



EUROPEAN UNION SUPPORT TO HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE ASEAN REGION

SHARE Project Management Office
ASEAN Secretariat | 70A Jl. Sisingamangaraja | Jakarta 12110 | Indonesia
Phone: +62 (21) 726 2991 | Email: info@share-asean.eu | Web: www.share-asean.eu

Annex 4 of Request for Proposal

Terms of Reference

Case Studies to Strengthen the Evaluability of SHARE Programme

I. Background

The Support to Higher Education in the ASEAN Region (SHARE) Programme is the European Union's flagship higher education programme with ASEAN since 2015.

SHARE supports the ASEAN Secretariat and ASEAN stakeholders to enable greater harmonisation and internationalisation of ASEAN higher education. It aims to catalyse the transfer of ownership of programme key achievements to ASEAN entities and nominated organisations to be embedded within sustainable ASEAN-led structures and processes. The SHARE Programme is fully committed to the implementation of the third ASEAN Work Plan on Education 2021 – 2025 for the duration of its extension.

The SHARE Consortium - comprised of the British Council, the DAAD, ENQA, and Nuffic - brings to bear its collective expertise and experience across the full scope and dimensions of international education in line with the further development of an ASEAN Higher Education Space and an ASEAN branded scholarship scheme, in collaboration with the ASEAN Secretariat and ASEAN stakeholders.

The overall objective of the SHARE Programme Extension is to strengthen regional cooperation, enhance the quality, regional competitiveness and internationalisation of ASEAN higher education institutions contributing to an ASEAN Community in 2025 and beyond.

The overall purpose of the SHARE Programme is:

- To enhance the harmonisation of ASEAN Higher Education area through the formulation of ASEAN Higher Education frameworks, taking into account the EU experience and promotion of equal access for girls and women to quality Higher Education free from discrimination; and
- To support mutual recognition, student mobility and equal opportunities for all, including female students and people with disabilities, among HEIs in ASEAN, and to strengthen people-to-people connectivity.



Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst
German Academic Exchange Service



European Association for
Quality Assurance in Higher Education

The expected results are:

- Enhanced opportunities for policy dialogue on strategic issues (including equal opportunities and gender equality) of harmonisation of ASEAN higher education involving variety of stakeholders including ASEAN and EU as required;
- ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework and ASEAN Regional Quality Assurance including disaggregated data collection further developed and supported;
- ASEAN Credit Transfer System (ACTS) and ASEAN-EU Credit Transfer System (AECTS) further developed and tested through mobility with scholarships.

SHARE Programme applies a systematic monitoring and evaluation using a logical framework document to regularly monitor progress throughout its delivery and form a framework for evaluation. This describes the programme as it was and demonstrates indicators achievements as evidence of the programme delivery. However, quantitative methods have limitations in demonstrating the efficacy of the programme, and its impact. A case study will be carried out to study intensely one set (or unit) of subject/topic – individual, program, platform, approach/models within a specific context as robust evidence to strengthen the evaluability of the SHARE Programme.

II. Objective of the Case Studies

SHARE is underpinned by a comprehensive results framework and monitoring plan that coordinates the collection and use of programme performance data. This data forms an important part of our understanding of the scope, scale and impact of SHARE, but only provides a partial picture of the results and impact achieved.

To generate deeper insights, SHARE is seeking proposals for the proposals for a series of case studies that will strengthen the evaluability of SHARE Programme. They will systematically collect qualitative data that provides a more comprehensive picture of the extent to which SHARE is supporting positive change in greater collaboration in higher education across ASEAN member states. The series of case studies will allow to better understand and communicate the contribution of SHARE to the development of an ASEAN Higher Education Space. The specific themes to be assessed through these case studies will be discussed and agreed with the consortium partners and the SHARE Team Leader. They will be drawn from all three programme result areas and will address the following questions:

1. To what extent has the SHARE Programme been effective in enhancing the harmonisation of ASEAN Higher Education? and
2. To what extent has the SHARE Programme been effective in supporting mutual recognition, student mobility, equal opportunities amongst HEIs in ASEAN to strengthen people-to-people connectivity?

Structure of case studies

The case studies should follow a basic structure that:

- i) describes the issue/challenge that SHARE is addressing.
- ii) describes what was delivered through SHARE to address this issue.
- iii) draws upon output/outcome data, where relevant, to describe immediate results and/or useful contextual information.

- iv) describes the impact delivered at an individual, institutional, or regulatory/policy level, depending on the focus of each case studies. We invite proposals as to approaches and will finalise a format during the inception period.

Case studies should also be guided by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) revised evaluation criteria, specifically:

- **Relevance: *Is the SHARE Programme (e.g., specific theme) doing the right things?***
The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries, global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.
- **Coherence: *How well does the SHARE Programme (e.g., specific theme) fit?***
The extent to which other interventions (particularly policies) support or undermine the intervention, and vice versa. Includes internal and external coherence.
- **Effectiveness: *Is the SHARE Programme (e.g., specific theme) achieving its objectives?***
The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups.
- **Efficiency: *How well are resources being used?***
The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.
- **Impact: *What difference does the intervention make?***
The extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.
- **Sustainability: *Will the benefits last?***
The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue, or are likely to continue

We envisage to commission a series of up to 6 case studies, produced over 2 periods. A final programme evaluation that will be commissioned in 2022 will embed the key findings.

III. Methodology

This following methodology is proposed:

- A consultation workshop with SHARE consortium partners to identify the specific themes, timeline, key informants and identify lessons learned and a dissemination plan for each case study.
- Review of programme documents and monitoring data relevant to each case study.
- Development of a data collection plan for each case study, identifying methods of collection (focus groups, individual interviews and so forth), participants, and timeline.
- Identify human interest stories to feature and be communicated to wider audiences
- A workshop to validate case study findings with consortium partners.
- Production of case study summaries using the structure described above.

We welcome suggestions of other approaches that will deliver against objectives.

IV. Deliverables

The selected consultancy/expert will produce the following deliverables:

- i. An inception report detailing approach and timelines
- ii. A summary of methods and approach for each case study
- iii. Completed 1st period of case studies with the format and content summarised in this document.
- iv. A workshop with SHARE consortium partners to review the 1st period of case studies result.
- v. Interim case study report
- vi. Completed 2nd period of case studies with the format and content summarised in this document.
- vii. A workshop with SHARE consortium partners to review the 2nd period of case studies result.
- viii. Final case study report

V. Reporting

The selected consultancy/expert will primarily report to Sr. MEL Officer of the SHARE Programme. They will work closely with the Team Leader and British Council East Asia Director of Evidence, Evaluation and Learning as well as with SHARE partners and any relevant bodies.

VI. Skills and Expertise Required

We are seeking a consultant, consultant team, or agency based in ASEAN region that has a proven combined track-record in the following:

- Academic background with a graduate degree in social sciences, economics, development or education;
- Experience of at least 5 years of conducting evaluation and / or impact evaluation – particularly within the higher education context in the ASEAN region;
- Experience of conducting case study research and developing best practice guides, preferably in the Higher Education sector in the ASEAN region;
- Familiarity with the European and ASEAN Higher Education internationalisation agenda;
- Fluency in English Excellent communication and facilitation skills;
- Strong analytical and report writing skills;
- Excellent time management skills and ability to meet deadlines;
- Availability to travel internationally if required.

VII. Provisional Timescales

The timeframe of this consultancy will be from December 2021 to September 2022. The final timeline of work will be agreed during the inception period, but the following is indicative.

Timeline for Request for Proposal

Timeline	Activity
15 October 2021	Call for proposal
22 October 2021	Clarification questions deadline
27 October 2021	British Council to respond to clarification questions
29 October 2021	Proposal submission deadline
3 November 2021	Application shortlisting
8 - 12 November 2021	Applicants Interview
19 November 2021	Announcement of successful applicants
30 November 2021	Contract concluded with winning supplier
1 December 2021	Contract start date

Indicative timeline for Consultancy work

Timeline	Activity
6 December 2021	Kick-off meeting
10 December 2021	Inception report submission
14 December 2021	Consultation with SHARE consortium partner workshop to identify case studies
21 December 2021	A summary of methods and approach for each case study submission
January – March 2022	Data collection for 1 st period of case study
End March 2022	Workshop with SHARE consortium partner to validate the result of 1 st period of case study
Mid-April 2022	Interim case studies report
June – August 2022	Data collection for 2 nd period of case study
Early September 2022	Workshop with SHARE consortium partner to validate the result of 2 nd period of case study
Mid-September 2022	Final case studies report submission

VIII. Anticipated Budget

The indicative budget allocated to this contract will be a maximum of EUR 25,000

IX. How to apply

Interested applicants should submit the following documents to sharepmo@britishcouncil.org by the response deadline, as set out in the timeline of proposal submission.

- Annex 2 – Supplier Response addressing the case study approach and structure specified above
- Annex 3 – Pricing Approach
- Curriculum Vitae of each member of the applying research team
- Writing sample of case study report of not more than 2 pages.

X. Evaluation criteria

Responses from potential applicants will be assessed on the following criteria.

• Award Criteria

Criteria	Item of evaluation	Weighting
Research Proposal	a. Method and delivery	40%
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Case study design and method approach 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Illustrative of stories feature 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feasibility of the work plan 	30%
	b. Skills and expertise of proposed team	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experiences from previous case study 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expertise and track record of proposed team 		
Commercial	Submitted budget (including cost breakdown)	20%
Social Value	The study contribution to integrated communities and encourage empowerment of women, vulnerable adults, and minority groups.	10%
Total score		100%

• Scoring Model

Points	Interpretation
10	Excellent – Overall the response demonstrates that the bidder meets all areas of the requirement and provides all of the areas evidence requested in the level of detail requested. This, therefore, is a detailed excellent response that meets all aspects of the requirement leaving no ambiguity as to whether the bidder can meet the requirement.
7	Good – Overall the response demonstrates that the bidder meets all areas of the requirement and provides all of the areas of evidence requested but contains some trivial omissions in relation to the level of detail requested in terms of either the response or the evidence. This, therefore, is a good response that meets all aspects of the requirement with only a trivial level ambiguity due the bidders failure to provide all information at the level of detail requested.
5	Adequate – Overall the response demonstrates that the bidder meets all areas of the requirement, but not all of the areas of evidence requested have been provided. This, therefore, is an adequate response, but with some limited ambiguity as to whether the bidder can meet the requirement due to the bidder's failure to provide all of the evidence requested.
3	Poor – The response does not demonstrate that the bidder meets the requirement in one or more areas. This, therefore, is a poor response with significant ambiguity as to whether the bidder can meet the requirement due to the failure by the bidder to show that it meets one or more areas of the requirement.
0	Unacceptable – The response is non-compliant with the requirements of the RFP and/or no response has been provided.

Annex I. SHARE Results Chain

