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# General information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title of assignment | Evaluation of the EU Support For Basic School Teachers' qualification In Sudan |
| Beneficiaries of the evaluation | Expertise France, European Union, Education authorities and associated institutions in Sudan and neighboring countries, Implementing partners |
| Countries of intervention of the project | Sudan, with activities in Chad, Egypt, Ethiopia and Djibouti. |
| Preferred location | Remote (ideally from East-Africa / Middle-East), with missions to Chad, Egypt, Ethiopia, and Sudan. |
| Estimated budget | 50,000€ |

# Background

## General context

EQUIP 2 is a €20M EU-funded programme implemented by Save the Children International, Expertise France (EF) and SOFRECO. It contributes to the improvement of conducive and inclusive learning environments in formal and non-formal settings, of basic school-teacher qualification through improved training, and enhances education system governance (and coordination amongst stakeholders) whilst supporting the academic research in education.

EF is responsible for the teacher training component (component 2 of the programme - €9M, started in June 2021), aiming at improving pre-service and in-service training for Sudanese teachers. Initially, the project was supposed to support certified teachers operating in formal education, but since the conflict erupted in April 2023, and after a 10-month suspension, an addendum was signed with the EUD (March 2024) to expand the activities (for example, inclusion of education in emergencies), the beneficiaries (non-certified teachers, volunteers, etc.), the countries of intervention (Sudan, Chad, Egypt, Ethiopia and Djibouti) and the duration (December 2025 VS November 2024).

## Project overview

**Project title**: EU Support For Basic School Teachers’ Qualification In Sudan

**Implementation dates**: June 2021 – December 2025 (the M&E activities will cover the project from the signature of the addendum, post-suspension, in April 2024)

**Location / intervention areas**: Sudan and neighbouring countries (Chad, Egypt, Ethiopia)

**Implementing partners mapping**:

Activity 1.1: Norwegian Refugee Council (Sudan)

Activity 1.2: Jesuit Refugee Services (Chad), Catholic Relief Service (Egypt), Plan International (Ethiopia)

Activity 2.1 and 3.1: British Council (Sudan)

Activity 2.2: Ginger SOFRECO (Sudan)

Activity 3.2: Reseau FIGURE (France, Sudan, Egypt, Ethiopia, Djibouti)

Activity 4: Sadagaat Charity Organisation (Sudan)

Activity digitisation: Reseau CANOPE (France)

**Target groups**: Sudanese nationals involved in teacher training activities (certified teachers, personnel from the National Centre for Teachers’ Training, university personnel, volunteer teachers, etc.) in Sudan and selected countries

**Project budget**: 9 million €

**Project objectives**:

Overall objective: Contribute to enhancing the right to quality equitable education in Sudan, with particular attention to vulnerable groups (especially girls, migrants, internally displaced persons and refugees)

Specific objective: The quality of teaching (content and pedagogical practices) is improved, and better takes into account students’ needs (especially girls, migrants, internally displaced persons and refugees)

**Expected results**:

(1) Education staff are trained on Education in Emergencies (EiE), and their capacity to deliver quality EiE activities (including on gender-based violence) is improved;

(2) In-service teacher training is enhanced through education staff’s capacity building and training institutions strengthening, with a focus on students’ specific needs (especially girls);

(3) Pre-service teacher training is improved through faculty deans and professors’ capacity building and higher education institutions’ strengthening;

(4) Knowledge products and tools are available to help tackle gender inequities in the teaching profession.

**The theory of change, the logical framework, the list of key activities and a mapping of the implementing partners can be found in annex**

# OBJECTIVES AND RESULTS SOUGHT

## Assignment objectives

### Purpose and objectives of the evaluation

The final evaluation of the EQUIP 2, Component 2 will serve as a key accountability and learning exercise. It will measure the extent to which the project has achieved its intended results and assess the overall effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, coherence and relevance of its interventions since the beginning of the project (June 2021) with a focus on the period since it resumed in April 2024. Furthermore, it will generate evidence-based findings to inform future programming in similar contexts, especially given the expansion of activities, target groups, and geographical coverage.

### Overall objectives and expectations of the assignment

The main objective of this evaluation is to provide the relevant national partners (e.g., Education authorities and associated institutions in Sudan and neighboring countries), the international partners, the agency Expertise France (field and head office teams), and the donor (European Union) with:

* A comprehensive, independent assessment of the performance of the “EU Support For Basic School Teachers’ Qualification in Sudan” project (EQUIP 2 – Component 2), paying particular attention to the results achieved since the signature of the addendum in April 2024, against the agreed objectives.
* Lessons and recommendations to improve, where relevant, current and future work.

In particular, this evaluation will:

* Review and assess the project’s progress in achieving its intended objectives, highlighting successes, challenges, and any unintended outcomes, as well as paying particular to the inclusion of vulnerable groups and of gender concerns.
* Identify the main factors (contextual, operational, or strategic) that have influenced project implementation and overall results.
* Provide actionable recommendations to strengthen ongoing activities and inform the design and delivery of future teacher training interventions, especially in crisis-affected contexts.

The evaluator should provide evidence-based analyses and clearly demonstrate cause-and-effect linkages to explain how and why certain outcomes were attained (or not). Their work must foster accountability among stakeholders, facilitate informed decision-making, and promote learning to enhance the impact of similar projects in the future.

## Scope of the evaluation

The scope of this final evaluation will include the following:

* **Period**: From the beginning in June 2021 through to the project’s conclusion in December 2025
* **Components:** All activities under the teacher training component (Component 2 of EQUIP 2), including in-service and pre-service teacher training, Education in Emergencies (EiE) capacity building, and the development of knowledge products and tools.
* **Country:** Sudan, Chad, Egypt, Ethiopia.
* **Beneficiaries**: Institutional partners (e.g., Ministries of Education and affiliated teacher training institutions), implementing partners (national and international NGOs, academic institutions, etc.), and the ultimate target groups—such as Sudanese certified teachers, volunteer teachers, education personnel (e.g., trainers, higher education faculty), and other stakeholders involved in delivering and overseeing teacher training activities.

# Criteria and evaluation questions

The evaluation will use the criteria defined by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC): relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

The evaluation questions detailed below have been developed by Expertise France and its M&E Partner. They will be reviewed by the evaluator during the evaluation inception phase, in order to suggest a final version in the inception report approved by the steering committee.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation criteria** | **Specific evaluation questions** |
| Relevance | 1. To what extent were the project objectives aligned with the expressed needs and priorities of beneficiary spokespersons (teachers, teacher trainers, volunteer educators) and responsive to the issues identified (including education in emergencies and gender equity)? 2. To what extent were the project objectives, expected results, and activities clearly formulated and coherent with each other? 3. To what extent did the project’s approach (including the expansions in scope and geography) respond to the initial capacity and needs of national stakeholders evolving due to the contextual changes and the evolution of the conflict (e.g., teacher training institutions, Ministries of Education)? |
| Efficiency | 1. To what extent have the project’s targets (output and outcome indicators) been achieved in a timely and cost-effective manner (both in terms of resources used and project management structure), considering the expanded scope (covering Chad, Egypt, Ethiopia, and potentially Djibouti) and any constraints imposed by the conflict in Sudan? |
| Effectiveness | 1. To what extent have project objectives been achieved for each output and outcome indicator? 2. To what extent have the project activities generated the intended results? What unanticipated results have been generated by the project? 3. How the effects of the activities differ depending on implementing partners and corresponding beneficiaries? How gender and vulnerable groups have been taken into account in the various activities throughout the implementation? |
| Viability / sustainability | 1. What evidence suggests that practices and behaviors of actors in beneficiary institutions (training centers, universities, Ministries) are changing and likely to continue beyond the project’s duration? 2. To what extent will the support provided (including the new EiE modules, gender-focused training, and digitalization efforts) have a lasting positive impact on teacher training systems and policies in the target countries? 3. To what extent have the project’s capacity-building efforts led to a tangible transfer of skills and knowledge among participating civil servants and educational personnel? |
| Impact | 1. To what extent has the project contributed to achieving its overall objective of enhancing basic school teachers’ qualification, particularly in emergency and fragile contexts? 2. What positive and negative (primary and secondary) long-term effects (direct or indirect, expected or unexpected) can be observed as a result of the project interventions in Sudan and neighbouring countries? |
| Coherence | 1. To what extent do the activities undertaken enable the donor to achieve the objectives of its development policy? 2. To what extent the project has built synergies with partners/agencies working in the same countries and on the same subjects? 3. To what extent are project activities and objectives aligned with the Sudan HRP and RRRP 2024-2025? |

The incumbent is expected to provide a value judgment on each of the evaluation questions raised by going through the criteria. As part of this analysis, the incumbent will ensure that the judgments made for each of the six evaluation criteria make it possible to cover all of the key stages of the project cycle.

The incumbent should also verify whether gender equality was taken into account when documents were identified / developed and to what degree they were present in the implementation and supervision of the work.

# Assignment description

## Methodology used

The evaluation shall adopt a results-based management (RBM) approach, consistent with Expertise France’s M&E Policy. This involves collecting and analyzing both quantitative and qualitative data to assess how effectively the project’ s interventions have contributed to achieving the intended outputs, outcomes, and overall objectives. The methodology should be structured to facilitate learning, accountability, and participatory engagement with all relevant stakeholders.In keeping with these guiding principles, the evaluation design will focus on gathering credible evidence of results while fostering dialogue and reflection among project partners, beneficiaries, and funders. The key components of this approach are outlined below.

1. **Participatory and Inclusive Approach**
   * **Stakeholder Engagement**: The evaluation team is expected to involve all key stakeholders—including national and local authorities, teacher training institutions, beneficiary teachers, and implementing partners—throughout the evaluation process. This includes data collection, validation of findings, and the co-creation of recommendations.
   * **Local Capacity-Building**: Drawing on EF’s M&E Policy emphasis on ownership, the evaluation should strengthen local M&E capacities where feasible.
2. **Data Collection and Analysis**
   * **Mixed Methods**: The evaluator should combine quantitative (e.g., surveys, standardized tests, existing monitoring data) and qualitative (e.g., key informant interviews, focus group discussions, case studies) techniques. This triangulation will provide robust, contextually nuanced evidence of project performance.
   * **Use of Existing Monitoring Data**: In line with EF’s policy to optimize resources and enhance efficiency, the evaluation team should incorporate the project’s routine monitoring data, dashboards, and baseline or midline findings (if available).
   * **Gender-Disaggregated Data**: Where relevant, data should be disaggregated by gender and other key variables (e.g., age group, geographical location), so that the evaluation can capture differential impacts on various beneficiary groups, consistent with EF’s commitment to gender equality and inclusivity.
3. **Ethical Considerations and Conflict Sensitivity**
   * **Confidentiality and Informed Consent**: The evaluator should ensure that all data-collection processes respect participants’ rights to privacy, confidentiality, and dignity, in alignment with EF’s ethical standards.
   * **Conflict Sensitivity**: Given the fragile context in Sudan and the neighboring countries, the evaluation must employ a “do no harm” approach, prioritizing the safety and well-being of participants and staff involved in any data-collection activities.

## Procedure

The incumbent is asked to closely link with Expertise when setting out their reasoning, and regularly throughout the assignment, from the point of developing the scoping outline up to the meeting to present the draft report. In particular, observations and initial areas of analysis must be shared at the end of the assignment, before the draft report is written.

Given that the implementing partners will conclude their activities at different moments of the year, the evaluation will be conducted over the period May – December 2025, with data collection being divided into two phases: one in Summer 2025 (for partners concluding activities in July) and one in Autumn 2025 (for partners ending in November).

Sections below outline in more details the phases the consultancy is expected to follow.

### Inception phase

During this preparatory phase, the incumbent must:

* + Gather and consult all the information and documents relating to the project that need to be evaluated (project outline, implementation and monitoring documents) and that contribute to understanding the project context. Documents to consult will be available from the following places: to be completed as appropriate
  + Identify all project stakeholders.
  + Reconstruct the project intervention logic by reviewing the project's logical framework to: (i) clarify the intervention objectives and translate them into a hierarchy of expected changes and (ii) help to assess the internal coherence of the intervention and III) identify the initial hypotheses (or assumptions, which are often implicit) that guided the project being developed, and retrospectively assess their legitimacy.
  + Drafting the **Inception Report**: Present the proposed methodology, detailed work plan, and data-collection instruments for approval by the steering committee. The inception report will also include the finalized evaluation framework comprehending: (i) the key questions for the evaluation to focus on; (ii) the stages of reasoning that will make it possible to answer the questions (judgment criteria); (iii) specifying the indicators to be used to answer the questions and the corresponding sources of information (documentation, interviews, focus groups, surveys, etc.). The evaluation framework will be discussed with Expertise France and the incumbent to guide discussions about how they plan to structure the evaluation process and to check how feasible it is.

In the inception report the incumbent will also put together a precise and analytical overview of the project, in the form of a descriptive project analysis, which must be shared with Expertise France before they begin the assignment. This document must include in particular:

* + A brief overview of the context and how it has developed.
  + A description of the project (objectives, content, contributors, way of working, etc.).
  + An analytical summary of the project's progress from the point of conception up to the date of the evaluation, which highlights key points in its development and presents the allocation and level of funding mobilized, and outlining any key difficulties encountered and any changes that have occurred.
  + A description of the methodology to be used during the evaluation, including the evaluation matrix, the sampling (whenever relevant), data collection tools (e.g.: interview guides, questionnaires, etc.), and method of analysis.
  + A proposed timetable for the data collection and analysis phases of the evaluation
  + The outline of the final evaluation report.

If changes are made to the intervention logic, any objectives redefined by the evaluator must be shared with Project Manager and the project team.

This preparatory phase is key and will serve to validate the methodology proposed by the incumbents.

### Data collection phase

Primary data collection is planned in two different periods, the first between July and August 2025 and the second between November and December 2025. During the first period, the consultant is expected to collect data on activities implemented by CRS and Plan International in Egypt and Ethiopia respectively, since contracts with these partners will end in July 2025. The second data collection will cover other partners ending activities in November 2025.

This collection process will be carried out remotely by a team based in the countries of intervention recruited by the service provider, if it is not possible to do so in person. It will include the use of qualitative and quantitative collection methods set out by the evaluator with all project stakeholders, based on a sample suggested by the evaluator.

Data collection tools may include:

* Field visits to various implementation sites, followed by on-the-spot feedback meeting held by the evaluator to present the preliminary results following the collection phase.
* Surveys
* Focus Group Discussions
* Interviews
* Document review

After each field visit, the evaluator is expected to produce a field report including the agenda of the visit, data collection tools used, stakeholders interviewed/surveyed, and preliminary results from data analysis and triangulation with existing project documentation and monitoring data. A short slide-deck will accompany the report to be presented at the feedback meetings to be conducted after each mission (see below section 5.2.3).

### Feedback phase

In order to ensure transparency, foster learning, and encourage active stakeholder engagement, the evaluation team will organize feedback workshops after each field visit and one final co-creation session with key institutions and partners involved in the project (e.g., teacher training institutes, government authorities, donor representatives, implementing partners).

Objectives of the feedback meetings and co-creation sessions may include the following:

**Feedback Meetings**

* Presentation of Preliminary Findings: The evaluator will share initial observations and draft conclusions derived from the analysis of data collected during each field mission, covering each of the agreed evaluation criteria (Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Sustainability, Impact, Coherence) and specific evaluation questions.
* Ranking of Conclusions: The evaluator will then present the general conclusions, ranking them in order of importance and reliability. Stakeholders will have the opportunity to discuss, validate, or challenge these findings, ensuring shared ownership of the evaluation process.

**Co-Creation Session/Workshop**

* Joint Reflection on Recommendations: This session will provide a platform for stakeholders to collectively interpret the findings, refine the conclusions, and co-create recommendations. Emphasis will be placed on identifying both strategic (long-term, high-level) and operational (implementation-focused) lessons.
* Prioritization: Recommendations will be grouped, prioritized, and linked explicitly to the corresponding findings and conclusions. The evaluator will facilitate discussions on feasibility, potential impact, and resource implications.

All the information gathered during the initial document review phase, the data collection phase, and the feedback phases will be consolidated, analyzed and triangulated so that it can be translated into evidence of the results and impacts produced by the project. Findings from this cross-analysis are expected to be included in the **final report.**

## Expected deliverables

The deliverables must be submitted by email in Word format to the recipients who will be indicated to the evaluation team during the start-up phase. They must be written in English.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverables | # pages max. | Estimated delivery date |
| 1. Inception report | 20 + annexes | May 31st , 2025 |
| 1. Field Reports + Slide-deck for feedback meeting | 15 pages + 12 slides max | Field visits in Ethiopia and Egypt: August 31st  Other field visits: October 15th |
| 1. Final report (preliminary then final) including an executive summary of approx. 3-4 pages | 40 + annexes | First draft November 1st  Final draft November 20th |
| 1. Slide-deck to be presented at the final co-creation workshop | 15 slides | November 1st |

The draft final report, which should not exceed 40 pages excluding annexes, will be produced at the end of the incumbent's work as well as an overview presentation in PowerPoint. Expertise France will provide comments and observations to the incumbent within three weeks of receipt of the draft report.

The final report, incorporating these observations, must be provided within 15 days of receipt of the comments. If these observations differ in their assessment to those of the incumbents, the incumbents can add them to the final report and provide comments.

# Structure of work

## Project evaluation management and governance (optional)

The evaluation is managed by the Expertise France Project Manager with support from a steering committee comprised of the Project Officer and the MEAL specialists of the department Human Capital and Social Development. The meetings of the steering committee of the evaluation may be extended to other relevant stakeholders (e.g. donor, implementing partners) as and when required.

Key roles of evaluation steering committee members are:

* To facilitate contact between the evaluation team, EU services and external stakeholders.
* Ensure that the evaluation team has access to all sources of information and documentation related to the work being evaluated and that they consult them.
* Identify and set out the evaluation questions.
* Discuss and comment on reports produced by the evaluation team. Feedback from each member of the reference group is collated by the Project Team Leader and then forwarded to the evaluation team.
* To support the feedback process from results, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned from the evaluation.
* To ensure effective follow-up of the action plan once the evaluation is completed.

## Coordination arrangements

The incumbent must work closely with Expertise France to put together their reasoning, through regular contact throughout the assignment, from the inception report to the meeting to present the draft report. In particular, observations and initial areas of analysis must be shared at the end of the data collection phase, before the draft report is written.

Furthermore, the incumbent will coordinate regularly with Expertise France’s M&E Partner, which has been supporting the harmonization of data collection tools for project monitoring and evaluation. By leveraging the partner’s work, the incumbent would avoid duplicative work and gain insights into the M&E practices of implementing partners, ensuring methodological consistency and alignment with existing ways of working.

## Schedule

The total assignment is estimated at 75 working days, between May 2025 and November 2025, as detailed below for information:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Activities | Location | Period | Estimated duration (H/D) |
| 1. Inception Phase | Remote | May 2025 | 15 days |
| 1. Data collection on the field + Feedback sessions | Sudan, Ethiopia, Chad, Egypt | Ethiopia and Egypt: July 2025  Chad, Sudan: October 2025 | 40 days |
| 1. Data Analysis and Final Report Drafting | Remote | November 2025 | 15 days |
| 1. Co-Creation Session and inclusion of feedback in the final report | Remote | November 2025 | 5 days |

The duration for each activity is an estimation, the evaluation team can propose a different distribution of days by activity if an alternative proposal seems more appropriate. The selected evaluation team must include a detailed workplan in its bid, including the days worked per activity and per member of the evaluation team, as well as the indicative dates and locations. This workplan will be discussed and approved during the inception meeting.

# Profile and team composition

## Desired profile(s)

### Expected expertise of the evaluator or team of evaluators

**Qualifications and experience**

* Post-graduate in a field relevant to the assignment: in public administration organization and management, social sciences, economy, educational sciences, international cooperation, monitoring and evaluation, business/engineering school or equivalent experience.
* Professional experience in monitoring and evaluation of at least 10 years.
* Experience in multi-country evaluation and multi-stakeholder coordination.
* Experience working on evaluations for similar projects in the field of education in emergency programmes (with a focus on education staff’s capacity building), humanitarian/education for refugees, aid to displaced persons.
* Good knowledge of the project’s intervention countries (Sudan, Chad, Ethiopia, Egypt)
* Experience working in evaluation funded by the EU viewed favorably

**Technical skills:**

* Professional experience in quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis (key informant interviews, focus groups, surveys, field observations, etc.)
* Excellent command of evaluation methodologies and tools
* Good knowledge of M&E systems for development programs and projects
* Experience and knowledge of field-based M&E
* Previous experience in facilitating workshops and participatory multi-stakeholder meetings to foster learning and co-creation of recommendations

**Administrative skills:**

* Excellent command of Microsoft Office tools (MS Office: Word, Excel, PowerPoint and LibreOffice equivalents).
* Excellent communication and organizational skills

**Language skills:**

* Excellent command of written and spoken English and Arabic (good writing, synthesis and analysis skills, etc.).

### Anticipated team structure

The evaluator may be an independent evaluator or an evaluation agency.

If it is a team of evaluators, the distribution of roles and responsibilities throughout the evaluation process must be presented. This will be discussed and approved during the kick-off meeting.

## Content of tenders

Tenders should include:

* Technical outline: demonstrate an understanding of and comment on the terms of reference, methodology, composition of the evaluation team, CVs and similar experience, and include the components mentioned in the terms of reference (detailed workplan, distribution of roles and responsibilities)
* Financial outline: overall budget for the evaluation, including the following: daily cost of each participant; breakdown of time spent on each intervention by participant and by phase; additional costs (services and additional documents); transport costs (international and local), logistics costs, translation costs; and proposed terms of payment.

## Tender assessment methods (optional)

Expertise France will select the bid with the best score based on the following table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Maximum score** |
| 1. Technical outline score, including: |  |
| * 1. Methodology score | 50 |
| * Demonstrated understanding of the ToR and the objectives of the services to be provided | 15 |
| * Overall methodological approach, quality control approach, relevance of the proposed tools and analysis of the difficulties and challenges encountered | 20 |
| * Structure of tasks and schedule | 15 |
| * 1. Evaluation team score | 30 |
| 1. Financial outline score | **20** |
| **Total score** | **100** |

# Annexes

* Logical framework of the project to be evaluated
* Theory of Change
* Description of Action