



ITT (Invitation to Tender)

For

Literature Review into Student Assessment

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Date: | 31 May 2014 |
| Introduction | <p>The British Council 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 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 Literature Review into Student Assessment.</p> <p>The British Council and the Wuhan Academy of Educational Science are working on developing and piloting a comprehensive student assessment and evaluation system, so it drives the system towards a direction that supports all-rounded development of young people. Through the project we also aim to capacity build policy makers and practitioners, and enable school based pilot/implementation to finally inform decision making.</p> <p>Literature review is the starting point of the project which is to provide project team the international evidence on effective assessment systems and support the design and development of the local formative and summative evaluation system.</p> <p>Wuhan Academy of Educational Science (WAES) is a top education research institute in China. It has more than 150 education experts, carrying out education theory research, education macro level decision research, education practice research and providing academic/policy consultancy on education decision, school management, education quality in Wuhan/Hubei province. It also plays the leading role in a national educational research consortium of 10 capital cities including Chongqing, Chengdu, Xiamen, Nanjing, Guangzhou, Tianjin, Harbin, Changchun, Dalian and Wuhan – all key Tier 2 cities.</p> |
| Background Information | Implementation of basic education quality assurance has become the basic trend of basic education management in many countries. |

In China, the 2010-2020 National Outline for Medium and Long-term Education Reform and Development Policy clearly states “the need to formulate a national standard of Education quality and create and perfect an Education quality assurance system” Creating a standardised level of Education quality that can be a practical guide for teachers, reforming education evaluation methodology and assuring education quality is at present an important task for the field of education.

Current Assessment Situation:

- With regard to assessment methods, the focus is on course examinations at all stages of education
- With regard to the content of the assessment, the main exam focus is on evaluating subject knowledge with the main point being to examine students grades
- Evaluation functions as a tool to discriminate between students abilities, as a method of comparison and selection and is rarely used as a method of diagnosis
- On the topic of assessment organisation, all students must participate and sampling is rarely used
- Examination questions are the main assessment tool, feedback and interview methods are rarely used
- With regard to the results of the assessment, the main point is to establish a grade that can then be used to rank the students

Wuhan

The system in Wuhan is very much influenced by the paramount need for students to reach the best possible standard in the examination which takes place at the end of the primary / middle phase of education. The outcomes of this examination are exceptionally important to students because this determines whether or not they will gain entrance to the best high schools and secure a future through university education.

Such strong emphasis on summative assessment is apparent throughout the primary / middle age range, although the outcome of the tests is less important. Formative assessment of students’ skills and development as independent learners is less evident. Additionally, schools measure students against the summative test outcomes and do not place any weight on value-added through the progress of students from individual starting points. As a result, many students report that, whilst they enjoy school and respect their teachers, there is continual pressure to pass tests and this is sometimes overwhelming.

Students with lower levels of ability appear to be given much encouragement to catch up and do better in the tests, but, possibly due to the large class sizes, their real learning difficulties are not recognised. As a result, their progress from starting points frequently goes unrecognised and it may well be that this has a negative effect on self-esteem and their confidence as learners.

Accountability of schools for their performance seems to be mainly through the summative test outcomes for students. Whilst teachers are monitored and

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| | <p>graded on their performance, this is largely an internal matter, and, again performance is judged by student test outcomes.</p> |
| <p>Scope of work</p> | <p><u>Objectives:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allow Wuhan project research team to study international evidence on effective assessment systems and uses this information to inform planning in Wuhan. 2. Refer to psychometrics (Item Response Theory and Generalizability Theory) applications in the assessment, Wuhan researchers/statisticians/psychometricians are able to analyse data from quantitative pilot. 3. In collaboration with stakeholders (e.g. headteachers, parents, teachers, municipal officials), Wuhan could design systems for reporting and communicating results from formative and summative assessments. <p><u>Output:</u></p> <p>Research report for the following component(s):The research will cover two components. At the end of the research, an evidence based report will be produced for each of the two components. We ask agencies to set out the approach and methodology they propose to use and the data sources (existing and/or to be collected as part of this project) they would use in order to meet the objectives for the research.</p> <p>Component I will focus on value added assessment in primary and secondary school</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy and practices for value added assessment in summative assessment, mainly in the UK, but also including other countries such as Holland etc. • The ways of data analysis • The challenges and obstacles encountered during the process. And the solutions to address. The experience and lessons accumulated • 5-6 case studies from the UK and other countries <p>The research should be carried out from national, institutional and individual level.</p> <p>Component II will focus on application of assessment tool on student assessment in primary and secondary school</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generalizability Theory (GT) 's application in the assessment result • Item Response Theory (IRT)'s application in the assessment result • 5-6 case studies <p>The research should not to describe the theory itself, but focus on how to use data to analysis the assessment result.</p> |
| <p>Timescales</p> | <p>This timetable may be subject to change.</p> |

| | <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>10 July 2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Report submitted</td> <td>31 August 2014</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 | 10 July 2014 | Report submitted | 31 August 2014 | | | | |
|---|---|----------|-----------|---|-------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|---|--------------|------------------------------------|----------------|---|-----|---------------------|-----|
| Activity | Date | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ITT Released | 1 June 2014 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ITT Return Date | 20 June 2014 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Final decision and Intention to award to appointed Supplier | 10 July 2014 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Report submitted | 31 August 2014 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Supplier Response | <p>Please complete Annex 1 Response Sheet and submit it to helen.lu@britishcouncil.org.cn and copy connectingclassrooms@britishcouncil.org.cn with the title 'Tender for Literature Review' no later than 24.00 GMT, 20 June 2014.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please ensure that you send your submission in good time to prevent issues with technology – late submissions may not be considered. • Do not submit any additional documentation except if specifically requested. • 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. • It is not acceptable to submit a generic policy in answer to a question. • All answers in the ITT response should be inserted in the space below the British Council requirement / question. • Where supporting evidence is requested as 'or equivalent' – it is the Supplier's responsibility to prove the relevant equivalence. • Any alteration to a question will invalidate your response to that question and a mark of zero will be applied. • Completion and submission of your response does not guarantee award of any British Council Contract | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Evaluation Criteria | <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 - Methodology and approach</td> <td>30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Section 4 - Timetable and staffing</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Section 5 - Understanding of BC aims/objectives and VFM</td> <td>10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Section 6 - Costing</td> <td>25%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>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.</p> | Criteria | Weighting | Section 1 – Mandatory and Discretionary Rejection | Pass/Fail | Section 2 - Knowledge and experience | 20% | Section 3 - Methodology and approach | 30% | Section 4 - Timetable and staffing | 15% | Section 5 - Understanding of BC aims/objectives and VFM | 10% | Section 6 - Costing | 25% |
| Criteria | Weighting | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Section 1 – Mandatory and Discretionary Rejection | Pass/Fail | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Section 2 - Knowledge and experience | 20% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Section 3 - Methodology and approach | 30% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Section 4 - Timetable and staffing | 15% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Section 5 - Understanding of BC aims/objectives and VFM | 10% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Section 6 - Costing | 25% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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. 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 either or both components. In either case the supplier is advised to submit costing for the two components separately in the Invitation to Tender response sheet at Annex 1. Where it's specified that 'separate costing required', the Supplier should provide the respective costing in a separate line.

The British Council may award the contract as a whole or separate to two contracts for the respective components should it comes to a decision to award contract to two suppliers. If you do not accept sharing the research with another supplier please state clearly in your proposal.