

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

PARTNERS IN PLAY PROJECT (P3) BASELINE STUDY CONSULTANCY

Part A: Cover Page

Issuance Date: [03/08/2020](#)

Questions Due Date/Time: [Friday 7th August 2020, 12:00 Noon GMT/](#)
poliveira@righttoplay.com

Proposal Due Date/Time: [Monday 17th August 2020, 12:00 Noon GMT, 5:00PM GMT/](#)
[RTP UK Country Office](#)

The Partners in Play (P3) Project implemented by Right To Play and funded by the LEGO Foundation, is soliciting proposals for [the services of an external evaluator](#).

Please submit your most competitive proposal in accordance with the terms of reference and instructions to offerors. Any award issued as a result of this RFP will be subject to all instructions, terms of reference/ specifications, certifications, terms and conditions and funder required clauses. This RFP document includes the following parts:

PART A:	Cover Page
PART B:	Terms of Reference
PART C:	Instructions to Offerors

All proposals, inquiries, and correspondence pertaining to this solicitation are to be directed to the attention of:

PARTNERS IN PLAY (P3) PROJECT

Attn: Patricia Oliveira, Global Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Manager

Email : poliveira@righttoplay.com

with Kwarteng Frimpong, **Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Specialist** in copy at:
KFrimpong@righttoplay.com

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

PARTNERS IN PLAY PROJECT (P3) BASELINE STUDY CONSULTANCY

Part B: Terms of Reference

1.0 RIGHT TO PLAY

Right To Play is a global organization committed to improving the lives of children and youth affected by conflict, disease and poverty. Established in 2000, Right To Play has pioneered a unique play-based approach to learning and development which focuses on quality education, life skills, health, gender equality, child protection and building peaceful communities. With programming in over 20 countries, Right To Play transforms the lives of more than one million children each week using play and sports, both inside and outside of the classroom. In addition to our work with children, Right To Play advocates with parents, local communities, and governments to advance the fundamental rights of all children. Right To Play is headquartered in Toronto, Canada and has operations in North America, Europe, the Middle East, Africa and Asia. Visit us at www.righttoplay.com

As such, Right To Play is seeking a consultancy firm/group to undertake the baseline study of the Partners in Play (P3) project in Ghana including the development of an evaluation framework design; the review, refinement and/or development of instruments; fieldwork administration and logistics plan; data collection, review and cleaning; data analysis; reporting; and dissemination documents. This will include the writing of all accompanying reports as specified in the key deliverables.

2.0 PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Partners in Play Project (P3) aims to improve the quality education for Ghanaian girls and boys aged 4-12 through a scalable and replicable Learn Through Play (LtP) model.

Target Area and Reach

With the support of RTP, the project will reach 689,920 children, representing three levels of intervention in three regions (Accra Region, Northern Region, Volta Region):

- 32,000 children (14,720 F); from 100 schools that will receive direct and intense RTP support (includes training of 800 teachers)
- 81,920 children (37,683); from 257 schools that will receive support from district support teams (RTP project staff will train district teams and provide support in the training, coaching and mentoring of additional 2,048 teachers)

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

PARTNERS IN PLAY PROJECT (P3) BASELINE STUDY CONSULTANCY

- 576,000 children (264,960 F) from 1800 schools, part of the GALOP project (Ghana Accountability for Learning Outcomes Project) that will receive support from district support teams. District support teams will train, coach and mentor 14,400 GALOP teachers¹.

An additional 2.55M children in Ghana will benefit from LtP over the next four years as part of the RTP's involvement in the GALOP initiative. This refers specifically to the integration of LtP into the national in-service training framework. This intervention/phase will not be covered by this baseline evaluation.

This will be achieved through a series of **Key Activities**, organized by target group, which include:

i. Government:

- Validation workshop of the teachers' coaching and Mentoring guides and framework,
- RTP participation in the working group on the development of training framework and training plans,
- Develop resource manuals for the integration of play-based learning in the existing subjects in teacher's education colleges,
- Partner with NaCCA, The National Council for Curriculum and Assessment in the development of the play-based teachers' guide to support KG and primary schools in the use of PBL to deliver the curriculum,
- Update of National INSET guidelines and development of content to include LtP approach,

ii. Professionals

- Purchase of Teaching & Learning materials to support play-based learning in 100 implementing schools,
- Training for teachers in Continuum of Teacher Training (CoTT)
- Facilitate a 3-day training on cascading model training framework aligned to the district INSET Plans,
- Workshop for selected education officials and teacher champions to develop plans for INSET/CPD per school and cluster level,
- Hold a workshop with teacher's champions and district support teams to develop the guidelines and content of the Learning Communities,
- Training for teacher champions on coaching and mentoring,

iii. Caregivers

- Conduct a 2-day training for CBOs/CSO on sports for development and LtP approaches and supplemental learning for children,
- Awareness raising events on the importance of learning through play, supplemental learning and child protection issues,
- Training provided to Parent Councils on LtP, gender equality, child protection, school management and supporting school action plans,

iv. Systems

- Develop District-level coaching and mentoring plan in collaboration with district education officials,
- Training of 765 district officials on coaching and mentoring and teacher portfolio building,
- Support partner districts on regular field support to schools/ coaching and mentoring trained teachers,

¹ District support teams will be trained by National Master Trainers and RTP trainers using the training framework to be developed by National level GALOP working group on INSE

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

PARTNERS IN PLAY PROJECT (P3) BASELINE STUDY CONSULTANCY

- Training of 24 National Trainers on PBL,
- Training of 765 Teachers District Support Teams in LtP
- Training of 200 National level Master
- Hold series of workshops with different faculty members to identify integration process of LtP into existing subjects/course and establish working groups for the development of LtP teaching guides
- Conduct quarterly meetings with education colleges on the integration of LtP in teaching and learning practices including practical experiences in schools for student teachers
- Training of teachers on play-based learning from supported teaching schools

P3 project defines success as improving the quality of education in Ghana by increasing literacy outcomes, attendance rates and improved holistic/core skills development among children.

Additionally, the project aims to achieve the following **key interrelated Outcomes** organized by target group, which will lead to improved quality education at four levels:

i. Government:

- **Lego Foundation Outcome 4.2.** Ghana adopts policies that include holistic/core skills that enable Learn through Play (LtP)
- **Immediate Outcome 1.1** Improved capacity of education sector to integrate LtP to deliver the curriculum.

ii. Professionals

- **Lego Foundation Immediate Outcome 2.1.** Professionals have improved or increased **awareness** and understanding to implement LtP in their learning environment
- **Lego Foundation Outcome 2.2.** Professionals have improved skills to implement LtP within their learning environments
- **Lego Foundation Outcome 2.3.** Professionals implement the LtP approach in their learning environments
- **Immediate Outcome 2.1** Improved knowledge and skills & practices of teachers to implement LtP
- **Immediate Outcome 2.2** Improved capacity of Communities of Practice (CoPs) to provide **peer support to teachers** to integrate LtP approaches.

iii. Caregivers

- **Lego Foundation Outcome 1.1.** Caregivers have increased awareness and understanding of the importance of holistic/core skills for their children and how LtP develops these skills
- **Lego Foundation Outcome 1.4.** Caregivers actively support LtP
- **Immediate Outcome 3.1** Improved awareness of learning needs of girls and boys among caregivers.

iv. Systems

- **Lego Foundation Outcome 3.2.** Institutions implement curricula and development plans that include LtP
- **Immediate Outcome 4.1** Improved ability of district administration to support teachers to integrate LtP into their teaching practice.
- **Immediate Outcome 4.2** Improved capacity of national, regional and district level education officials to plan and monitor the integration integrate LtP into INSET (in service training)

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

PARTNERS IN PLAY PROJECT (P3) BASELINE STUDY CONSULTANCY

- **Immediate Outcome 4.3** Improved capacity of pre-service teacher training institutions to integrate LtP into training for student teachers.

In addition to following outcomes indicators will also be measured: %/total of children that demonstrate life skills (M/F); % of children who perceive their learning climate to be supportive (M/F); % of lessons which engage learners in child-centered learning

Please refer to Outcomes Logframe indicators in Annex I

For background information, please refer to The LEGO Foundation report Learning through play: a review of the evidence (2017) (https://www.legofoundation.com/media/1063/learning-through-play_web.pdf)

3.0 OBJECTIVES

The primary objectives of the baseline study are as follows:

1. To produce a rigorous evaluation framework design, including an analytical framework which can be used for the midline and endline evaluations;
2. To review, refine and/or develop reliable and valid survey and other measurement instruments;
3. To report the baseline starting points for the P3 project's intended outcomes;
4. To inform realistic and achievable targets that are grounded within the local context;
5. To produce evidence which facilitate discussion and learning regarding program best practices among beneficiaries, community members, Right To Play staff, partners and institutional stakeholders;
6. To produce evidence which inform organizational strategic learning and continuous improvement to strengthen capacity to carry out quality program design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation in the future.

4.0 EVALUATION OVERVIEW

The objective of these ToR is to procure the services of an independent external evaluator to conduct a mixed-method base line evaluation of the project P3.

The evaluation design will allow to assess the coherence, delivery, effectiveness, sustainability and impact of the project and report the findings and lessons learnt throughout the process.

Evaluation questions:

The Evaluation Team will be required to develop an evaluation approach that answers the following overarching questions:

- **Process** – Was the project successfully designed and implemented?

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

PARTNERS IN PLAY PROJECT (P3) BASELINE STUDY CONSULTANCY

- **Impact** – What impact did the project have on the main outcomes of interest and specifically its contribution to increasing literacy outcomes, attendance rates and improved holistic/core skills among children. How and why was this impact achieved? ²
- **Value for Money (VfM)** – Did the project demonstrate a good VfM approach?
- **Effectiveness** – What worked (and did not work) to increase the main outcomes of interest and specially literacy, attendance and holistic/core skills among girls as defined by the project?
- **Sustainability** – How sustainable were the learn through Play activities, and was the project successful in leveraging additional interest and investment?

Specific project level evaluation questions will be outlined as part of the MEL Framework. These questions will help define the scope and focus of the project evaluation process. The successful bidder will be expected to work with the Project Management Team to review and revise these questions as appropriate at the outset of the project. Project specific context is important in this respect

Activities/Tasks (Services) or Specifications (Goods)

1. The initial part of the baseline study will involve a **comprehensive review of the P3 program**, monitoring, and evaluation plan including a desk research and literature review which include the following key project documents:
 - logic model (RTP's ToC),
 - performance measurement framework,
 - MEL Plan,
 - review of existing tools,
- 2. **Propose measurement tools** (including revision of existing tools).
3. **Development of a robust evaluation framework** (using the OECD/DAC criteria for evaluating development assistance). This will comprise relevant research questions, a rigorous sampling methodology; and review, and/or draft measurement instruments to be piloted during the training of data collectors and enumerators.
4. **Sample design.** The sampling methodology should include baseline sample size calculations while considering the need to assure meaningful statistical testing at the endline.
5. **Data collection:** A fieldwork/data collection administration and logistics plan (includes Data quality assurance detailed process) will be developed and implemented, ensuring coordination with Right To Play country team. Travel will be required and the consultancy team will need to develop a robust data collection strategy while ensuring ability to train (as needed) enumerators, to collect the requested qualitative and quantitative data. Right To Play Country Office is expected to be involved in the coordination with national counterpart

² The evaluation of literacy outcomes will be conducted by the LEGO Foundation/research partner and hence data will not be collected as part of this baseline evaluation. However, analysis and triangulation of data is expected to be carry out by the evaluators.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

PARTNERS IN PLAY PROJECT (P3) BASELINE STUDY CONSULTANCY

for approval in accessing beneficiaries, a consultancy firm/group should be mindful of this during planning.

6. Data analysis and report writing. The final part of the baseline study process will consist of the review, cleaning and analysis of the data collected and drafting of the country-level report with inputs from the validation workshop. The consultancy team must also produce key findings that will be used for dissemination.

5.0 TIMELINE

The baseline study for the P3 program will be conducted within the anticipated timeline of September 2020 to March 2021, depending on COVID19 circumstances and related school opening.

6.0 LOCATION

The evaluation framework design process is expected to be carried out remotely at the consultants' base, with significant collaboration with the Global MEL Right to Play Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning team and project Management Team. For the field work and data collection, extensive in-country travel is expected in Ghana as per the proposed evaluation approach.

7.0 METHODOLOGY

Overall evaluation approach and design

The overall evaluation approach requires the Evaluation Team to design, plan and conduct a mixed-methods evaluation.

Research design

Comparison groups: bidders are required to outline their approach to evaluating the impact of the project. This should include consideration of the most rigorous approach to establishing a counterfactual. This should enable comparison of the outcomes achieved by a target group who were affected by a project intervention with the outcomes achieved by a group who are similar in every way to the target group, except that they have not in any way been exposed to or affected by the project intervention i.e. a comparison group. Careful consideration should be given to the use of **quasi-experimental methods** for this purpose.

Measuring outcomes: bidders are expected to understand the project's key and immediate outcomes and suggest the most appropriate data collection approach to evaluate each outcome indicators. This should include a mixture of quantitative and qualitative approaches.

The Evaluator will be expected to pilot tools that will be used for data collection and refine as necessary.

Project sampling framework: The Evaluation Team will be required to propose a sampling framework for both qualitative and quantitative samples. These should be of a sufficient size and representativeness to allow reasonable:

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

PARTNERS IN PLAY PROJECT (P3) BASELINE STUDY CONSULTANCY

- Levels of certainty that the findings are representative for the target population.
- Ability to generalise the intervention's effectiveness to similar contexts.
- Ability to generalise the insights into what works and why for similar contexts. Minimum sample sizes required to determine whether the intervention is effective with the degree of precision required. Determining the proper sample size requires (1) calculating a minimum sample size necessary, (2) accounting for sampling design, and (3) accounting for attrition. The sampling size should reflect the three levels of intervention described above (100 schools direct and intense RTP support; 257 schools who will receive support from district support teams with additional RTP support; 1800 GALOP schools that will receive support only from district support teams under RTP's cascade model).

Research questions may include:

- Is the P3 programme relevant to the contexts where it operates and whether it is reaching the most vulnerable children,
- Does the intervention address the barriers that most significantly affect educational outcomes
- Is the theory of change consistent with the outcomes it aims to achieve and likely to lead to the effectiveness of the intervention,
- What are the current levels of children's life skills proficiency? What is the impact of Right to Play's child centered learning in the development of such skills across time?
- Does Right To Play's particular approach on training, coaching and mentoring for teachers and other educational personnel lead to successful application of learning through play? In which ways?
- What specific Right To Play child centered practices are associated with increased learn through play methods used in the classroom?
- What are the current levels of teacher's awareness, knowledge and skills to facilitate learn through in their learning environment with their children?
- What is the impact of RTP's teaching, coaching and mentoring approach to teacher's instruction and management practices in the classroom (teacher directed/child-centered)?
- In which ways does Right To Play's particular approach engages parents and caregivers in being aware of and support the learn through play approach and gender-specific learning needs of girls and boys?
- What aspects of RTP's Cascade Model are adopted into national, regional and district level systems that operationalise Learn through Play?

Data Collection Tools

The evaluation will include a toolkit with relevant, appropriate tools to measure progress on the outcome indicators selected and to adequately answer the research questions posed. It is required that the consultancy firm refine the questions and propose additional ones to answer each of the outcomes identified above.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

PARTNERS IN PLAY PROJECT (P3) BASELINE STUDY CONSULTANCY

Where necessary as per indicator needs, existing tools will undergo a critical review and revision while new ones will be developed. The following is a (non-exhaustive) list of tools that will need to be revised/developed:

- Teacher Coaching and Mentoring Assessment (existing)
- Teacher Survey
- Life Skills Assessment (existing ISELA tool)
- Interview Guides (stakeholders and beneficiaries)
- Focus Group Discussions (FDG, children, parents, community members, other stakeholders)
- Classroom Observation (Child centered learning- existing)
- Parents' Knowledge Attitudes and Practices (KAP)
- School/Classroom Environment Review Guide (existing)
- School Records Guide (for attendance, etc)

Data collection plan/ quality assurance process

The research planning process will entail an in-depth **training of enumerators and data collectors** which will include piloting of the instruments to ensure satisfactory reliability and validity. Tools will be subsequently refined after training and prior to going to the field. Firms will need to collect data using tablets and other softwares.

Data Analysis

Data on outcome indicators will be analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. Moreover, an analytical framework is required to be submitted as part of the evaluation design process which will detail the specific analytical methodology to produce the result for each indicator and each research question posed. The consultant will engage significantly with the Right To Play team to determine and agree on these.

The consultant will require to utilize analytical software to analyze both the quantitative (e.g. Excel, SPSS, STATA, R), and qualitative (e.g. Nvivo) data. Outputs from data analysis will be submitted as part of the deliverables, as will the scripts (or list of commands) with clear notes/guidance, particularly for quantitative data analyzed (in SPSS, STATA, R).

8.0 GENERAL CONDITIONS OF THE CONSULTANCY

Steering Committee

A steering committee of key implementation stakeholders (i.e. Right To Play country and global staff) will be formed to guide and inform the research process. They will help to inform the relevance and appropriateness of the evaluation design framework, the data collection tools and the analytical framework. They will also help to ensure that the research planning and data collection processes

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

PARTNERS IN PLAY PROJECT (P3) BASELINE STUDY CONSULTANCY

are sound, culturally appropriate and contextually relevant to Right To Play's programmatic needs and to the needs of all relevant stakeholders (i.e. beneficiaries, community members and partners).

Measurement Plan

The measurement plan adheres to the P3 program Performance Measurement Framework (PMF) and MEL Plan and uses a results-based management approach for tracking the progress of outputs and outcomes against targets.

Consultancy Expectations

- The consultancy firm/group will have an orientation to Right To Play's program delivery model;
- The consultancy firm/group will submit a detailed work plan and time frame for the completion of the baseline research;
- The data analysis and draft reports will be shared with Right To Play with sufficient time to allow for Right To Play to review and provide feedback, which will be incorporated into subsequent work;
- After the completion of any research reports, a presentation will be given to Right To Play staff and appropriate stakeholders to share both results and recommendations;
- Throughout each phase, the consultancy firm/group will be expected to maintain regular communications with Right To Play regarding progress;
- Travel and accommodations for visits within the country are to be included in the budget
- The consultancy firm/group must follow OECD-DAC principles for evaluation;
- All materials, processes, methodologies, reports, plans and other works provided to the consultancy firm/group or developed by the consultancy firm/group on behalf of Right To Play remain the property of Right To Play;
- All data must be stored in a safe and secure location, allowing full access to Right To Play staff during the evaluation process;
- Upon completion of the research, all raw data must be submitted to Right To Play.

9.0 ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES (SUMMARY)

The consultancy firm/group will report directly to RTP's Global, Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Manager at Right To Play International and all deliverables should be submitted to her according to the schedule outlined in the "Key Deliverables and Timeline" section below.

The consultancy firm/group's roles and responsibilities include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Background research to familiarize themselves with the P3 program and Right To Play's approach (i.e. program documents provided by Right To Play);
- Document review of program, monitoring and evaluation plans, MEL Plan, including logical model, performance measurement framework, and existing tools;
- Development of the evaluation design/framework in collaboration with the Right To Play International Steering Committee;
- Development and implementation of a fieldwork/data collection administration and logistics plan of implementation;

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

PARTNERS IN PLAY PROJECT (P3) BASELINE STUDY CONSULTANCY

- Data collection, entry & cleaning, and analysis;
- Data validation and interpretation through internal review of findings (with inputs from validation workshop);
- Completion of final report
- Preparation and presentation of findings and recommendations.

10.0 KEY DELIVERABLES AND TIMELINE (NEGOTIABLE AND TO BE FINALIZED WITH RTP STAFF)

DELIVERABLE	DETAILS	DEADLINE
1. Submission of Proposal	Please include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cover letter • Expression of interest • Technical Proposal • Capabilities and Past Performance • Cost Proposal • Qualifications: CVs for all those proposed in the Evaluation Team, clearly stating their roles and responsibilities for this evaluation. • Draft of the proposed work plan (Gantt Chart) • Two writing samples, ideally reports the firm/organization/group has lead authorship on 	August 3 rd - 17 th 2020
2. Interviews	Interviews	August 18 th - 30 th 2020
3. Award of Contract	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract to be signed 	September 6 th 2020
4. Right To Play Consultations and document review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial consultations will begin this week and extend throughout the duration of the planning period 	September 7 th -18 th 2020
5. Evaluation Framework Design Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation Framework Design Document (incl. underlying ToC assumptions, sampling methodology and calculations, evaluation criteria and RQs, stakeholder participation in evaluation management, dissemination plan, etc) 	September 30 th 2020
6. Draft Instruments Reviewed/ Refined/ Developed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Instruments (non-exhaustive & some existing) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Teacher Coaching and Mentoring Assessment (existing) ○ Teacher Survey ○ Life Skills Assessment (ISELA tool) ○ Interview Guides ○ Focus Group Discussions (FDG, children, parents, community members, other stakeholders) ○ Classroom Observation ○ Parents' Knowledge Attitudes and Practices (KAP) ○ School/Classroom Environment Review Guide 	October 15 th 2020

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

PARTNERS IN PLAY PROJECT (P3) BASELINE STUDY CONSULTANCY

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ School Records Guide (for attendance, e ● Draft Data Analysis Framework 	
7. Fieldwork (Data Collection) Plan Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Fieldwork logistics and schedule (i.e. in Excel) ● Fieldwork manual including data collectors' training guide 	October 15 th 2020
8. Data Collectors Training Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Data collectors training agenda (x3) ● Revised draft instruments (following pilot during training) ● Data collectors' training report (x3) 	October 20 th 2020
9. Fieldwork Completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Fieldwork completion reports (x3) 	October 25 th 2020
10. Data Collected	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cleaned, raw data in two formats: excel and a stats software format (e.g. SPSS or STATA) 	October 30 th – November 15 th 2020 – TBC – COVID19
11. Analyzed data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Populated performance measurement framework with analyzed data 	TBC (3 weeks)
12. Draft Baseline Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Validation workshop ● Revised data analysis framework document ● Draft country report & Summary of main findings 	TBC
13. Final Baseline Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Finalized data analysis framework document ● SPSS or Stata scripts with clear, easy to understand notes ● Final country report ● Final summary PPT 	

The above timeline is negotiable and subject to change based on consultation with Right To Play International, and Country staff.

11.0 QUALIFICATIONS

- A consultancy firm/group with at least 7-15 years of experience in the research and/or evaluation field, including experience in quantitative and qualitative data collection, analyzing quantitative and qualitative data, and report writing;
- Extensive experience creating measurement frameworks, refining indicators, and creating measurement tools for education focused programs;
- Extensive experience managing and designing evaluation studies (e.g. experience in Ghana is of value added, with children and young people, in remote settings, etc.);
- Extensive experience in international education at the primary levels;
- Experience in life skills measurement and behavioural change measurement;
- Experience using participatory methodologies and following OECD-DAC principles for evaluation and measurement;
- Applicant should have a relevant degree in social sciences, international development, statistical sciences, or another related field;
- Excellent skills and experience with data analysis using statistical computing tools (Excel, SPSS, STATA, NVIVO);

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

PARTNERS IN PLAY PROJECT (P3) BASELINE STUDY CONSULTANCY

- Excellent working proficiency in English;

12.0 LOGFRAME (Outomes & Indicators)

GOAL: Improve the quality of education for Ghanaian girls and boys aged 4-12 through a scalable and replicable LtP model		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. #/% of children achieving at least a minimum proficiency in reading/literacy (M/F) ii. Primary School Net Enrollment Rate (M/F) iii. %/total of children that demonstrate holistic/core skills (M/F) iv. % of children who perceive their learning climate to be supportive (M/F) v. % of lessons which engage learners in child-centered learning (disaggregated by teacher sex) vi. Primary school drop-out rate 		
Government	Professionals	
Outcome 4.2.: Ghana adopts policies that include holistic/core skills that enable LtP	Outcome 2.3.: Professionals implement the LtP approach in their learning environments Outcome 2.2.: Professionals have improved or build skills to implement LtP within their learning environments Outcome 2.1.: Professionals have improved or increased awareness and understanding to implement LtP in their learning environment	
Immediate Outcomes	Immediate Outcomes	
1.1 Improved capacity of education sector to integrate LtP to deliver the curriculum % Ghana Country policies with language that is reflective of holistic skills and/or LtP based learning approaches % Ghana Government is developing policy guidelines or proposals	2.1 Improved knowledge and skills of teachers to implement LtP Outcome 2.3 Indicators # Hours Professionals are using LtP in their learning environment % Professionals who self-report using LtP % Children who report facilitating LtP in their learning environments % Professional lesson or session plans that include LtP % Learning environments that show evidence of LtP methods or manipulative % Professionals who are implementing LtP in their learning environments Outcome 2.2 Indicators # Professionals trained % Professionals who have the skills to facilitate LtP in their learning environments with their children in accordance with the LtP Principles Outcome 2.1 Indicators # Professionals trained % Professionals who improve in their knowledge of Learning through Play principles and facilitation methodologies and its link to holistic skills development	2.2 Improved capacity of Communities of Learning to provide peer support to teachers for implementation of LtP %/total of teachers who report receiving support from CoPs to improve their teaching practices (M/F) %/total of male and female teachers leading CoP activities (M/F)
Caregivers	Systems	
Outcome 1.1.: Caregivers have increased awareness and understanding of the importance of holistic skills for their children and how LtP develops these skills	Outcome 3.2.: Institutions implement curricula and development plans that include LtP	

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

PARTNERS IN PLAY PROJECT (P3) BASELINE STUDY CONSULTANCY

Outcome 1.4.: Caregivers actively support LtP			
Immediate Outcomes	Immediate Outcomes		
3.1 Improved awareness of learning needs of girls and boys among caregivers <i>% Caregivers recommend LtP to peers, other caregivers, their own families, communities, children's education facilities and or teachers</i> <i># Caregivers trained</i> <i>% Caregivers who improve in their knowledge of the importance of holistic skills development in their children</i> <i>% Caregivers who improve in their knowledge of Learning through Play principles and facilitation methodologies and how these contribute to skills development</i> <i>% Caregivers who improve in their knowledge of their own role as well as that of other adults and children in LtP</i>	4.1 Improved ability of district administration to support teachers to integrate LtP into their teaching practice <i>% Institutions with implementation plans</i> <i>% Institutions implementing LtP</i> <i># Institutions reached</i>	4.2 Improved capacity of national, regional and district level education officials to integrate LtP into INSET (in service training) <i>Same indicators 4.1</i>	4.3 Improved capacity of pre-service teacher training institutions to integrate LtP into training for student teachers (University of Education Winneba and Teachers Colleges) <i>% Schools / universities / ECD centres that have school development plans that include LtP and/or holistic skills assessment</i>

Part C: INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS

1. DEFINITIONS

Offeror: The individual or firm providing proposals for the services requested under this RFP.

Sub-Contractor/Vendor: The individual or firm awarded the services requested under the RFP in the form of a sub-contract.

Buyer: Right To Play

2. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION AND REQUIREMENTS

Offerors are encouraged to read the RFP document in its entirety and ensure that their proposal addresses all of the items cited in the proposal instructions and meets the selection criteria. All proposals must be submitted by the deadline established on the cover page of this RFP. Offers received after this due date and time will not be accepted for consideration.

Questions:

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

PARTNERS IN PLAY PROJECT (P3) BASELINE STUDY CONSULTANCY

All questions or clarifications regarding this RFP must be in writing and submitted to poliveira@righttoplay.com with Kwarteng Frimpong, **Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Specialist** in copy at: KFrimpong@righttoplay.com no later than **Friday 7th August 2020, 12:00 Noon GMT/**. Questions and requests for clarification, and the responses thereto, will be circulated to all RFP recipients who have indicated interest in this RFP.

Only written answers from RTP's authorized representative will be considered official and carry weight in the RFP process and subsequent evaluation. Any answers received outside the official channel, whether received verbally or in writing, from employees of RTP, the P3 Project, or any other party, will not be considered official responses regarding this RFP.

Submission of Proposals:

The offeror's proposal must be accompanied by a cover letter typed on paper with an official organizational letterhead and signed by an individual who has signatory authority for the offeror. The offeror must submit a complete proposal package on or before the due date and time to **Patricia Oliveira** at poliveira@righttoplay.com with Kwarteng Frimpong, **Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Specialist** in copy at: KFrimpong@righttoplay.com. Proposals must be submitted by email only with the subject line "RFP P3 Ghana Baseline" **The deadline for the submission of proposal is Monday 17th August 2020.**

The proposals must be prepared in two separate volumes: i. Technical Proposal; and ii. Cost Proposal. The technical and cost proposal must be kept separate. Technical proposals must not make reference to pricing data in order to evaluate the technical proposal strictly on the basis of technical merit.

The written proposal must contain the following information and documentation:

a) **Technical Proposal Requirements/ Proposed Plan and Approach**

The Technical proposal shall describe how the offeror intends to carry out the Terms of Reference as stated in Part B. It should be concise, specific, complete, and demonstrate a clear understanding of the work to be undertaken and the responsibilities of all parties involved. It must demonstrate the offeror's eligibility, as well as their capabilities and expertise in conducting each step of the activity.

Offerors shall include only information necessary to provide a clear understanding of the proposed action and the justification for it. Greater detail than necessary, as well as insufficient detail may detract from a proposal's clarity. Assume that the reader is not familiar with the particular context in

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

PARTNERS IN PLAY PROJECT (P3) BASELINE STUDY CONSULTANCY

which the project will be implemented. Minimize or avoid the use of jargon and acronyms as much as possible. If acronyms or abbreviations are used, include a separate page explaining the terms.

b) Capabilities and Past Performance

The offeror must submit a capabilities statement along with documentary evidence of past performance.

The capabilities statement should not exceed five (5) pages in length and will be used to evaluate the offeror's organizational, financial, and technical capacity, in relation to the Terms of Reference in Part B. The Capabilities Statement must include but is not limited to: size of the agency, financial resources available to complete this work, staffing competencies and capabilities, past experience performing similar work with other donor organizations, and a company profile and/or brochure.

c) Cost Proposal Requirements

1. The offeror should submit their most competitive and complete cost proposal.
2. A fixed unit cost and total cost proposal for completion of works as described in the terms of reference (Part B).
3. All costs must be stated in [Canadian Dollars \(CAD\)](#).
4. A fixed price for each category of deliverable, each of which will be considered a fixed price budget for that specific segment of work. The price of the sub-contract/PO to be awarded will be an all-inclusive fixed price. No profit, fee or additional costs can be included after the award. All items/ services must be clearly labeled and included in the total offered price.
5. Offered price must include comprehensive insurance, shipping and handling charges, and state INCOTERM, if any.
6. Please indicate all prices exclusive of VAT, Excise or other taxes.
7. The offeror should submit cost proposal budget narrative.

Cost Proposal Budget Narrative Preparation Instructions

A detailed budget narrative that justifies the costs as appropriate and necessary for the successful completion of proposed activities should be attached to the budget. The budget narrative should clearly describe the project and cost assumptions. All proposed costs must be directly applicable to performing the work under the award and budgeted amounts should not exceed the market cost/value of an item or service.

The budget narrative should be of sufficient detail so that someone unfamiliar with your organization or the activity could review and adequately understand and grasp the assumptions, reasonableness and calculation method used.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

PARTNERS IN PLAY PROJECT (P3) BASELINE STUDY CONSULTANCY

Budget narrative must be prepared using Microsoft Excel software. Supporting information must be provided in adequate detail for conducting a comprehensive analysis.

d) Other Requirements

Please provide other requirements i.e. business registration information (copy of registration or incorporation etc.), applicable trade license or equivalent, company tax registration or equivalent, institutional brochures, publications, financial audit statements, etc.

Offer is to include:

- Qualifications: bidders are required to clearly identify and provide CVs for all those proposed in the Evaluation Team, clearly stating their roles and responsibilities for this evaluation. Please note that if the enumeration is to be sub-contracted, the evaluator will be ultimately responsible for the enumerators they are subcontracting to.
- Initial draft of the proposed work plan in Gantt chart style.
- Two writing samples, ideally reports the firm/organization/group has lead authorship on

3. AWARD

RTP intends to issue a fixed price purchase order / sub-contract to the offeror(s) who best meet the criteria specified in this RFP and are determined to be responsible and eligible sub-contractor to provide the required goods/services.

4. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Proposals will be evaluated first to ensure that they meet all mandatory requirements and responsive. To be determined responsive, a proposal must include all documentation as listed. Proposals that fail to meet these requirements will receive no further consideration. A non-responsive proposal to any element may be eliminated from consideration.

Responsive proposals will be evaluated and ranked by a committee on a technical basis according to the criteria below. Those proposals that are considered to be technically acceptable shall then be evaluated in terms of cost.

For the purpose of selection, the evaluation will be based on the following weighted point scale (totaling 100 points) of the proposal in its entirety, including, but not limited to, the following:

No.	Criteria	Points
1	Technical Approach, Methodology and Implementation plan	40

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

PARTNERS IN PLAY PROJECT (P3) BASELINE STUDY CONSULTANCY

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Comprehensiveness of proposal approach. Clarity and appropriateness of proposed activity.• Implementation plan and proposed timeline are realistic and include all proposed elements of activity.• Responsiveness to Terms of Reference	
2	Capabilities and Past Performance <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Organizational, financial and technical capabilities and resources to implement this work• Previous successful past experience implementing similar activities.	20
3	Proposed Costs <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reasonableness of proposed budget based on scope of activities proposed.• Summary budget, detailed budget, and budget notes included.• Comparative lowest price	30
4	Deliverable timeframe.	10
	Total	100

4. TERMS OF AWARD

This document is a request for proposals only, and in no way obligates RTP or its donor to make any award. Please be advised that under a fixed price contract the work must be completed within the specified total price. Any expenses incurred in excess of the agreed upon amount in the sub-contract will be the responsibility of the sub-contractor and not that of RTP or its donor. Therefore, the offeror is duly advised to provide its most competitive and realistic proposal to cover all foreseeable expenses related to provide requested goods/services.

All deliverables produced under the future award/sub-contract shall be considered the property of RTP. RTP may choose to award a PO/sub-contract for part of the activities in the RFP. RTP may choose to award a PO/sub-contract to more than one offeror for specific parts of the activities in the RFP.

5. PROPOSAL VALIDITY

The Offeror's technical and cost proposals must remain valid for not less than 120 calendar days after the deadline specified above. Proposals must be signed by an official authorized to bind the offeror to its provisions.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

PARTNERS IN PLAY PROJECT (P3) BASELINE STUDY CONSULTANCY

6. PAYMENT TERMS

RTP payment cycle is net 30 days upon receipt of deliverables, goods/services, inspection and acceptance of goods/services as in compliance with the terms of the award and receipt of vendor invoice. Full cooperation with RTP in meeting the terms and conditions of payment will be given the highest consideration.

Payment Schedule:

- First payment: After signing of contract agreement with Right To Play (10%)
- Second payment: Submission of evaluation framework design (including draft analysis framework) and relevant instruments (15%)
- Third payment: Submission of analyzed data appropriate for PMF entry (40%)
- Fourth payment: Submission of draft report (15%)
- Final payment: Submission of final report, PowerPoint presentations and final analysis framework approved by Right To Play (20%)

7. FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Offerors which are firms and not individuals must include in the capabilities statement that they have the financial viability and resources to complete the proposed activities within the period of performance and under the terms of payment outlined below. RTP reserves the right to request and review the latest financial statements and audit reports of the offeror as part of the basis of the award.

8. LANGUAGE

The proposal, as well as correspondence and related documents should be in English.

9. NEGOTIATIONS

The offeror's most competitive proposal is requested. It is anticipated that any award issued will be made solely on the basis of an offeror's proposal. However, the Project reserves the right to request responses to additional technical, management and cost questions which would help in negotiating and awarding a PO/sub-contract. The Project also reserves the right to conduct negotiations on technical, management, or cost issues prior to the award of a PO/sub-contract. In the event that an agreement cannot be reached with an offeror the Project will enter into negotiations with alternate offerors for the purpose of awarding a PO/sub-contract without any obligation to previously considered offerors.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

PARTNERS IN PLAY PROJECT (P3) BASELINE STUDY CONSULTANCY

10. REJECTION OF PROPOSALS

RTP reserves the right to reject any and all proposals received, or to negotiate separately with any and all competing offerors, without explanation.

11. INCURRING COSTS

RTP is not liable for any cost incurred by offerors during preparation, submission, or negotiation of an award for this RFP. The costs are solely the responsibility of the offeror.

12. MODIFICATIONS

RTP reserves the right, in its sole discretion, to modify the request, to alter the selection process, to modify or amend the specifications and scope of work specified in this RFQ.

13. CANCELLATION

RTP may cancel this RFP without any cost or obligation at any time until issuance of the award.

Right To Play is a child-centered organization. Our recruitment and selection procedures reflect our commitment to the safety and protection of children in our programs.

To learn more about how we are and what we do, please visit our website at www.righttoplay.com.