

## Section 4 – Appendix A

### CALLDOWN CONTRACT

**Framework Agreement with:** Coffey International Development Limited

**Framework Agreement for:** Global Evaluation Framework Agreement (GEFA)  
Lot 1: Impact Evaluation

**Framework Agreement Order Number:** PO 7448

**Call-down Contract For:** Independent evaluation contract for The Girls'  
Education Challenge Fund Phase II (GEC II)

**Call-down Contract Order Number:** PO 10019

I refer to the following:

1. The above mentioned Framework Agreement dated **12 September 2016**;
2. Your proposal of **October 2019** as amended and clarified by your subsequent e-mails dated:

**REDACTED**

and I confirm that DFID requires you to provide the Services (Annex A), under the Terms and Conditions of the Framework Agreement which shall apply to this Call-down Contract as if expressly incorporated herein.

#### **1. Commencement and Duration of the Services**

- 1.1 The Supplier shall start the Services no later than **5 February 2020** ("the Start Date") and the Services shall be completed by **30 June 2025** ("the End Date"), with the option of extending for up to a maximum of 12 months, or unless the Call-down Contract is terminated earlier in accordance with the Terms and Conditions of the Framework Agreement.

#### **2. Recipient**

- 2.1 DFID requires the Supplier to provide the Services to the **Department for International Development (DFID)** ("the Recipient"). GEC Phase II implementing partners and projects are also key recipients of the services.

### 3. Financial Limit

- 3.1 Payments under this Call-down Contract shall not exceed **£8,648,830.80** ("the Financial Limit") – inclusive of all government taxes, if applicable as detailed in Annex B.

Coffey have confirmed that that this value is inclusive of all costs including local government taxes and, where applicable, UK VAT.

Included within this Financial Limit:

- The financial ceiling for expenses shall be **REDACTED**. Only expenditure actually incurred will be reimbursed, with receipts required before any Payment is made under the Call-down Contract;
  - The ring-fenced demand-driven portfolio of rapid research studies and learning reviews shall be £2m. Any expenses subsequently associated with the ring-fenced £2m shall be based on actuals (with the Annex B unit rates as a ceiling - provided they are in line with the overall budget agreed with DFID and DFID policy on expenses).
- 3.2 Note that all expenditure in relation to the following items shall be subject to prior DFID approval and compliance with the GEFA capped fee rates:
- **REDACTED**
- 3.3 When Payments shall be made on a 'Milestone Payment Basis', the following Clause 22.3 shall be substituted for Clause 22.3 of the Framework Agreement.

## 22. PAYMENTS & INVOICING INSTRUCTIONS

- 22.3 Where the applicable payment mechanism is "Milestone Payment", invoice(s) shall be submitted for the amount(s) indicated in Annex B and payments will be made on satisfactory performance of the services, at the payment points defined as per schedule of payments. At each payment point set criteria will be defined as part of the payments. Payment will be made if the criteria are met to the satisfaction of DFID.

When the relevant milestone is achieved in its final form by the Supplier or following completion of the Services, as the case may be, the Supplier shall notify DFID in writing indicating both the amount or amounts due at the time and cumulatively. Payments pursuant to clause 22.3 are subject to the satisfaction of the Project Officer in relation to the performance by the Supplier of its obligations under the Call-down Contract and to verification by the Project Officer that all prior payments made to the Supplier under this Call-down Contract were properly due.

### 4. DFID Officials

- 4.1 The Project Officer is:

**REDACTED**

4.2 The Contract Officer is:

**REDACTED**

**5. Additional Documents to be included in the Contract**

5.1 The following documents are included in and form part of this Call-down Contract:

**REDACTED**

**6. Key Personnel**

6.1 The following of the Supplier's Personnel cannot be substituted by the Supplier without DFID's prior written consent:

**REDACTED**

**7. Reports**

7.1 The Supplier shall submit project reports in accordance with the Terms of Reference at Annex A.

**8. Sub-Contractors**

8.1 The Supplier has DFID's consent to appoint the following sub-contractors:

**REDACTED**

**9. Duty of Care**

All Supplier Personnel (as defined in Section 2 of the Agreement) engaged under this Call-down Contract will come under the duty of care of the Supplier:

- I. The Supplier will be responsible for all security arrangements and Her Majesty's Government accepts no responsibility for the health, safety and security of individuals or property whilst travelling.
- II. The Supplier will be responsible for taking out insurance in respect of death or personal injury, damage to or loss of property, and will indemnify and keep indemnified DFID in respect of:
  - II.1. Any loss, damage or claim, howsoever arising out of, or relating to negligence by the Supplier, the Supplier's Personnel, or by any person employed or otherwise engaged by the Supplier, in connection with the performance of the Call-down Contract;

- II.2. Any claim, howsoever arising, by the Supplier's Personnel or any person employed or otherwise engaged by the Supplier, in connection with their performance under this Call-down Contract.
- III. The Supplier will ensure that such insurance arrangements as are made in respect of the Supplier's Personnel, or any person employed or otherwise engaged by the Supplier are reasonable and prudent in all circumstances, including in respect of death, injury or disablement, and emergency medical expenses.
- IV. The costs of any insurance specifically taken out by the Supplier to support the performance of this Call-down Contract in relation to Duty of Care may be included as part of the management costs of the project, and must be separately identified in all financial reporting relating to the project.
- V. Where DFID is providing any specific security arrangements for Suppliers in relation to the Call-down Contract, these will be detailed in the Terms of Reference at Annex A.
- 10. Break Clause**
- 10.1 There shall be formal break points after the first 6 months (Inception phase), after each 12-months of Implementation and at the pre-extension point (65-months).
- 11. Section 2 - Framework Agreement Terms and Conditions**
- 11.1 Section 2 - Framework Agreement Terms and Conditions require certain parameters be set on an individual Call-down Contract basis. The following clauses will supersede their counterparts at Section 2, for the purposes of this Call down Contract only:

### **SCHEDULE 3: INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS**

#### **7. INSURANCE CLAIMS**

- 7.2 Except where DFID is the claimant party, the Supplier shall give DFID notice within twenty (20) Working Days after any insurance claim in excess of £85,000 relating to or arising out of the provision of the Services or this Agreement and/or any Call Down contract on any of the Insurances or which, but for the application of the applicable policy excess, would be made on any of the Insurances and (if required by DFID) full details of the incident giving rise to the claim.

### **ANNEX 1: REQUIRED INSURANCES**

#### **PART A: THIRD PARTY PUBLIC & PRODUCTS LIABILITY INSURANCE**

#### **3. LIMIT OF INDEMNITY**

- 3.1 Not less than to be £8,648,830.80 in respect of any one occurrence, the number of occurrences being unlimited, but £8,648,830.80 any one occurrence and in the aggregate per annum in respect of products and pollution liability.

**4. TERRITORIAL LIMITS**

4.1.1 N/A

**8. MAXIMUM DEDUCTIBLE THRESHOLD**

8.1 Not used

**ANNEX 1: REQUIRED INSURANCES**

**PART B: PROFESSIONAL INDEMNITY INSURANCE**

**3. LIMIT OF INDEMNITY**

3.1 Not less than £8,648,830.80 in respect of any one claim and in the aggregate per annum.

**4. TERRITORIAL LIMITS**

4.1. N/A

**8. MAXIMUM DEDUCTIBLE THRESHOLD**

8.1 Not used.

**12. Intellectual Property Rights**

12.1 Clause 25 of Section 2 shall be deleted and replaced by the following provisions

**25. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS**

25.1 Save as expressly granted elsewhere under this Call Down Contract:

25.1.1 DFID shall not acquire any right, title or interest in or to the Intellectual Property Rights of the Supplier or its licensors, namely:

- (a) the Supplier Background IPR;
- (b) the Third Party IPR; and
- (c) Project Specific IPRs.

25.1.2 The Supplier shall not acquire any right, title or interest in or to the Intellectual Property Rights of DFID or its licensors, including the:

- (a) DFID Background IPR;
- (b) DFID Data; and
- (c) Programme Name and any rights and interests in it at all times.

25.2 Where either Party acquires, by operation of Law, title to Intellectual Property Rights that is inconsistent with the allocation of title set out in Clause 25.1, it shall assign in writing such Intellectual Property Rights as it has acquired to the other Party on the request of

the other Party (whenever made).

- 25.3 Neither party shall have any right to use any of the other Party's names, logos or trade marks on any of its products or services without the other Party's prior written consent.
- 25.4 Any Project Specific IPRs created under this Call Down Contract shall be owned by the Supplier. DFID grants the Supplier a licence to use any DFID Background IPR for the purpose of fulfilling its obligations under this Call Down Contract during its Term. The Supplier grants to DFID a perpetual, irrevocable, non-exclusive, assignable, royalty-free licence to use, sub-license and/or commercially exploit any Project Specific IPRs.
- 25.5 The Supplier hereby grants to DFID and shall procure that any relevant third party licensor shall grant to DFID a perpetual, irrevocable, non-exclusive, assignable, royalty-free licence to use, sub-license and/or commercially exploit any Supplier Background IPRs or Third Party IPRs that are embedded in or which are an integral part of the Project Specific IPR Items.
- 25.6 The Supplier shall promptly notify DFID if it reasonably believes that it will be unable to grant or procure the grant of the licences set out in Clause 25.5 above and the Supplier shall provide full details of the adverse effects this may have on DFID's use of the Project Specific IPRs
- 25.7 The Supplier shall, during and after the Term, on written demand indemnify DFID against all Losses incurred by, awarded against, or agreed to be paid by DFID (whether before or after the making of the demand pursuant to the indemnity hereunder) arising from an IPR claim.
- 25.8 If an IPR claim is made or anticipated, the Supplier must at its own expense and DFID's sole option, either:
- 25.8.1 procure for DFID the rights in Clause 25.5 without infringing the IPR of any Third Party; or
- 25.8.2 replace or modify the relevant item with non-infringing substitutes with no detriment to functionality of performance of the Services

### **13. REDACTED**

### **14. Call-down Contract Signature**

- 14.1 If the original Form of Call-down Contract is not returned to the Contract Officer (as identified at clause 4 above) duly completed, signed and dated on behalf of the Supplier within 15 working days of the date of signature on behalf of DFID, DFID will be entitled, at its sole discretion, to declare this Call-down Contract void.

For and on behalf of  
The Secretary of State for  
International Development

Name:  
  
Position:

Signature:

Date:

For and on behalf of  
Coffey International Development Limited

Name:

Position:

Signature:

Date:

**Section 4, Annex A**

**Department for International Development**

**Terms of Reference (ToR)**

**Independent evaluation contract for the  
Girls' Education Challenge Fund Phase II (GEC II)**



## Table of contents

1) Introduction to the Requirement	Page 3
2) The Purpose and Recipients of the Evaluation	Page 6
3) Scope and Objectives	Page 8
4) Methodology	Page 15
5) Evaluation Approach: Ways of Working	Page 17
6) Data collection and analysis	Page 18
7) Evaluation Outputs	Page 22
8) Constraints and Dependencies	Page 23
9) Implementation Requirements	Page 24
10) Payment by Results	Page 27
11) Responsibilities:	Page 28
12) Logistics and Procedures	Page 29
13) Budget	Page 29
14) Asset Management	Page 30
15) Duty of Care and Risk Management	Page 30
16) Branding and Transparency, Delivery Chain Mapping and General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)	Page 31
17) License to Operate	Page 32
18) Safeguarding and Do No Harm	Page 33
19) End of Contract Activities	Page 33
20) Background and context	Page 34

### Appendixes:

A: Schedule of Processing, Personal Data and Data Subjects

### Annexes:

- 1: Key Performance Indicators and Mechanism
- 2: GEC data available from project level evaluations for GEC-T projects
- 3: SEGRA and SEGMA Guidance
- 4: Project Level Budget Expenditure
- 5: The GEC Theory of Change
- 6: Duty of Care Risk Assessments

## 1: Introduction to the Requirement

1.1: The Department for International Development (DFID)<sup>1</sup> leads the UK's work to end extreme poverty. DFID is tackling the global challenges of our time including poverty and disease, mass migration, insecurity and conflict. DFID's work is building a safer, healthier, more prosperous world for people in developing countries and in the UK too.

1.2: DFID's Girls' Education Challenge (GEC)<sup>2</sup> was launched in 2012 with a commitment to ensure up to one million of the world's most marginalised girls completed a full cycle of either primary or secondary education. The original business case<sup>3</sup> set out an 8 year vision. Phase I (2012-16) was funded with £355m, and a one year no-cost extension (to 2017) was agreed in 2014. GEC Phase I targeted 1.4 million marginalised girls and provided funding through 37 different projects.

1.3: DFID commissioned an independent evaluation of the first phase of the programme and evaluation which can be accessed here: REDACTED. The evaluation found that over 800,000 girls demonstrated measurably improved learning as a result of their participation in these projects.

1.4: Phase II of the programme is operating between 2017 and 2025. 41 projects are receiving £500 million to support their activities.

1.5: GEC Phase II builds lessons learned from the first phase, and four lessons in particular:

- The need to further refine GEC's approach to successfully reach the most marginalised girls;
- Girls' learning outcomes are very low and comprehensive strategies are needed to ensure girls reach foundational literacy and numeracy,
- Different packages of interventions are needed to address barriers at different transition points in a girls' journey through education.
- The need for substantive, insightful and credible evidence to understand which types of approaches are effective in raising the learning outcomes for marginalised girls in different contexts.

1.6: GEC Phase II aims to support the provision of high quality education for up to 1.5 million marginalised girls aged 10 to 18 . Designed as a 'challenge fund', it aims to find better ways of supporting girls to attend school, raise their literacy and

---

<sup>1</sup> REDACTED

<sup>2</sup> REDACTED

<sup>3</sup> REDACTED

numeracy skills and ensuring they receive a high quality education. GEC projects tackle a range of socio-economic barriers that prevent girls from attending school and receiving a high quality education.

1.7: The programme aims to contribute to more gender inclusive education systems and schools; improve teaching quality; provide tailored education support such as mentoring and bursaries; and tackle harmful social norms that prevent girls from going to school.

1.8: This second phase of the programme comprises of two types of project:

- A **Girls' transition window (GEC-T)** to continue funding successful GEC Phase I projects and ensure that one million marginalised girls transition successfully from primary education into secondary education, further education, vocational education or training. This window comprises of 27 projects (selected from 37 GEC Phase I) located in 14 countries. They have timeframes of between three and eight years. This window supports DFID's commitment to 12 years of quality education for all children by continuing to work with the one million girls supported by the GEC since 2012 as they transition to the next stage of their education. The GEC-T projects started implementing activities in mid-2017.
- A **Leave no girl behind window (LNGB)** to fund 14 targeted 'catch up' projects for up to 500,000 highly marginalised girls in 10 countries: Afghanistan, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Nepal, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Zimbabwe. These projects started in late 2018. The Leave No Girl Behind window reaches beyond the scope of conventional education strategies to engage out-of-school adolescent girls including girls with disabilities, those at risk of early marriage and pregnant girls with new learning opportunities. A set of bespoke, innovative initiatives will support girls onto vocational and educational pathways, and enable them to gain sustainable skills including literacy and numeracy.

1.9: Projects are designed and delivered by implementing partners including international NGOs, social enterprises and private sector organisations. Projects deliver a broad range of interventions including tailored classroom teaching, teacher development and school improvement; educational technology and distance learning; community engagement; and financial support to girls, their families and their schools.

1.10: Across both funding windows the programme aims to provide:

- A strong focus on accelerating girls learning outcomes so that marginalised girls achieve functional literacy and numeracy, and acquire relevant knowledge, skills and attitudes needed for life and work,
- A systematic approach to reduce school dropout during adolescence including tackling harmful social and gender norms, child marriage,<sup>4</sup> early pregnancy, domestic work, or violence,
- A deepening of engagement with partner Governments, civil society, other donors and partners to sustain and scale up cost effective GEC innovations beyond the lifetime of the programme.
- An integrated research and evaluation programme to inform project, DFID and other stakeholder decisions about investments, design and delivery of learning strategies at all stages of a girls' education journey - during her foundational years in school, her early adolescence and as she transitions from education to work.

1.11: Projects have been designed by implementing partners to address the specific barriers and levers to marginalised girls participating in education and improving their literacy and numeracy skills in the contexts in which they are operating. As such, all aim to address equity and exclusion. Some projects also aim to address household-level poverty by providing scholarships, bursaries and financial support to families of the girls.

1.12: All of the projects are supporting girls within contexts in which national schooling systems, other projects and specific national and regional education policies operate. The GEC-T projects provide training, support and classes mostly within government schools whilst the GEC-LNGB projects plan to create classes and support girls outside of the formal school environment such as in community education settings and technical and vocational education and training (TVET) facilities. Due to the geographical coverage and scope of the programme it is not possible within this ToRs to provide wider contextual information about each of these.

1.13: The programme is managed by an external Fund Manager. The Fund Manager leads programme management, co-ordination, project level monitoring. The Fund Manager also leads verification of project level evaluations, provision of technical assistance to project level evaluations and sharing learning across the programme. The Fund Manager consortium is led by PWC at the present time. This contract will continue until June 2020 and a new Fund Manager contract will be procured in early 2020 until the end of the GEC Phase II.

---

<sup>4</sup> The programme will develop mechanisms for closer linkages with the DFID supported UN Joint Programme to End Child marriage and ensure knowledge on what works on supporting adolescent girls education and life skills is shared between implementing partners.

1.14: The GEC-Phase II programme recognises and supports the commitment made at the Second High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness (2005). At this forum it was recognized that aid could - and should - be producing better impacts. The Paris Declaration was endorsed in order to base development efforts on first-hand experience of what works and does not work. It is formulated around five central pillars: Ownership, Alignment, Harmonisation, Managing for Results and Mutual Accountability. Given the level of funding through national governments, donor agencies and other stakeholders, robust approaches to generate substantive and insightful evidence through evaluation and research activities about what works, where and why in different contexts is vital. Through this programme of evaluation and research work we aim to provide timely, relevant and robust evidence that can be used by national governments to inform their work to improve access to quality education for marginalised girls.

1.15: DFID has explored working with other donors and partners to commission this evaluation. Whilst it has not been possible to commission this evaluation jointly due to different priorities and interests of other donors, we have led a highly collaborative approach to designing the scope of this evaluation and developing the Terms of Reference. This scope of work has been designed in consultation with a wide range of stakeholders at DFID, the GEC II projects and external stakeholders engaged in increasing access to high quality education for marginalised girls.

1.16: Further information about the GEC Phase II can be accessed by reviewing documents attached in the following links:

Development Tracker documents:

Including business cases, evaluation reports, annual reviews and log frames  
REDACTED

1.17: The overall programme Theory of Change is included in Annex 4. Individual projects have their own theories of change.

1.18: Given the scale and scope of funding for both the programme and the evaluation, DFID intends to work in a flexible and supportive way with the independent Evaluation Supplier throughout this contract.

## **2: The Purpose and Recipients of the Evaluation**

2.1: The primary audiences for the evaluation deliverables are DFID policy and programme staff, DFID's Education Advisers and GEC Phase II implementing partners and projects. It is envisaged that these primary audiences will use the

findings to learn across the portfolio to understand what has worked, how and why and in different contexts for different groups of marginalised girls.

This information will subsequently be used to inform:

- How DFID works with our partners to adapt and improve GEC investments to best meet the needs of targeted beneficiaries; and
- Future multilateral, bilateral and other investments in education.

This will drive effective, relevant and efficient investments that deliver results and represent value for money.

2.2: In the seventeen<sup>5</sup> countries where the GEC is operating, national governments will also be primary audiences for specific evaluation and research deliverables. It is envisaged that specific findings and deliverables will be used to support and inform decisions made by these governments to invest in inclusive education programmes and policies to meet the needs and rights of marginalised girls.

2.3: The secondary audiences are other international donors, agencies and stakeholders working in and investing in education. This includes UNICEF, the World Bank, the Global Partnership for Education (GPE), USAID and the Norwegian and Canadian Ministries of Foreign Affairs. It is envisaged that all evaluation and research deliverables will be global public goods that can inform decisions about strategic investment and decisions about girls' education.

2.4: As such, learning is the primary purpose of this evaluation contract with accountability as the secondary purpose.

2.5: The evaluation will be delivered over a 65-month contract term, from February 2020 to June 2025, to be aligned with the delivery of the second phase of the GEC. The contract term will comprise of a 6-month Inception phase followed by a 59-month Implementation Phase.

The contract will include the option to extend for up to a maximum of 12 months, dependent upon the progress and timeframe of programme delivery and at DFID's discretion.

This timeframe will enable the Supplier to capture relevant longitudinal evidence about the delivery, outcomes and impacts and inform on-going decisions about management, delivery and future investments.

---

<sup>5</sup> Afghanistan, Ethiopia, Somalia, Kenya, Pakistan, Uganda, Tanzania, Nepal, Mozambique, Malawi, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Rwanda, Democratic Republic of Congo, Nigeria, Ghana, Sierra Leone

There is also potential to scale up by up to 25% of the contract value or scale down, depending on performance, context and approval from DFID. The Supplier is required to commit to being fully prepared to respond to changes in scale and scope of the programme.

### **3: Scope and Objectives**

#### **3.1: The contract will focus on five interconnected areas of inquiry:**

- How and why different approaches have delivered intended and unintended outcomes, including improved literacy and numeracy, for different groups of marginalised girls in different contexts. This area of inquiry should consider boys as secondary beneficiaries and gender inequalities within educational participation and attainment.
- If, how and why the design and delivery of the programme contributed to success and created challenges.
- How and why have wider education systems, the socio-political environment, economy influenced the achievement of outcomes, created challenges, barriers or levels for success. This should include appropriate analysis of how projects have worked within and influenced these wider systems.
- The sustainability of the outcomes within national government education systems over the medium term (five to ten years) and scale-ability, transferability and replicability of different approaches in different contexts.
- The value for money offered by different approaches in relation to different outcomes for girls and boys with different characteristics and in different contexts. An appropriate and robust assessment of equity will be crucial to any assessment of value for money.

The Evaluation Supplier will also manage a ring-fenced £2m demand-driven portfolio of rapid research studies and learning reviews that will deliver specific findings in response to the needs of primary audiences. The scope of this work will be determined by DFID, an independent evaluation advisory group and GEC Phase II projects. It is envisaged that these studies will be led by different external research agencies, evaluators or other relevant organisations.

An example of the scope, scale and methodological approach of studies that we aim to support through this demand-driven portfolio is: Research to improve the

quality of teaching and learning inside Syria (Integrity, 2018). This study can be accessed at: REDACTED

### 3.2 Questions to be answered through the independent evaluation programme

This is an independent meta-level evaluation contract which will:

- Synthesise project level evaluations, evaluative evidence and wider contextual evidence. This will involve an assessment of the quality of evaluative evidence.
- Strategically and systematically collect and analyse primary data in response to gaps in coverage or quality of project level evidence.
- Deliver 10-12 evaluations that are accessible, contain substantive and insightful findings in response to specific stakeholder audiences.

The table below lists the main high-level evaluation questions with OECD-DAC (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) and other relevant evaluation criteria.

Area of Inquiry	High level evaluation questions and sub-questions	Suggested approach	Required evaluator expertise	OECD-DAC criteria and other relevant criteria
How and why different approaches have delivered intended and unintended outcomes, including improved literacy and numeracy, for different groups of marginalised girls in different contexts. This area of inquiry should consider boys	<p>Which approaches/strategies have been more and less effective (how, why and for different groups of girls) in different contexts for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improving learning outcomes (numeracy, literacy and other outcomes)</li> <li>• Minimising attrition</li> <li>• Removing barriers to participating in education</li> <li>• Supporting successful transitions from primary to secondary and to the labour market</li> </ul>	<p>Informed by wider evidence base and the Theory of Change (TOC)</p> <p>Providing substantive and insightful analysis in relation to the intermediate programme outcomes.</p> <p>Series of evaluations that are focused on specific questions, regions,</p>	<p>Highly skilled and experienced in synthesis of large and diverse primarily quantitative secondary data sets.</p> <p>Highly experienced and skilled in identifying substantive, insightful further evaluative questions and subsequent analysis of intermediate outcomes.</p>	Relevance, effectiveness, equity and coherence



as secondary beneficiaries and gender inequalities within educational participation and attainment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unintended outcomes</li> <li>• Changing self-perceptions of identity</li> <li>• Being inclusive for different groups of girls and marginalised boys</li> <li>• Spillover and wider effects</li> <li>• Social and emotional well-being</li> </ul> <p>How have different enabling and inhibiting factors contributed to and/or limited the achievement of intended and unintended outcomes in different contexts?</p> <p>Which approaches and strategies have been effective in enabling girls facing multiple barriers access education and improving learning outcomes?</p>	<p>contexts and groups.</p> <p>Synthesis of primarily quantitative evidence from project evaluations to understand outcomes and impacts of different approaches.</p> <p>Mixed methods primary data collection and analysis.</p> <p>Qualitative data collection and analysis to answer understand causal mechanisms and relevance of context.</p> <p>Marginalised boys should be considered as secondary beneficiaries in these studies</p> <p>Analysis using a gender-lens.</p> <p>Analysis of credible and significant contribution and 'necessary' and 'sufficient'.</p> <p>Analysis of whether nodes/pathways</p>	<p>Skilled in designing and delivering qualitative evaluations to answer 'how', 'why' 'for whom' and 'in which contexts' questions to complement quantitative data analysis</p> <p>Strong skills and experience in theory based evaluations.</p> <p>Skilled in QCA and analysis of credible and significant contribution.</p> <p>Team highly skilled in using a gender-lens to analyse quantitative and qualitative data sets.</p>	
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		have large effects.		
If, how and why the design and delivery of the programme contributed to success and created challenges.	<p>To what extent has the design and delivery of the programme contributed to success and challenges in different contexts?</p> <p>This should include analysis of:</p> <p>Setting of learning outcome targets, design and relevance of a challenge fund, a focus on girls rather than gender, PbR components and approach to research, monitoring and evaluation.</p>	Mixed method primary data collection and analysis.	<p>Analysis of credible contribution and 'necessary' and 'sufficient'.</p> <p>Identification of whether nodes/pathways have large effects.</p> <p>Skilled in process evaluation.</p>	<p>Relevance, effectiveness and efficiency</p> <p>[Process Evaluation]</p>
How and why have wider education systems, the socio-political environment, economy influenced the achievement of outcomes, created challenges, barriers or levels for success. This should include appropriate analysis of how projects have worked within and influenced these wider systems.	<p>How and to what extent have projects complemented national and regional efforts to improve the quality and availability of education for marginalised girls in different contexts?</p> <p>How have wider education systems, other stakeholders and the socio-political environment influenced intended and unintended project outcomes? What are the implications for sustainability of outcomes?</p>	<p>Identification of whether nodes/pathways have large effects.</p> <p>Qualitative data collection and analysis to answer understand causal mechanisms and relevance of context.</p> <p>Review of evaluative evidence (not necessarily from evaluations) and additional mixed-methods primary research and analysis.</p>	<p>Ability to analyse credible (and significant) contribution and 'necessary' and 'sufficient' through alternative hypothesis testing.</p> <p>Skilled in analysing diverse datasets and wider socio-economic and political analysis.</p>	<p>Relevance, effectiveness, coherence and equity</p>

		<p>Analysis of credible contribution and 'necessary' and 'sufficient'.</p> <p>Analysis in relation to sustainability of outcomes</p>		
<p>The sustainability of the outcomes within national government education systems over the medium term (five to ten years) and scale-ability, transferability and replicability of different approaches in different contexts.</p>	<p>Which, where and why are some programmes/approaches and their impacts more likely to be sustainable over the medium term (5-10 years)?</p> <p>What is the potential for scaling up and out of different approaches and elements of different approaches in different contexts?</p> <p>If, how, where and why has the GEC influenced wider international and national programmes and policies?</p>	<p>Mixed methods primary data collection and analysis of socio-political environment.</p> <p>Qualitative data collection and analysis.</p> <p>Analysis of large quantitative data sets.</p> <p>Synthesis of varied evaluative evidence</p>	<p>Highly skilled in developing evidence-based ex-ante theories of change</p> <p>Highly experienced in applying designing and delivering an evaluation with a long-term ex-ante perspective</p> <p>Skilled at understanding and applying evaluative approaches that minimise the macro-micro disconnect and provide useful credible evidence to inform decisions about transferability, replicability and scaling up.</p>	<p>Impacts within the context of sustainability</p>

Value for money	What is the value for money and efficiency of different approaches in relation to their impact?	Quantitative data analysis of impact data, costs data  Evaluative Assessment of VFM with particular reference to equity	Quantitative impact evaluation expertise  Highly skilled and experienced in synthesis of large and diverse primarily quantitative secondary data sets.  Experience in economic analysis and evaluation skills that consider Economy, Effectiveness, Efficiency and Equity on a macro and portfolio level scale.	Efficiency and impacts
-----------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------

3.3: The Evaluation Supplier may propose alternative questions and modifications to these questions during the Inception Phase based on their analysis of the ToRs and relevant GEC II documents. DFID approval of proposals is required before alternatives/modifications can be applied.

3.4: The evaluation contract will operate over a 65-month contract term. The timeframe for the contract has been agreed to maximise opportunities to capture long-term substantive findings in timeframes that correspond to the timeframe for GEC Phase II programme and opportunities for evidence to inform policy and management decisions.

In addition to annual reviews, the contract will allow for formal break points after the first 6 months (Inception phase), after each 12-months of Implementation and at the pre-extension point (65-months). Break points will involve a substantive discussion on performance, progress towards outcomes, KPIs and challenges.

3.5: It is expected that the contract will deliver 10-12 evaluations that address the above high level questions. It is also expected that the Evaluation Supplier will lead portfolio-level analysis of midline and endline quantitative findings that are reported by the independent project evaluations. The scope, structure, number,

sequencing and content of these studies will be agreed with DFID during the Inception phase.

3.6: Evaluation findings should consider activities and approaches within the wider development trajectory of the country/region and wider evidence about development effectiveness.

3.7: The Evaluation Supplier is required to deliver substantive and insightful analysis. The evaluations should consider design, delivery, outcomes and learning about specific themes, topics, approaches or geographical regions. Evaluations should consider how and why outcomes and impacts have been achieved by evaluating specific drivers and barriers including teaching quality, leadership and specific pedagogical approaches.

3.8: It will be necessary for the Evaluation Supplier to ensure appropriate and relevant contextualisation of findings throughout all evaluation activities. Appropriate analysis of context should be informed by credible triangulation of data-sets.

3.8: When considering contexts in which different outcomes have occurred, the Evaluation Supplier will analyse the influence of the wider educational system as well as the socio-political, cultural and the economic environment. This should include analysis of the fragility of different contexts and the extent to which this has influenced delivery of activities and outcomes.

3.10: The Evaluation Supplier contract requires meta-level synthesis and analysis of project level evaluations that use quasi-experimental methods and gather wider quantitative and qualitative data.

3.11: The Evaluation Supplier will be responsible for refining the proposed evaluation questions and proposing the most suitable evaluation approaches and methodologies.

3.12: The Evaluation Supplier will not be responsible for assessing the performance of individual projects against specified learning outcomes. This is the responsibility of the Fund Manager and project level evaluator.

### **Cross-cutting themes**

3.13: DFID considers human rights, anti-corruption, humanitarian support, the capacity of partner countries and civil society important cross-cutting themes in all development programmes and critical to understanding achievements, delivery and

lessons learned. As such, wherever possible and appropriate, the Evaluation Supplier should aim to explore these themes through the duration of the contract.

3.14: Where possible and appropriate, the Evaluation Supplier should consider how formal and informal partnerships with other organisations that may have similar or different goals have facilitated and impeded the achievement of delivery and outcomes. These should inform the Evaluation Supplier's understanding of the context of achievements, delivery and lessons learned.

#### **4: Methodology**

4.1: The evaluation approach will primarily require synthesis of quantitative and qualitative evidence from project level evaluations, monitoring data and other evaluative evidence.

4.2: The contract will also require substantial qualitative data collection and analysis to provide insightful evaluative evidence to answer 'how' and 'why' questions. This is because there is limited qualitative data being collected through the project level evaluations.

4.3: Where there are gaps in quantitative evidence and where there is low quality of quantitative evidence gathered by project level evaluations, there will also be a need for quantitative primary data collection and analysis. We do not anticipate that there will be a major need for this type of data collection or analysis by the independent Evaluation Supplier. The availability and quality of the project level evaluation data will be explored by the evaluation supplier in the six-month Inception phase of this contract.

4.4: The evaluation strategy should be informed by the GEC Phase II Theory of Change (Annex 4). We expect all evaluation findings to inform the revision of the Theory of Change.

4.5: The Theory of Change will be amended on an annual basis in partnership with the Fund Manager and DFID staff based on evidence from the evaluation contract, research studies, monitoring activities and lessons learned across the programme. We expect the Evaluation Supplier to co-lead the amending the Theory of Change with DFID and the Fund Manager.

4.6: The ToRs provide the overall high-level evaluation questions that need to be answered through this programme of work. The Evaluation Supplier will deliver a series of thematic, regional, and/or other types of evaluations that focus on specific evaluation questions and respond to the high-level evaluation questions

identified in section four of the ToRs. The Evaluation Supplier will work in ways that are identified in section five of the ToRs.

4.7: The Evaluation Supplier will deliver an appropriate evaluation framework, design and methodology to answer the high level questions in ways that will provide credible, timely, insightful and substantive evidence to meet the needs of the main audiences.

4.8: We anticipate that a small team of evaluators will need to work in three to five countries to conduct primary research for each of the evaluations.

4.9: DFID has a preference for a core group of evaluators working full time and/or the majority of their time on this evaluation contract rather than many evaluators working a small number of days. We believe that this staffing structure will be important in ensuring the quality of the evaluation contract given the scale of the evaluation, large scope of work and ambitious vision of the overall GEC Phase II programme.

4.10: It is anticipated that this evaluation contract will differ from GEC Phase I evaluation, because it will primarily involve synthesis and focused qualitative data collection rather than substantive quantitative data collection.

This approach is different because of i) the scope and scale of quantitative data collection that is being undertaken through the GEC Phase II project level evaluations and ii) audience need for credible and substantive evaluative evidence about understanding which types of approaches are effective for different groups of girls and boys in different contexts.

4.11: The Evaluation Supplier will use data and findings from the GEC Phase I Evaluation<sup>6</sup> to inform the identification of hypotheses for testing or evaluation questions to explore within this evaluation. We expect that the first three hypotheses or evaluation questions will be identified in the Inception phase of the contract. Timeframes for the development of other hypotheses and questions will be agreed during the Inception phase.

4.12: The Evaluation Supplier will identify potential risks and challenges and will pro-actively mitigate and manage them throughout the evaluation.

4.13: During the Inception phase, the Evaluation Supplier will provide an evaluation matrix which shows how the first three each of the evaluation questions or hypotheses will be answered, including identification of key data sources and methods of analysis. During the Inception phase, the Evaluation Supplier will also

---

<sup>6</sup> The evaluation reports are available at: REDACTED

develop a plan to clarify processes, timeframes and strategies for identifying future questions and hypotheses to test.

4.14: The Evaluation Supplier will address cross-cutting themes and assess the quality of evidence.

### **Rapid Research and Learning Review Fund**

4.15: Through this contract we require the Evaluation Supplier to manage and deliver a £2 million demand-driven portfolio of rapid research studies and learning reviews that provide timely, responsive and robust evidence to address the needs of specific primary audiences. The research questions will be identified by DFID and the GEC projects in consultation with the Evaluation's Independent Advisory Group. **The £2m budget for this requirement will be ring-fenced within the contract budget, and any changes to the value will be dependent on context, need and approval from DFID.**

The Evaluation Supplier will manage calls for proposals for independently commissioned research, evaluation and learning activities that are proposed and will be managed by GEC II projects. The Evaluation Supplier will be responsible for disbursing relevant funds. The Evaluation Supplier will design and manage this fund to ensure it is inclusive, maximises value for money, and activities are efficient and relevant to DFID in accordance with the expected ways of working that are listed in section five (below).

## **5: Evaluation Approach: Ways of Working**

The Evaluation Supplier will:

5.1: Build on lessons learned and findings from the GEC Phase I evaluation.

5.2: Ensure that the evaluation process and approach is inclusive, participatory and support equitable participation of stakeholders with different backgrounds and with different characteristics.

5.3: Design, lead and manage the evaluation contract in ways that are gender-responsive<sup>7</sup>.

5.4: Adhere to DFID's ethical principles for the conduct of research and evaluation<sup>8</sup>.

---

<sup>7</sup> REDACTED

<sup>8</sup> REDACTED



5.5: Ensure that the evaluation approach and budget are disability inclusive (DFID, 2018)<sup>9</sup> and aligned with the principle of ‘nothing about us without us’.

5.6: Adhere to international best practice standards evaluation, including the OECD-DAC standards<sup>10</sup> whilst also considering the relevance the consultation<sup>11</sup> and proposals to revise these standards and criteria (OECD-DAC, 2018)

5.7: We expect the Evaluation Supplier to deliver in accordance with these required ways of working throughout the contract ensuring their proposed approach is relevant and appropriate to the principles, standards and ways of working that are outlined in this section of the ToRs.

5.8: The Evaluation Supplier will be responsible for obtaining ethical approval at an organisational and national level before primary data collection, identifying and managing ethical integrity and safeguarding issues throughout the lifecycle of the contract.

## **6: Data Collection and Analysis**

6.1: The Evaluation Supplier will receive access to all available project monitoring data and evaluation data that is collected by the 27 GEC-T projects and the 15 GEC Leave No Girl Behind (LNGB) projects when it is received after August 2019. Further information is available at the Girls’ Education Challenge website: REDACTED.

6.2: The Evaluation Supplier will draw heavily on the robust and thorough approach to project level evaluation across GEC projects. Each of the 27 GEC II Transition projects are required to competitively commission and manage independent evaluations to measure the additional effect of their work on the girls’ learning outcomes (numeracy and literacy), girls’ transition (from primary to secondary school or vocational / employment pathways) and sustainability. The project level evaluations collect baseline, midline and endline data using standardised SeGRA (literacy) and SeGMA (numeracy) tests and a wider mixed-methods data collection and analysis in response to the specific design of individual project evaluations. The exact SeGRA and SeGMA questions in each subtask are different for each project based on the needs and intended learning outcomes of children targeted by projects and the needs of relevant local curricula. As such, whilst they are using a standardised approach there is

---

<sup>9</sup> REDACTED

<sup>10</sup> REDACTED

<sup>11</sup> REDACTED

divergence and difference in the numeracy and literacy tests that are set by each project.

6.3: The majority of GEC-T projects have followed a standardised and reasonably consistent approach to the design, piloting and approval of their SeGRA and SeGMA tests. The learning test blueprint (Annex 2 and developed with input from the National Foundation for Educational Research) detailed the guidance that projects followed. This includes overall design principles, the number of subtasks, the style of questions therein, sources for example questions, together with marking guidance. This was the basis against which the majority of projects tests were designed and approved against. A small number of projects, largely as a result of particularly low levels of learning, deviated from this approach and, for example, often followed multiple choice type questions. These tests were developed in consultation with projects and local curriculum personnel.

6.4: The Fund Manager supports projects to set up robust quasi-experimental evaluations, with treatment and comparison groups that are necessary to demonstrate the 'additional' impact of GEC-funded interventions over-and-above what would have otherwise occurred.

6.5: Each project level evaluation is also required to collect evaluative data in relation to a minimum of three, and a maximum of five intermediate outcomes (IOs). These IOs should reflect the key steps within the project Theory of Change identified as essential enablers to improve learning, transition and sustainability. Attendance is the single compulsory IO that all projects have collected data against – typically an in-school measure drawing upon a combination of register data and classroom spot checks. The remaining IOs are: teaching quality and improvement, greater self-esteem and confidence, community attitudinal and behavioral change, economic empowerment of households and families, improved school management and governance, life skills, and sexual and gender based violence.

6.6: Evidence from the mixed-methods evaluations are used and will continue to be used by projects, the Fund Manager and DFID to inform decisions about how to adapt programmes, provide specific technical assistance and manage the portfolio to maximise impacts and relevance.

6.7: All data sets from the evaluations are disaggregated by defined socio-economic characteristics. Please see Annex 1 for further information available from project level evaluations.

6.8: Given the project level evaluation approach for GEC-T projects, there are identified comparison schools and classes for each of the GEC-Phase II Transition projects.

6.9: Discussions about the evaluations of the GEC-LNGB projects are on-going. We will share all evaluation data from these projects with the Evaluation Supplier when the procurement process is complete.

6.10: A template showing the financial cost data that is collected and can be analysed by the evaluation team is listed in Annex 3.

6.11: The UK based Evaluation Team at the Fund Manager provides technical assistance to support and raise the quality of project level evaluations. The team quality-assure all evaluation deliverables and data sets and verify these when they are satisfied that they reflect good practice in international development evaluation. The quality of the project level evaluation data, plans and deliverables are reviewed from the UK and as such there is no external quality assurance of the data collected by independent evaluation teams at the national/project level. The design, commissioning and management of individual project level evaluations are the responsibility of different GEC projects.

6.12: The following six-monthly monitoring data is available from projects:

- Number of classrooms constructed and/or renovated
- Number of teachers trained (male)
- Number of teachers trained (female)
- Number of school management committees trained
- Number of girls' club leaders trained (female)
- Number of girls' club leaders trained (male)
- Number of vocational course places taken up
- Number of text books distributed
- Number of student kits distributed (e.g. uniforms, stationery etc)
- Number of girls' receiving WASH kits/sanitary wear
- £ in bursaries/stipends/cash transfers distributed
- Number of computers/tablets provided
- Number of assistive learning devices (to female beneficiaries)
- Number of assistive learning devices provided (to male beneficiaries)
- Number of community awareness raising and/or sensitisation events held
- Number of stakeholder engagement meetings held
- Number of children attending school with relevant characteristics (self-reported by projects)
- Number of classes (self-reported by projects)
- Attendance (self-reported by projects)
- Teachers and relevant teacher characteristics (self-reported by projects)
- Rubric based assessment data from projects about teacher quality and

gender and social inclusion will be available from individual projects (validated by the FM).

This monitoring information is collected through quarterly narrative project report: progress; challenges; lessons learnt; questions and actions coming out of self-assessment tools and additional output-related monitoring data collected by projects. Specific technical monitoring reports are also collected about questions posed by project managers on technical issues.

6.13: Annex 1 has further information about specific information available from project level evaluations. Disaggregation by gender, socio-economic and other variables is included within this annex.

6.14: The Evaluation Supplier will engage with and collect primary data with sufficient sample sizes and coverage across the projects for the following stakeholder groups:

<b>Essential target groups</b>	<b>Relevance to intervention/evaluation</b>
Girls who are the direct intended beneficiaries of projects	Direct intended project beneficiaries
Boys who are the secondary beneficiaries of projects	Secondary beneficiaries
Teachers employed by projects	Stakeholders delivering projects
Teachers working in other schools in relevant regions	Comparison teachers to understand differences in approaches and strategies
Policy makers and officials working on national and regional education policy	To understand wider context that projects are operating within and if and how projects are influencing at a system level
Community leaders	Important gatekeepers for access to education
Head teachers	Responsibility for leading projects and strategic coherence
Other donor agencies in the region	Synergies and coherence of the projects with wider educational initiatives and policy
DFID country office staff	Synergies and coherence of the projects with wider educational initiatives and policy
Marginalised girls and boys who are not participating in the project and live in local areas	Intended and unintended project beneficiaries that are not being reached – understanding barriers to inclusion and participation

6.15: It is essential that the Evaluation Supplier ensures that there is sufficient budget, fieldwork and time allocated for classroom observation within the primary fieldwork plans.

6.16: The Evaluation Supplier will be responsible for developing evaluation plans which will include the geographical scope of fieldwork, sampling approaches, the most appropriate techniques to code and analyse data and how this data will be synthesised and presented. All data collection, analysis, synthesis and presentation plans will need to be approved by DFID before work starts

6.17: The evaluation team will be able to request access to local data sets about school enrolment, attendance and project level monitoring records. These should provide valuable wider contextual data to support the evaluation and effectiveness of projects. Availability, coverage and quality of these data sets will vary according to national and local systems and policies.

## **7: Evaluation Outputs**

### **7.1: Output 1: Evaluation Inception report: End of month six**

The Evaluation Supplier is responsible for reviewing project level evaluations, monitoring data and other evaluative evidence and leading discussions with the primary audiences to understand their needs, expectations and aspirations for the evaluation. This should inform the Evaluation Supplier's assessment of the feasibility and merit of different evaluation studies and approaches.

DFID will support and work with the evaluation team to identify and contact the intended primary audiences of the evaluation.

The evaluator should subsequently produce an Inception report that includes the following:

- The timeframe, sequencing, logic, substantive content and structure of 10-12 evaluations which respond to the main evaluation questions that are identified within these ToRs.
- An assessment of the coverage and quality of evidence gathered by project level evaluations.
- An evaluation approach and methodology paper. This should include proposals for feasible, robust and appropriate approaches for synthesis, meta-level evaluation and identification of where there are primary data gaps and needs for data collection. Subsequent identification of primary methods of data collection, sampling and analysis strategies are required for the first two evaluations.

- A gender analysis paper that shows how the evaluation approach will utilise equity-focused and gender sensitive evaluation approaches and methodologies
- A timeline for activities
- An appropriate framework for the classification of the quality of evidence
- A stakeholder mapping and communication plan that identifies key audiences, timeframes needed for decisions and type of information required in consultation with DFID's Girls' Education Influencing and Engagement Lead.
- Plans for effective management of the research and learning call down facility in accordance with the ToRs.
- A preliminary review of the GEC II Theory of Change (ToC) with suggested refinements. This should support use of the ToC within the evaluation.

7.2: The primary audiences for the Inception report will be: DFID's Girls' Education Team Evaluation & Evidence Adviser and the Independent Evaluation Advisory Group.

7.3: The remaining deliverables and their intended audiences for the duration of the contract will be agreed during in the Inception phase.

7.4: It is required that DFID has unlimited access to all materials produced by the Evaluation Supplier.

7.5: The Payment-by-Results schedule and Key Performance Indicators (KPI's) will be refined during the Inception phase of the contract. Output-based payments during Implementation will be based on timely DFID approval of finalised evaluation reports and deliverables from the 10-12 studies. All payments will be released subject to meeting the quality standards outlined in these ToRs.

## **8: Constraints and Dependencies**

8.1: There will be a number of challenges in delivering this work, some of which are identified below.

- The programme level evaluation approach relies on project level evaluations to provide robust and relevant evidence. Whilst these are quality assured and supported by the Fund Manager in the UK there is some variation in the quality of these and the scope of their deliverables.
- There are individual project level ToCs and an overall Fund ToC. The Evaluation Supplier will need to analyse and review the different and relevant

Theories of Change to understand the context, contribution and value of different evidence.

- Individual projects will hold their own monitoring and evaluative evidence that could be synthesised and included within the evaluation. The scope, quality and coverage of this data is varied. The quality and usability of data from all projects cannot be guaranteed and will need on-going monitoring.
- Data will need to be analysed in relation to the outputs of 27 GEC-T projects and 15 LNGB projects that are operating in a range of countries with information about their context. This data will be available in a range of formats and locations. It will require substantial work to collate and synthesise into a comprehensive and accessible database.
- This work will require collaborative working with GEC projects in ways that are participatory, collaborative and imposes a minimal time and resource burden on projects. The Evaluation Supplier will consider and apply the most effective, feasible and appropriate ways of working to ensure collaborative and effective working with GEC projects and project evaluation teams.
- Any supplier delivering the GEC Phase II Fund Manager contract as either a lead or consortium partner is not eligible to tender for this contract due to a Conflict of Interest
- If a supplier is evaluating a GEC project, we require the tender to clarify how they will mitigate any potential COIs.
- Other conflicts of interests will be considered on a case-by-case basis by DFID and must be reported within tenders. For possible COIs, tenderer must include proposals about how these will be mitigated and managed throughout the duration of the contract.

## **9: Implementation requirements**

9.1: We require strong partners to the Evaluation Supplier within their consortium , preferably based in the global south, which has extensive experience in international education evaluation or educational expertise, with a particular knowledge of marginalised young people. Meaningful partnerships should be established in both the scope of work and the funding allocated to the partner/s.

9.2: We require substantive and meaningful partnerships with consultancies and/or research institutes and evaluators based in the global south to ensure they

are strategically and substantively engaged within this scope of work. This will be a necessary requirement to ensure the contract delivers high quality, robust and contextually relevant deliverables.

9.3: The work specified under this contract requires a range of skills and expertise. This includes theory-based evaluation, analysis, synthesis and interpretation of large quantitative data sets, qualitative and quantitative primary data collection and analysis; and subsequent generation of substantive and insightful analysis about what is effective, why and how in different context for different groups.

9.4: The Evaluation Supplier will manage a team with expertise in delivering successful, insightful, robust evaluations in the field of education to deliver this evaluation.

9.5: The Evaluation Supplier will provide intellectual leadership, strategic advice and challenge to successfully drive forward this complex programme of work.

9.6: The Team Leader and wider team will have a relevant and appropriate range of expertise, skills and successful experience of evaluating educational programmes that aim to support marginalised and vulnerable young people.

9.7: The Evaluation Supplier will adopt a flexible and responsive approach to this programme of work that is able to critically reflect upon and respond to emerging findings and the changes to the external environment.

9.8: The key deliverables in the Implementation phase are delivery of a high-quality portfolio of 10-12 evaluations and delivery of demand-driven research and learning studies. All deliverables should be robust, insightful, and relevant to DFID and other key stakeholder needs for evidence.

9.9: All evaluation deliverables will be quality assured by DFID's independent quality assurance service (EQUALS) prior to any associated output-based payment being made.

9.10: The Evaluation Supplier will bring together a range of technical skills, including strengths in:

- Expertise in and ability to see the bigger picture across a wide range of varied and complex evaluation data and information from a variety of sources, rather than focus on specific details;
- Extensive knowledge, expertise and experience in educational development evaluation, education systems and initiatives that aim to support marginalised young people;



- Expertise and experience in different approaches to synthesizing complex and varied evaluative evidence to high quality methodological standards;
- Management of complex projects;
- Expertise and experience in advising on, designing, managing and leading theory-based evaluations;
- Constructively engaging and working with a wide range of stakeholders with different interests and levels of expertise;
- Knowledge and demonstrated practical engagement in international development assistance for education, learning and development outcomes;
- Expertise and experience in developing and delivering communication, dissemination and promotion of learning with a wide range of stakeholders (donors, developing country government, civil society) through appropriate channels and tailored products (workshops, web-based activities, accessible and engaging reports, practical guidance etc), and achieving meaningful uptake and use of evidence;
- Demonstrated understanding of how different audiences learn, reframe, change and improve, and experience of applying this to develop and deliver effective learning strategies which ensure that knowledge and learning lead to transformation, change and improvement;
- Knowledge and experience of working with HMG departments, developing country governments; other donors / international organisations, civil society, etc;
- Experience of successfully designing and undertaking monitoring and evaluation in developing countries, including regional and multi-country programmes.

9.11: It is expected the Evaluation Supplier will have the skills required to produce work that will meet the standards of the Government Social Research Service (GSR) REDACTED as well as DAC REDACTED and DFID's standards REDACTED.

## **10. Payment by Results**

10.1: DFID encourages payment-by-results approaches with payments linked to both the achievement of outputs and performance against agreed KPI's.

10.2: Expenses (including but not limited to Travel, Subsistence, Accommodation, Office Costs etc) shall be paid monthly in arrears and shall be based on actuals, with the final Pro Forma Cost Template unit rates as a ceiling (provided they are in line with the overall budget agreed with DFID and DFID policy on expenses).

10.3: In relation to Fees:

Inception fees shall be paid:

- i. Input-based:  
REDACTED% shall be paid monthly in arrears against inputs i.e. as they are incurred, provided they are in line with the overall budget agreed with DFID;
- ii. Output-based:  
REDACTED% at the end of the inception phase upon satisfactory delivery and DFID approval of the below outputs:
  - Detailed work plan for Year 1, including quarterly outputs linked to payment milestones;
  - High level work plan for remaining years, including outputs linked to payment milestones;
  - Inception Key Performance Indicators refined and agreed - to be used to measure performance during implementation;
  - Agreed logistical framework;
  - Inception report with detailed methodology.
- iii. KPI-based:  
REDACTED% at the end of the inception phase based on assessed performance for that period as measured against the KPI's and KPI mechanism detailed later in these TORs.

Implementation fees shall be paid:

- i. Output-based:  
REDACTED% shall be paid quarterly in arrears (with payments being due at the end of each 3-month implementation period) based on satisfactory delivery and DFID approval of outputs as agreed by the parties prior to each 3-month implementation period - provided they are in line with the overall budget agreed with DFID.

Outputs linked to specific payment milestones shall include the following (note: these shall be detailed in the submitted Pro Forma 5 - Milestone Payments Proposal):

- Finalised evaluation reports and deliverables from the 10-12 studies – in line with the Terms of Reference and work plan;
- Management of calls for rapid research and learning studies proposals – for each year of Implementation;
- Delivery of insightful final products from evaluation studies, which will include reports, slide-packs and working papers – for each year of Implementation. Note that final deliverables will be informed by the primary audiences for these studies;

- Other substantive evaluation deliverables.
- ii. KPI-based:  
 REDACTED% shall be paid quarterly in arrears (with payments being due at the end of each 3-month implementation period) based on assessed performance for that period as measured against the KPI's and KPI mechanism detailed later in these TORs (as amended and agreed prior to implementation).

It is anticipated that quarterly contract management meetings will be held with DFID, and the Supplier must build this KPI payment element into its proposed Contract Management Plan.

The final performance-based payment shall be due three months after completion of the project.

## **11: Responsibilities:**

### **Reporting**

11.1: The Evaluation Supplier will report directly to the Evidence and Evaluation Lead in the Girls' Education Team.

11.2: The Evaluation Supplier will be required to share quarterly narrative and financial progress reports and attend management meetings on a quarterly basis. It is also envisaged that there will be telephone progress meetings every second week to discuss progress in accordance with workplans, challenges, risks and other issues. .

11.3: DFID's Senior Responsible Officer for the Girls Education Challenge Fund will be responsible for leading the implementation of the recommendations.

11.4: An independent external advisory panel for the contract will also be established. This will include external evaluation and education experts. It is envisaged that the group will work collaboratively with the Evaluation Supplier and DFID. The Evaluation Supplier will be required to attend and present at advisory group meetings and work in a positive and constructive manner with members of the group.

11.5: The key responsibilities of the group will be to:

- Work collaboratively and constructively with the Evaluation Supplier and DFID to help ensure that the design of plans, delivery of activities and all outputs are relevant, timely, robust and appropriate.

- Provide timely, relevant and independent advice about the feasibility, quality, relevance, rigour and appropriateness of methodologies and outputs.

## **12: Logistics and procedures**

12.1: The Evaluation Supplier will be responsible for all logistic arrangements for themselves and members of the evaluation team. DFID will facilitate the convening of meetings and site visits where necessary. All relevant expenses should be included within the Contract budget.

## **13: Budget**

13.1: The maximum budget available over the 65-month contract term is £8,648,830.80 million (inclusive of all applicable taxes). This maximum budget includes the ring-fenced £2 million for the demand-driven portfolio of rapid research studies and learning reviews .

The Evaluation Supplier will demonstrate effective and efficient costing within the allocated budget while maintaining excellent value for money and delivering high quality work.

The contract will include the option to extend for up to a maximum of 12 months. Subject to Business Case approvals, the maximum budget available for the 12-month extension term is £2 million (inclusive of all applicable taxes).

13.2: Fee rates will be fixed for the duration of the contract.

## **14: Asset Management**

14.1: The Supplier will need to set out how they will maintain, control and report on any assets purchased with DFID funds, mitigating against theft, damage or loss. A detailed asset management plan will be developed within the delivery plan for this programme. DFID will then determine how the assets are disposed of at the end of the programme as part of the closure strategy. Any funds not spent by the programme will be returned to DFID at the end of the programme. All assets will be disposed of in a way that represents best VfM with a clear record of decision making, including approval by Head of Department or delegate.

## **15. Duty of Care and Risk Management**

15.1: The Evaluation Supplier is responsible for the safety and well-being of their Personnel and Third Parties affected by their activities under this contract, including appropriate security arrangements. They will also be responsible for the provision of suitable security arrangements for their domestic and business property.

15.2: The Evaluation Supplier is responsible for ensuring appropriate safety and security briefings for all of their Personnel working under this contract and ensuring that their Personnel register and receive briefing as outlined above. Travel advice is also available on the FCO website and the Evaluation Supplier must ensure they (and their Personnel) are up to date with the latest position.

15.3: Activities may require the Evaluation Supplier to operate in conflict-affected areas and parts of it are highly insecure. Travel to many zones within the region will be subject to travel clearance from the UK government in advance. The security situation is volatile and subject to change at short notice. The Evaluation Supplier should be comfortable working in such an environment and should be capable of deploying to any area required within the region in order to deliver the Contract (subject to travel clearance being granted).

15.4: The Evaluation Supplier is responsible for ensuring that appropriate arrangements, processes and procedures are in place for their personnel, taking into account the environment they will be working in and the level of risk involved in delivery of the Contract (such as working in seismically active, dangerous, fragile and conflict-affected environments). The Evaluation Supplier should ensure their personnel receive the required level of training and, if appropriate, complete a UK government approved hostile environment training course prior to deployment.

15.5: As the countries/areas of work involved in this intervention are currently undetermined at the present time. Travel related to this contract will only be required for countries where GEC are being implemented: Afghanistan, Ethiopia, Somalia, Kenya, Pakistan, Uganda, Tanzania, Nepal, Mozambique, Malawi, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Rwanda, Democratic Republic of Congo, Nigeria, Ghana, Sierra Leone. DFID is not in a position to be able to provide specific Duty of Care assessments for all countries at this point because the specific country selection will be agreed after the Inception phase of the contract. It is necessary that the Evaluation Supplier is able to operate within Fragile and Conflict Affected Countries (FCAS), medium and low risk environments. On this basis, DFID assumes that this programme will be rated as 'Medium/High' risk. All countries included in fieldwork will be DFID priority countries and countries with GEC

projects. We have attached three country risk assessments: Pakistan, Sierra Leone and Kenya (Annex 6).

15.6: During the programme, it is DFID's expectation that any contracted Evaluation Supplier will provide a full Duty of Care assessment for each potential country/area of work where in-country ground work is expected to be necessary. If the programme activities take place in medium or high risk locations, DFID will share available information with the Evaluation Supplier on security status and developments in-country where appropriate.

15.7: The Evaluation Supplier must ensure they are fully responsible for Duty of Care in line with the details provided above and should confirm that:

- a. They fully accept responsibility for Security and Duty of Care.
- b. They understand the potential risks and have the knowledge and experience to develop an effective risk plan
- c. They have the capability to manage their Duty of Care responsibilities throughout the life of the contract.

15.8: Tenders must include in their bid a robust assessment of the associated key risks and detail their approach to risk management and how they propose to manage and mitigate risks over the duration of the contract. This will need to be revisited at the end of the inception phase, and reflected on and updated regularly throughout implementation.

## **16: UK Aid Branding, Transparency, Delivery Chain Mapping and General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR)**

16.1: Partners that receive funding from DFID must use the UK aid logo on their development and humanitarian programmes to be transparent and acknowledge that they are funded by UK taxpayers. Partners should also acknowledge funding from the UK government in broader communications but no publicity is to be given in relation to this Contract without the prior written consent of DFID.

16.2: DFID has transformed its approach to transparency, reshaping our own working practices and pressuring others across the world to do the same. DFID requires suppliers receiving and managing funds to release open data on how this money is spent, in common, standard, re-useable format and to require this level of information from immediate sub-contractors, sub-agencies and partners.

It is a contractual requirement for all suppliers to comply with this, and to ensure they have the appropriate tools to enable routine financial reporting, publishing of accurate data and providing evidence of this to DFID. Further ITAI information is available from:

16.3: Delivery Chain Mapping is a process that identifies and captures, usually in visual form, the name of all partners involved in delivering a specific good, service or charge, ideally down to the end beneficiary. Addressing this is the actions /activities required to manage regular and exceptional risk throughout the network to reduce exposure and vulnerability.

The Evaluation Supplier will provide a delivery chain map to enable DFID to understand all agencies that are engaged delivering this work. Delivery chains support transparency and tracking of funds throughout a contract.

16.4: Please refer to the details of the GDPR relationship status and personal data (where applicable) for this project as detailed in Appendix A and in the Terms and Conditions of the contract.

## **17: License to Operate**

17.1: The Evaluation Supplier, consortium members and all downstream partners will have the appropriate licence to operate in the relevant countries. Award of contract will be dependent on evidence being provided of the necessary licences.

## **18: Safeguarding and Do No Harm**

18.1: DFID maintains a zero-tolerance approach to sexual exploitation and abuse within Supplier organisations, which includes their downstream supply chains. We expect DFID partners to follow our lead and robustly consider environmental and social safeguards through their own processes. The capacity of our partners to do this and their effective performance will be a key risk assessment factor in programme delivery and monitoring and evaluation.

18.2: The Supplier will have responsibility for assessing safeguarding policies and practices of consortium members and downstream partners. Supplier(s) will comply with all DFID safeguarding policies and will be required to demonstrate that they have robust approaches in place to reduce the risk of bullying, harassment and exploitation and to manage instances if they take place.

18.3: DFID requires assurances regarding protection from violence, exploitation and abuse through involvement, directly or indirectly, with DFID suppliers and programmes. This includes sexual exploitation and abuse, but should also be understood as all forms of physical or emotional violence or abuse and financial exploitation.

18.4: The Supplier must demonstrate a sound understanding of the ethics of working in this area and applying these principles throughout the lifetime of the programme to avoid doing harm to beneficiaries. In particular, the delivery of interventions including research and programme evaluations should recognise and mitigate the risk of negative consequence for women, children and other vulnerable groups. The supplier will be required to include a statement that they have duty of care to informants, other programme stakeholders and their own staff, and that they will comply with the ethics principles in all programme activities. Their adherence to this duty of care, including reporting and addressing incidences, should be included in both regular and annual reporting to DFID.

18.5: A commitment to the ethical design and delivery of evaluations including the duty of care to informants, other programme stakeholders and their own staff must be demonstrated.

18.6: The Supplier will be requested to conduct an Environmental and Safeguarding Risk Assessment during the Inception phase, to consider the potential positive and negative environmental impacts of programme activities (for example related to use of reusable materials in vocational education training).

## **19: End of Contract Activities**

19.1 Three months before the expiry date of the contract the Evaluation Supplier will prepare a draft Exit Plan for DFID's approval which shall include:

- i. A disposal plan for all assets procured throughout the lifetime of the programme in accordance with DFID procedures on asset management and disposal;
- ii. Addresses any material items that are necessary or desirable for the continued co-operation of the UK Government with partner governments after the contract ends;
- iii. The Suppliers' plans on co-operating to ensure the smooth transfer of responsibilities from the service provider to any persons or organisation taking over such responsibilities after the contract ends;
- iv. The Suppliers' plan to deliver to DFID (if requested or as otherwise directed by DFID) prior to the contract end date (or termination of the contract), any finished work or, unfinished materials or work-in-progress which relate to the contract;
- v. The Suppliers' plans to provide DFID before the contract ends a summary of the status and next steps in relation to any on-going projects or other material and unfinished activities being conducted or monitored by the service provider;
- vi. The return by the Supplier of all Confidential Information to DFID before the contract end date;



- vii. Allows for a period of up to sixty (60) days after the contract end date (or termination date) for the exit process to be properly implemented.

## **20: Background and context:**

20.1: The UK is committed to ensuring that all girls receive twelve years of quality education by 2030. Educating girls is the right and smart thing to do - investing in girls' education delivers significant economic, health and social benefits (World Bank, 2018<sup>12</sup>).

20.2 The cross-government Girls Education Campaign is a collaboration between the Department for International Development (DFID), the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) and the Department for Education (DfE), which looks to combine the strength of the UK education sector, the quality of DFID's work in the toughest contexts and the FCO's diplomatic capabilities. Standing together in a triple alliance, our three Departments are driving forward an integrated campaign to accelerate global action to ensure 12 years of quality education and learning for all girls by 2030.

20.3 Most recently the campaign organised a girls' education event at the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA). Prime Minister Theresa May, alongside the leaders of France, Canada and Global South Partners Kenya, Niger and Jordan asked delegates to join the commitment to ensuring that all girls can access 12 years of quality education by 2030. The work of the Girls Education Challenge Fund (GEC) was referenced and held out as an exemplar to encourage other countries to step up their response to the global learning crisis. The UK believes that 12 years of quality education for girls is a development imperative.

20.4: DFID's Education Policy (DFID, 2018<sup>13</sup>) has three strategic priorities: investing in good teaching, backing systems reform which delivers results in the classroom and targeting support to the most marginalised children. It provides the strategic context for DFID's engagement in education, the Girls Education Challenge Fund and this evaluation.

This policy highlights the following:

## **Barriers to learning:**

---

<sup>12</sup> REDACTED

<sup>13</sup> DFID Education Policy: Get Children Learning (DFID, 2018) REDACTED

Whilst developing countries have expanded schooling at an impressive rate in recent decades, education systems in developing and conflict-affected countries are not consistently delivering quality education, **leading to a learning crisis**. This is a tragic waste of human potential which is holding back development and posing risks to stability. Over half the world's children – around 387 million – are not on track to read by the end of primary school. This translates to over 90 percent of children in low-income countries and 75 percent in lower-middle income countries. Learning inequalities between rich and poor students begin early and grow wider over time. They are compounded by other sources of disadvantage, such as gender, disability, ethnicity and location. There is often little support once children fall behind.

**Barriers to access and attendance persist:**

Up to 50 percent of children with disabilities are out of school because schools do not provide disability inclusive access and/or teaching approaches. In addition, girls frequently drop out of school due to violence, pregnancy or child marriage and are not supported to remain or return to school. Many children have to work to support their family's income, which can limit opportunities to attend school. Children in conflict-affected countries are one third less likely to complete primary school whilst and less than two percent of humanitarian aid went to education in 2015.

**There is limited and fragmented evidence around how to improve numeracy and literacy learning outcomes in different contexts for the most marginalised girls and other groups of young people** (World Development Report, 2018<sup>14</sup>). Through this independent evaluation contract, we aim to support national governments and donors to tackle the learning crisis. We are seeking substantive and insightful evaluation findings that can drive more effective and efficient investments to deliver the best possible outcomes for marginalised girls.

20.5: The Evaluation Supplier will build on evidence available through the Girls' Education and Gender Equality rigorous literature review (DFID, 2014<sup>15</sup>), the evaluation findings from the first phase of the Girls Education Challenge Fund (DFID, 2018<sup>16</sup>), the University of Oxford's longitudinal research study about childhood poverty 'Young Lives Matter'<sup>17</sup> (2000), the World Development Report (2018)<sup>18</sup> and other relevant sources of evidence.

---

<sup>14</sup> REDACTED

<sup>15</sup> REDACTED

<sup>16</sup> REDACTED

<sup>17</sup> REDACTED

<sup>18</sup> REDACTED

20.6: GEC projects are accountable to their intended beneficiaries and responsible for using the UK tax-payer's money efficiently and effectively to deliver the priorities as outlined within DFID's Education Policy (DFID, 2018).

## **Appendixes**

A: Schedule of Processing, Personal Data and Data Subjects

### **Annexes:**

- 1: Key Performance Indicators and Mechanism
- 2: GEC data available from project level evaluations for GEC-T projects
- 3: SEGRA and SEGMA Guidance
- 4: Project Level Budget Expenditure
- 5: The GEC Theory of Change
- 6: Duty of Care Risk Assessments

## Appendix A: of Contract Section 3 (Terms of Reference) Schedule of Processing, Personal Data and Data Subjects

This schedule must be completed by the Parties in collaboration with each-other before the processing of Personal Data under the Contract.

The completed schedule must be agreed formally as part of the contract with DFID and any changes to the content of this schedule must be agreed formally with DFID under a Contract Variation.

Description	Details
<b>Identity of the Controller and Processor for each Category of Data Subject</b>	<p>The Parties acknowledge that for the purposes of the Data Protection Legislation, the following status will apply to personal data under this contract:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) The Parties acknowledge that Clause 33.2 and 33.4 (Section 2 of the contract) shall not apply for the purposes of the Data Protection Legislation as the <b>Parties are independent Controllers</b> in accordance with Clause 33.3 in respect of the Personal Data necessary for the administration and/or fulfilment of this contract.</li><li>2) For the avoidance of doubt the Evaluation Supplier shall provide <b>anonymised data</b> sets for the purposes of reporting on this project and so DFID shall not be a Processor in respect of anonymised data as it does not constitute Personal Data.</li></ol>

## Annex 1 – Key Performance Indicators and Mechanism

Following inception, these KPI's shall be refined and agreed and used to measure performance during Implementation.

<u>Key Performance Indicators</u>	<u>KPI Description</u>	<u>KPI % Weighting</u>	<u>Score (1 to 6)</u>	<u>Max. Possible Total Score</u>
1. Quality and delivery	1a) Quality of deliverables and alignment of project outputs to project need 1b) Timeliness of milestone delivery 1c) Quality and timeliness of reporting (including financial reporting) 1d) Appropriate and effective identification and management of risks	30		180
2. Financial management & forecasting	2a) Robust cost control in line with Contract 2b) Accurate and timely submission of forecasting and invoices	20		120
3. Personnel	3a) Performance of team leader (including managing staffing levels, staff performance and sub-contractors) 3b) Performance of team and appropriate level of expertise / skill level of personnel allocated to project 3c) Key resources proposed at Contract award still appropriately allocated to project or have been replaced by an acceptable equivalent 3d) Ability to problem solve and address issues with appropriate escalation channels	20		120
4. Client Relationship Management	4a) Extent to which supplier is responsive and flexible to DFID and stakeholder needs 4b) Regularity of communication with DFID and delivery of agreed action points 4c) To what extent does supplier ensure that they are aligned to current DFID priorities 4d) Project Team provide a professional service and demonstrates willingness to improve partnership with DFID and project stakeholders	20		120
5. Continuous Improvement & Innovation	5a) Provider has sought to improve on the last reporting period's performance 5b) Supplier proactively promotes innovation in programme 5c) Ability to maximise value for money for DFID including flexibility to scale up or down quickly as appropriate 5d) Actively capturing and sharing lessons learnt	10		60
TOTAL		100		600

In line with the maximum total score of 600, the proposed payment % structure shall be as follows:

Total Score	Payment
400 and above	100%
200-399	80%
100-199	40%
99 and below	10%

## Annex 2: Data available from GEC-T

### Standardised data

Type of data	Variables	Methodology for aggregating	Period	Notes
Learning	Literacy Numeracy	Number of girls additionally learning (above control/comparison/benchmark levels) extrapolated from outcome learning data.	Midline and Endline	Learning data will be available for all projects. The data comes from EGRA/EGMA tests and adapted higher level SEGMA/SEGMA tests based on a blue print provided by the FM. Each project uses their own set of tests which are adapted to fit the local context (curriculum and girls learning levels)
Learning	Literacy and numeracy results cut by key sub groups/characteristics	Extrapolated from evaluation reports and aggregated to the beneficiary population.	Baseline, Midline, Endline	There may be some missing variables for particular projects.
Learning	Literacy and numeracy results cut by- barrier	Extrapolated from evaluation reports and aggregated to the beneficiary population.	Baseline, Midline, Endline	



Transition	Girl's successfully transitioning	Number of girls transitioning successfully (as defined by projects) and additionally transitioning (above control/comparison/benchmark levels) extrapolated from evaluation data.	Midline and Endline	Data will be available for all projects. Note: successful transition is not limited to the move from primary to secondary but also next grade, transition to TVET or age appropriate employment. It is project defined for their context and group of girls. Project reports will document this definition clearly.
Transition	Transition rates cut by subgroup/characteristics	Extrapolated from evaluation reports and aggregated to the beneficiary population	Baseline, Midline, Endline	
Transition	Transition by barrier	Extrapolated from evaluation reports and aggregated to the beneficiary population.	Baseline, Midline, Endline	

Disability (as defined by Washington Group questions)	Overall disability prevalence and cut by impairment type	Extrapolated from evaluation reports and aggregated to the beneficiary population.	Baseline, Midline, Endline	Data will be available for all projects. Two sets of the WG questions were used: guidance stated if more than 50% of the baseline sample was under 12 then the longer set should have been used, if more than 50% were 12 or over the shorter set could be used. Disability focused projects were asked to use the longer set of questions.
Characteristics	Age Grade Orphan Married Mothers Poor households Language difficulties Parental education	Extrapolated from evaluation reports and aggregated to beneficiary sample.	Baseline, Midline, Endline	All projects may not provide data against each type of characteristic

Barriers	Safety getting to school Distance to school Chore burden Parental support for school Self-reported attendance Access to school facilities Girl reported teacher absence	Extrapolated from evaluation reports and aggregated to beneficiary sample.	Baseline, Midline, Endline	Not all projects may provide data against the same barriers. This data is all quantitative (survey collected). Project reports also include some qualitative data on barriers to education but this has not been collated across the portfolio.
----------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Data available at project level only (not collected in standardised format)

Type of data	Variables	Information available	Period	Notes
Third learning outcome	Financial literacy O-level results	Changes in scores for the third learning outcome over time. These are project specific and cannot be aggregated.	Midline and Endline	Only a small number of projects selected a third learning outcome.
Transition	Barriers to transition	Reasons for sample girls dropping out from HHS. Qualitative data on barriers.	Midline and Endline	Quantitative data on barriers, e.g. survey questions, will mostly be comparable. Qualitative data will be project specific and found at the individual project report level.

Sustainability	School, community and system level	Change in scores for overall sustainability across the evaluation. These are derived from indicators that are composed of quantitative and qualitative data.	Baseline, Midline, Endline	These are project specific indicators.
Learning – foundational literacy and numeracy	Proficiency levels for each subtask	Proficiency mapping in evaluation reports, i.e. proportion of non-learners, emergent, established and proficient learners for each skill type, e.g. addition, subtraction, reading.	Baseline, Midline, Endline	Uniform bands used for proficiency. However, difficulty of the subtasks may vary across projects.
Learning – literacy and numeracy	Grade mapping	Girls level in literacy and numeracy as determined by EGRA/EGMA and SEGMA/SEGMA subtasks and mapped to grade expectations based on the curriculum (project and EE led exercise) in evaluation report. Shows the percentage of girls achieving their grade level vs. grade levels below and above.	Baseline, Midline, Endline	The mapping is unlikely to be exact but should be indicative of any skills gaps. The FM does not verify this mapping as it is country and curriculum specific.
Intermediate outcomes	Attendance	Girls self-reported attendance Caregiver reported attendance for girls Classroom attendance and enrolment registers Spot checks by EE	Baseline, Midline, Endline	Attendance rates are calculated differently across projects and data is of varying quality.
Intermediate outcomes	School governance and management	Project specific school level indicators such as proportion of schools with school improvement plans created, number of parent committees etc. Qualitative data	Baseline, Midline, Endline	

Intermediate outcomes	Quality of teaching	Teacher surveys (self-reported) Classroom observations Girl's school survey Qualitative data	Baseline, Midline, Endline	
Intermediate outcomes	Community based attitudes and behaviour change	Household surveys – self reported caregiver attitudes and behaviours Qualitative data	Baseline, Midline, Endline	
Intermediate outcomes	School related gender-based violence	Household and school survey questions on corporeal punishment Classroom observations Qualitative data	Baseline, Midline, Endline	Some consistency due to use of HHS questions
Intermediate outcomes	Economic empowerment	HHS questions Composite of economic empowerment: income and savings data		Refer to household survey tool and school survey tool
Intermediate outcomes	Life skills (LS) and self-esteem (SE)	Data from project specific tools, e.g. CARE Youth Leadership Index. Life Skills set of questions included in the HHS	Baseline, Midline, Endline	

Girls characteristics data requested from projects in evaluation reports

	Intervention (Baseline)	Control (Baseline)	Source (Household and Girls School survey)
<b>Sample breakdown (Girls)</b>			
<b>Orphans (%)</b> - Single orphans - Double orphans			PCG_11g PCG_13g
<b>Living without both parents (%)</b>			PCG_10g PCG_12g
<b>Living in female headed household (%)</b>			HH_8
<b>Married (%)</b>			PCG_22g
<b>Mothers (%)</b> - Under 18 - Under 16			PCG_23g
<b>Poor households (%)</b> - Difficult to afford for girl to go to school - Household doesn't own land for themselves - Material of the roof (material to be defined by evaluator) - Household unable to meet basic needs - Gone to sleep hungry for many days in past year			PCG_7enr  PCG_11econ  PCG_2econ  PCG_5econ  PCG_7econ
<b>Language difficulties:</b> - Lol different from mother tongue (%) - Girl doesn't speak Lol (%)			PCG_2enr  PCG_3enr

<b>Parental education</b> - HoH has no education (%) - Primary caregiver has no education (%)			HH_13  PCG_6
<b>Sample breakdown (Boys)</b>			
<i>Where data has been collected for boys, please provide the sample breakdown below using the same categories from above as far as possible.</i>			

Girls barriers data requested from projects in evaluation reports

	Intervention (Baseline)	Control (Baseline)	Source
<b>Sample breakdown (Girls)</b>			
<b><i>Home – community</i></b>			
<b><i>Safety:</i></b>			
Fairly or very unsafe travel to schools in the area (%)			PCG_9
Doesn't feel safe travelling to/from school (%)			CS_W13s
<b><i>Parental/caregiver support:</i></b>			
<i>Sufficient time to study:</i> High chore burden (evaluator to specify threshold, %)			PCG_26g
Doesn't get support to stay in school and do well (%)			HHG_7
<b><i>School level</i></b>			
<b><i>Attendance:</i></b>			

Attends school half the time (%)			PCG_6enr
Attends school less than half time (%)			PCG_6enr
Doesn't feel safe at school (%)			CS_W14s
<b>School facilities:</b>			
No seats for all students (%)			CS_W5s
Difficult to move around school (%)			CS_W6s
Doesn't use drinking water facilities			CS_W7s
Doesn't use toilet at school			CS_W9s
Doesn't use areas where children play/ socialise			CS_W11s
<b>Teachers:</b>			
Disagrees teachers make them feel welcome			CS_WA
Agrees teachers treat boys and girls differently in the classroom			CS_1s
Agrees teachers often absent from class			CS_2s



**Annex 3**  
**SEGRA and SEGMA Guidance**

As included in the Invitation to Tender pack.

## Annex 4

### Project Level Budget Expenditure

#### Financial Management System (FMS) expenditure

Project level expenditure is reported and verified quarterly to the GEC Fund Manager under the following categories by output in Table 1.

**Table 1**

Cost Category 1 (CC1)	Cost Category 2 (CC2)
<b>Central Administration</b>	Fees – local
	Fees - international
	L and, building and construction
	IT and Office equipment
	Vehicles
	Expenses relating to assets
	Travel - local
	Travel - International
	Hotel accommodation and subsistence costs
	Education supplies
	Training material costs
	Grants or bursaries
	Overheads
	Taxes
	Any other costs not covered by the above
<b>Monitoring and Evaluation</b>  <b>Project Delivery</b>	Fees – local
	Fees - international
	Land, building and construction
	IT and Office equipment
	Vehicles
	Expenses relating to assets
	Travel - local
	Travel - International
	Hotel accommodation and subsistence costs
	Education supplies
	Training material costs
	Grants or bursaries

	Support Costs
	Taxes
	Any other costs not covered by the above

The FM does not receive activity level expenditure from projects.  
However, activity based budgeting is done for all projects at proposal stage.

### Analysed expenditure

The FM analyses FMS expenditure against activities delivered in a yearly VfM economy analysis. This allows the FM to estimate project expenditure per unit delivered (e.g. cost per teacher trained). The list of expenditure analysed in the VfM economy analysis is listed in Table 2. Projects are not required to report this level of detailed expenditure to the FM.

**Table 2**

<b>Classroom / Student Materials</b>
Materials for girls with disability
Sanitary packs
Solar lamps
Student kits
Teacher supplies / kits / course materials / classroom kits
Textbooks
Training manuals / materials
Uniforms
<b>Construction</b>
Classrooms constructed
Classrooms furnished or refurbished
Libraries / reading corners constructed
school grounds improved
Schools constructed
WASH facilities / Girl friendly latrines / toilets built
<b>Hiring/payment of teachers</b>
Grants / Stipends / Incentives for trainee teachers or teacher assistants
Teachers hired / paid
<b>Stipends, scholarhsips, cash transfers</b>
Families / parents with IGA training

Grants for IGAs
Secondary scholarships / bursaries
Stipend / bursary / scholarships / cash transfers
Vocational scholarship / bursaries
VS&L / SACCOs groups formed and/or supported
Womens /Mothers groups set-up and/or supported
<b>Training of teachers</b>
Head teachers trained
Pre-service teachers trained
Teacher assistants / apprentices trained
Teacher trainers trained
Teachers trained
Teachers trained, classroom management
Teachers trained, Financial literacy
Teachers trained, gender responsive pedagogy
Teachers trained, ICT
Teachers trained, Life skills
Teachers trained, literacy / numeracy
Teachers trained, STEM
Teachers trained, vocational

## Annex 5

### The GEC Theory of Change

The programme level Theory of Change was developed by DFID's Girls' Education Team when the GEC Phase II Business Case was drafted. It is included in the published Business Case.

Barriers	Inputs	Outputs	Assumptions	Outcomes
<b>Barriers to access:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inability to meet cost of education</li> <li>• Gender norms that restrict adolescent girls' aspirations and mobility.</li> <li>• High burden of household duties and chores</li> <li>• Long distance to school</li> <li>• Disability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meet cost of education</li> <li>• Household and community level interventions that address beliefs and attitudes around adolescent girls</li> <li>• Build/set up new school or CBE</li> <li>• Provide transport to make schools accessible</li> <li>• Encourage parents to support girls' learning</li> <li>• Access and learning aides for disabled girls</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accessible, local schools</li> <li>• Bursaries and loans to make private schools accessible</li> <li>• New schools established</li> <li>• More time for girls to study</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality teachers are deployed to schools and teach</li> <li>• Overcrowding is reduced or its affects overcome</li> <li>• Schools are adequately overseen by gov't to prevent illegal collection of fees</li> <li>• Financial support is effectively targeted at marginalised girls</li> </ul>	Higher enrolment, attendance and retention.
<b>Barriers to attendance:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create a safe, nurturing learning environment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Positive community attitudes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumptions about parental/community attitudes are correct and</li> </ul>	Improved attendance and retention.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of female aspiration and decision making power</li> <li>• Threats to girls' safety and security at and on way to school</li> <li>• Harmful social norms and broader gender discrimination</li> <li>• Age related barriers (e.g. menstruation, early marriage)</li> <li>• Lack of inclusion and gender skills amongst teachers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase women's role in school-based management</li> <li>• Improve teachers' skills and resources for inclusion</li> <li>• Strengthen child protection and reporting mechanisms and other SRGBV interventions</li> <li>• WASH</li> <li>• Community attitudes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increased girls' self-esteem</li> <li>▪ Zero tolerance of violence including sexual violence in schools, ensuring disciplinary action against perpetrators.</li> <li>▪ Supporting safe community transport schemes to school</li> <li>▪ Improved understanding of the nature of multiple barriers leading to marginalisation</li> <li>▪ Improved teaching skills</li> </ul>	<p>can change in a short time frame.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Girls' self-esteem can be measured.</li> <li>• Complementary services meet girls health/social/security needs to enable girls to attend school and learn.</li> </ul>	<p>Improved transition to next year or cycle of education.</p>
<p><b>Barriers to learning:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor teaching methodology</li> <li>• Little focus on assessment of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher training and monitoring of impact</li> <li>• Effective use of technology</li> <li>• Assessment system and training on use of data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improved teacher quality</li> <li>▪ Regular use of assessment data to inform next steps in teaching and training</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Training requirements are accurate and teachers convert into practice.</li> <li>▪ Assessment of learning is possible.</li> </ul>	<p>Higher learning outcomes.</p> <p>Improved attendance and retention of</p>

<p>learning and use of results data to improve learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poor school governance and management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Embed evidence based policy making</li> <li>• Improve school governance</li> <li>• Develop governmental capacity to manage education providers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Effective use of technology</li> <li>▪ Improved use of data to inform learning.</li> <li>▪ Better school governance.</li> <li>▪ Improved understanding of Education officials to monitor learning and respond to evidence.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Technology works, is used in the intended way, and is scalable.</li> <li>▪ Marginalisation and gender understood and targeted by school leadership.</li> <li>▪ Governments regulate/oversee schools, including private and community based schools, and are able to do so without stifling their capacity to innovate.</li> <li>▪ Data is provided in an accurate, useful and timely manner.</li> </ul>	<p>marginalised girls.</p> <p>Improved transition to next year or cycle of education.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## Annex 6

### Duty of Care Risk Assessments - Sierra Leone and Kenya

RISK	Overall Security	Violent Crime	Civil Disorder	Terrorism	FCO Travel Advice	Transportation	War	Hurricane	Earthquake	Flood	Medical Services
Sierra Leone	3	3	3	2	2	3	1	1	2	3	3
Kenya	4	5	5	4	3	3	1	1	3	3	3
	1	2	3	4	5						
	Very Low Risk	Low Risk	Medium Risk	High Risk	Very High Risk						
	Low		Medium	High Risk							



## Duty of Care Risk Assessments - Pakistan

Theme	DFID RISK SCORE										
Province	Islamabad Capital Territory & Rawalpindi	Punjab (north) including Lahore	Punjab (south)	Sindh (north)	Sindh (south) including Karachi	Baluchistan	FATA	Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (south) including Peshawar	Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (north and east)	Karakorum Highway (KKH)	Gilgit-Baltistan (except KKH)
Overall Rating*	2	3	3	4	4	5	5	4	3	3	2
FCO Travel Advice	2	2	2	3	2	4	4	4	3	4	2
Host Nation Travel Advice	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Transportation	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Security	2	3	3	4	4	5	5	4	4	4	3
Civil Unrest	4	4	3	3	4	2	4	4	3	2	3
Violence/crime	3	3	4	4	5	4	4	4	3	3	2
Terrorism	3	3	3	3	4	5	5	5	3	3	3
Conflict (war)	2	2	2	2	2	4	5	3	2	2	2
Hurricane	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Earthquake	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	4	4	4
Flood / Tsunami	2	4	4	4	4	3	2	2	2	2	2
Medical Services	1	2	3	3	2	4	4	3	3	4	4
Nature of Project Intervention											

1 Very Low Risk	2 Low Risk	3 Medium Risk	4 High Risk	5 Very High Risk
Low		Medium	High	