

## Questions & Answers for RFP-SOT-2024-002

*Leading from the Middle: Leadership for Foundational Learning in Rwanda*

RTI International

Solicitation number RFP-SOT-2024-002

**RFP Release Date: February 14, 2024**

**Question Submission Deadline: February 23, 2024**

**Question Response Posted Deadline: February 28, 2024**

Proposal	Submission	Deadline	(revised):	March	14,	2024
----------	------------	----------	------------	-------	-----	------

1. What are any business considerations that might influence the completion date? [We anticipate holding to the expected completion date.](#)
2. How will the final selection of districts be determined, and what level of collaboration is expected with the government in the district selection process? [The district selection process will be conducted in full collaboration with the government and other key stakeholders utilizing a positive deviance selection approach.](#)
3. Are there any preferences or considerations for the selection of districts in the Western and Northern provinces of Rwanda? [The RFP referenced these provinces solely as examples to be used in proposal submissions. The final districts may or may not be in these provinces.](#)
4. In addition to the requirement for fluent Kinyarwanda-speaking teams, are there any specific cultural considerations or sensitivities that should be taken into account during data collection? [There are always contextual considerations to be considered during data collection. We rely heavily on our local partners to identify those considerations and respond/prepare accordingly.](#)
5. **Timeline:** The timeline described in the TOR does not account for the time required to obtain research approvals (specifically, the ethics approval from the Rwanda National Ethics Committee – RNEC). We have reviewed the process and found that, for data collection to happen within the indicated timeframe on the TOR, applications for research approval must be submitted **by April 18** (as per [RNEC calendar](#)). Is there flexibility in the timeline? [We acknowledge this consideration and plan to submit the application to RNEC in advance of mid-April.](#)
6. **Considerations regarding school term dates:** Another consideration regarding the timeline and implications of adjusting the timeline is school term dates. Interviews with teachers and school leaders, for example, carry budget implications if these interviews need to be conducted during school holidays. For this reason, we suggest moving up the contracting period to early April, if possible, to allow for the application submission for RNEC approval by the deadline of April 18. This would ensure that data collection is conducted during the school term (avoiding examination periods). [Please see response above regarding RNEC submission timeline. With respect to the school calendar, we understand Term III to be ending 5 July, with national exams for basic education from 8-10 July. The provisional timeline indicates data collection ending by June 21<sup>st</sup>, which is within the Term III schedule, but may overlap with the revision and exam preparation period which can pose time constraints for education officials and staff.](#)

We also recognize that the current preparation and data collection timeline is ambitious and in response, are adapting the approach and timing for the partner selection, contracting and inception phase. Please see updates to the RFP.

7. **Observation/Coaching Records and Time Capture Surveys:** The TOR indicates that part of the data collection sample will be made up Observation/Coaching Records and Time Capture Surveys. We would like to request more detail on the expectation of these activities, to inform our budget development.

For the observation/coaching records, we hope to collect these records from DEOs (to the extent applicable) SEIs and Teachers, ideally for the entire 2023-2024 academic year. We are still exploring the exact nature of these records but expect to capture the available records via tablet, either entry with a template or capturing the image for later coding/data entry.

For the time capture, we expect to design two alternative capture options, in collaboration with the data collection partner. Provisionally, we are planning for either a self-reported time capture or an interview-style time capture or a combination of the two. We recognize these require different approaches and level of effort and as such, please include budget for two visits with respondents over the period of several weeks, with time for an initial mini-training on the time capture and a 30-minute de-brief upon collection of the time tracking data. Time recording may be paper-based or app-based depending upon initial feasibility discussions, but the offeror does not need to include any app development in their level of effort or budget.

8. **Planning Allocation in Timeline:** The TOR states that "Instrument coding, translation and testing completed, enumerator training plan, final sample and data collection protocols, detailed field plan for pilot and data collection" should take place between May 6 - May 10. We are concerned that this amount of time is insufficient given the volume of research instruments and the need to develop instrument-specific protocols. Is there flexibility to extend the time allocated to this phase of the project? We agree this is too ambitious of a timeline and have moved the front end of the timeline up and will finalize a manageable timeline with the selected partner.
9. **Activity 4B:** As part of activity 4b in the TOR, the firm is responsible for 'post-data collection note expansion/memos covering reflections, insights, and flagging potential biases and for initial extraction/coding of major themes in relation to the research questions'. We request further information on the type of analysis expected for these activities. The intent of this activity is to ensure the RTI team has full benefit of the reflections of the data collection team given their proximity to the work. With these notes, we would like to capture the reflections of the field team that might help inform the interpretation of the qualitative data in particular. For instance, if there are areas of inquiry that respondents seem particularly reticent to respond to or if the relevance/understanding of certain questions was low, we would like to have that information. We anticipate this information will be brought forward through the regular briefings during data collection, reviewed for completeness and balance and then shared with the RTI team in the form of a briefing note.
10. **Inter-rater Reliability Testing:** The TOR states that 'The training program should incorporate inter-rater reliability testing as appropriate and ensure an acceptable rate (as agreed between Offeror and RTI) is achieved before fieldwork commences'. Which instrument is this testing for? Given that the sample sizes for this data collection are small, we would like to get more details

on what is expected in relation to inter-rater reliability testing. Laterite carries out back-checks as part of our standard quality assurance processes - is back-checking sufficient? [Thank you for this question and we concur that IRR for the types of instruments being used in this study is not necessary. Back-checking \(as appropriate\) will be sufficient.](#)

11. **Appendix A - Budget Template:** We would also like to request a copy of the 'Appendix A - Budget Template' in Excel as we have been unable to find this document on the RFP advertisements. [Please see attached.](#)