

## ITT (Invitation to Tender)

For

### Capacity Building for School Self-evaluation in Chongqing, China

<b>Date:</b>	31 May 2014
<b>Introduction</b>	<p><b>The British Council</b> creates international opportunities for the people of the UK and other countries and builds trust between them worldwide. We are a Royal Charter charity, established as the UK's international organisation for educational opportunities and cultural relations. Our 7000 staff in over 100 countries work with thousands of professionals and policy makers and millions of young people every year through English, arts, education and society programmes. Our first office in China opened in 1943 and we work in four cities in mainland China. In Beijing we operate as the Cultural and Education Section of the British Embassy. In Shanghai, Guangzhou and Chongqing we operate as the Cultural and Education Section of the British Consulates-General.</p> <p>UK school inspection and quality assurance system has a long-standing reputation worldwide. In China, assessment and quality assurance has led the new wave of education reform in the recent years. In order to promote UK-China exchanges and collaboration in this field, we have developed a number of initiatives with partners and would like to invite tenders to provide services for <b>Capacity Building for School Self-evaluation:</b></p> <p>The British Council and the Chongqing Educational Evaluation Institute have launched a 2 year project to build effective model and stronger culture of school self-evaluation and improvement. The project has recruited about 30 local schools to pilot the self-evaluation framework/handbook developed by local experts based on UK Ofsted framework with contextual value-added (CVA) measures.</p> <p>The project includes a series of capacity building activities to: a) motivate and enable schools to conduct evaluation and make improvement as a result; b) support external inspectors/professionals to understand and play their roles in interfacing with and advising school self-evaluation and improvement.</p> <p><b>Chongqing Educational Evaluation Institute (CEE)</b> also as Chongqing Assessment of Educational Quality was founded in 2008. They play an important role in developing local evaluation standards/indicators, implementing quality monitoring and evaluation and delivering relevant training etc.</p>
<b>Background Information</b>	<p><b>School Education Quality Assurance in China</b></p> <p>In China, the 2010-2020 National Outline for Medium and Long-term Education Reform and Development Policy states that "to take the quality improvement as the core task of education reform and development, establish the national standards for education quality and create and perfect the quality assurance system." Creating standards and indicators that can be a practical guide for schools and teachers, reforming evaluation methodologies and assuring the</p>

	<p>quality are at present top priorities for China education.</p> <p>China established national education inspection team in 1994 and the State Council Education Inspection Committee in 2010 to guide the national and local education evaluation. The National Assessment Centre of Education Quality (NAEQ) as a professional organization established in 2007 is to develop standards and monitor the quality at the national level. At the provincial and city level, there are 16 professional organizations established to conduct education quality assessment and evaluation, including Chongqing Educational Evaluation Institute (CEE).</p> <p>Although achievements have been made in some ways, challenges are ahead:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of autonomy and accountability. For a long time, government takes up the holistic role to regulate, manage, and also evaluate but it is time to separate duties of regulation, management and evaluation. The model of 'government to regulate, school to manage, and wider society to evaluate' is promoted and piloted in some areas.</li> <li>• Imbalanced development. The quality of education varies in developed and underdeveloped regions in China. There is yet to be a ready national quality standards system that is also applicable in different regions of China.</li> </ul> <p><b>School Evaluation in Chongqing</b></p> <p>Chongqing developed ten standards to evaluation the quality of schools which include process indicators like organisational management, moral education, staff management, curriculum and classroom teaching; and results indicators like student behaviours, academic achievements, health and safety, interest and speciality, and academic burden on students.</p> <p>Chongqing Educational Evaluation Institute (CEE) is keen to develop a set of specific indicators and practical toolkits against the standard framework for school implementation. Ofsted contextual value-added framework is what they would like to learn from.</p>
<p><b>Scope of work</b></p>	<p><b><u>Outcomes:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants are equipped with the knowledge and skills required to conduct school evaluation in their respective roles.</li> <li>• Participating schools are motivated to improve performance through self-evaluation and confident of doing so.</li> <li>• Toolkits gained, with action plans discussed and assessed.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Outputs:</u></b></p> <p>The appointed supplier is supposed to deliver <b>at least Activities 2&amp;3&amp;4 or 5 and preferably all</b> as below:</p> <p><b>Activity 1: Provide consultancy to Chongqing school evaluation framework/handbook (2 contact days)</b></p> <p>To provide consultancy to Chongqing Educational Evaluation Institute (CEE) who is developing a local school evaluation framework/handbook based on UK Ofsted framework with contextual value-added (CVA) measures. Suppose it could be mainly managed through email or telephone communication and would not be necessarily visits.</p>

	<p><b>Activity 2: Design and deliver 1-day training workshop for inspectors</b>  To train local inspectors/evaluation professional so that they could understand and apply Ofsted framework to interface with and advise on school self-evaluation and improvement.</p> <p>Report is to be submitted within 15 working days after the completion of the training providing evidence and suggestions against expected outcomes.</p> <p><b>Activity 3: Conduct Mock inspection</b>  To conduct mock inspection in one or two local schools with local inspectors /evaluation professionals by applying Ofsted framework.</p> <p><b>Activity 4: Design and deliver two 2-3-day training workshops for project schools</b>  The first workshop is to enable project schools to conduct self-evaluation confidently and effectively by applying Ofsted framework. Before the workshop, about 30 project schools are grouped to pilot self-evaluation by applying part of Ofsted framework based on their own understanding. So the reflection of the pilot could be shared and discussed at the workshop.</p> <p>The second workshop is supposed to be a progression course to the first one with focuses on value-added (VA) measures and school improvement plan. Before the workshop, project schools are grouped to do the second pilot of the whole Ofsted framework.</p> <p>Report is to be submitted within 15 working days after the completion of the training providing evidence and suggestions against expected outcomes.</p> <p><b>Activity 5: Design and organise UK Attachment and Study Visit Programme</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To design and organise two-week attachment/shadowing programme for 1-2 project team core members (English speakers) so they have deep understanding and experience about UK school evaluation and quality assurance system.</li> <li>• To design and organise one week UK study visit for about 10 delegates from local partner and project schools on school evaluation. Programme is expected to include: meeting with education authorities/Ofsted/academic professionals/senior practitioners, school visit, observing Ofsted inspection (if possible).</li> </ul>
<b>Timescales</b>	This timetable may be subject to change.

	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Activity</th> <th>Date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ITT Released</td> <td>1 June 2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ITT Return Date</td> <td>20 June 2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Final decision and Intention to award to appointed Supplier</td> <td>5 July 2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Project briefing</td> <td>The week of 7 July 2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Training course designed; UK attachment/visit programme designed</td> <td>10 August 2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Training workshop for local inspectors; Mock inspection; First training workshop for project schools</td> <td>Mid to late September 2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td>UK attachment and study visit</td> <td>Mid to late October 2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Second training workshop for project schools</td> <td>March 2015</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Activity	Date	ITT Released	1 June 2014	ITT Return Date	20 June 2014	Final decision and Intention to award to appointed Supplier	5 July 2014			Project briefing	The week of 7 July 2014	Training course designed; UK attachment/visit programme designed	10 August 2014	Training workshop for local inspectors; Mock inspection; First training workshop for project schools	Mid to late September 2014	UK attachment and study visit	Mid to late October 2014	Second training workshop for project schools	March 2015	
Activity	Date																					
ITT Released	1 June 2014																					
ITT Return Date	20 June 2014																					
Final decision and Intention to award to appointed Supplier	5 July 2014																					
Project briefing	The week of 7 July 2014																					
Training course designed; UK attachment/visit programme designed	10 August 2014																					
Training workshop for local inspectors; Mock inspection; First training workshop for project schools	Mid to late September 2014																					
UK attachment and study visit	Mid to late October 2014																					
Second training workshop for project schools	March 2015																					
<b>Supplier Response</b>	<p>Please complete Annex 1 Response Sheet and submit it to <a href="mailto:natalie.huang@britishcouncil.org.cn">natalie.huang@britishcouncil.org.cn</a> and copy <a href="mailto:connectingclassrooms@britishcouncil.org.cn">connectingclassrooms@britishcouncil.org.cn</a> with the title 'Tender for Capacity Building for School Self-evaluation' no later than 24.00 GMT, <b>20 June 2014</b>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Please ensure that you send your submission in good time to prevent issues with technology – late submissions may not be considered.</li> <li>• Do not submit any additional documentation except if specifically requested.</li> <li>• Supporting evidence (PDF, JPG, PPT, Word and Excel formats only - other formats should not be used) can be provided to substantiate your response – please ensure that all attachments/supporting evidence is clearly labelled with the appropriate question number.</li> <li>• It is not acceptable to submit a generic policy in answer to a question.</li> <li>• All answers in the ITT response should be inserted in the space below the British Council requirement / question.</li> <li>• Where supporting evidence is requested as 'or equivalent' – it is the Supplier's responsibility to prove the relevant equivalence.</li> <li>• Any alteration to a question will invalidate your response to that question and a mark of zero will be applied.</li> <li>• Completion and submission of your response does not guarantee award of any British Council Contract</li> </ul>																					
<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<p>The award criterion for this tender is the most economically advantageous. The Supplier's submission will be taken into consideration only if they pass Section 1 - Mandatory and Discretionary Rejection.</p> <p>Supplier responses will be assessed using the following criteria and weightings.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Criteria</th> <th>Weighting</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Section 1 – Mandatory and Discretionary Rejection</td> <td>Pass/Fail</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Section 2 – Knowledge and experience</td> <td>20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Section 3 – Approach and Timetable</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Section 4 – Programme design and content</td> <td>30%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Criteria	Weighting	Section 1 – Mandatory and Discretionary Rejection	Pass/Fail	Section 2 – Knowledge and experience	20%	Section 3 – Approach and Timetable	15%	Section 4 – Programme design and content	30%											
Criteria	Weighting																					
Section 1 – Mandatory and Discretionary Rejection	Pass/Fail																					
Section 2 – Knowledge and experience	20%																					
Section 3 – Approach and Timetable	15%																					
Section 4 – Programme design and content	30%																					

Section 5 – Understanding of BC objectives and VFM	10%
Section 6 – Costing	25%

Evaluation of submitted responses will be undertaken by the evaluation panel. The qualitative aspects of your response will be evaluated entirely on your response submitted. Evaluation of all submissions will only consider information presented within the response. Previous/current relationships with suppliers cannot be taken into account when evaluating submissions. Any previous experience must be clearly evidenced within the response. Evaluation will be fair and transparent.

The responses under each section will be scored based on the following matrix:

Points	Interpretation
15	A comprehensive and strong answer indicating the supplier is fully capable and experienced to deliver the required outcomes and outputs. A detailed response that directly responds to all requirements with no ambiguity and relevant examples provided.
12	There are slight concerns that the supplier will not be able to achieve all the outcomes required and response lacked details of relevant experience. A less detailed response that broadly responds to the requirement with some ambiguity and few relevant examples provided.
10	There are concerns that the supplier will not be able to achieve the outcomes required and response significantly lacks details of relevant experience. A less detailed response that broadly responds to the requirement with some ambiguity and no/irrelevant examples provided.
5	There are serious indications that the supplier will not be able to achieve the outcomes required and has not provided appropriate evidence of experience to successfully deliver the outcomes required. A response that is not entirely relevant to the requirement, with ambiguity and lacking specific detail.
0	The answer is non-compliant and/or no relevant information has been received to demonstrate the supplier can achieve the required outcomes. No response or a response that is entirely irrelevant.

The lowest all-inclusive cost proposed will receive 15 points. All other submissions will be allocated a % score pro-rata.

The final evaluation score will then be calculated for each response by adding together the scores for each Section.

The Supplier can put in a tender for all activities or 2&3&4 or 5 separately. The supplier is advised to submit costing for activities separately in the Invitation to Tender response sheet at Annex 1.

The British Council may award the contract as a whole or separate to several contracts for the respective activities should it comes to a decision to award contract to more than one suppliers. If you do not accept sharing the relevant information with another supplier please state clearly in your response.

