Questions and Answers for UIS RFP-UIS-PPLT: Piloting the Policy-Linking Toolkit

- 1. The modified Angoff is mentioned as an example of "...one of the established standard setting methodologies...proposed in the Policy Linking Toolkit..."
- a. What are the other "established standard setting methodologies proposed in the toolkit?

The modified Angoff method is just one of several established standard setting methodologies. However, while the first draft of the toolkit included several options for methodologies, modified Angoff is now the only standard setting methodology proposed in the toolkit.

b. Can other appropriate methodologies be proposed or is the toolkit recommendation exhaustive with respect to methodologies?

We are currently piloting the methodology and simultaneously conducting an evaluation of the process. Following on the pilot, we may end up changing the methodology. However, once the toolkit is finalized—late this summer—we expect the methodology proposed within to be final, whether that be modified Angoff or another method. As background, the Angoff methodology was selected given its ease of execution in relation to some of the other methods. The intention is that governments can be capacitated to lead workshops on their own moving forward.

- 2. Can detailed information about the Policy Linking Toolkit be provided?
- a. Can a copy of the toolkit be made available to inform proposal development and to support accurate scoping and costing?

Despite the toolkit being a specific tool that we want to administer to ensure comparable procedures, it does not depart from usual standard setting practices in terms of the stages of the implementation, the qualifications of the staff needed and the costs of the implementation. Thus, we cannot make the toolkit available. The final toolkit will be ready in July.

- b. If a copy of the toolkit cannot be made available, can a Policy Linking Toolkit users guide be provided? See above.
- 3. The RFP indicates "Contractor shall also identify which assessment instruments the Government would like to use to connect reading and math outcomes to SDG 4.1."

Typically, the assessment of interest is clearly identified by the local educational agency. Are there multiple forms of each assessment that requires the contractor to select the most appropriate assessment? If not, can any additional information associated with the need to identify the assessment of interest be provided?

Our experience in some countries has been that the country has multiple possible assessments that they might use to link to SDG 4.1.1. For instance, some countries have national assessments, end-of-term assessments, various regional assessments, and the EGRA and EGMA. In those cases, the governments have asked for advice on which would make the most sense to link. If the government knows which assessment they would like to use, then this statement will not apply, but we do not expect the choice to be clear in all cases. When it is not, the Contractor will need to help the government weigh the pluses and minuses of the various options, which will also likely include an alignment study between the assessments and the Global Proficiency Framework.

- 4. The RFP indicates that the contractor will support the selection of participants. Can it be assumed that the local educational agency will strongly support recruitment? Yes
- 5. Can it be assumed:
- a. The *contractor* will provide a memo to the local educational agency introducing the task and commitment to the participant pool
- b. The *local educational agency* will distribute the memo to the appropriate persons with a statement supporting and endorsing the important work to be done
- c. The *contractor* will monitor the sample and track the obtained sample to achieve the desired demographic representation.
- d. The *contractor* will provide details about the obtained sample to UNESCO/USAID and the local educational agency for review and approval.
- e. If necessary, the local educational agency will do multiple rounds of reaching out to the participant pool to support sample acquisition if the *contractor* indicates the need for additional participants from a given cell (with a cell for each desired combination of demographics)

These are all fair assumptions. The local educational agency will also likely need some description of the profile of candidates that the Contractor seeks. This should be provided in the memo or ahead of the memo.

6. An ideal schedule is provided. Can it be assumed there is some flexibility with respect to the actual workshop dates as long as the final deliverable dates are maintained?

Yes, that is fine. Please propose feasible dates for workshop completion to the extent possible, recognizing that there may need to be flexibility based on the governments' schedules. The final toolkit will be ready in July therefore consider the proposed sequence of activities for your quote rather than the timeline.

- 7. Is the contractor expected to cost for and arrange for the following or will the local educational agency provide this?
- a. meeting spaces,
- b. necessary onsite equipment such as laptops and/or printers,
- c. hotel rooms for participants,
- d. compensation for participants, and
- e. meals for participants

No, the organization of the workshops will be arranged separately.

8. Will local educational agencies provide all copies of the selected assessment and ancillary materials (e.g., scoring guides, etc.) or will the contractor need to print copies for each participant?

We recommend that you budget for these costs.

9. The RFP indicates: "They must work to get a copy of that assessment (including test booklets and scoring guides), the results and datasets of the most recent application of the assessment to inform the design of materials for the workshop."

Can it be assumed that these materials will be provided upon request by the local educational agency and if necessary, that UNESCO and USAID will facilitate the acquisition of these materials?

Yes, for the most part this is true. The policy linking quality assurance guidelines require that governments make these materials available in advance of a policy-linking workshop. However, it will be the Contractor's responsibility to make arrangements to obtain these documents. UNESCO and/or USAID will only step in should the contractor encounter a challenge with obtaining the relevant materials.

10. The RFP requests a quotation for various components including facilitation of one or two four-day workshops per country, as well as development of four types of reports.

Can it be assumed that the development of a single report of each type that summarizes the workshop activities for all five countries and not separate reports for each country is desired?

We expect separate reports for each country.

11. How does UNESCO envision that the Contractor will evaluate the Policy-linking methodology: simply through hand-on experience and feedback on the benchmarking process; or through a formalized research design involving data collection tools, data collection before/during/after the benchmarking workshop, and analysis?

UNESCO expects the Contractor to provide feedback on the process and to collect information required by the Policy Linking Quality Assurance Policy, which is currently in draft form.

12. Are all standard workshops to be conducted in English and/or will an interpreter be provided by the local Education agency?

The workshops will be conducted in whatever the language of assessment is for the relevant country. If the language is one other than English, the Contractor will be responsible for providing their own interpreters or providing staff who speak the language of assessment (the latter is preferred when possible).

13. Does the contractor need to translate the national assessments into English?

See question 10. If the assessment is not in English and the contractor does not have staff who speak the language of assessment (preferred), the Contractor will need to translate the assessment. If this is the case, we strongly encourage Contractor's to identify subject-matter experts to conduct the translation to avoid losing nuances of the assessment in translation.

14. If there are multiple local languages, is the expectation that all assessments are considered or only the instruments identified by the local coordinator?

See question 3.

15. Vendors assume all reports will be in English, is this correct?

That is correct.

16. Vendors assume the data we receive will be clean and sufficient for calculating item difficulty statistics which align with the standard setting method to be used, and that any data dictionaries required will be provided in English, is this correct?

It is relatively safe to assume that the data will be clean, though we cannot guarantee this in all cases. Data dictionaries may or may not exist, but the Contractor should be able to work with the government or an implementing partner to identify fields, labels, units, etc. if a dictionary is not available. The dictionary will likely be provided in the language of the assessment. We recommend that Contractors plan to either have staff who speak the language of assessment or budget for translation of the data dictionary. We will work with the Contractor if other unexpected costs arise during implementation related to the cleanliness of the data, etc.

17. Vendors assume we will be able to have assessments with sufficient items for standard setting (we are assuming 45 items pre assessment in our costing for time to familiarize with items), is this correct?

This is not, unfortunately, a fair assumption. Sufficient items will be needed to complete a policy linking workshop (the quality assurance policy requires it), but since we haven't seen the assessments these governments intend to use, it is possible that a country may not have an assessment with a sufficient number of items. If this is the case, we expect the Contractor to work with the government of the relevant country to identify gaps in their assessment that need to be addressed prior to completing a policy linking workshop. If that happens, the Contractor will not be expected to complete the workshop but instead to provide guidance on what the government needs to consider with regards to updating their assessment and/or curriculum framework.

18. With the new proposal due date of 09 March 2020, will the current project schedule be updated as well since the start date on RFP pg. 14 is currently 17-03-2020?

The final toolkit will be ready in July therefore please consider the proposed sequence of activities as the basis for your quotes.

19. How should charges for overhead be reflected in the quotes?

As this will be a contract for services these charges should be built in to the quotes.

20. Will UIS release funds on project commencement, throughout the project or at the end?

The UNESCO practice is to make payment upon final acceptance of each deliverable.