

Terms of Reference

For

Final Evaluation

Contracting authority	Stichting SPARK
Subject	Final Evaluation for "Together we build a Better Future, Syria Education Programme" Project
Locations:	Turkey, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria
Duration:	6 and a half weeks (starting from the date of the contract signature)
Application Closing Date:	17 April 2022 / 23:59 Turkey Time
Application Method:	Offers should be sent to <i>ihale@spark-online.org</i> no later than 17 April 2022 / 23:59 Turkey Time
Last date for questions	All interested bidders must address their questions within a maximum of 5 days prior to the submission date
Start Date:	22 April 2022

1. Program background

The overall objective of the action is to improve the livelihood options of Syrian refugees, IDPs, returnees and vulnerable host youth through higher education

opportunities and increased access to jobs. This is in line with the Action document of the IsDB/AN and its Results Framework.

This action is a continuation of the SPARK scholarship programme that sets itself apart by its comprehensive approach and focus on creating sustainable jobs for graduates. SPARK has 25 years of experience in employment programs and entrepreneurship training. Moreover, by working cost-efficient and negotiating lower tuition fees, we can serve a higher number of vulnerable youth and maximize our impact.

2. Criteria for Submitting a Bid

Applicants must meet the following criteria:

- Be legally registered and have actual operations in Turkey, Iraq, Lebanon, Syria or Jordan. It is not expected that the service provider has legal registrations in all the mentioned countries. However, the service provider should have legal registration in one or two of the mentioned countries. SPARK can only support in linking the service provider to field researchers (if needed) during the data collection phase through its network;
- Be directly responsible for the preparation/ management/implementation of the project, i.e. not act as an intermediary;
- Proven experience in project evaluation for similar projects;
- Providing higher education and business development expert will be an advantage;
- Experienced evaluation expert is a key;
- Access to the geographical locations of the project (Turkey, Jordan, Iraq, Lebanon, and Syria);
- A well-trained data collection team who knows Turkish, Kurdish and Arabic languages as the evaluation will be conducted with Turkish, Kurdish and Arabic speaking beneficiaries;
- Be financially sound and have financial continuity throughout the project.

3. Program strategic objectives and sub-activities

The overall objective of the program is to contribute to livelihood options for Syrian, IDPs and vulnerable host youth in Turkey, Jordan, Iraq, Lebanon, and Syria. To make achieving that goal more manageable, it has been divided into three main specific objectives, and they as well as progress so far are as the followings:

- The capacity of 10 TVET institutions and local Syrian NGOs and CSOs inside and outside Syria was assessed and built:
 - Select TVET and local CSOs as partners: **36**
 - Provide selected TVET and local CSOs with capacity-building training: **20**

- A total of 1150 Syrians, refugees, IDPs and vulnerable host community members received vocational education and training
 - Conduct needs/labour assessment for the target regions: **5**
 - Register students and verify their applications: **1431**
 - Provide vocational education and training: **1431**
- 3 student's well-being and satisfaction survey completed
 - Conduct well-being and satisfaction survey: **2**
- A total of 860 students are aware of the extracurricular activities offered by SPARK with info about SPARK solutions.
 - Organize and deliver Info days: **1540**
- 460 students found jobs/internships through job skill training and employment services:
 - Deliver training on professional development & job skills: **2121**
 - Link to students to Internships/jobs opportunities: **477**
- 115 students established their own business through entrepreneurship support
 - Organize and deliver entrepreneurship training: **1060**
 - Provide incubation programme: **36**
 - Provide access to finance for start-ups: **160**
 - Provide one-on-one support to start-ups: **160**

4. Program partners

Country	Type of Activity	# of Partners
Iraq	QE (Quality Education)	1
	EEP (Economic and Entrepreneurship Support)	5
Lebanon	QE	5
	EEP	3
Jordan	QE	4
	EEP	1
Turkey	QE	7
	EEP	6
Syria	QE & EEP	4

5. Data collection

The following is the suggested sample based on the project achievements:

Data Collection Method	Targeted Group	Quantity
KIs	Partner representatives /service providers/ trainers/ and main stakeholders (can be online)	9
	SPARK staff (program manager) (online)	1
Sub-total		10
FGDs	FGD partner staff who received training from SPARK (Online)	1

	FGDs with the beneficiaries (can be online) (1 FGD for each component and 1 FGD for each country)	15
Sub-total		16
Surveys*	*SPARK has recently conducted an annual satisfaction survey. The service provider will use the results and/or gathered data from this activity to enrich the findings of the final evaluation. This will add the quantitative aspect to the qualitative data collection.	

6. Objectives of the Final Programme Evaluation

The objectives of this Final Project Evaluation are:

1. To evaluate the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact (with a special focus on impact and sustainability) of the various components of the project.
2. To identify lessons learned, and formulate recommendations for similar future programming.
3. How effective has the programme been in providing access to higher education.
4. Impact and effectiveness of additional support services (various kinds of implemented trainings)
5. Sustainable impact beyond the programme especially with regards to employment.
6. Relating the impact of the project to overall SPARK ToC (Theory of Change). SPARK ToC will be shared with the service provider together with other related documents after signing the contract.

7. Timeline of the Evaluation

The evaluation process should be initiated by “April 28rd, 2022” and the final evaluation report to be delivered by “July 9th, 2022” at the latest, deviations from the aforementioned timeline without clear and reasonable justifications could impact payment release, or refusal to release depending on the severity of the deviation.

The timeline of the evaluation is as followed (Please note that the provided timeline can be subject to limited modification after desk review based on a common understanding between the two parties):

Activities	Working Weeks
Briefing with the evaluation focal point and SPARK program manager (kick-off meeting)	1 day
Desk review	3 days
Inception report (Including data collection tools)	1 week
Fieldwork, which includes the collection of primary data, meetings with stakeholders	2 Weeks
Analysis and draft report	2 weeks

Incorporation of feedback from SPARK	1 week
Total	6 and a half weeks

8. Main Tasks and Responsibilities:

- Development of work plan(s) and timeline of evaluation activities;
- Review of existing IsDB/AN documentation, including assessments, curriculums, deliverables etc.;
- Meetings and/or interviews with SPARK Staff, local partners and beneficiaries;
- Analysis of gathered data through reviews, meetings and/or interviews;
- Development of draft evaluation report and submission to SPARK Programme and M&E teams;
- Processing of feedback on the draft report from SPARK Programme and M&E teams;
- Finalization of final evaluation report and submission to SPARK Programme and M&E teams.
- The evaluation should cover all project aspects and all the geographical locations targeted by the project
- All the tools and the report should capture the OECD evaluation criteria.

9. Deliverables

❖ Inception report

- Introduction and background
- Methodology
- Design

Annexes (Tools and questionnaires in the inception phase, they are accepted only in English and they are provided in separate files)

❖ Final evaluation report

The following is the suggested format of the evaluation report:

- Abbreviations
- Background
- Executive Summary
- Scope of Evaluation
- Methodology
- Findings of the evaluation based on OECD evaluation criteria with a main focus on impact and sustainability
- Recommendations
- Conclusion

Tools in Arabic, English, Turkish and Kurdish can be provided at the end of the assignment with the final report

❖ Presentation of findings of the evaluation

This deliverable can be done after finalizing the first draft of the evaluation report or at the end of the assignment.

- ❖ Any other document produced in the course of the evaluation
- ❖ Good quality photos from the conducted evaluation activities

10. Selection Criteria:

1. The tender evaluation committee will evaluate and award the contract based on the following **selection criteria**:

- ❖ **Price**
- ❖ **Quality**

2. **Selection method** (selection criteria evaluation):

- Price
 - Criteria weight is **50 %**
 - Formula: (Best Tenderer Price/Evaluated Tenderer Price) *Criterion Weight.
 - The price shall be quoted in USD and it must include VAT (KDV).
 - If the service was based in Turkey, the payment will be made in Turkish Lira according to the exchange rate of the Turkish Central Bank at the date of the invoice.

- Quality
 - Criteria weight is **50%**

Point evaluation (weighted points):

Criterion will obtain between 0 and 5-point, 5 points being the maximum, 0 points being the minimum and the points obtained will be multiplied by criterion weight.

PIN expert evaluation committee will assign up to 5 points for the best quality of the sample, based on the following evaluation grid:

Score	Benchmark for Services/Works
5	Excellent response with no weaknesses shown and exceeds the requirement - also provides comprehensive, detailed, and convincing assurances that the services will be delivered to an excellent standard
4	A very response that demonstrates real understanding and fully meets the requirements - offers assurances that the service delivered will be of a high standard
3	A satisfactory response that demonstrates a reasonable understanding of the requirements and gives reasonable assurance of delivery of

	services to an adequate standard, but does not provide sufficiently convincing assurance to be able to award them a higher mark
2	A response where reservations exist - lacks full credibility/convincing detail, and there is a significant risk that the response will not deliver/be successful
1	A response where serious reservations exist - may be because, for example, insufficient detail is provided and the response has fundamental flaws or seriously lacks credibility with a high risk of non-delivery
0	The response completely fails to address the criterion under consideration

Those bidders who get less than 3 for the capacity of the bidder shall not be accepted or considered and their offer will be rejected.

For each bid, points from all evaluation criteria will be added up and the winning bid will be the bid with the highest number of points. In case of an equal number of points, the winning bid will be the one with the lowest price.

11. SPARK Offers

The payments for the Final Programme Evaluation will be done by SPARK, according to the following scheme:

- %25 of the total contracting sum upon approving the inception report
- %75 of the total contracting sum upon approval of the Mid-Term Programme Evaluation Report

12. How to Apply

Interested applicants must provide:

- Official registration documents in Turkey, Iraq, Jordan, or Lebanon
- The CVs of the evaluation team
- Technical Proposal which includes also a brief description of the company highlighting their related work with similar projects
- A clear financial breakdown

If you have any questions please contact SPARK, via email: ihale@spark-online.org