Terms of Reference for the

Independent Evaluation Committee of the

Global Partnership for Education

March 2014

Context

In October 2013, the Board of Directors of the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) appointed an Independent Steering Committee (ISC) to prepare a framework for the external evaluation of the Global Partnership for Education. In November 2013, the Board, recognizing the major organizational changes within the Global Partnership after 2010, and the launch of its first Strategic Plan in 2012, mandated the ISC to present a longer-term evaluation plan to the Strategy and Policy Committee, which would include a proposal for a shorter-term light-touch evaluation. The Board also agreed that the ISC should play a more prominent role in advising the Global Partnership on evaluation issues.

Role of the Independent Evaluation Committee (IEC)

In particular, the IEC will:

- Advise the Board about the overall design and process for implementing independent external evaluations and the Secretariat of the Global Partnership on internal Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) approaches;
- Act as the primary oversight body in relation to the implementation of external evaluations, ensuring timeliness of all deliverables and adherence to the TOR;
- Ensure the overall quality of the evaluation design and the implementation of the evaluation; and

- Ensure the independence of the evaluation process.

Overseeing independent evaluations:

- Oversee and ensure the overall independence and quality of the evaluation process.
- Prepare the Approach Paper, the Request for Expressions of Interest, the evaluation Terms of Reference, and the Requests for Proposals in accordance with World Bank Procurement procedures.
- Review proposals and recommend the evaluation contractors in accordance with World Bank Procurement procedures.
- Resolve any issues that may arise on contracts, conflicts of interest, or access to information between the consultants and the GPE Secretariat or CEO in accordance with World Bank Procurement procedures.
- Review and comment upon the inception report, drafts of the evaluation reports, and the final report before submission to the GPE Board.
- Assist in dissemination.

Appointment, Composition, and Governance of the IEC

The Independent Evaluation Committee is appointed by the GPE Board for an initial period of two years, after which the Board will review the composition and objectives of the IEC.

The IEC will be comprised of at least five individuals with expertise in the areas of international educational development, aid architecture and aid effectiveness, and evaluation practices of international development programs. Proposed members will be selected to reflect a diversity of institutional experience, including a member from the World Bank's Independent Evaluation Group (IEG), and varied geographical and methodological expertise.

Members are contracted as independent consultants, except the member from the World Bank's Independent Evaluation Group (IEG) who is appointed in her/his capacity as IEG staff. The IEC will receive administrative and financial support from the Secretariat. The independence of the IEC and the evaluation contractors will be preserved in all interactions with the Secretariat.

Appointment of Chair. After their appointment, the IEC members will appoint a chair selected by consensus. The Chair's tasks shall include all direct communication with the evaluation contractors, the Board of Directors, and the GPE Secretariat on behalf of the committee; circulation of documents for appraisal and comment by the IEC; organization and chairing of IEC meetings; organization and chairing of meetings with the evaluation contractors and participation in meetings with stakeholders. The Chair will be consulted by the GPE Secretariat before invoices for payment and reimbursement from evaluation contractors and IEC members are approved.

Decision-making. No substantive decisions shall be made by the Chair without advice and consent of the full IEC. When IEC decisions cannot be made by consensus, they will be arrived at by majority vote, with the Chair holding an additional vote in the case of a tie.

Reporting. The IEC will be an independent body reporting to the GPE Board. It will provide quarterly updates to the GPE Secretariat and the GPE Board through the Strategy and Policy Committee on the progress of the evaluation. The IEC will also provide additional information when required by the evaluation process or when requested by the GPE Board.

Logistics, Costs and Administrative Arrangements. The GPE Secretariat shall be responsible for establishing the contracts for the IEC members, and will handle reimbursements for travel and other costs, based on an agreed budget and estimated level of effort. The M&E Team will also provide logistical support to the IEC. However, as noted above, the IEC shall operate independently and at arm's length from the Secretariat and the GPE Board which shall not interfere with the content and direction of the evaluations once the Evaluation Approach Paper is approved by the Board.

Members of the IEC are expected to work up to 15 days and undertake up to three trips per year for the duration of the appointment, with the exception of the chairperson, who is expected to work up to 60 days and undertake up to four trips per year. No IEC member should have a real or perceived conflict of interest. Each IEC members will submit a conflict of interest declaration at the outset of her/his term on the IEC, and annually or whenever a potential conflict of interest emerges thereafter. They cannot, for example, be GPE staff or consult for the Global Partnership (apart from the IEC role), nor be consultants on any GPE-funded projects or initiatives within other organizations. The declarations will be discussed within the IEC and submitted to the Board.

ANNEX: Work Plan and Timeline for 2014 and 2015

Work Plan

In the period between March 1, 2014 and September 1, 2015, the IEC will undertake the following tasks:

- Planning and advising on the independent evaluations of the Global Partnership
- Prepare an Approach Paper for the interim evaluation for review and approval by the GPE Board.
- Establish a timeline for the interim evaluation and a proposed budget.
- Advise the GPE Secretariat on its internal evaluation plans, strategies and frameworks, including its data collection efforts (time permitting). This role will not involve day-to-day oversight but rather discussion of selected, strategic documents prepared by the GPE secretariat.

Timeline

Activity	Timing
1. GPE Evaluation Approach Paper and Budget approved by the GPE Board	March 31 2014
2. Request for Expression of Interest	April 10, 2014
3. Review of Expressions of Interest	May 1–10, 2014
4. Shortlist and Request for Proposals (Full terms of reference at this stage)	May 15, 2014
5. Final Date for Submission of Proposals	June 15, 2014
6. Final Selection of Consultants and Contract	June 30 2014
7. Inception/Evaluation Framework Report from Consultants 8. Quality Assurance and Face-to-face Meeting with IEC 9. Revision and Finalization of Design	August 2014
10. Evaluation Data Collection 11. Country Case Studies	September 2014–January 2015

12. Organizational and Global-level Data Collection 13. Short Field Reports to IEC	
14. Analysis and Draft of High-level Findings to IEC 15. Meeting with IEC to Discuss Analysis, High-level Findings and Agree to Outline for the Final Report	March 1, 2015
16. Draft to IEC/Revisions	May 1, 2015
17. Full Draft to Secretariat for Comment (2 weeks) 18. Revisions (1 week) 19. Full Draft to Board for Comment (2 weeks)	June 31 2015
20. Final Revisions	August 31, 2015
21. Final Published Report – Including Front Note/ Responses from Board, Secretariat and IEC	October 1, 2015

ANNEXE 2

Approach Paper:

Independent Evaluation of the Global Partnership for Education

Prepared by the GPE Independent Steering Committee

Draft for Board Approval: Updated March 4, 2014

1. Introduction

1.1 In November 2013 the Board of the Global Partnership for Education mandated an Independent Steering Committee (ISC) to reconsider and prepare a new framework for the external evaluation of the Global Partnership for Education. In recognition of the major organizational changes within the Global Partnership after 2010, and the launch of its first Strategic Plan in 2012, the Board mandated the ISC to propose an approach for an interim evaluation (delivered no later than September 2015). It also requested the ISC to advise the Board on the timing and actions needed to prepare for a comprehensive impact evaluation of the Global Partnership in subsequent years.

1.2 This approach paper is focused on establishing the basic approach for an interim progress evaluation of the Global Partnership. It briefly touches on steps that might be taken to position the Global Partnership for a comprehensive impact evaluation by 2018, when the Global Partnership will enter a new strategic planning period and host its next replenishment campaign.

1.3 At the conclusion of the Interim evaluation, the Independent Evaluation Committee[1] will provide the GPE Board with a recommendation about the additional evaluation products that are needed to ensure that a robust impact

[1] As stated in the related Board paper, the name of the Independent Steering Committee is being changed to Independent Evaluation Committee. Thus, references to ISC work in the future are labeled as IEC or Independent Evaluation Committee.

evaluation can be completed in time for the Global Partnership's next strategic planning cycle.

2. Purpose and Scope of the Interim Evaluation of the Global Partnership

2.1. The purpose of the interim external evaluation of the Global Partnership is to inform its members, the GPE Board and GPE management about the progress that the Global Partnership has made towards achieving its strategic priorities and objectives.

2.2. The interim evaluation will be formative in nature, providing information useful for the Global Partnership's strategic planning for the post 2015 period. It will focus on the activities and accomplishments of the Global Partnership in the period between 2010 and 2014 at both the global and the country levels. It will build upon and draw from the findings of the Fast Track Initiative evaluation completed in 2010.

2.2.1. The interim evaluation will identify key changes that have taken place since the last evaluation, notably in relation to the transition to a partnership.

2.2.2. The interim evaluation will explore the financial, programmatic and partnership contributions made by the Global Partnership at the global and country level.[2]

2.3. The interim evaluation will focus on improvements in the organizational effectiveness of the Global Partnership, looking primarily at the domains of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency.[3] In order to capture the effects of recent reforms in the Global Partnership's approach and activities, it will explore "areas where activity has improved results, where it has been unique, where it has resulted in faster action, or where it can be thought of as being new or innovative" over this most recent period.

2.4. The final interim evaluation report will identify lessons learned and formulate recommendations for improvement, and will identify issues that can be addressed

[2] This phrase is borrowed from the GAVI evaluation: see http://www.gavialliance.org/results/evaluations/gavi-second-evaluation-report/

in the comprehensive impact evaluation that should be planned at the end of the 2015 to 2018 strategic cycle.

3. Evaluation Questions for the Interim Evaluation

3.1. The following question will be answered in the interim evaluation:

How have organizational changes since 2010 improved the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency of the Global Partnership at global and country levels?

3.2. More specifically, the evaluation will answer the following questions at the country and the global levels.

3.2.1. <u>At the country level:</u>

a) How have changes within the Global Partnership since 2010 contributed to national capacity to formulate and implement education sector policies that improve outcomes in the areas of learning, access and inclusion, with specific reference to:
   - Direct support provided by the Secretariat through its country-level technical assistance and programs of funding.
   - Funded GPE programs (including the management arrangements with the Global Partnership's implementing partners).
   - GPE partnership and coordination activities (e.g, the Global Partnership's support for Local Education Groups, donor coordination, and civil society participation).

b) What effect or additionality has the GPE had on the flow of resources (national and international) to education at the country level?

3.2.2. At the global level:

a) What have been the major contributions of the Partnership at the global level since 2010?
b) How have changes in governance and management affected the Global Partnership's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency?
c) What effect or additionality has the Global Partnership had on the global flow of resources to education?
d) Are global-level and country-level resources and activities (including the Global Partnership's monitoring and evaluation activities) aligned and utilized for optimum relevance, effectiveness and efficiency?

4. Evaluation Design and Methodology for the Interim Evaluation

4.1. This section establishes minimum design standards for the evaluation. The final design for this evaluation will be developed through an inception report which will be reviewed for quality assurance by the IEC.

4.2. The evaluation should be organized around the chain of activities and inputs that are deployed by the Global Partnership in order to achieve its goals and objectives. Thus the evaluation should at minimum identify the Global Partnership's programmatic framework and develop a model of the organization's theory of change. It will utilize this theory of change to show how Global Partnership activities are or are not linked together in ways that enhance the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the organization, and its capacity for meeting its stated goals and objectives.[4]

4.3. Through desk review, the evaluation should describe the scope and changing characteristics of Global Partnership programs and activities at the global and national levels.

4.4. The evaluation should include a rapid organizational review of the Global Partnership's governance and management systems, utilizing existing

[4] For a review of approaches to developing a theory of change see:
http://r4d.dfid.gov.uk/pdf/outputs/mis_spc/DFID_ToC_Review_VogelV7.pdf

organizational reports, financial data and interviews with staff and board members as the main source of information.

4.5. The evaluation should triangulate its findings through the use of short surveys and/or interviews with GPE board members, partners and constituencies.

4.6. The evaluation must include at minimum 5-8 short country studies, selected to ensure geographic balance and the inclusion of fragile/conflict affected countries. In order to access improvements in the GPE model the evaluators may also wish to consider including countries with recent (2010-2014) program approvals and countries with longer experience with FTI/GPE, including ones for which country case studies from the FTI evaluation are available in order to assess change since then.

4.7. To answer questions 3.2.1 (b) and 3.2.3 (c), the evaluation will utilize existing data on education and international finance for basic education, drawing on reports from the UNESCO Global Monitoring Report, the Global Partnership's own Results Report, and the UNESCO Institute for Statistics (among others).

4.8. The final evaluation report shall be no longer than 50 pages, with additional analysis and data presented as annexes to the report.

4.9. The evaluation design will be guided by the Global and Regional Partnership Program (GRPP) Evaluation Sourcebook and the OECD DACs development evaluation criteria, which set quality standards for global program evaluations. Innovations to these approaches, including modification of methods for specific components of the evaluation, are encouraged.

5. Scoping Note on Rigorous Impact Evaluation

5.1. The ISC recommends that as a separate stream of work, it contracts a consultant to prepare a technical scoping note on the inclusion of rigorous impact evaluation methodologies in the 2017/2018 comprehensive evaluation. Such a scoping note would build on the analysis prepared by Howard White for the 2009 review. It would be ready for late 2015.

6. Roles and Responsibilities

6.1. The integrity of the evaluation will require strict maintenance of independence. Based on the lessons learnt from the FTI evaluation and evaluations of other global partnerships, we recommend the following roles and responsibilities for the four key actors in the evaluation.

- The Independent Evaluation Committee (IEC) will be appointed by the Board for an initial two-year term, in consultation with the GPE Secretariat. It will oversee the overall independence, quality and timeliness of the evaluation process. It will prepare TOR for the evaluation, advise on selection of the evaluation consultants, ensure a design of the highest quality, ensure timeliness in the delivery of key drafts of sub-studies and the final synthesis report, and report regularly to the Strategy and Policy Committee and the Board. It will ensure that there is an opportunity for correction of factual errors and comments by key stakeholders at key stages in the evaluation process, while preserving the integrity and autonomy of the evaluation.

- The GPE Secretariat will issue the contracts with the Evaluation Contractor and IEC members and handle all payments related to the implementation of the evaluation. Staff from the secretariat will provide administrative and logistical support to the IEC. The Secretariat will assist the work of the evaluation team by agreeing to be interviewed, facilitating country visits, and providing access to information and data.

- The GPE Board will appoint the IEC (completed). It will comment upon and approve the Approach Paper for the evaluation prepared by the IEC. It will be given an opportunity to comment on a draft of the evaluation report. It will receive regular reports on the progress of the evaluation from the Independent Evaluation Committee.

- Evaluation Contractor (EC) will be selected based upon the recommendations of the IEC and formally contracted by the GPE Secretariat through an international competitive bidding process. The EC will have the independence to conduct a high-quality and uncompromising report prepared in accordance with the highest professional and ethical standards. The EC will report to the IEC on a regular basis and respond to its written feedback on matters related

to quality and validity. It will be responsible for the timely delivery of agreed sub-reports and a final evaluation synthesis report to the IEC.

7. Proposed Timeline and Deliverables

The proposed timeline for the evaluation, following the approval of this Approach Paper, is as follows:

Activity	Timing
22. GPE Evaluation Approach Paper and Budget approved by the GPE Board	March 31 2014
23. Request for Expression of Interest	April 10, 2014
24. Review of Expressions of Interest	May 1-10, 2014
25. Shortlist and Request for Proposals (Full terms of Reference at this stage)	May 15, 2014
26. Final Date for Submission of Proposals	June 15, 2014
27. Final Selection of Consultants and Contract	June 30 2014
28. Inception/Evaluation Framework Report from Consultants 29. Quality Assurance and Face-to-face Meeting with ISC 30. Revision and Finalization of Design	August 2014
31. Evaluation Data Collection 32. Country Case Studies 33. Organizational and Global-Level Data Collection 34. Short Field Reports to IEC	September 2014-January 2015
35. Analysis and Draft of High Level Findings to IEC 36. Meeting with the IEC to Discuss Analysis, High-level Findings and Agree to Outline for the Final Report.	March 1, 2015
37. Draft to IEC/ Revisions	May 1, 2015
38. Full Draft to Secretariat for Comment (2 weeks) 39. Revisions (1 week) 40. Full Draft to Board for Comment (2 weeks)	June 31 2015
41. Final Revisions	August 31, 2015
42. Final Published Report – Including Front Note Responses From Board, Secretariat and IEC	October 1, 2015

8. Budget Request

The estimated cost of the evaluation is approximately US$1.8 million (including the costs of the Evaluation Contractors, the Independent Evaluation Committee, and any consultative meetings). In addition, this budget includes the costs of a scoping note on rigorous impact evaluation, and the costs of an independent steering committee.

Expect costs can be broken down as follows:

Component	**Cost**
Design and inception report	$120,000
Country cases (5-8 @ $100- 150,000)[5]	$750,000
Global-level document and data review	$150,000
Global-level survey/interviews	$ 80,000
Analysis preparation and revision of final report	$150,000
Meetings with Independent Evaluation Committee	$75,000
Annual costs of the Independent Evaluation Committee (over 2 years)	$280,000
Costs for one scoping paper on rigorous impact evaluation and data requirements for the 2017/2018 comprehensive evaluation	$ 40,000
TOTAL	$1,645,000

[5] Country case studies were estimated based on costs incurred for country cases in the FTI evaluation and the Evaluation of Basic Education (2002). Typically country cases require a team of 3-5 evaluators skilled in education policy analysis, financial and economic analysis, and interview and survey evaluation methodologies. Approximately one week of background research, three weeks of field research and two weeks of analysis and case study preparation for a team of 3-5 were included in this estimate.