation will apply these two toolkits to assess how scalable the different investment education models that CATALYZE assisted are. What phase are the models in? What aspects of the model have been met and what needs to be to further scale-up the piloted investment education models?

4.4. Gender¹⁶ and Disadvantaged Groups

Question 4: How were the needs of disadvantaged groups and gender issues incorporated and/or addressed by the activity’s interventions and what lessons can be incorporated in future activities?

The evaluation will specifically consider the extent to which outcomes were achieved by disadvantaged groups, in particular women and girls and low-income individuals. Each evaluation question must therefore take on an inclusive, equity lens and include a focus on gender-specific differential access to project services, participation in project activities, and benefits/results. The evaluation team is also encouraged to examine differential perceptions of the value of outcomes in beneficiary and other stakeholder communities, along with differences in the willingness/interest of community and education system leaders to invest in sustained outcomes for girls and boys separately as well as together. At a minimum, this will require that data be disaggregated from a gender perspective, with specific research on why gender-differential effects (e.g., gender-specific access, participation, results, or benefits) do or do not exist.

5. Evaluation Design & Methodology

The following table summarizes the illustrative data collection methods and sources for each evaluation question to guide evaluation design.

Table 2: Data collection methods and sources per evaluation question

Evaluation Question	Data Collection Methods & Type (Illustrative)	Data Sources
Relevance / Appropriateness	Document review.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Market assessments conducted by EduFinance before activity design. ● USAID documents such as Education policy, PSE Approach, MBIO’s result framework; ● Activity design, planning and implementation documents including contracts and modifications; ● Government policy, planning and strategy documents.
	Qualitative methods as culturally appropriate	Activity staff, government counterparts/clients and other stakeholders.

¹⁴ <https://www.brookings.edu/research/millions-learning-scaling-up-quality-education-in-developing-countries/>

¹⁵ <https://msiworldwide.com/additional-resources/msi-scaling-framework>

¹⁶ As per the USAID Evaluation Policy, at least one evaluation question should examine the program effect on gender equality.

	and piloted in country.	
Effectiveness	Harvesting secondary data.	Government education data, if available and appropriate
	Assessments of learning outcomes, in accordance with the methodologies described in the respective indicator's PIRS.	Children
	Surveys to determine effectiveness of workforce development program using the USAID Workforce Outcomes Reporting Questionnaire (WORQ) ¹⁷ .	Youth
	Qualitative methods as culturally appropriate and piloted in country.	Beneficiaries (children/youth), school administration, Government "clients" participants, and stakeholders.
Scalability and Sustainability	Document Review	Planning documents, e.g., sustainability plan.
	Qualitative methods as culturally appropriate and piloted in country.	Stakeholders including staff, representative of target population, Govt. counterparts and other relevant actors.
Gender and Disadvantaged Groups	Document Review; Harvesting and analysis of secondary data (such as enrollment record)	Activity planning documents and gender strategy.
	Qualitative methods as culturally appropriate and piloted in country.	Stakeholders including staff, representative of target population, government counterparts and other relevant actors.

Measurement of learning outcomes of primary-school age children: Improvement of learning outcomes of primary school children is a top priority of the EduFinance mechanism and, as such, merits some further description here of USAID's measurement requirements. For primary school children, the key learning outcome of interest is reading skills which will be measured with the USAID standard and/or custom indicators shown in Table 1 for evaluation question 2b. Reading skills of primary school children will have to be assessed at baseline and at the end of the activity. The assessment tool should be criterion-based, have satisfactory psychometric validity and reliability and not be subject to corruption, cheating, or score inflation. Assessments should be age-appropriate to the target population and validated in the context. They should directly assess individual reading skills; self-assessments should not be used. The language(s) of assessment should be the same as the language(s) of instruction for the reading program. Subcontractors are advised to use the two recommended assessment tools – the Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) or the Annual Status of Education Report

¹⁷ <https://www.edu-links.org/resources/WORQ-Toolkit>

(ASER) assessment. Alternative assessment tools with robust justification and substantiation are also permissible.

5.1. Evaluation Timeline

Learning outcomes will be measured twice over the course of implementing the EduFinance activity: at baseline and towards the end of implementation of the activity. Additional information will also be collected during this time to answer other evaluation questions like the relevance and appropriateness of the activity. The specific questions that the evaluations will be investigating will be discussed during the stakeholder consultation phase described below (see “Evaluation Process”).

5.2. Evaluation Planning in COVID-19 Pandemic

The COVID-19 pandemic may affect the timing, design and implementation of the evaluations. The CATALYZE EduFinance mechanism will monitor the impact of COVID-19 on the implementation of each EduFinance activity and assess if the evaluations can be implemented as described in this SOW. Some evaluations may not be able to comply with all the specifications laid out in this SOW, in particular if the interventions changed, but may nevertheless be conducted, as long as respondents are safely accessible and/or secondary data can be used to answer key evaluation questions. In light of the USAID guidance for MEL during the Covid-19 pandemic¹⁸, we will work with the evaluation subcontractor to document the ways in which the evaluations could be adapted by adding additional questions that help explain or describe the ways in which the pandemic or its second order impacts are visible in the evaluation findings or conclusions. If the original evaluation plan cannot meaningfully continue, CATALYZE EduFinance will consider repurposing evaluation funds for learning activities elsewhere in the project.

6. Ethical Clearance

USAID’s *Policy Brief on Ethics in Research and Evaluation in the Education Sector*¹⁹ explains that performance evaluations involving primary data collection from children or other types of vulnerable individuals will require a review by a properly constituted ethical committee or Institutional Review Board (IRB). The contractor must, in fact, seek ethical clearance for every evaluation that will be conducted from both a US-based and an in-country IRB. It is therefore important that the subcontractor develops an ethics clearance plan for every evaluation being designed *and includes the costs of obtaining ethical clearance accordingly in the evaluation budget.*

7. Evaluation Process

The section below briefly describes the key steps that every EduFinance evaluation – baseline and endline – will follow.

1. Stakeholder consultation: During this meeting, the EduFinance team, USAID/Washington, the USAID Mission, implementation partner and the evaluation contractor will select the evaluation questions to be investigated, the indicators to be measured, and the timeline of the evaluation, in particular the baseline learning assessment.
2. Development of evaluation design and workplan: The contractor will develop the evaluation design and workplan (see “deliverables” below for a description of both).

¹⁸ [Guidance for USAID Education Sector Implementing Partners: Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning \(MEL\) During the Covid-19 Pandemic June 2020.](#)

¹⁹ <https://www.edu-links.org/sites/default/files/media/file/IRB%20Policy%20Brief%20FINAL.pdf>

3. Recruitment of evaluation team: The contractor identifies and recruits the evaluation team.
4. Team mobilization: The contractor mobilizes the evaluation team. This may include developing specific terms of reference for team members and orienting them on the evaluation process.
5. Tool development: The evaluation team designs or adapts the data collection instruments that will be used during the evaluation. The tools may need to be translated to local language and piloted.
6. Evaluation logistics planning workshop: logistics such as dates of field visits, transportation, etc are discussed.
7. Fieldwork: Data is collected using the tools developed above.
8. Data analysis: The evaluation team analyses the collected data and prepares a presentation, including data visualizations, for the exit briefing.
9. Development of draft evaluation report: The evaluation team prepares the draft evaluation report and submits it to CATALYZE and USAID (Mission and Washington) for review.
10. Finalization of evaluation report: The evaluation team finalizes the evaluation report (see “Deliverables” for more information).
11. Dissemination event: The evaluation team presents the evaluation findings and any lessons learned from the evaluation process at a virtual event organized for this purpose.
12. Sharing: The evaluation contractor submits final evaluation report to the Data Warehouse²⁰ and the data to the Development Data Library (DDL)²¹.

8. Deliverables, per Evaluation

These deliverables are expected to be submitted per country of work. Total of 6 evaluations that include baseline and endline data, with reports submitted for baseline assessment (6) and evaluations (6), including endline assessments. One synthesis/ overall evaluation report will be submitted following endline.

Evaluation Design: The contractor must submit an evaluation design to CATALYZE after consultations with the respective mission have been completed. The design will become an annex to the evaluation report.

The evaluation design will include:

1. Evaluation design matrix that links the Evaluation Questions from the SOW to data sources, methods, and the data analysis plan.
2. Draft assessment tools, questionnaires and other data collection instruments or their main features.
3. Ethics clearance plan.
4. List of potential interviewees and sites to be visited and proposed selection criteria and/or sampling plan (must include sampling methodology and methods, including a justification of sample size and any applicable calculations).
5. Limitations to the evaluation design.

Workplan: The contractor is expected to develop a workplan within 4 weeks of the evaluation design and submit it to EduFinance team. The work plan will include:

1. Draft schedule and logistical arrangements
2. Members of the evaluation team delineated by roles and responsibilities
3. Evaluation milestones
4. Anticipated schedule of evaluation team data collection efforts
5. Locations and dates for piloting data collection efforts, if applicable

²⁰ <https://dec.usaid.gov/dec/home/Default.aspx>

²¹ <https://data.usaid.gov/>

6. Proposed evaluation methodology including sampling design with a power analysis, if applicable
7. Evaluation report outline

Draft evaluation report: A draft evaluation report must be developed for both the baseline and endline evaluation and must follow the USAID Evaluation Report Template²². The report must be submitted in accordance with the timeframe described in the evaluation work plan.

Final evaluation report: The evaluation team will review the comments received on the draft report and finalize the document. The evaluation report of the second, follow-up evaluation should contain a comparison of baseline and follow-up assessments.

Synthesis report: The evaluation team will combine all completed evaluation reports into a comparative and/or synthetic analysis which offers useful insight into learning outcomes across the region of work.

Dissemination event: The evaluation team is expected to hold a virtual event to present the evaluation findings to relevant stakeholders and share any lessons learned about the evaluation process.

9. Budget

The ceiling for all evaluation activities, including design, data collection, analysis, and reporting for the evaluation activities is **USD \$2,500,000**. Proposals that exceed this ceiling will not be accepted.

10. Evaluation Team Competencies

The contractor is encouraged to establish partnerships with other technical service providers in order to bring in relevant areas of expertise. In general, every evaluation team should have the skills listed below. Additional competencies may be needed in accordance with individual evaluations.

- Ability to provide strategic management of the evaluations, to manage the evaluation team/s and cooperate with USAID, Palladium and the implementing partners
- Demonstrated experience in designing and conducting education evaluations and assessments, in particular the [Early Grade Reading Assessment \(EGRA\)](#) and/or [ASER tool, or a comparable assessment tool](#)
- Knowledge of evaluating public-private sector partnerships (PPPs) and private sector financing activities.
- Demonstrated experience in designing and conducting mixed method evaluations and using quantitative and qualitative data analysis methods
- Knowledge of the local context and of the education system of the country where the partnerships is implemented
- Ability to engage and supervise a team of local enumerators and assure data quality
- Experience with conducting meta-analyses in which results of several evaluations are combined in order to determine overall trends
- Ability to produce a high-quality evaluation report that includes data visualizations

²² <https://www.edu-links.org/resources/evaluation-report-template-education-programs>