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SECTION 1. ABOUT THE PROGRAMME

1.1 General purpose

STiR Education is issuing this RFP to receive proposals from interested agencies to design and implement the impact evaluation of STiR’s programme.

1.2 Programme Background and Context

Educators play a significant role in shaping the minds of millions of students around the world. This makes the educators’ role all the more critical, being an important cog in the wheel of education at every level. The kind of education they provide their students can have a long-lasting impact on them. A positive and wholesome experience can help shape their future positively, while negative experiences can lead to lost opportunities on a huge scale.

Aspiring teachers need specialised training before they begin teaching children or other adults. And education officials hold positions at various levels who keep track of academic progress in schools, colleges, and universities across the country. These roles require specific skill sets as well. With technology becoming more and more accessible, intentional learning has become more popular among both educators and learners worldwide. Intentional learning emphasises self-awareness, reflection, and continuous improvement rather than simply memorising facts or passing tests.

Motivation is a key factor when it comes to educators, who inspire and motivate students to succeed. And this motivation can either be extrinsic or intrinsic. Extrinsic motivation comes from outside influences, like rewards or punishments. When someone’s primary driver is extrinsic, they are likely to disengage if the reward or punishment discontinues. Intrinsic motivation, on the other hand, comes from within. It is a desire to do something because the individual finds the activity satisfying.

Schools and Teachers Innovating for Results (STiR Education) began with a small pilot aimed at finding micro innovations with 25 teachers in Delhi, India, in 2012. The conversations during the pilot indicated that teacher networks could aid intrinsic motivation among the teachers. It could reignite their love for teaching. In 2016, the government of Delhi requested we work with all 1,025 schools across the state. This move paved the path for the pivot towards government learning partnerships, where officials run and manage the approach with STiR support in all the geographies. Thereafter, learnings from a randomised control trial conducted in 2017 led us to focus on improving intrinsic motivation across the system.

By 2018, all STiR programmes in India (Delhi, Karnataka and Uttar Pradesh) and Uganda were implemented through District Learning Partnerships (DLP). We worked with education officials and teachers at the district level in these geographies. Our Tamil Nadu (India) programme was initiated in 2018. STiR ended the Uttar Pradesh programme in December 2019 due to a lack of government buy-in and funding challenges. In early 2020, we revised our theory of change to include the Foundations of Lifelong Learning (FLL) to articulate clearly the change we wanted to witness across the system, especially at the student level. We also introduced the strategic shift towards the Central Learning Partnership (CLP) to ensure that our existing sustainability strategy has central government ownership and leadership.
at its core. STiR began its programme implementation in Indonesia in the year 2022 and is aiming to scale it in the coming years. In early 2023, STiR successfully registered an entity for its programme implementation in Ethiopia.

By 2025, we want to work with our government partners to focus on the importance of intrinsic motivation towards improved learning outcomes and see meaningful progress towards this. Our vision is not to only meet a certain “behaviour change” target. We want to see meaningful progress in behaviour change with a continued focus to deepen them sustainably in the system over time.

1.3 Programme design and the theory of change

We support education systems to reignite intrinsic motivation in every teacher and officials to role-model the foundations of learning for every child. For this, we work in partnership with state and national governments. The systems run the approach from the start with active support from our teams and cover all programme costs from the outset. This ensures long-term ownership and sustainability.

Our interventions are based on three core principles – 1) Peer networks, 2) Action and feedback, and 3) Reflection. These core activities underpin everything we do for teachers, school leaders and officials. These mechanisms are organised into what we call Learning Improvement Cycles (LICs). These LICs last approximately 3 months and are built around monthly teacher network meetings, classroom observation and reflection.

Each LIC focuses on a different theme (e.g., the science of learning). First, district officials are introduced to the content (mainly focused on leadership skills) for the next term in a three-day training meeting. Then they lead training sessions for school leaders to build their confidence and capability to lead teacher network meetings.

At each level, we introduce monthly coaching and support to enable high-quality feedback. And regular alignment meetings at district and state levels provide an opportunity for all stakeholders to analyse data, share learning and develop plans to strengthen the delivery.

Overall, our implementation model is not a cascade model. We work towards building a culture of intrinsic motivation across systems, not just delivering content. So the relationships at every level are necessarily two-way, based on openness, honesty and a commitment to a common goal.

We work towards building a culture of learning across systems, not just delivering content. So, the relationships at every level are necessarily two-way, based on openness, honesty and a commitment to a common goal. Over time, we
expect to see officials and school leaders developing the foundations of learning. They will spend more time in schools supporting and understanding teachers. And recognise their crucial role in driving improvements.

1.4 Monitoring and impact evaluation – Where we are today

To learn if we are making progress against our progress pathway and thereby working toward realizing our vision, we use both qualitative and quantitative approaches for monitoring and evaluation.

We use practical behavioural measures that are consistent across our geographies. We want to see intrinsically motivated students, teachers, education officials, and education leader managers. The following table outlines the specific behaviours we think affect this, and this is what we seek to measure. Since our theory of change describes a role modelling effect from the education officials to the teacher and further to the students, we collect data on a similar set of indicators across these stakeholders.

We employ technology to effectively monitor our programme implementation and progress. Our monitoring data is collected using Survey CTO, a mobile data collection platform that enables data entry even in offline settings. Our data is visualised on Apache Superset (open-source data visualisation and analytics platform). This end-to-end approach to data management is employed given our interest in using these datasets to build predictive models to forecast future programme needs (in the long-term), as well as enabling us to analyse trends and correlations between various moving parts of our programme (in the short-term). Increasingly, our government partners are embedding these indicators in their own data systems.

We also leverage existing learning and data mechanisms in our geographies and seek to integrate with them to build robust data utility systems. We have explored the use of technology to provide timely support at scale for sustaining
motivation amongst our stakeholders. Existing research and evidence around intrinsic motivation in the workplace describes how providing timely support and nudges are effective in sustaining motivation. Aligned with this thought, we have piloted multiple iterations of a WhatsApp Chatbot. One-to-one messaging on WhatsApp uses personalised communication as a tool to increase stakeholder engagement (thereby enabling us to engender one of our 5 core foundational behaviours).

We have also conducted several studies focused on the impact evaluation of our programmes. These studies were designed and implemented through external agencies. Some of the findings from the impact evaluation are as follows:

- **A 2022 survey** of 8,000 teachers in India showed that following their participation in our programme:
  - More than 85% reported improvements in student reading (88%) and numeracy (86%) levels.
  - 94% reported that their classrooms were safer and that their students feel happier in class.

- Two external studies found significant increases in foundational literacy and numeracy outcomes:
  - A 2018 RCT in Delhi (World Bank) found evidence towards statistically significant gains in math learning levels among students, which appear to be driven by gains in the lowest learning levels.
  - A 2015-17 study with ASER in Uttar Pradesh found a 2 percentage-point increase in grade 4 and 5 reading scores.

- Our external longitudinal study data suggests that students taught by STiR teachers had high levels of grit and determination, were engaged and participated meaningfully in classroom activities.

- Failure rates in Uganda have dropped from around 27% to less than 5% annually.

- 99% of the teachers in Uganda reported the support given by school leaders was useful for planning and practice.

### 1.5 Key aspects that need to be considered for designing and implementing the impact evaluation

#### a) Disruption due to Covid-19

STiR has adapted its delivery model and content to support distance learning for education officials, teachers and head teachers via radio in Uganda further to the closing of schools in 2020 and 2021 due to COVID-19. The radio shows might be the first possible exposure some study participants received from STiR’s coaching and role modelling support, and it would be highly useful to understand how it was received, understood and applied. Understanding these experiences can highlight how to expand delivery mechanisms for CPD to ensure better access, quality and value for money for these inputs going forward.

In India, technology was leveraged to reach students and connect education officials. A process for reflection meetings was set up across cadres. Through this, video content containing model examples and best practices was delivered.

#### b) Programme implementation at varying maturity levels

STiR has been responding to the evolving nature of the education ecosystem across its programme geographies. The focus is to ensure a system-led programme which is aligned with the government’s priorities. Under this model, networks are in school, with the head teacher being the Education Leader and all teachers of the school being part of the Network. Teachers meet within their respective schools for the first and second network meetings and meet with about 3 to 5 other neighbouring schools for network meetings. Each of the in-school networks is led by a School Education Leader (SEL) who in most cases is the head teacher or deputy of the school. The SEL is under the leadership of the District Education Leader (DEL).
In addition to the focus through a system-led model, we have been working towards ensuring the sustainability of our programmes. Our Central Learning Partnership (CLP) seeks to ensure that the conditions and mechanisms for governments to deliver the approach are in place and functioning from the very start of our engagement with a system. The core function of our approach then becomes building the capacity of these mechanisms to effectively own the programme, primarily at the central government level.

We have also been focusing on scaling up its programme across India and Uganda, leveraging the existing education system as the core programme infrastructure. This implies changes and adaptations to the delivery model. While the core principles of the intervention remain consistent, the overall model for leading, quality assuring and supporting the intervention has been adapted to fit the system roles and priorities. Continuous scaling-up activities, therefore, create different versions of the programme, affecting the evaluation design itself.

**India**

Currently, we work with government education ecosystem in the states of Delhi, Karnataka, and Tamil Nadu in India. While the core model of our programme remains the same across these states, it is tailored to suit the needs of the education system in these states.

For Karnataka, STiR’s intervention supports the state government’s programme – Kalika Chetaniye, which was introduced post-Covid as a learning recovery programme for school students. In Tamil Nadu, STiR’s intervention is limited to supporting the state government in implementing their Samagra Shiksha programme which aims at improving school effectiveness measured in terms of equal opportunities for schooling and equitable learning outcomes.

Under both these MoUs, STiR supports the education ecosystem at a different level, while adhering as closely as possible to its core design that involves supporting officials and teachers directly aimed at improving intrinsic motivation.

In Delhi, we deliver our support under the flagship Teacher Development Coordinator (TDC) programme in partnership with the Delhi State Council of Educational Research and Training (SCERT) and Directorate of Education (DoE). The TDC program aligns with the state’s priority of strengthening professional development at scale through a co-learning environment. The program has successfully reached all 13 districts in Delhi, covering 1029 schools. The District Institute of Education and Training (DIET) is the academic lead of the program – the 24 facilitators including DIET Principals, DIET lecturers, and block resource persons across Delhi play a central role in the facilitation and operation of the program.

Regular school support is provided through 200 Mentor Teachers appointed by the state, along with the CIM team. The Teacher Development Coordinator is a dedicated role, developed to support teachers in creating schools as learning institutes. The coordinator directly works with all the in school teachers to achieve the vision of the program “A System where everyone can learn”.

The Delhi government recently invited us to expand our work around intrinsic motivation to 1,530 Municipal Corporation of Delhi (MCD) schools. The MCD schools are primary schools catering to grades 1 to 5. They are crucial as they take in children from diverse backgrounds and are responsible for ensuring Foundation Literacy and Numeracy (FLN). We hope to strengthen and amplify the work around FLN and student learning
by mentoring teachers and school officials, working closely with the districts and ensuring a motivated cadre of stakeholders across level.

Uganda
STiR began its programme implementation in Uganda in the year 2017. We are now present in 79 districts in Uganda. We work in partnership with the Ministry of Education and Sports (MoES) and the Association of Secondary School Headteachers of Uganda (ASSHU). Our programme implementation model uses peer networks to motivate and support teachers and local officials. We focus on improving learning outcomes for all children by increasing the abilities of their teachers in classrooms, and improving their interactions with students. We partner with governments to improve their support for teachers and reignite their passion for teaching.

At the heart of our approach are teacher network meetings. In our networks, groups of 20-30 teachers meet monthly within a school or across clusters of local schools. In the meetings, teachers learn new practices (such as effective checking for understanding) to enable higher quality engagement with children. This is reinforced through monthly coaching calls and development-focused peer observations.

Ethiopia
STiR is expecting to begin the implementation of its programme in Ethiopia in the year 2023. The scope of this RFP does not include conducting the impact evaluation of our programme in Ethiopia.

Indonesia
STiR began implementing its programme in Indonesia in the year 2022. We are currently present in 2 districts - Kota Kediri and Kabupaten Lumajang. Our work in Indonesia coincides with the leadership of Minister Nadiem Makarim whose vision is to transform the education system in Indonesia, through the Emancipated Learning (Merdeka Belajar) policy. The philosophy is creating a fun and happy learning environment for students, teachers, the community, and all the people. “Merdeka” or “Free” in terms of freedom from rules that limit the space for the students to create and develop themselves. This focus aligns with STIR’s vision and for our first learning improvement cycle, we focus on the theme “Growth Mindset”. Our programme enables incremental improvements at every level of government education systems that contribute to a system shift. In peer networks, teachers and officials learn new strategies to embed into their professional practice, and we reinforce this learning through monthly coaching and support.

c) Focus towards student-centric outcomes

We have learned over the years that we are able to provide a unique offer to the systems in which we work, through a learning approach that has helped us understand our strengths. More recently we are increasingly focusing on learning the impact of our programmes on student outcomes. While our internal monitoring focuses on student-centric outcomes at the classroom level like engagement, critical thinking, safety, etc., more in-depth focus on academic outcomes at the student level is needed through impact evaluations.

1.6 Deadline for Submitting Proposals

Interested agencies are requested to submit a detailed technical proposal and a detailed financial proposal via email to procurement@stireducation.org by August 7th, 2023 5 PM GMT.

1.7 Definitions
SECTION 2. OBJECTIVES OF THE IMPACT EVALUATION AND SCOPE OF WORK

2.1 Objectives of the Impact Evaluation

The objective of this study is to evaluate the impact of STiR’s programme. This includes answering the following evaluation questions for each of STiR’s programme geographies:

2.1.1. What is the impact of STiR’s programme on student learning outcomes, their foundations of learning, and their socio emotional learning?
2.1.2. To what extent are education officials, teachers, and students intrinsically motivated as a result of engagement with the STiR programme?
2.1.3. What is the impact of STiR’s programme on the education ecosystem? What processes, structures or routines have been established/changed in the government education system as a result of the STiR programme? Are there any spillover benefits to government initiatives/priorities?
2.1.4. What is the Social Return on Investment (SRoI) associated with investing in STiR’s programmes?
2.1.5. To what extent does the STiR programme develop officials’ and teachers’ capacities to be effective learners and role-models?
2.1.6. What is the impact of STiR’s programme on gender and equity?

While we work towards strengthening systems and processes through our programmes, we aim to share the findings of the impact evaluation with our key stakeholders so that they can better understand how best to support our work. Essentially, it would help us understand the context of the ecosystem in which our programmes operate. Therefore, in addition to measuring the impact of our programmes, we would also like to focus on building robust evidence for our Theory of Change (ToC). This will further help us to review and refine our ToC to best suit the changing needs of the ecosystem.

While developing the evidence base, our priority is to understand the impact of our programmes at the student level and at the institution/stakeholder level. For this, we aim to leverage both qualitative and quantitative evaluation approaches. This would help us understand what changes are needed in the future interventions for them to be more effective in achieving their goals.

2.2 Scope of work

The scope of work under this impact evaluation study is as follows:

2.2.1. Conduct a review of the literature to identify potential impact evaluation approaches applied in other studies (peer-reviewed/other credible sources) that may be relevant to STiR and can potentially inform the current impact evaluation design.
2.2.2. Develop a robust impact evaluation framework (including a detailed approach & methodology) to answer the evaluation questions (mentioned under Section V – Objectives). The framework must be tailored to each programme geography based on the programme maturity - Indonesia, India (Delhi, Karnataka, and Tamil Nadu), Uganda, and Ethiopia. The impact evaluation must establish a clear
causal relationship between STiR’s programme and the expected outcomes. This must include both quantitative and qualitative approaches.

2.2.3. Prepare a Logical Framework (log-frame) aimed at facilitating the evaluation with respect to STiR’s Theory of Change.

2.2.4. Develop the evaluation and data collection tools, and translate them into local languages.

2.2.5. Conduct impact evaluation for each of the programme geographies - Indonesia, India (separately for the states of Delhi, Karnataka, and Tamil Nadu), and Uganda. The evaluation must consider the aspects as mentioned under ‘Section 1 - 1.5 Considerations for Impact Evaluation’. This includes conducting primary surveys. Please note that while an evaluation framework needs to be developed for all the programme geographies, the impact evaluation need not be implemented for Ethiopia. However, if budgets allow, it is preferred that a baseline evaluation for Ethiopia is also conducted under the scope of this impact evaluation.

2.2.6. Analyse the quantitative and qualitative data collected during the study and report the findings to answer the evaluation questions separately for each programme geography – India (Delhi – TDC and MCD schools, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu separately), Uganda, and Indonesia.

2.2.7. Benchmark and compare the findings from this study with similar interventions reported in the literature.

2.2.8. Calculate Social Return on Investment (SRoI) associated with investing in STiR’s programmes.

2.2.9. Any other allied information or reports if needed within the scope of work based on the available information.

**SECTION 3. TENTATIVE TIMELINES AND KEY DELIVERABLES**

The project is expected to be completed within a period of 6 months from the date of signing of the contract. The procurement process is expected to be completed by the end of August 2023 and the contract is expected to be signed in September 2023. A list of the key deliverables, along with the timelines, that must be submitted during the project implementation is provided in Table 1 below.

Please note that the actual timeline for the data collection may differ across STiR’s programme geographies based on the availability of the stakeholders (education officials, teachers, and students) and government permissions for the surveys (which would need to be sought at the earliest once there is clarity on the details of the survey, like sample size, potential respondents, survey districts, etc.) which must be ascertained by the selected agency while working on deliverable D2 as per Table 1 below. If government permissions for conducting the surveys do not align with the timelines mentioned below, then these timelines will need to be adjusted accordingly with mutual agreement between STiR and the agency conducting the impact evaluation.

*Table 1: Key Deliverables and Timelines for Submission*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Key Deliverable</th>
<th>Month 1</th>
<th>Month 2</th>
<th>Month 3</th>
<th>Months 4 &amp; 5</th>
<th>Month 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>Inception report <em>(This must include a review of the literature to identify potential impact evaluation approaches)</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. No.</td>
<td>Key Deliverable</td>
<td>Month 1</td>
<td>Month 2</td>
<td>Month 3</td>
<td>Months 4 &amp; 5</td>
<td>Month 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2</td>
<td>Draft impact evaluation framework</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(This must include a logical framework, detailed approach &amp; methodology for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>study, and a mapping of impact evaluation activities along with the respective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>timelines for implementation based on consultations with STIR across each of its</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>programme geographies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Draft impact evaluation tools and data collection tools</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(This must include an English version along with its translated versions in local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>languages for the respective programme geographies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Data collection and regular updates on the progress of the surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5</td>
<td>Draft impact evaluation report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(This must include detailed analysis of the data to answer the 6 evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>questions mentioned under Section V – Objectives for each of the STIR’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>programme geographies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>Final impact evaluation report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(This must include incorporation of the feedback shared for the draft inception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 4. Payment Milestones

Payments shall be made to the selected agency as per the milestones provided in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Payment milestone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Submission Timeline (From the date of signing the contract, T)</th>
<th>Payment Milestone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td>T + 1 Month</td>
<td>30% of the contract value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 and D3</td>
<td>T + 3 Months</td>
<td>30% of the contract value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4, D5, and D6</td>
<td>T + 6 Months</td>
<td>40% of the contract value upon satisfactory submission of all and final reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 5. Required Team Composition of the Proposer Agency

To undertake the assignment, interested agencies must provide a team of researchers to this study who possess the necessary expertise and experience to design and implement a comprehensive and robust impact evaluation for complex social interventions. Among other experts, the following technical experts will necessarily be needed for the study (as shown in Table 3 below).

Table 3: Key technical experts required for the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Expert</th>
<th>Number of Experts</th>
<th>Qualification and Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Lead</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Extensive experience in leading rigorous impact evaluation projects which include experimental and quasi-experimental research designs. S/he should have an advanced degree (preferably PhD) in Economics/Statistics/Education/Social Sciences/any other relevant discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Evaluation Expert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Extensive experience in designing and implementing rigorous impact evaluations which include experimental and quasi-experimental research designs. S/he should have an advanced degree in Economics/Statistics/Education/Social Sciences/any other relevant discipline. Specific experience in designing M&amp;E framework and conducting impact evaluation of complex development projects (preferably in Education) is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Matter Expert (Country Specific)</td>
<td>3 (India, Indonesia, and)</td>
<td>Experienced in managing rigorous quantitative and qualitative research/evaluation. S/he should have an advanced degree in Education/Social Sciences or any relevant discipline. Country expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Expert</td>
<td>Number of Experts</td>
<td>Qualification and Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda/East Africa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>should have experience in conducting education-based research in the respective country/region - India, Indonesia, and Uganda/Africa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analyst**

Experienced in conducting quantitative and/or qualitative research (preferably in education). S/he should have a Master's degree in Economics/Statistics/Education/Social Sciences or any other relevant discipline.

Additionally, experts for any other aspects not mentioned above and field staff/ enumerators/survey supervisors for data collection will be required during the implementation of this project as non-technical experts. The proposer agency is required to propose the required numbers and effort expected to be put in by them in their work plan.

**SECTION 6. CONFIDENTIALITY AND DATA OWNERSHIP**

All data collected under and provided by the selected agency for this assignment is the sole property of STIR Education and may only be used for purposes outlined in this assignment. These data may not be shared with anyone unless explicitly approved in writing by STIR Education. The data must be uploaded to a secure server designated by STIR Education, and the selected agency must adhere to any and all human ethics and confidentiality protocols provided by STIR Education. All the data collected for this assignment must be handed over to STIR Education before closure of the contract. Any publications using these data must be explicitly approved in writing by STIR Education prior to the publication and the logo and name of STIR Education should be acknowledged in the publications.

STIR is GDPR compliant as well as adheres to the in-country data protection laws. The agency will be required to comply with all such laws on data protection and privacy.

**SECTION 7. GUIDELINES FOR THE PROPOSAL SUBMISSION AND SELECTION CRITERIA**

7.1. **Guidelines for the proposal submission**

The technical proposal must include the following sections, among any other sections that the proposer agency deems relevant/useful:

7.1.1. Credentials of the agency – This includes a background of the agency and a list of relevant project experience.

7.1.2. Proposed approach & methodology for the current project – This must include the proposed approach and an assessment of potential risks/threats to answering the 6 evaluation questions mentioned under Section V – Objectives, and a mitigation plan.

7.1.3. Work plan and staffing – A table with the total expected commitment of each team member (in work-days) should be incorporated in the proposal. We will require activity time sheets for such costs.

7.1.4. Credentials of the proposed team – This includes detailed Curriculum Vitae (CV) of all proposed experts.

7.1.5. Tax compliance certificates scan copies to be shared (eg- GST number, VAT number or as applicable in the country of the agency)
The financial proposal must include the overall amount of budget proposed for the assignment, inclusive of all applicable taxes. This amount should then be disaggregated into item-wise expenses to be incurred during the implementation of this assignment. The cost of each deliverable (D1 to D6) must also be clearly mentioned in the financial proposal.

A template for submitting the financial proposal is provided in Annexure-1 (enclosed with this RFP document). This template must be used while submitting the financial proposal. Please note that the financial proposal must be submitted in Microsoft Excel and PDF signed format. Please retain all the Excel formulae in your working sheets. Incomplete applications will not be considered for shortlisting.

7.2. Selection Criteria
Proposals submitted before/by the deadline (mentioned above) shall be evaluated based on the quality of the technical proposal and the budget proposed in the financial proposal.

Financial proposal will be scored out of a maximum score of 100. The lowest bid will be scored as 100 and the other financial bids will be scored proportionately lower as compared to the lowest bid amount.

Please note that the financial proposal should not exceed GBP 250,000 (£ 250,000) inclusive of all applicable taxes. Taxes will be withheld as applicable. The proposals will be evaluated based on the selection criteria.

The quality of the technical proposal shall be evaluated and scored out a maximum score of 100. Each of the sections shall be evaluated separately and scored out of maximum scores as shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Scoring of the technical and financial proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Criteria</th>
<th>Maximum Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credentials of the proposer agency</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed approach &amp; methodology for the current project</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work plan and staffing</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credentials of the proposed team</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Proposal</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The agency that scores the highest out of a maximum score of 200 shall be selected. Please note that a minimum score of 70 is required under the technical proposal to be considered for the evaluation of the financial proposal. The selected agency will be contracted subject to being successful in STIR’s due diligence process.