REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL

Modification #1

Date: February 3, 2020
Subject: Request for Proposal (RFP) for Baseline study of McGovern-Dole (McGovern-Dole) International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program in Mauritania

Q&A February 14, 2020
RFP Number: CPI-MGD-RFQ 01/2020
Offer Deadline: February 28, 2020
Submission: procurement.mauritania@counterpart.org

NB: This RFP is subject to change pending donor approval.

Counterpart International (hereinafter Counterpart) is soliciting proposals for a firm as described in this Request for Proposals (RFP). These services are required under the “Future is Ours” Project in Mauritania under the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program (hereinafter “the Award”) by the issuing United States Department of Agricultural (hereinafter USDA).

Firms invited by Counterpart (hereinafter “bidders or Offerors”) to submit offers (hereinafter “bids” or “offers”) for the services described in the attached supply schedules are under no obligation to do so. The Bidder shall bear all costs associated with the preparation and submission of the Proposal, Counterpart will in no case be responsible or liable for those costs, regardless of the conduct or outcome of the solicitation.

This Request for Proposals includes the following sections:

I. Instructions to Bidders
II. Technical Specifications

All correspondence and/or inquiries regarding this RFP should be requested in accordance with the enclosed Instructions to Bidders (Section I, Clause 10, Clarifications).

The Instructions to Bidders (henceforth ITB) shall not form part of the bid or of the consultancy. They are intended to aid bidders in the preparation of bids. For the purposes of interpretation of these ITB, unless otherwise stated, the number of days stated herein shall be consecutive calendar days.

Submission of bids should be completed in accordance with the enclosed instructions to Bidders (Section I, Clause 11, Submission of Bids).
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SECTION I – INSTRUCTIONS TO BIDDERS (ITB)

1. Introduction

1.1 RFP No. CPI-MGD-RFQ 01/2020 Baseline study dated February 3, 2020: Counterpart, acting on behalf of The Future is Ours, is hereby soliciting bids for a consultant/firm that will carry out the baseline evaluation for the project as described in Section II of the ITB.

2. Eligible Source Countries for Goods and Services

2.1 A bidder will be considered ineligible if it has been suspended, debarred, or ineligible, as indicated on (1) the “List of Parties Excluded from Federal Non-Procurement Programs” and/or (2) the “Consolidated Lists of Designated Nationals”.

3. Preparation of Bids

3.1 Bidders are expected to examine the specifications and all instructions contained in this RFP. Failure to do so shall be at the Bidder's risk.

3.2 The Bid prepared by the Bidder and all correspondence related to the Bid and exchanged by the Bidder and Counterpart shall be in English.

4. Contents of Bid

4.1 Submitted bids are required to consist of the following documents:

   Technical Proposal
   The applicant shall submit a full technical proposal to Counterpart via an electronic submission with the following documents:

   i) CVs of Proposed professional Staff
   Lead evaluator qualifications
   a. Resume/CV of the lead evaluator of the firm that demonstrates at least 5-7 years of solid experience in evaluating USG-funded program/project (preferably USDA-funded projects), especially in Sub-Saharan Africa. Prior experience working in Mauritania is a plus.
   b. The lead evaluator should have a master’s degree (PhD preferred) in social science (Education, Anthropology, Economics, Sociology), and excellent knowledge and experience in education program evaluation including school feeding programs.
   c. The lead evaluator of the firm should demonstrate expertise and experience in the techniques, approaches and methodology related to the collection and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data: sampling techniques, focus groups, surveys, semi-structured interviews, crossing data, and content analysis. S/he shall also have professional experience in conducting sociological surveys in the field of international development, preferably in education, health, poverty, literacy and/or school feeding projects.
   d. The lead evaluator should have excellent knowledge and experience in education program evaluation including administrating Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) methodologies.

   Associate consultant:
   a. Resume/CV of the associate evaluator that demonstrates at least 5 years of solid experience MS in statistics, international development or any related background.
b. Experience and knowledge in the use of electronic data collection tools in evaluations.
c. Background in statistics and evaluation methods that use counterfactual and experimental/quasi-experimental approach with cohort analysis experience.
d. Experience in data processing, analysis and reporting.
e. Ability to hire experienced enumerators that are proficient in French and Arabic. **Fluency in French is required.** If the proposal is submitted by a consortium of partners, qualifications of each proposed partner should be presented.

ii) **Proposed methodology and structure of the evaluation, which will include:**
- Proposed sampling methodology
- Proposed evaluation design with a detailed description of tools to be used
- Team composition and structure
- Quality control method and tools

iii) **Workplan, which will include:** Detailed timeline of activities – in days is required for each stage of the baseline evaluation. It is important to note that the baseline survey will not exceed three months from contract signature to submission of final report to USDA.

iv) **References:** The applicant is required to submit three references with email and telephone contact information related to past experiences of evaluation research.

Price Quote: An itemized budget in US dollars. The contract will be at a firm fixed price and should not exceed USD 200,000. All costs associated with logistics such as transportation should be included in the evaluator’s budget.

5. **Format and Signing of Bid**

5.1 The Bidder shall prepare one bid in two parts (technical and price quote) with all the required sections of the proposal and shall be signed by a person duly authorized to bind the Bidder.

6. **Price Quote**

6.1 Bidders shall prepare a price quote in a Microsoft Excel document specifying the detailed cost breakdown and the total price of the services offered in response to this RFP. The Bid shall clearly indicate that the prices shall be for the services of technical specifications described in Section II.

6.2 The Bidder shall indicate the unit price in USD for each service, the description, the quantity, and the total cost in USD of the Bid. If there is any discrepancy between the unit price and the total amount, the unit price shall be considered as correct and the total amount adjusted accordingly. It shall be assumed that the Bidder is not bidding on any item for which a unit price or total amount is not indicated.

7. **Statement of Qualifications**

7.1 The Bidder shall include in its bid evidence its technical qualifications and ability to perform if the bid is accepted. This shall consist of references to successful prior projects of a similar
nature. These references should include contact names, e-mail addresses, and telephone numbers of persons who can be contacted regarding the Bidder's prior performance.

8. **Bid Validity Period**

8.1 Bids shall remain valid for **ninety (90) days** after the offer deadline. A bid valid for a shorter period shall be rejected as non-responsive.

9. **Deadline and Late Bids**

9.1 It is the Bidder’s sole responsibility to ensure that bids are received by Counterpart on or before the offer deadline of **February 28, 2020**. Only electronic submissions will be accepted. Faxed bids will not be accepted.

9.2 A Bid received after the deadline for submission of bids shall be rejected. Bidders will be held responsible for ensuring that their bids are received in accordance with the instructions stated herein and a late bid will not be considered even though it became late as a result of circumstances beyond the Bidder's control. A late bid will be considered only if the sole cause was attributable to Counterpart, its employees or agents.

10. **Clarification of Bidding Documents**

10.1 All questions pertaining to this RFP must be submitted by **February 14, 2020**. Questions may be submitted, in written form, to: procurement.mauritania@counterpart.org. Questions will be answered three (3) business days after the Q&A period closes via email.

11. **Submission of Bids**

11.1 Only electronic submissions will be accepted. All bids with technical and price schedule must be received by **February 28, 2020** to procurement.mauritania@counterpart.org. Please submit as a Word document and/or PDF and include in the subject line “Mauritania McGovern-Dole Baseline Evaluation.” The technical proposal should not exceed 20 pages excluding relevant attachments.

11.2 Ensuring successful transmission and receipt of the bids is the responsibility of the Bidder. It is recommended that no e-mail exceeds the size of 10 MB, inclusive of attachments.

12. **Amendment of Bidding Documents**

12.1 Counterpart may at its discretion, for any reason, whether at its own initiative or in response to a clarification by a Bidder, modify bidding documents by amendment. All prospective Bidders that have received bidding documents will be notified of the amendment by e-mail and such amendments will be binding on them.

13. **Modification of Bids**

13.1 Any Bidder has the right to withdraw, modify, or correct its bid after it has been delivered to Counterpart, provided the request for such withdrawal, modification, or correction is received by Counterpart by the deadline above. Counterpart may ask any Bidder for a clarification of its bid; nevertheless, no Bidder will be permitted to alter its Bid Price or make any other material modification after the deadline unless the RFP has been amended or the deadline extended.
14. **Criteria for Award and Evaluation**

14.1 Subject to Clause 15, Counterpart will award the consulting position to that Bidder whose proposal is deemed acceptable and which offers the best value based upon the evaluation criteria in Section II – Technical Specifications – Evaluation Criteria. For a bid to be deemed acceptable, it must comply with all the terms and conditions of the RFP without material modification. In addition, the successful bidder must have the technical expertise, management capability, workload capacity, and financial resources to perform the work. Counterpart may, at its option, reject all bids.

15. **Counterpart’s Right to Accept Any Bid and to Reject Any or All Bids**

15.1 Counterpart will reject any bid that is nonresponsive. Furthermore, Counterpart reserves the right to waive any minor informalities in the bids received if it appears in Counterpart’s best interests to do so, to reject the bid of any bidder if, in Counterpart’s judgment, the bidder is not fully qualified to provide the services as specified in this RFP or to reject all bids.

16. **Notification of Award**

16.1 Before the expiration of the period of bid validity, Counterpart will notify the successful Bidder in writing that its bid has been accepted.

16.2 Upon the successful Bidder acknowledging receipt of the Notification of Award, Counterpart will promptly notify each unsuccessful Bidder that their bids were rejected. If after notification of award, a Bidder wishes to ascertain the grounds on which its bid was not selected, it should address its request to Counterpart in writing.
SECTION II – TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS

1. **Background**

Counterpart is seeking a qualified consultant/firm to conduct the baseline study for the newly funded Mauritania McGovern-Dole program named *The Future is Ours!* This five-year program (2019 – 2024) will assist the Government of Mauritania to reduce hunger, improve health, and strengthen the primary education system. Implemented in Brakna and Gorgol regions of Mauritania, the program will serve 209 schools through integrated activities aligned with national education and health policies. The baseline study will be performed between *March to June 2020* and will feature surveys as well as recommendations on indicators for the evaluations that will follow.

USDA requests that baseline information be collected by the project within 6 (six) months of project award date, in order to set accurate and realistic targets and to enable the project to monitor progress and performance throughout the project. Counterpart expects this baseline study to be fully integrated in the body of information that the project will use for performance monitoring and evaluation, and for learning.

These services will be implemented between *March and June 2020*, with completion of data collection before the start of Ramadan on April 23, 2020.

2. **Roles and Responsibilities**

- **Develop a rigorous evaluation design given rules of implementation and feasibility of options:** Using the program logic as the foundation, independent evaluators must assess the program design and implementation to develop the most rigorous evaluation design feasible given the context. The consultant is responsible for developing an evaluation design report, in consultation with Counterpart and USDA, which summarizes the evaluation design, sampling, analysis plan, and other critical design elements of the evaluation.

- **Support Counterpart and USDA to build buy-in and ownership of evaluation:** The consultant will meet with Ministry of Education and local stakeholders to develop the evaluation design based on program design and implementation. When possible, the consultant will work with Counterpart and other local partners to advise on a program implementation roll-out plan that enables a rigorous evaluation design. In addition, the consultant will continuously present the evaluation objectives, materials, and results for Counterpart and local stakeholders to maintain commitment to the evaluation.

- **Develop evaluation materials that are held to international standards:** Using the program logic as a foundation, the independent evaluators define how key outcomes will be measured and develop the survey instruments or other data collection tools in order to answer critical evaluation questions.

- **Ensure appropriate review of evaluation materials and research protocols:** Independent evaluators are responsible for ensuring all evaluation materials, including the evaluation design, survey instruments, sampling strategy, data collection and entry protocols are appropriately reviewed. The independent evaluators will document all approvals and informed consent procedures throughout the evaluation time period.

- **Manage and supervise all data collection:** The independent evaluator is responsible for all data collection work.

- **Lead data cleaning, analysis, interpretation of results:** The consultant is responsible for leading any necessary data cleaning and consultation with the data collection firm to produce final analysis
files. The consultant is responsible for leading all analysis in line with the agreed analysis plan developed with Counterpart, and consulting with Counterpart should the analysis plan need to be revised or adapted.

- **Produce evaluation reports**: The consultant is responsible for sharing initial evaluation reports with local stakeholders and Counterpart for review and feedback. The consultant is responsible for documenting all feedback and responses.

- **Lead public dissemination efforts**: The consultant is responsible for leading public dissemination efforts facilitated by USDA and Counterpart such as local workshops, conferences or other opportunities to publicly disseminate the results of the evaluation. The evaluator will advise Counterpart on any public dissemination opportunities and collaborate as appropriate.

3. **Goal of the Evaluation**

   The baseline study will produce quantitative data used to compare progress on the midterm, final and impact evaluations. It will also produce qualitative findings that will themselves be used for comparison but also to help guide program strategy and implementation. Counterpart expects the baseline study to provide information on contextual factors that may slow or accelerate the changes that the program expects to make. This information should enable project staff to validate the design of the project and, if needed, recalibrate its interventions. The contextual factors should focus on, among others, governance at the school, community, and national levels, perceived nutritional and health needs of the beneficiaries, as well as school management committees’ needs in capacity building.

   The potential for “graduation” of the school feeding program should also be a focus of the baseline study. The evaluation should also pay close attention to gender and social inclusion dynamics to ensure that considerations related to gender and social inclusion are factored into future programming. The results of this baseline evaluation should be curated for feedback to project stakeholder groups including beneficiaries.

   During the baseline, the theory of change (ToC) will be improved, with support from the consultant. This will consist of formulating a ToC for each strategic objective. A graphic representation of the ToC will be made to facilitate a better understanding, and the consultant will also prepare a matrix of evaluation questions based on the ToC.

4. **Dissemination**

   The baseline report will be shared with stakeholders including USDA, Ministries such as Ministry of Education, community-based Parent Teacher Associations (PTA), school and community leaders (teachers, mayors, etc.). Per the USDA Monitoring and Evaluation policy, the baseline evaluation report will be made publicly available. The publicly available version of the report will be free from personal identifying information.

5. **Program Overview**

   *The Future is Ours!* program will be implemented by Counterpart International along with its local partners EcoDev, ONG Actions, and regional partner, Associates in Research and Education for Development (ARED). The program will be implemented in phases with different cohorts of beneficiaries and treatments for each phase.

   Local partners, EcoDev, ONG Actions, ARED bring deep networks that anchor the evidence-based set of program activities in local knowledge. Working in 209 schools, *The Future is Ours!* will link national level decision makers to local level school stakeholders by integrating improved student
literacy and nutrition outcomes with school governance, engaging regional health and education actors, and building capacity of the Ministry of Education to improve the quality of primary schools. The program addresses the many challenges facing Mauritanian children and families by working through schools, communities, and government to strengthen institutions and change behaviors, both inside and outside the classroom.

Using best practices in Early Grade Reading (EGRA), a pilot literacy project will test a holistic approach to improve student learning outcomes. This pilot is a component of a larger set of activities that contribute to intermediate and higher-level outcomes as mapped out in the Results Frameworks in the next section.

**Results and Activities**

Improved literacy of school-aged children (Strategic Objective 1) is to be achieved through a) improved quality of literacy instruction, b) greater student in class concentration and c) increased attendance. Improved literacy will be achieved through improved access to school supplies and materials, improved literacy instruction materials and teachers’ attendance, and increased skill and knowledge of teachers and school administrators. Improved attentiveness will be achieved by increased access to food through school feeding. Improved student attendance and enrollment will result from increased access to food, reduced health absences and improved school infrastructure. This pathway is illustrated in the results framework below.

Policy results which support the implementation and sustainability of Strategic Objective 1 are increased capacity of government institutions, improved policy and regulatory framework, increased government support, and increased engagement of local organizations and community groups.

Increased use of health, nutrition and dietary practices (Strategic Objective 2) will be achieved through improved knowledge of health and hygiene practices, of safe food preparation, and storage, and of nutrition, increased access to water and sanitation services, increased access to preventative health interventions and to food preparation and storage tools and equipment. The effectiveness and sustainability of SO2 are supported by the same policy results as for SO 1.
Results Framework for Improved Literacy of School-Age Children

- Improved Quality of Literacy Instruction (MGD 1.1)
  - More Consistent Teacher Attendance (MGD 1.1.1)
  - Better Access to School Supplies & Materials (MGD 1.1.2)
  - Improved Literacy Instructional Materials (MGD 1.1.3)
  - Increased Skills and Knowledge of Teachers (MGD 1.1.4)
- Improved Attentiveness (MGD 1.2)
- Increased Student Attendance (MGD 1.3.1)
- Improved Health-Related Absences (MGD 1.3.2)
- Increased Community Understanding of Benefits of Education (MGD 1.3.5)
- Improved School Infrastructure (MGD 1.3.3)
- Increased Student Enrollment (MGD 1.3.4)

Activities
- Activities 7: Supplies & materials; 8 establish activities to promote literacy; 9 extracurricular activities; 10 production of books & supplementary reading materials
- Activities 8: Establish activities to promote literacy; 19 training school administrators
- Activities 12: Provide energy-saving stoves
- Increased Access to Food (School Feeding) (MGD 1.2.1.1, 1.3.1.1)
- Increased Use of Health, Nutrition & Dietary Practices (See RF2) (MGD 1.2.2)
- Activities 2: Building/rehabitation; 3 building/rehab warehouses & storerooms
- Activities 14: Raising community & parental awareness of the importance of education

Increased Capacity of Government Institutions (MGD 1.4.1)
- Activities 1: Building local, regional, national level; 8 establish activities to promote literacy

Increased Policy & Regulatory Framework (MGD 1.4.2)
- Activity 1: Building local, regional, national level

Increased Government Support (MGD 1.4.3)
- Activity 1: Building local, regional, national level

Increased Engagement of Local Organizations & Community Groups (MGD 1.4.4)
- Activity 1: Building local, regional, national level; 8 establish activities to promote literacy; 9 extracurricular activities; 19 training school administrators; 21 training government officials

---

Results Framework for Improved Literacy of School-Age Children
Results Framework for Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices

- Increased Knowledge of Health & Hygiene Practices (MGD 2.1)
- Increased Knowledge of Safe Food Prep & Storage Practices (MGD 2.2)
- Increased Knowledge of Nutrition (MGD 2.3)
- Increased Access to Clean Water & Sanitation Services (MGD 2.4)
- Increased Access to Preventative Health Interventions (MGD 2.5)
- Increased Access to Requisite Food Prep & Storage Tools & Equipment (MGD 2.6)

Activities:
- 16 food prep & storage practices; 17 training: good health & nutrition practices
- 2 building/rehab latrines; 3 building/rehab wells & water station systems
- Activity 6: distribution deworming medication vit/min
- Activities 3 bldg/rehab warehouses storerooms; 12 provide energy-saving stoves

- Increased Capacity of Government Institutions (MGD 2.7.1)
- Improved Policy & Regulatory Framework (MGD 2.7.2)
- Increased Government Support (MGD 2.7.3)
- Increased Engagement of Local Organizations & Community Groups (MGD 2.7.4)

Activities:
- 1 capacity building: local, regional, national level; 17 training: good health & nutrition practices
- Activity 1 capacity building: local, regional, national level
- Activity 1 capacity building: local, regional, national level
- Activity 1 capacity building: local, regional, national level
- 15 training: food prep & storage practices; 17 training: good health & nutrition practices; 18 training parent-teacher associations; 19 training: school administrators; 21 training: government officials
6. Terms of Reference (TOR)

The awarded firm will work under the supervision of Counterpart International’s Program Team based in Mauritania and Washington D.C area. The geographical focus of the program is on Brakna and Gorgol regions in Mauritania. The firm is responsible for the quality of the data collection, data cleaning, analysis and translation of findings into an accurate and high-quality report. To successfully complete the baseline study, the awarded firm must complete the following tasks:

- Operationalize research questions and indicators. Of special interest is the effectiveness of teacher trainings, as well as the research questions on sustainability that will be assessed in terms of government support and capacity.
- Conduct a survey to collect high quality data from treatment and control schools to provide baseline values for the research questions and for program indicators. Data quality is to be ensured through data logic consistency checks and validation rules, as well as ongoing monitoring of data collected during the survey. Key aspects of fieldwork include the following tasks:
  - Identifying control schools
  - Operationalizing research questions for measurement
- Produce a baseline report containing a) descriptive statistics of baseline values including, where appropriate, disaggregated by gender, department, and grade, b) In addition to the descriptive statistics, the report will include recommendations on methodology for implementing subsequent evaluations.

The firm will also provide Counterpart with all data sets in both original and final (cleaned) version used for analysis. The firm will also provide all tools used as well as a survey manual that will inform survey implementation for subsequent evaluations.

Do No Harm

Counterpart International works on the assumption that ethics comes before evidence, in line with the principles of ‘Do No Harm’: ensuring that any kind of intervention does not inadvertently or in any way do harm or worsen the situation. It is essential that any interaction and work carried out as part of this evaluation do not in any way negatively impact the individuals or communities involved. It is critical that during data collection the psychological impact of the research on participants is considered, as well as their physical security.

7. Research Questions

The following research questions will be answered cumulatively by the midterm, final, and impact evaluations. The baseline study therefore must assess the baseline status of these questions. The awardee will be responsible for operationalizing these research questions so that they can be consistently and accurately measured in subsequent evaluations. The operationalization of the research questions will be informed by review of similar evaluations and research, including other MGD evaluations.

McGovern-Dole project level performance
- Have program outputs and outcome targets been achieved? (see “MGD Outcome Indicators that Require Baseline Values” table below)

School feeding and nutrition
- What is the effect of school feeding on attendance, enrollment and attention?
- What is the interaction between school feeding and improved hygiene practices?

Education and Literacy
- How effective are reading-oriented extra-curricular activities in improving literacy?
- How effective are teacher trainings?

**Health and Maternal & Child Health (MCH)**
- What is the effect of deworming medicine on student attendance?
- What is the effect of latrine and water access on student attendance, especially for girls?
- Is there behavioral change in handwashing for students?

**Methodological**
- What is the best way to measure the three undefined MGD outcome indicators (MGD 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3.2)?
- How reliable is school and government-collected attendance and enrollment data? How can the accuracy be improved?

**School Feeding Sustainability**
- What is the government capacity to manage school feeding at regional and national levels?
- What commitment has the government shown regarding school feeding? (e.g. do they have a school feeding policy, clearly defined roles for managing school feeding, plans to expand school feeding budget)?

### Table 1: MGD Outcome Indicators that Require Baseline Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result #</th>
<th>Title in Result Framework</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MGD S01</td>
<td>Improved Literacy of School Aged Children</td>
<td>Percent of students who, by the end of two grades of primary schooling, demonstrate that they can read and understand the meaning of grade level text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGD 1.1</td>
<td>Improved Quality of Literacy Instruction</td>
<td>Number of schools receiving improved literacy instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGD 1.2</td>
<td>Improved Attentiveness</td>
<td>Percent of teachers noting improved attentiveness in students participating in school feeding program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGD 1.3</td>
<td>Improved Student Attendance</td>
<td>Average student attendance rate in USDA supported classrooms/schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGD 1.3.2</td>
<td>Reduced Health-Related Absences</td>
<td>Percentage of schools receiving USDA food security and health assistance which experience a decline in average student absenteeism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGD 1.3.4</td>
<td>Improved Student Enrollment</td>
<td>Number of students enrolled in school receiving USDA assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGD 2.4</td>
<td>Increased Access to Clean Water and Sanitation Services</td>
<td>Number of schools using an improved water source Number of schools with improved sanitary facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGD S02</td>
<td>Increased Use of Health, Nutrition and Dietary Practices</td>
<td>Number of individuals who demonstrate use of safe food preparation and storage practices as a result of USDA assistance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. **Approach and Methodology**

The firm will use a combination of document analysis, stakeholder mapping and stakeholder consultations to create a good situational overview of the current public environment, discourse and stakeholder interaction in relation to the program objectives. Primary data collection tools and sampling plan will be developed by the consultant in close collaboration with the *Future is Ours!* team. A good shared understanding of key concepts and how to best measure them is key for a valid baseline measurement. Furthermore, quantitative tool(s) should be developed that allow for accurate measurement of the relevant indicators and concepts. The focus of quantitative data collection should be on the ultimate target group.

For a more in-depth understanding and analysis of quantitative findings, it is advised to combine the quantitative data collection with more qualitative data from the primary target groups as well as other relevant stakeholders. Especially concerning subjects that are sensitive and difficult to measure through quantitative techniques, such as barriers to attending schools for girls, a well-described and culturally sensitive methodology is requested. Tools should be piloted prior to full scale data collection to resolve any issues with formulation, length, or data entry.

**Design overview**

The survey conducted for the baseline study will include treatment and control schools. Treatment schools will be those where the program is implemented while control schools will be the ones outside of the program implementation area. The awardee will select control schools using the same criteria used for choosing treatment schools. Counterpart will provide these criteria to the awardee. Within sampled schools, interviews will be conducted with students, directors, teachers, parents. In addition, interviews will be conducted with government officials to assess capacity and commitment for sustainability. A list of potential respondents for these interviews will be provided to the awardee.

**Document review**

Documents to be reviewed as part of the baseline study include the evaluation plan, the performance monitoring plan, the work plan, the proposal, USDA Monitoring and Evaluation policy as well as baseline studies and evaluations for other McGovern-Dole projects.

**Enumerator recruitment and data collection training**

The evaluation firm will identify and recruit local enumerators for data collection who should have a bachelor’s degree and experience conducting applied research, surveys and evaluations. Given the nature of the research, Counterpart has a strong preference for both female and male enumerators. During the data collection training, supervisors can be identified.

The evaluation firm will be responsible for developing a Data Collection Manual for review by the Counterpart team prior to training. The firm will also be responsible for printing all data collection instruments for training, incorporating (and translating) any revisions to instruments following the training and pilots, and printing all instruments for data collection. **The data collection must be completed before the start of Ramadan on April 23, 2020.**

**Pilot survey**

The awardee is required to conduct a pilot survey to test all questionnaires. The pilot is especially important because questions phrasing will be used for the subsequent evaluations and must elicit accurate responses. Sufficient time must be allocated for updating all instruments based on pilot findings.

**Survey**

Sampling for the student surveys will use a two-stage cluster design with the first stage being school selection and the second student selection. The exact sample sizes will be left to the firm conducting...
the baseline study. However, all sampling will comply with the 95 percent confidence level, 5 percent margin of error standard. Sample designs for teachers and directors will also meet this 95 percent, 5 percent standard.

**Reading Tools**
The evaluations will use Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) methodologies. EGRA is another reading assessment tool that has been used with McGovern-Dole evaluations in other countries. A baseline EGRA, Snapshot of School Management and Effectiveness (SSME) survey, and a language mapping assessment will inform the design of materials, teacher training and community mobilization activities.

**Data entry, cleaning and analysis**
The local data collection firm is responsible for entering all data collected under this evaluation. This includes double-entry of all survey data. Survey data must be entered in Excel files. Supervisor(s) will conduct thorough data checks and submit to Counterpart a final, clean dataset. Data collection firm will also prepare and deliver a codebook to accompany the final dataset. Survey data analysis will be carried out using an appropriate statistical package such as R or Stata. Analysis will include means and means comparisons by gender, grade and department, along with tests of statistical significance.

**Firms with capacity to collect data using tablets or smart phones are encouraged to propose conducting electronic data entry using tools such as ODK, KoboToolbox, or others. While using electronic data collection, the firm must explain the methodology of programming/testing surveys, cleaning, and submitting electronic data.**

9. **Assignment Timeline, Place of Performance, and Other Conditions**

Counterpart anticipates the preparatory work and review of relevant reports and documents to be completed according to the deadlines presented below.

The first draft of the baseline evaluation report is due to Counterpart on or about June 15, 2020. Once the draft is submitted, Counterpart will have seven business days to review the report, raise concerns, provide comments, and send it back to the evaluator. The evaluator will then address Counterpart’s comments and concerns and submit a revised report to Counterpart for Counterpart and the donor’s review. The final version of the report is due no later than July 2. Should Counterpart still not be satisfied with the quality of the final baseline report, then both Counterpart and the evaluator will negotiate a no-cost extension to ensure both parties are satisfied with the result.

Throughout the baseline evaluation, there must be open communication between the evaluator and Counterpart through phone calls, emails, text messages, Skype calls, or face-to-face meetings for effective coordination between both parties and to ensure that potential issues are resolved in a timely manner. Any anticipated changes to the plan during the evaluation must be submitted in writing and be approved by Counterpart.
### Deliverable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Revised deadline (estimated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deadline of bids submission</td>
<td>March 28, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of firm and signing of contract</td>
<td>March 16, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of Baseline Evaluation Workplan to Counterpart: (Literature review, evaluation design including data collection and analysis methodology; draft sampling strategy, and intended respondents /key informants; quality assurance plan; draft evaluation schedule; and draft data collection tools)</td>
<td>March 30, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize data collection tools and evaluation schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field work: travel and training of data collectors</td>
<td>Up to April 22, 2020 (before Ramadan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Work: testing of the data collection tools and calibrate, data collection and analyses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debriefing on preliminary findings at CPI Field Office and/or CPI HQ</td>
<td>May 15, 2020 (or based on offerors timeline)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of first draft report</td>
<td>June 15, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and comment of first draft (and subsequent drafts as necessary) by Counterpart International, followed by review and comments by USDA</td>
<td>June 16-30, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of final report, datasets and tools</td>
<td>July 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** Field work must take place on or around the suggested dates. The evaluation team must complete field work before April 23, 2020 which marks the beginning of the month of Ramadan.

### 10. Staff Structure

The evaluation team will comprise one international program evaluator (Team Leader), an Associate consultant, and two or more local or international consultants or members of a consulting firm selected for their technical expertise. To the extent possible, the evaluation team will be gender balanced. For full qualifications, see ITB, Section I, 4. Content of Bid, I. Qualifications.

### 11. Baseline Report

The following table outlines requirements for the Final Baseline Report:

| Report Length | Maximum of 40 pages, excluding the Table of Contents, Acronym List, and Annexes and should be written in English; Times New Roman font size 12. |
| Illustrative Report Outline | Acknowledgement  
|                           | Table of Contents  
|                           | Table of Exhibits  
|                           | Acronym List  
|                           | Executive Summary (in English and French)  
|                           | Chapter 1. Evaluation Purpose and Research Questions  
|                           | Chapter 2. Project Background  
|                           | Chapter 3. Evaluation Method  
|                           | 3.1 Methodologies  
|                           | 3.2 Sampling Framework  
|                           | 3.3 Data Sources and Data Collection Methods  
|                           | 3.4 Field Work  
|                           | 3.5 Analysis Plan  
|                           | 3.6 Strengths and Limitations  
|                           | Chapter 4. Findings  
|                           | Chapter 5. Conclusion and Recommendations  
|                           | 5.1 Summary of Key Findings  
|                           | 5.2 Lessons Learned  
|                           | 5.3 Recommendations  
|                           | References  
|                           | Annexes  
| Executive Summary | Include an Executive Summary that provides a brief overview of the evaluation purpose, project background, evaluation questions, methods, findings, and conclusions.  
| Questions | Address all evaluation questions in the Terms of Reference.  
| Methods | • Explain evaluation methodology in detail.  
|         | • Disclose evaluation limitations (e.g. selection bias, recall bias, etc.).  
|         | NOTE: A summary of methodology can be included in the body of the report, with the full description provided as an annex.  
| Findings | • Tables with baseline results, disaggregated by gender, department, and grade.  
|         | • Brief description of each table, including any context or explanation needed to help the reader in interpreting and understanding.  
|         | • Detailed description of findings for methodological research questions and key indicators as described in the Terms of Reference.  
| Recommendations | • Support recommendations with specific findings.  
|                | • Provide recommendations that are action-oriented, practical, and specific.  |
Annexes

Include the following as annexes, at a minimum:

- Terms of Reference
- All evaluation tools (questionnaires, checklists, discussion guides, surveys, etc.).
- A list of sources of information (key informants, documents reviewed, other data sources)

Only if applicable, include as an annex Statement(s) of Differences regarding any significant unresolved differences of opinion on the part of funders, implementers, and/or members of the evaluation.

All deliverables must be approved by Counterpart.

12. Method of payment

Payment will be based on the following milestones:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Evaluation Workplan and Methodology Plan Submission</td>
<td>20% of the total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Data Collection and Field Work; Debriefing</td>
<td>20% of the total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Evaluation Report Submission</td>
<td>25% of the total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report submitted and approved; all data handed over to Counterpart</td>
<td>35% of the total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Roles and Responsibilities

The evaluator will be responsible for all the deliverables listed in the TOR and will be free to draw its own conclusions free from political or organizational pressure. The evaluator will coordinate with Counterpart staff including Senior Program Manager, Program Officer, Director of Program Evaluation and Learning and Counterpart Mauritania Chief of Party with regards to the overall scope, direction, and completion of this assignment. USDA will provide guidance as needed along with feedback on the initial draft, to be included in the final report. USDA will also be consulted as a key informant prior to evaluation fieldwork.

Counterpart staff will provide all relevant reports, data and related information necessary to prepare the evaluator for the assignment. And as needed, Counterpart staff will facilitate field logistics, including potential meetings with all relevant stakeholders during the field visit in Mauritania. The HQ point of contact will be the Senior Program Manager while the in-country point of contact will be the Chief of Party. Counterpart HQ Senior Program Manager is responsible for approving evaluation deliverables.

14. Evaluation Criteria

Proposals for this baseline evaluation will be evaluated based on the following criteria:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Firm (team leader) prior experience in similar work</td>
<td>25 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed overall methodology</td>
<td>25 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed sampling method and data collection and data entry</td>
<td>25 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe for delivery of Evaluation deliverables</td>
<td>5 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of quality control</td>
<td>10 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>10 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Score:</strong></td>
<td><strong>100 points</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When drafting the proposal, the Consultant/Firm should be careful to include all information requested above. Failure to submit a complete application will result in the rejection of the proposal.