

Request for Quotation

Terms of Reference

External Evaluation (2018-2022) of the Mahatma Gandhi Institute of Education for Peace and Sustainable Development (MGIEP)

Type of Contract: Contract for Services

Duration of contract: March 2023- July 2023

Organization: UNESCO MGIEP

Estimated level of effort: 50 professional working days *or similar*

Solicitation Process: Request for Quotation (RFQ)

Last Date of Submission: 28 February 2023 (11:59 PM IST)

1. Introduction

This document outlines the Terms of Reference for the second external evaluation (2018-2022) of UNESCO's Mahatma Gandhi Institute for Education on Peace and Sustainable Development (MGIEP) (<https://mgiep.unesco.org>). The evaluation will take place in the first half year of 2023.

2. Background

The Mahatma Gandhi Institute of Education for Peace and Sustainable Development (MGIEP) is UNESCO's Category 1 Institute set up with the generous support of the Ministry of Education (MOE), Government of India in 2012. UNESCO MGIEP contributes to SDG 4.7 implementation through the review and assessment of education policy and practice. MGIEP designs, pilots and scales the use of the social and emotional learning (SEL) curriculum using innovative digital pedagogies; builds an evidence-base for UNESCO MGIEP's interventions through experimental designs; and drives capacity development of K-12, youth, teachers and education decision-makers. The aim is to build kinder brains. UNESCO MGIEP's SEL interventions draw on advances in neuroscience research that have shown that human well-being requires a 'whole brain' approach. It builds on the human brain functions as a connected network where rational and emotional components need to be trained and nurtured to ensure a human flourishing and drive behavioural change. MGIEP is the first Institute of its kind in the Asia Pacific region and the youngest Category 1 Institute of UNESCO. In 2012, the Director-General of UNESCO, Ms Irina Bokova, and the then President of India, Mr Pranab Mukherjee, launched the institute.

The institute is primarily funded by the Ministry of Education, Government of India (GOI). The second agreement was signed in 2020 for the period 2020-2024. The GOI increased the overall five-year funding to USD 17.5 million as compared to the initial funding of USD 12 million.

UNESCO MGIEP's strategy (2022 - 2025)(<https://bit.ly/3Y00J5W>) complements UNESCO's Medium-term strategy 2022-29 (41C/4)¹ and stems from the Secretary-General's Education for All initiative (<https://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/pdf/The%20Global%20Education%20First%20Initiative.pdf>), and the targets presented in the **Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4 and in particular SDG4.7**. This strategy aims to equip future generations with the tools to lead change for a more peaceful and sustainable world. UNESCO MGIEP's objectives are based on the preamble of UNESCO's Constitution, which calls for defenses for peace to be created in the minds of men and women. UNESCO advocates for a transformative approach towards education, which prioritizes the understanding of and respect for human rights; inclusion and equity; cultural diversity; fostering a



unesco

Mahatma Gandhi Institute of
Education for Peace and
Sustainable Development

desire and capacity for living together peacefully, as essential elements of just, peaceful, and sustainable societies.

¹ UNESCO's Medium-term strategy 2022-29 (41C/4)

<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000378083>



SDG 4: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all.

4.7: By 2030, ensure all learners acquire the knowledge and skills needed to promote sustainable development, including among others through education for sustainable development and sustainable lifestyles, human rights, gender equality, promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, global citizenship, and appreciation of cultural diversity and of culture's contribution to sustainable development.

UNESCO MGIEP's mandate is focused on achieving the **Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) Target 4.7**, as reflected in the implementation of the UNESCO 41C/5² Work Plan through the following Outcomes and Expected Results:

UNESCO's 41C/5 Work Plan	UNESCO MGIEP Programme Categories
Outcome 7: ED3 - Learners are empowered to lead healthy lives, promote sustainable development, and engage with the world as creative and responsible global citizens	Building Kinder Brains through SEL and Digital Learning (K-12, Youth, Teachers, Decision Makers) Biodiversity, Global Citizenship
Outcome 2: ED9 - Education and learning reimagined through interdisciplinary research, foresight and public policy debate	Advance Research in SEL, Digital Technology and Ethical AI to inform education policy

² UNESCO's Approved 41C/5 Programme and Budget 2022-25 <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000380868>

3. Purpose and Use

Recalling Article 5 of the Operational Agreement which states “*The Director General and/or the Board shall initiate every five years an external evaluation of the activities carried out by the Institute in order to take the necessary decisions concerning its programmatic and regional focus and priorities to better respond to the needs of the Member States*”, the main purpose of the second five-year evaluation [2018-22] is to assess the relevance, coherence, overall performance and effectiveness/ (signs of) impact of the work implemented by the MGIEP and sustainability.

The findings of the evaluation report will be shared with the Governing Board members and the report is a requisite for the third five-year operational agreement for the period 2025-2029. It is proposed that the findings of the evaluation will demonstrate the results achieved and the impact the Institute has made in Member states globally and in particular in countries in the Asia Pacific region, in order to determine the Institute’s future funding needs. The negotiation for the third operational agreement with the MOE, GOI should start by the third quarter of 2023 and the agreement should be signed by mid-2024. ¹

4. Scope of Evaluation

The first external evaluation focused on the MGIEP’s operations for the period 2012-2017 and was concluded in October 2017.

The second five-year evaluation will focus on the period **2018-2022**. The evaluation will take note of the progress and achievements of the Institute, including an assessment of the implementation of recommendations made in the first evaluation (<https://bit.ly/3YnKFL5>). The geographical scope is global with priority consideration of activities in the countries in the Asia-Pacific region.

4.1 Main Dimensions

The findings and recommendations of the external evaluation should assist UNESCO’s Education Sector, the Ministry of Education (MOE) and the MGIEP Governing Board in making evidence-informed decisions regarding the MGIEP’s future strategic vision, its institutional setting and operational framework and should focus on particular on the following main dimensions:

Relevance :

- The extent to which the MGIEP’s program and activities are addressing the needs of countries it works with and is aligned with the UNESCO strategic work programme (C/4 and C/5 programme and budget documents).

Coherence:

- The positioning of MGIEP through its portfolio of activities in the overall landscape of SDG 4.7 with a view of MGIEP’s comparative advantage and complementarity and partnerships with other actors and stakeholders contributing to the objectives of the 2030 Agenda and SDG4 in particular.

¹ i.e it includes a request for increasing the funding from 3.5 million USD per year to 5 million USD per year for the third five-year tranche.

- The institutional setting of MGIEP in its configuration within UNESCO, including complementarity of responsibilities and potential synergies, nature and quality of partnerships and agreements between headquarters, field offices, other relevant Category 1 institutes and other relevant partners.

Innovation and Creativity :

- The extent to which innovative and novel approaches are used by the institute as a laboratory of ideas for achieving the desired results established by the stated objectives, outputs and outcomes.

Efficiency:

- Functional performance such as Institute resource allocation and management (financial and human), governance and timely implementation of the programme using an inclusive approach to achieve results cost-effectively.

Effectiveness /(signs of) Impact:

- Effectiveness/ (signs of) Impact of the UNESCO MGIEP courses/training undertaken by the teachers and students
- Effectiveness/ (signs of) Impact of the Institute's research including partnerships with the scientific and academic community.

Sustainability:

- The MGIEPs sustainability as a Category 1 Institute (i.e. its financial and institutional sustainability in terms of adequate financial resources, human capacities and partnerships) and sustainability and scaling of its results

4.2 Evaluation Questions

The following questions of the evaluation are indicative. The questions will be further refined in consultation with the evaluation reference group and agreed upon in the evaluation inception report. The evaluation shall assess in particular those questions that are identified as of high priority and as possible provide answers to additional questions that might be deemed useful.

Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the present portfolio of activities relevant to the Institute's mandate? - Is the portfolio balanced in terms of the demand from stakeholders and what is offered? Is there a significant gap between these two? - To what extent are the needs addressed with particular attention to issues concerning women /girls and disadvantaged groups /learners with disabilities (gender equality and inclusion) - Are the projects within the present portfolio designed in a manner that is scientifically rigorous, innovative, and policy-relevant? - What is the geographical scope of the Institute's projects and is this adequate for achieving its mission and mandate? - Are the projects regionally well distributed? - How does it contribute to UNESCO's strategic Objectives and Expected Results (as defined in the respective C4 and C5 strategic and budget and programme documents)
Coherence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What are the comparative strengths of MGIEP within the broader landscape of partners active in contributing to SDG 4.7? - Have the projects benefitted from partnerships with like-minded organizations working towards the same goals and objectives?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are the partnerships between the Institute and external partners relevant, and sufficient for the successful implementation of the work programme? - To what extent has the institute engaged with field offices, regional offices, and other category 1 institutes in the implementation of its work, and what are potential overlaps and complementarities? - What are the positioning /comparative strengths of the Institute in the broader landscape of actors and partners active in related fields of work? - Do the projects contribute towards UNESCO's work programme and is there a logical framework or theory of change underlying the Institute's portfolio of projects?
Innovation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How innovative were the Institute's approaches, frameworks, tools, and methodologies? - What was the publication record of the Institute's work in peer-reviewed journals? - To what extent are issues of LNOB, environmental and social impact addressed via innovative course content?
Effectiveness/ (sign of) Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What are the MGIEP's main achievements and challenges? - How effective were the strategies and tools used in the implementation of the projects for the achievement of results? - To what extent have the Institute's activities generated positive (or negative) effects/ changes in the participation of young people, women, and persons with disability? - To what extent did the project reach the targeted beneficiaries at the project goal and outcome levels? How many beneficiaries have been reached? - To what extent have partnerships to promote gender issues been strengthened? Have the courses and training resulted in gains in gender equity? Are the monitoring frameworks established adequate to measure results, to measure gender responsive and gender transformative results? - To what extent are specific results achieved in a gender-responsive/gender transformative manner; what are the effects /impact on disadvantaged groups women and girls. learners with disabilities - Is the Theory of Change underpinned by evidence that confirms the causal linkages between MGIEPs operations and the observed results? - Is the Institute's communication and outreach strategy adequate and efficient in achieving its objectives? - What are the intended and unintended effects resulting from the implementation of the projects? - How many downloads, users and mentions in social media did the Institute garner over the time under consideration?

<p>Efficiency</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the management structure of the Institute adequate for the efficient implementation of its work programme? This involves financial and human resource management. - Is the staffing structure adequate for the implementation of the Institute's work programme? - Is the composition of the Governing Board adequate for the successful implementation of the work programme? - Are the lines of communication between the Institute and the UNESCO Education Sector clear and relevant for the efficient implementation of the Institute's work programme? - Are the lines of communication between the Institute and the Ministry of Education (MOE) of the Government of India (GOI) clear and relevant for the smooth functioning of the Institute? - Have all the operational agreement and seat agreement clauses been implemented?
<p>Sustainability</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the funding structure of the Institute stable and sustainable? - To what extent are issues concerning environmental impact taken into consideration? - What are the plans and or strategies to sustain the achievements made so far and how to scale them up by making the beneficiaries self-reliable or having policy-level interventions with the partner governments? - How has the institute managed the challenges posed by the worldwide crisis due to COVID-19? What are the steps taken to manage the challenges and what are the results and impact of the same? - To what extent have the capacities of the partners been developed to enhance the scalability and scalability of the UNESCO MGIEP's digital courses to the governments in different countries for sustainable development?

5. Methodology

In line with [UNESCO's Evaluation Policy](#) (2022-29), the evaluation will have to comply with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) [Norms and Standards for Evaluation](#), UNEG [Guidelines for Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations](#) and UNEG [Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation](#). The evaluation team will also have to ensure that ethical, human rights and gender equality principles are duly integrated at all stages of the evaluation process.

The evaluation will include the methodological elements mentioned below. The evaluation team will further refine these during the inception phase and may suggest other innovative evaluation methods and approaches.

● **Desk review of primary and secondary documentation:** Documents will include the seat agreement between UNESCO and the GOI, the first and second operational agreement between UNESCO and GOI, the first external evaluation report, annual reports, Governing Board meeting

reports, Executive Committee meeting reports, Institute reports to the General Conference of UNESCO, published papers, web-based documentation, internal memorandums, project documents and monitoring data produced by MGIEP, and academic literature.

- **Interviews and consultations**, via phone, email or in person, including online surveys, if relevant, of heads of NatComs in relevant countries, NCERT, representatives of beneficiary countries, participants of the training, participants in seminars, end-users etc.; representatives of donor countries or donor organizations or implementing partners at central and decentralized levels; key stakeholders from UNESCO MGIEP, HQ, Field Offices, and Bangkok regional office;
- **Web and citation analytics** to help assess the use and potential impact of the MGIEP interventions such as the social and emotional learning (SEL) curriculum
- **The refining of the Theory of Change for MGIEP's work on SDG 4.7**
- **Questionnaires and surveys** addressed to various groups of stakeholders who will be identified at the inception phase, including end beneficiaries.
- **One field visit to New Delhi, India** will be organized to have in-person meetings with the UNESCO team and the ministry officials, and other stakeholders and beneficiaries based in New Delhi.

Minimum requirements and information gathering

- The assignment corresponds to a maximum of up to 50 professional working days.
- It is considered an advantage if an evaluation team is gender balanced and includes team members from a variety of backgrounds that demonstrate academic, geographic and cultural diversity.

6. Roles and Responsibilities

The evaluation will be managed by MGIEP with the support of IOS and the Executive Office of the UNESCO Education Sector, and the Evaluation Management/Steering Group, The evaluation will be conducted by an independent external evaluation team or individual consultant (registered as a legal entity)

6.1 Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)

A Reference Group will be set up to accompany and quality assurance of the evaluation process and provide feedback on the Terms of Reference and the various deliverables (Inception Report, Stakeholder Workshop and Draft Evaluation Report). The Reference Group will include the following:

- 1) Director of MGIEP,
- 2) Representative of ED
- 3) Representative of IOS

The Evaluation Reference Group will be advised by the following:

- 1) A representative from Governing Board - Chair or member of the Executive Committee
- 2) External expert in the field of Social and emotional learning in Education, Digital education, and/or education for peace, sustainable development and global citizenship.
- 3) A representative from the MOE-GOI.

6.2 Evaluation Team and Resources

A. Qualifications

The consultant/s comprising the evaluation team should possess collectively the following mandatory qualifications and experience:

- An advanced university degree with a specialization in education, social sciences, educational policy, or related fields **(all team members)**
- Extensive knowledge of the education sector and in particular, areas covered by SDG 4.7 **(3 work assignments)**
- Extensive knowledge in the science of learning and Social and Emotional Learning and the use of evidence-based research and policy **(3 experiences/work assignments)**
- Extensive knowledge of networks and in particular, youth networks working in the area of education for peace, sustainable development and global citizenship **(3 experiences/work assignments)**
- Experience in applying qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods, with a minimum of seven years of professional experience for the lead expert **(a minimum of five years experience for the other team members)** in programme and policy evaluation
- a strong record in designing, conducting and leading evaluations. At least some of this experience will be in the education-related area. **(5 experiences/ work assignments)**
- Experience in gender and youth analysis and gender and youth in evaluation **(3 experiences/work assignments)**
- Excellent analytical and demonstrated excellent drafting skills in English: demonstrated ability to collect and analyse information, synthesize ideas and feedback and prepare reports clearly and concisely; (oral communication and report writing) **(3 work examples)**
- No previous involvement in the implementation of the activities under review

The evaluation team should possess the following desirable qualifications and characteristics:

- Knowledge and understanding of the global education agenda, Agenda 2030 and the SDGs (**3 experiences/work assignments**)
- knowledge and experience in the assessment of organizational effectiveness and governance issues (**3 experiences/work assignments**)
- Knowledge of the role of the UN and its programming (**3 experiences/work assignments**)
- Understanding and application of UN mandates in Human Rights and Gender Equality (**3 experiences/work assignments**)
- Experience with assignments for the UN (**3 experiences/work assignments**)
- Experience as an educator (**3 experiences/work assignments**)
- Experience with assignments focusing on multi-stakeholder partnerships, coordination and capacity building (**3 experiences/work assignments**)

Verification of these qualifications will be based on the provided curriculum vitae. Moreover, references, web links or electronic copies of the two or three examples of recently completed evaluation reports should be provided together with the technical proposal. Candidates are also encouraged to submit other references such as research papers or articles that demonstrate their familiarity with the subject under review. The recommended composition of the evaluation team is one senior and one junior evaluator.

B. Budget

The evaluation is estimated to require 50 days of professional time, including travel. The external team members are expected to travel to New Delhi at least once to conduct interviews during the data collection phase, and /or hold a stakeholder workshop for discussing and validating findings and recommendations. Some of these tasks may be conducted through virtual meetings via Zoom and MS Teams.

Logistics

The external evaluator(s) will be responsible for his/her/their logistics: office space, administrative and secretarial support, telecommunications, the printing of documentation, etc. S/he/they will also be responsible for the execution of the data collection work plan, but MGIEP will facilitate this process to the extent possible by providing contact information such as email addresses. About field visits, MGIEP will assist the evaluator(s) in providing documentation, setting up meetings and providing security clearance documents, etc. The evaluator(s) is/are responsible for all travel-related costs, including transport to and from the airport and transport to and from interviews. The travel costs should be itemized in the financial proposal

7. Deliverables and Schedule

The evaluation is expected to commence in March 2023 and be concluded by June 2023. The indicative timetable of key activities and deliverables is shown below:

Activity / Deliverable	Timing
Call for proposal uploaded on the website	February 2023
Selection of external evaluation team; contractual arrangements completed	beginning March 2023
Evaluation launch – Online meetings	Mid-March 2023
Inception report (deliverable 1)	end March 2023
Data collection & analysis; field missions	April 2023
Stakeholder workshop and draft evaluation report (deliverable 2)	mid/end May 2023
Final Evaluation report (deliverable 3) and communication outputs such as a PPT presentation, evaluation brief and or infographics) (deliverable 4)	end June 2023

The Draft and Final Evaluation reports should be written in English and comprise no more than 30 pages, excluding annexes. It should be structured as follows:

- ✓ Executive summary (2-4 pages)
- ✓ Programme description and Intervention Logic
- ✓ Evaluation purpose
- ✓ Evaluation methodology (including challenges and limitations)
- ✓ Main Findings
- ✓ Lessons learned
- ✓ Recommendations and conclusions: Annexes including TOR, interview list, data collection instruments, key documents consulted, detailed description of the methodology

Deadlines for Submission of Proposals

Technical and financial proposals attached in two separate files, with budgets, should be submitted by 11:59 pm IST (New Delhi time) on 28 February 2023 to procurement.mgiep@unesco.org with the subject line: “Confidential proposal for MGIEP Institute level External Evaluation”. All eligible technical proposals will be assessed based on their responsiveness to the TOR. The proposals should include the following documents:

The technical proposal should consist of:

- a) An up-to-date curriculum vitae of consultant (s); Company profile, where relevant
- b) A statement indicating how their qualifications and experience make them suitable for the assignment.
- c) An indication of the approach/methodology to be adopted to carry out the assignment, including any inputs that may be required from UNESCO MGIEP.
- d) Time Schedule of the Assignment

The technical criterion will be measured under the following categories:

- 1) **The expertise of the firm or individual:** previous evaluations successfully implemented or conducted in support of capacity development in developing countries is required; a minimum of 7 years of international experience in programme/project evaluation and experience with the UN system are desirable.
- 2) **Proposed work plan and approach:** the technical proposal should include the work plan and approach intended for the evaluation. The proposal should include examples of previous evaluations of similar education-related research Institutes.
- 3) **Qualifications and experience of the evaluation team:** to be provided in detailed CVs (see mandatory and desirable criteria above). Refer to 6.2 above for more details.

Financial Proposal

The estimated budget should include all costs, including travel and accommodation for visits to New Delhi and Paris (if required). The budget should offer some details so that the costs of expertise and travel are visible.

Financial information and documentation including but not limited to:

- a. Proposed fee breakup in the RFQ template annexed with this term of reference. The bidders are requested to fill in the same and attach any additional information as an annexure.
- b. Company incorporation documents viz. Company Registration Certificate (CIN), Articles of Association, Memorandum of Association, Copy of PAN, tax registration and compliance and Composition of Board of Directors (Applicable for Indian Nationals)

If any additional scope of services is foreseen, kindly highlight these along with the cost.

Notes:

- 1) Any proposal received by UNESCO MGIEP after the deadline for submission of proposals, shall be rejected.
- 2) A two-stage procedure will be used in evaluating the proposals, with an evaluation of the technical component being completed prior to any price component being opened and compared.
- 3) Those proposals passing the technical threshold minimum of 70 out of 100 points will then be selected for comparison of financial proposals. The Price Component will be opened only for submissions that pass the technical evaluation.
- 4) Only shortlisted bidders would be contacted. The quotations will be evaluated based on the evaluation criteria set by the MGIEP.
- 5) UNESCO MGIEP has the right to meet with the selected bidders and negotiate the final financial amount before signing the contract.
- 6) All quotations/price breakups are to be provided in USD.

PENALTY CLAUSE

1. The contracting service provider is expected to maintain complete confidentiality by not sharing or using the resources/documents made available or created by them as part of this contract with any external agency outside of UNESCO MGIEP.
2. The contracting service provider is required to sign a statement of non-disclosure as per the UN Policy.
3. In the event of cancellation of the contract or part of the contract by UNESCO MGIEP, the contracting service provider shall be paid only a part of the cost that shall be dependent on the

- extent of the task being completed as per the terms of the contract.
4. UNESCO MGIEP will have the right to withhold any part / full payment until there is 100% satisfaction of the deliverable.
 5. In case the contracting service provider cancels any part of the contract then the cancellation cost shall be mutually agreed upon by UNESCO MGIEP and the contracting service provider.

Annexe 1: Indicative list of key documents to be consulted

- MGIEP Seat Agreement
- MGIEP Operational Agreements
- MGIEP Statutes
- MGIEP Medium-Term Strategy (2022 – 2025)
- MGIEP Rules of Procedure
- First external evaluation report
- Governing board meeting reports
- Executive committee meeting reports
- Annual reports
- MGIEP Publications
- Internal relevant memorandums
- MGIEP website

UNESCO is committed to achieving workforce diversity in terms of gender, nationality, and culture. Individuals from minority groups, indigenous groups and persons with disabilities are equally encouraged to apply.

For more information, please contact:

Ms Divya CHADHA
National Finance and Administrative Officer
UNESCO MGIEP
35 Ferozshah Road, ICSSR Building, 1st Floor, New Delhi 110001, India
email: procurement.mgiep@unesco.org
Website: www.mgiep.unesco.org



unesco

Mahatma Gandhi Institute of
Education for Peace and
Sustainable Development

Financial Proposal / Price Schedule					
Request for Quotation Ref:					
Total Financial Proposal [currency/amount]:					
Date of Submission:					
Authorized Signature:					
Description of Activity/Item		No of Consultants	Rate per Day [currency/amount]	No of person-days	Total [currency/amount]
1	Remuneration				
1.1					
1.2					
Description of Activity/Item		No of Consultants	Rate per Day [currency/amount]	No of person-days	Total [currency/amount]
2	Other Expenses				
2.1					
2.2					
2.3					
2.4					
2.5					
2.6					
TOTAL					\$0