TERMS OF REFERENCE (ToR)

Rapid Effectiveness and Outcomes Study of Passport to Earning (P2E)

Under the Shopner Sharothi Project

Particular	Details
Commissioning organisation	JAAGO Foundation Trust (JFT)
Project / development partner	Shopner Sharothi | UNICEF
Assignment	Rapid P2E Effectiveness and Outcomes Study
Study locations	Bandarban and Cox's Bazar districts, Bangladesh
Target group	Adolescent girls and young women aged 13–24, based on approved P2E eligibility criteria
Proposed methodology	Short, mixed-methods study: programme-record review; focused learner survey; focused employer survey; limited FGDs/KIIs
Proposed period	Up to 30 calendar days after contract effectiveness and field-readiness conditions are met
Selection method	Technical evaluation: 80 points | Financial evaluation: 20 points
Submission deadline / focal person	

Section 1. About JAAGO Foundation Trust

JAAGO Foundation Trust (JFT) is a non-governmental organisation in Bangladesh working to expand access to education, skills, youth development and inclusive opportunities. Its programmes emphasise the participation of underserved communities, including adolescent girls and young women, and apply standards for child safeguarding, protection from sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA), gender responsiveness and disability inclusion.

Section 2. Project Overview and Background

Shopner Sharothi operates in Bandarban and Cox's Bazar to strengthen education, skills and economic opportunities for adolescent girls and young women. Passport to Earning (P2E) offers transferable, digital and employability-related learning through eligible project-supported delivery pathways, including institution-based courses and other modalities recorded in the approved project framework.

The available programme records can establish participation and completion, but certificates and attendance alone cannot show whether learning is relevant, applied, or associated with better opportunities. A short, practical study is therefore proposed to understand P2E delivery quality, learner experiences, perceived benefits, skills application and early education or livelihood transitions, and to identify programme improvements.

Study framing: This is an effectiveness and outcomes study—not a causal impact evaluation. A credible causal estimate of impact would require an appropriate comparison or counterfactual design or another robust identification strategy. The proposed assignment is not designed for that purpose, particularly given the short timeframe and limited baseline evidence.

Results-framework figures requiring validation

Reference in source ToR	Stated target	How it will be used
P2E enrolment (Output 2.1.2)	10,279	Programme-wide target only; reconcile achieved unique enrolments and pathway eligibility.
Course completion (Outcome 2.1b)	8,656	Verify the approved completion definition and actual administrative completion records.
Perceived prospects (Outcome 2.1a)	8,656	Check the signed indicator reference sheet for eligibility, wording and denominator.
In-person centre-based skilling	4,100	Provisional subcomponent of the overall target; confirm linkage with P2E records.
Skills on Wheels	1,320	Provisional subcomponent of the overall target; avoid double counting.

These values are stated targets, not verified achievements or survey sample sizes. Their definitions, modality coverage, denominators and any historical revisions shall be validated with the approved results framework and current deduplicated project MIS before reporting.

Section 3. Purpose and Objectives of the Assignment

Overall purpose: To assess how effectively P2E was delivered, the extent of learners' reported skills and opportunity gains, and emerging education/employment/enterprise-related outcomes; identify delivery barriers and equity gaps; and provide practical recommendations for future implementation.

Specific objectives are to:

- Review actual outreach, enrolment, participation, completion and certification against approved targets and implementation records.
- Assess course relevance, accessibility, delivery quality, satisfaction and factors supporting or preventing completion.
- Document perceived changes in digital confidence, transferable skills, career awareness and expected education, employment or entrepreneurship opportunities, without treating recall-based reports as measured pre/post effects.
- Identify whether and how learners have applied skills and taken early verifiable steps towards education, employment or self-employment, distinguishing achievements from intentions.
- Explore key differences and barriers relating to location, age, disability, connectivity and delivery modality where records and sample sizes allow.
- Provide feasible, prioritised recommendations for course delivery, learner support, institutional coordination, follow-up and monitoring.
- Assess the P2E digital learning platform and learner user journey, from onboarding and registration to navigation, course progression and completion, and identify the need for incorporating emerging technologies (e.g., AI-enabled guidance, adaptive learning, offline/low-bandwidth features).
- Assess how learning assessment and certification are designed and applied, including the type of assessments used, the credentials awarded, and the extent of employer endorsement and recognition in content design and certification.
- Capture employers' perspectives on observable changes in P2E learners' skills, work-readiness and performance after course completion, and the value employers place on P2E credentials.

Section 4. Study Questions and Coverage

Theme	Focused study question
Participation and completion	Who enrolled and completed P2E, and what explains patterns of non-completion?
Relevance and implementation	Are content, access arrangements, language and training delivery suitable for learners?
Learning and perceived outcomes	What benefits and confidence/skills applications do participants report?
Progression pathways	What credible education, job-search, employment or enterprise steps have occurred since participation?
Platform and user journey	How effectively does the digital platform support learners from onboarding to course completion (navigation, usability, drop-off points), and which emerging technologies should be incorporated?
Assessment and certification	What types of assessment and credentials are used, how credible and recognised are P2E certificates, and to what extent are employers involved in endorsing content and certification?
Employer perspectives	What changes do employers observe in P2E learners' skills, work-readiness and performance after completing P2E courses?
Equity and lessons	What barriers affect marginalised groups and which realistic changes should JAAGO prioritise?

Study coverage includes the two project districts and all eligible P2E modalities in the verified participant register. Administrative analysis should include all records that meet approved data-quality rules. Primary research will cover selected learners and a limited set of institutional and programme stakeholders; it is not a census of 10,279 learners.

Section 5. Scope of Work and Proposed Mixed-Methods Design

5.1 Inception and rapid document review

- Review the approved project proposal, logframe/indicator reference sheets, P2E curriculum, delivery plans, MIS, attendance, completion and certification records, and available MEAL assessments or baseline material.
- Confirm actual implementation cohorts, dates, P2E modality eligibility, the status of learner-contact information, and practical field access with JAAGO programme and MEAL teams.
- Review P2E platform analytics and user-journey data (registration, log-in, course progression, drop-off and completion), assessment formats, credential types and any employer endorsement arrangements for content and certification.
- Prepare a brief evaluation matrix, streamlined sampling rationale, draft tools, consent/assent forms, operational safeguards and a 30-day schedule. Obtain written approval before contacting respondents.

5.2 Focused quantitative learner survey

- Conduct approximately 200–250 short, structured learner interviews, subject to a defensible sample plan and access constraints approved at inception. Keep the instrument to approximately 15–20 minutes where practical.
- Use verified participant records as the selection frame, drawing a stratified/random sample where feasible across the two districts and eligible P2E pathways. Include certified/completer learners for the perception measure and a limited non-completer group where needed for barriers analysis.
- Capture participation status, course relevance, perceived skills and opportunities, examples of learning application, reported transitions, barriers and recommendations. Check key completion and transition claims against programme or other available evidence.

- If random selection is not feasible, disclose the alternative selection approach and do not generalise survey percentages to the whole participant population or present unsupported confidence intervals.
- Employer survey: In addition to learners, conduct a focused survey/structured interviews with a purposive sample of employers (e.g., approximately 20–30 employers or supervisors who have hired, hosted or engaged P2E learners) to understand observed changes in learners after P2E courses, including skills application, work-readiness, productivity and soft skills.
- Through the employer survey, also assess employers' awareness and recognition of P2E credentials, their views on the relevance of course content and assessment, and their willingness to endorse or co-design content and certification.

5.3 Limited qualitative inquiry

- Conduct approximately age-appropriate focus group discussions (FGDs) and key informant interviews (KIIs), ensuring appropriate coverage of both districts and diverse learner experiences where feasible.
- KIIs may include teachers/institutional focal persons, JAAGO staff and other relevant stakeholders; use short semi-structured guides focused on practical delivery issues and progression support.
- Document two brief, verified learner stories illustrating both opportunities and constraints, with consent and safeguarding protections. Success-story production is not a substitute for balanced findings.

5.4 Analysis and synthesis

- Prepare a concise administrative indicator dashboard showing enrolment, completion, certification and the approved perceived-prospects indicator where valid evidence permits.
- Analyse structured surveys mainly through descriptive tables (counts, percentages and appropriate disaggregation) and integrate qualitative themes and verifiable examples. Avoid subgroup comparisons that are too small to interpret.
- Distinguish programme output achievement, learner perceptions, reported applications and independently verified milestones. Address incomplete records, selection and recall bias, and short follow-up periods.
- Share a concise draft for JAAGO review and complete one focused feedback/validation meeting (online is acceptable); incorporate agreed corrections into the final report.

Section 6. Sampling, Indicator Interpretation and Study Limitations

The proposed survey size and qualitative activities are indicative ceilings for a rapid assessment, not a claim of statistical power. Bidders may propose a smaller or differently allocated sample if evidence shows it is more feasible without undermining the core study questions. The inception report shall describe the sampling universe, number of eligible/accessible participants, selection procedure, response-rate tracking and implications for interpretation.

The programme's formal perceived-prospects measure must follow the signed indicator reference sheet, including whether certification is an eligibility condition, the positive-response question, reference period and correct denominator. The consultant may provide an indicative survey estimate only where eligibility and selection conditions support it; otherwise report a clearly labelled sample-based descriptive result and recommend how JAAGO should obtain a robust indicator value.

The study must not report attributable impact, measured pre/post improvement, net additional employment or causal effects from the rapid study design. Actual education/employment/enterprise progressions should be distinguished from anticipated opportunities, attempted steps and unverified reports.

Section 7. Research Ethics, Safeguarding, Inclusion and Quality Assurance

- Follow JAAGO safeguarding, child protection, PSEA, confidentiality and data-protection policies. Determine required ethics and institutional permissions before data collection; no participant contact shall occur without the appropriate approvals.
- Obtain informed consent from adult respondents. For those aged below 18, obtain appropriate parent/guardian permission and age-appropriate assent in accordance with the approved protocol; protect learners from coercion or adverse consequences for declining.
- Arrange appropriately trained, gender-sensitive and culturally competent field staff; provide accessible language and reasonable disability accommodations, especially for remote and minority-language settings.

- Minimise personal identifiers, segregate contact lists from survey data, use secure digital collection and controlled access, and submit only agreed de-identified analysis data to JAAGO.
- Pilot tools, brief enumerators, use built-in validation checks, conduct daily supervisor review and selected back-checks, and document any data-quality exceptions and corrective action.
- Apply a safeguarding incident referral pathway; no researcher may privately investigate allegations, publish identifiable stories/images without separate authorisation, or contact minors through unsecured personal channels.

Section 8. Expected Deliverables and Duration

The proposed assignment is a rapid 30-calendar-day consultancy. The schedule is achievable only if JAAGO provides a usable learner register, access approvals and focal-point support at mobilisation. Where safeguarding/ethics clearance or participant access is not ready, the contract schedule and scope must be formally adjusted rather than omitting required protections.

Deliverable	Expected submission	Minimum acceptance requirements
1. Inception note and final tools	By Day 5–7	Approved methods, verified frame/status summary, sample/allocation plan, brief evaluation matrix, tools, safeguards, schedule and responsibilities.
2. Data collection and rapid findings note	By Day 19–20	Completed approved interviews, documented response and quality checks, descriptive toplines and emerging implementation issues.
3. Draft effectiveness study report	By Day 25–26	Concise draft with administrative findings, survey/qualitative results, limitations, evidence table and prioritised recommendations.
4. Final report and data handover	By Day 30	Approved Word/PDF report; 2-page summary; presentation slides; agreed de-identified dataset, codebook, instruments and data-quality notes.

Reporting expectations: Approximately 15–20 pages for the main analytical report, excluding annexes; a short management summary; a brief findings presentation; and editable data products. The assigned JAAGO programme and MEAL focal persons will review deliverables jointly, with written acceptance required at each payment milestone.

Section 9. Implementation Arrangements and JAAGO Support

- JAAGO will provide relevant project documents, a verified participant register to the extent available, project/MEAL focal persons, stakeholder introductions and timely consolidated feedback.
- The consultant will independently manage tools, field staffing, ethical permissions within its remit, field operations, data cleaning, analysis, logistics and deliverable quality.
- A short inception meeting and weekly brief progress check-ins will monitor scope, delays and safeguarding risks; material issues shall be escalated immediately.

Section 10. Required Qualifications and Experience

- Individual consultant or lead researcher with a relevant postgraduate qualification and at least five years of applied programme assessment, evaluation or social research experience.
- Proven experience with mixed-methods research, learner/youth surveys, basic quantitative and qualitative analysis, and concise evidence-based reporting.
- Knowledge of education, digital skilling, employability, adolescent and gender-responsive programming; field familiarity with Bandarban/Cox's Bazar is strongly preferred.

- Demonstrated ability to apply child safeguarding, PSEA, confidentiality and disability-inclusive research procedures; sufficient team capacity to deliver within the proposed period.

Section 11. Proposal Submission Requirements

Interested qualified individuals or firms should submit separate Technical and Financial Proposals. No financial information may appear in the Technical Proposal.

11.1 Technical Proposal (recommended maximum: 15 pages excluding CVs/legal annexes)

- Short understanding of assignment and clear explanation of why this is an effectiveness/outcomes study, not a causal impact evaluation.
- Concise mixed-methods design, justified sample and district/modality coverage, proposed interview counts, indicator measurement approach, analysis plan, quality assurance and ethical safeguards.
- Realistic 30-day work plan with staff roles, level of effort, key assumptions and delivery risks; relevant organisational/individual experience and 1–2 comparable examples.
- CVs of key personnel and applicable registration/financial/legal documents required by the final solicitation (e.g., trade licence/incorporation where applicable, TIN/BIN, current tax submission evidence).

11.2 Financial Proposal (recommended maximum: 5 pages)

Provide an itemised BDT budget stating cost item, unit, quantity, unit rate and total for professional fees, data collection, travel, accommodation, translation/accessibility, supervision, analysis and report preparation. State whether the quoted amount includes applicable VAT/tax assumptions. Financial proposals must be submitted as a separate PDF.

11.3 Submission instructions — to be finalised before advertisement

Item	Instruction / confirmation required
Proposal deadline and time	[TO BE CONFIRMED BY ADMIN & PROCUREMENT]
Email for submission	procurement.jft@jaago.com.bd
Clarification focal person / questions deadline	[TO BE CONFIRMED]
Hard-copy submission (if permitted)	Admin & Procurement Department, JAAGO Foundation Trust, House #57, Road #7B, Block #H, Banani, Dhaka 1213
File names	P2E Effectiveness Study – Technical Proposal / Financial Proposal
Final authorised submission channel	[EMAIL / HARD COPY / BOTH — TO BE CONFIRMED]

Section 12. Evaluation and Selection Criteria

Selection will follow JAAGO Foundation Trust's approved procurement procedures. Responsive technical offers will be assessed first. The final solicitation must specify the minimum technical qualifying threshold and approved financial-scoring method before release.

Technical criterion	Points
Understanding of assignment, outcome focus and study questions	10
Feasible rapid mixed-methods design and indicator interpretation	25
Safeguarding, data quality and practical data analysis approach	15
Relevant consultant/team experience and local capacity	20
Realistic 30-day work plan and staffing arrangement	10
TECHNICAL TOTAL	80
FINANCIAL TOTAL (competitive cost and value for money)	20
GRAND TOTAL	100

Recommended financial score, subject to Procurement approval: 20 × (lowest evaluated responsive financial offer ÷ the bidder's evaluated financial offer). Bidders must disclose actual or perceived conflicts of interest. Technical eligibility threshold: [PROCUREMENT TO APPROVE BEFORE ISSUE].

Section 13. Payment Terms and General Conditions

Proposed payment milestone	Share	Condition
First payment — inception approval	40%	Written acceptance of inception note and study tools.
Second payment — draft report	30%	Satisfactory fieldwork evidence and written acceptance of draft findings.
Final payment — completed assignment	30%	Written approval of final report and full agreed de-identified data and materials handover.

The payment schedule is proposed only and shall be subject to JAAGO's authorisation and the signed contract. Payments will be processed against accepted deliverables and valid invoices, applying VAT and income-tax deductions as required by applicable Bangladesh law.

- Confidentiality, data ownership and publication: Study instruments, de-identified datasets and agreed outputs shall be handed over to JAAGO in editable formats; identifiable data must not be shared or published without prior written permission.
- Independent and ethical research: The consultant shall not make unsupported causal claims, fabricate evidence, misrepresent findings or pressure respondents. Conflicts of interest must be declared.
- Safeguarding and staff conduct: All team members must follow JAAGO child safeguarding and PSEA standards. Incident reporting follows designated channels.
- Performance and termination: Replacement of key staff, substantive subcontracting, revisions, acceptance, delay management and any termination are subject to the written agreement and JAAGO's applicable procurement requirements.

Internal administrative checks before external release

Before issue: Programme/MEAL must validate P2E indicators, participant records, access and safeguarding clearances. Procurement/Finance must approve the deadline, submission channel, technical threshold, financial scoring and payment terms. Remove this note before external publication.