

Higher Education Partnership (HEP)

Attachments for the Programme Document

Contents

Attachment 1: Results Framework	2
Expected results at the programme level	2
Results framework at the project level	5
Project-level indicators	5
Attachment 2: Risk management table	6
Risk management table for the programme level	6
Risk management at the project level	7
Attachment 3: Programme budget	8
Attachment 4: Project-level eligible costs	9
Project-level general costs for the HEI	9
Budget lines	9
Eligible cost items	9
Attachment 5: Selection criteria in detail	12
Qualitative evaluation criteria	12

Attachment 1: Results Framework

Expected results at the programme level

The programme has one impact, two outcomes and both outcomes have two outputs. These create a continuum where reaching outputs contributes to respective outcomes, and reaching two outcomes contributes to reaching the expected impact.

Each project will contribute towards selected outputs. It is preferable for a project to contribute at least to two outputs.

The project-level results are collected together and analysed to determine the programme-level results.

Programme-level indicators

The projects under the programme are expected to monitor these *programme-level* indicators. In addition, they are they are expected to prepare a *project-level* results framework with indicators relevant to their expected impact, outcomes and outputs.

In order to limit the total number of the indicators, the programme-level indicators are limited to four. However, these require two annual satisfaction surveys. The surveys are described below.

The programme-level indicators are defined only at the level of impact and outcomes. Since the projects develop during their span of implementation, it is understandable that major results may be reached only towards the end of the project implementation.

<i>Results Framework at Programme level</i>			
IMPACT	Indicators	Sources of verification	Assumptions
HEIs in the partner countries contribute to sustainable development by providing high-quality, inclusive and working-life relevant higher education.	1. Satisfaction of the leadership of the partner HEIs on the impacts of the projects	Annual standard leadership feedback survey (see explanation 1 below)	Leaders know the project and have interest to provide independent views
OUTCOME 1			

Outcome 1: Strengthened educational and institutional capacities of partner HEIs in providing working-life relevant higher education	2. Number of staff engaged in capacity development, including exchange programmes 3. Number of educational institutions, incl. higher education, reached through measures aimed to increase their capacity.	Project reports	The project has reached the student level and they have interest in providing independent views
OUTPUT 1: Strengthened educational capacity, including/in particular renewed degree programmes and individual courses			
OUTPUT 2: Strengthened capacity of teachers and experts in teaching and administration (professional development)			
OUTCOME 2			
Outcome 2: Improved quality of the partner HEIs' education, including digitalized and blended education	4. Student satisfaction ¹ on new and/or revised courses	Annual standard student feedback survey (see item 2 below)	
OUTPUT 3: Improved pedagogical methods and new innovative solutions created for teaching and learning.			
OUTPUT 4: Improved access to higher education for students with vulnerable backgrounds			

Clarification for the obligatory programme-level indicators for the projects:

a. Satisfaction of the leadership of the partner HEIs on the impacts of the projects.

Surveys for the partner HEI's leadership:

- a. Minimum 4 leaders (=n). Leaders answer by name because their answers provide direct feedback for project implementation.
- b. Questions to be included in survey: a) How well has the project supported your Higher Education Institution in strengthening the overall institutional and educational (a: scale

1-6, with 6 as top score, a: justification: please provide the justification as an open narrative answer); b) How well has the project supported your Higher Education Institution in terms of improved pedagogical methods, including using innovative methods and covering students with vulnerable backgrounds? (b: scale 1-6, with 6 as the top score; b justification: please provide the justification as an open narrative answer).

Scoring $(\sum a+b)/2n$. Arithmetic average. Each score provided by the leaders for questions a and b above are counted together. This sum is divided by the number of answering leaders times two. Since the leaders answer by name, the data can be disaggregated by sex.

b. Number of staff engaged in capacity development, including exchange programmes

Staff engaged with the project during the calendar year. Minimum for 'engagement' is two working days.

c. Number of educational institutions, incl. higher education, reached through measures aimed to increase their capacity

Here it is sufficient to give the number of the partnering HEIs. This indicator is special because similar data is counted from all educational projects (i.e. beyond HEP) financed by the MFA of Finland. This indicator is so called 'aggregate indicator' also relevant for the SDG reporting.

- a. Rationale: as the institutional capacity to improve learning outcomes is difficult to measure, its progress is possible to monitor on the basis of the number of institutions reached through programmes and projects that aim to increase their institutional capacity as such. Capacity development programmes of educational institutions aim at increasing the pedagogical and/or managerial capacity of the institutions. It is assumed that their successful implementation thus leads to improved learning outcomes.
- b. Methodology: educational institutions refer to pre-primary, primary, secondary, vocational and higher education schools and universities. This indicator measures the number of institutions that the project/sector programme is covering with capacity development interventions (e.g. school improvement programmes, professional development for staff, institutional cooperation).

d. Students' satisfaction on new and/or revised courses

Student satisfaction survey

- a. Minimum 10 students (=m). The answers of the anonymous students but they are asked to indicate their sex.
- b. Questions to be included in survey: a) Have you seen any positive changes in the educational methods related to X courses during the past year? (scale 1-6, with 6 as top score; Justification: please provide the justification as an open narrative answer). b)

Have you seen positive changes in the contents of the education related to X courses during the past year? (scale 1-6, with 6 as top score; justification: please provide the justification in an open narrative answer).

- c. Scoring: similar method as above for leaders: $(\sum a+b)/2m$. Since students are asked to provide information on their sex, the scoring can be counted also separately for men and women.

Results framework at the project level

Each project is expected to prepare its own results framework.

The project-level impact and outcome should make some kind of reference to the programme-level results framework.

The project-level result framework should also make reference to the selected theme or themes (i.e. at least one of the three themes of the programme).

Project-level indicators

All projects are expected to provide information on ***the four programme-level indicators defined above***.

In addition, each project is expected to define a small number (e.g. 4–6) ***additional project-level indicators*** which link directly to its own impact statement, or outcome or outputs.

Indicator data is collected annually. When data is presented in the annual report, it is useful to provide a narrative description (what does the indicator tell us; how reliable is the data; is the indicator cumulative or not; etc.)

Attachment 2: Risk management table

Risk management table for the programme level

Risk category	Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Level of risk	Risk treatment
Strategic risks					
	Political instability in a partner country	2	3	6	Programme design, monitoring and adaptive management
	Instability in the HEIs (administrative, political, financial issues or student unrest)	2	3	6	Programme design, monitoring and adaptive management
Operative risks					
	Programme and project-level design regarding partnering arrangements do not create trust and real cooperation	1	4	4	Programme design, the selection of the projects and the guidance for inception phase focus on this issue.
	Personnel changes in MFA, EDUFI or HEIs	2	2	4	Handing over notes
	Delays in project-level implementation	2	2	4	Projects instructions; project monitoring
	Delays in the accreditation of the study programmes	2	2	4	Realistic planning
	Sexual harassment and discriminatory/unprofessional practices.	2	2	4	While risks may have limited impact on the project, they may have major impacts on the personal level and, therefore, require immediate action
Economic risks					
	Corruption at the programme or project level	1	4	4	Financial monitoring. Corruption treatment procedures of the MFA
	Programme or project budget and its implementation plan not realistic	2	2	4	Adaptive management approach and adequate scope for adjustment
	Some Finnish HEIs consider the financial terms of the programme participation not conducive	1	3	3	Proper design and follow-up
	Financing problems in case the projects are delayed				Projects instructions; project monitoring

Accidents					
	Major health or security crisis with large-scale impact on MFA, EDUFI or HEIs	1	3	3	Alternative implementation arrangements considered in advance

Scoring likelihood and impact

Likelihood	Description
1. Unlikely	The risk materialises only during exceptional circumstances. Usually, it does not happen at all.
2. Possible	The risk materialises sometimes. Similar cases have taken place in this project context or in similar circumstances elsewhere.
3. Likely	The risk materialises often and is likely to happen in projects with a similar profile.
4. Very likely, definite	There is a significant likelihood that the risk will materialize in this project.

Level of risk = likelihood x impact.

Risk management at the project level

The programme document is expected to include a risk management table at the project level. The risks relate to the specific project context, and they do not need to have any link to the programme-level risk matrix.

Analysing risks at the project level is closely linked with the setting of programme approach and expected results as well as budgeting decisions. Attachment 11 includes a guidance on making the project level risk assessment.

Attachment 3: Programme budget

The programme budget is as follows:

	2023	2024	2025	2026	Total
MFA financing for all projects together	460,800	1,965,760	3,753,900	751,760	6,932,220 92,1%
MFA financing for EDUFI administrative support and capacity building	64,200 *	34,240 *	246,100	248,240	592,780 7,9%
Total MFA financing	525,000	2 m€	4 m€	1 m€	7,525,000€
Annual financing from MFA for individual project—annual shares**		20 %	15 %	55 + 10 %	100%
Additional financing: self-financing by HEIs; 10% of the total budget of each project					

* Edufi receives MFA financing for administering also HEI-ICI in 2023-24.

** The contracts of the individual projects are from the beginning of 2024 to to the end of 2026. The payment schedule is based on one advance payment and then following the real costs. The schedule (indicating maximum acceptable additional/cumulative payments for a project) is as follows:

- 2024 Advance payment in January 2024 – 20 %
- 2025 Against approved annual report 2024 – 15 %
- 2026 Against approved annual report 2025 – 55 %
- 2026 Final payment based on approved completion report – 10 %

Attachment 4: Project-level eligible costs

Project-level general costs for the HEI

HEP has a revised financing arrangement. While the self-financing has been reduced from 20% to 10%, the **salary-related general costs for HEI are capped at the level of 30% of the total salary package** (i.e. salary plus other statutory salary-related obligations).

The budget of a Higher Education Partnership project automatically includes a flat rate of 30% for the general costs of HEI, counted from the total salaries (including statutory fees etc.) and paid to the HEI. In other words, when counting the project expenditure, the HEI needs to add a budget line “salary-related general costs for the HEI”. The eligible cost item is 30% x the total salaries paid to the HEI.

This applies both to Finnish and partnering HEIs. The aim of the arrangements is i) to achieve equality between various Finnish and partner HEIs, and ii) simplicity.

The HEI is encouraged to allocate “the salary-related general costs for the HEI” back to the HEI unit actually implementing the project. However, this is the internal matter of the HEI.

Budget lines

The budget should be prepared using the format which is provided when the call for applications is open.

The budget must be presented in euros (€) and it is broken down by calendar year and by the following cost items:

- 1–3. Salaries and indirect costs of Coordinating Finnish HEI and the partner HEIs
4. Travel costs
5. Mobility
6. Procurement of services
7. Procurement of assets of southern partners
8. Contingency costs

All costs must be actual and verifiable from the bookkeeping.

Eligible cost items

The budget must be presented in euros (€) and it must be broken down by calendar year and by the following cost items:

1-3) Salaries and indirect costs of Coordinating Finnish HEI and the partner HEIs

The HEIs must use permanent staff or staff recruited for the purpose of carrying out the assignment. People in expert roles should in general have a long-term commitment to the HEI in question, in order to

ensure continuity, to ensure the utilization of knowledge and experience and the institutionalization of practices.

All costs related to salaries need to be presented in the institution's own accounting system. All salaries need to be verifiable, tasks explained and justified and directed to the project. Salaries need to be based on actual working time and must be based on working time records. The working time records of the staff must be approved within the universities according to the procedures by each higher education institution. The level of salaries must be in accordance with the national/institutional remuneration policy. Salary top-ups must be avoided. Finnish HEIs should verify the completed work of the partner HEIs and ensure that employer responsibilities according to local regulations are duly taken care of.

Indirect project costs (fixed percentage 30% of the salaries for project) include the project's share of the office space rental cost, IT/telephone, and other joint administrative services at the institution where project activities are carried out.

4) Travel costs of experts

Travel costs include travel and accommodation costs and the per diem allowances of the coordinating Finnish HEI and partner HEIs (both non-Finnish and Finnish partner HEIs).

The level of the Finnish experts' travel costs follows the Finnish State Travel Regulation (Valtion matkustussääntö, annually updated and available on the web page of the Ministry of Finance in Finland <http://www.vm.fi>).

The level of per diems for partner country experts are paid according to their own country-specific regulations, however this must be done in such a way that the costs do not exceed the amounts in the Finnish State Travel Regulation.

Costs related to participation in conferences not clearly linked to the project activities may not be included in travel costs.

5) Mobility

Part of the total programme budget should be allocated to the exchange of students, trainees and teachers between the participating HEIs. Additionally, staff exchange is supported. During the project inception phase, the project is expected to make a detailed plan for the mobility scheme together with the HEIs supporting services for internationalisation (e.g., transparent selection procedure, credit transfer, visa arrangements, supporting services for practical arrangements).

It is suggested that the mobility should be organised on a reciprocal principle: all participating HEIs are expected to send and host teachers, students and staff. The short implementation period of the project needs to be taken into account.

The programme supports the mobility of students pursuing either a bachelor's or master's degree. However, only PhD students from partner countries are supported. If the funding is used for scholarships for individual dissertation students, the subjects of the thesis must be related to the objectives of the project. If the term for visit to Finland extends beyond the project period, the financing arrangement for the remaining period needs to be clarified in advance.

A mobility grant can only be awarded to a registered degree student of a higher education institution participating in the project. Physical mobility periods should preferably be combined with virtual cooperation. Credits taken in the host institution need to be fully credited towards a degree in the home institution.

The programme does not support mobility that aims at completing a degree in the host country, be it at bachelor's, master's or PhD level.

The maximum duration of each exchange is one year. However, it is preferable that student exchanges last over 2 months.

The suggested monthly scholarship is 700 euros for outgoing students from Finland and 850 euros for incoming students to Finland plus travel and accommodation expenses.

HEIs may often have annual fees for participation in education. Mobility can be supported only when these short-time students are exempted from annual fees.

The staff and teacher exchanges can be budgeted on the basis of actual living expenses (travel costs, accommodation, daily allowance or scholarship if the duration is long). The maximum duration is 1 month.

6) Procurement of services

Services and subcontracting costs include ICT services, communication and dissemination costs, seminar and workshop arrangements, licenses and fees, interpretation, translation and auditing and evaluation, for example.

The core project activities should not be outsourced. HEIs receiving state aid must observe the obligations set out in the Act on Public Contracts (2016/1397) when subcontracting.

7) Procurement of assets of southern partners

Fixed assets can be procured for non-Finnish partner. As a general rule, procurements must be made in non-Finnish partner countries based on the procurement regulations in the country of procurement. Explanations must be provided for any possible procurement made in Finland.

At the end of the project, the fixed assets will remain the property of the institution for which it has primarily been procured for and which has used it. The Finnish HEI must ensure that they are recorded as the partner HEI property and that the maintenance of fixed assets after the project funding is ensured. Please note the rules relating to subcontracting: Act on Discretionary Government Transfers (Valtionavustuslaki 688/2001) and Act on Public Contracts (2016/1397).

8) Contingency costs

A maximum of 10% of the total costs can be left unallocated in the planning of the project as contingencies. The project board decides on the utilization of the contingency funds. The contingency costs can be used only for items which support achieving the expected outcome and outputs.

Attachment 5: Selection criteria in detail

Qualitative evaluation criteria

The qualitative evaluation criteria will be finalised by the evaluators based on their expertise when the Call for Applications is opened. The specifications within brackets [] tentatively guide the interpretation of the criteria. Each evaluation criterion has 2–5 specifying questions. When the evaluation is conducted, these specifying questions are analysed in totality. Thus, the assessment will result in only 5 numbers. This also means that specifying questions do not necessarily have equal weight within the evaluation criteria, but contribute to the overall assessment of an evaluation criterion.

1. Relevance (20 points)

The project's relevance to the overall aim and objectives of the HEP programme including:

- The level of correspondence between the objectives of the project and the aim and objectives of the HEP programme. [The project corresponds with minimum one output of the programme in a concrete manner which is relevant to the HEIs and the partner country situation. The project focuses on the selected themes such as high-quality education, climate change or food security.]
- The extent to which the project exhibits novelty in the use of the methods of learning and the use of virtual/blended learning platforms. [The learning methods are relevant to the context, and their utilization is based on realistic expectations from both sides. Novelty is pedagogically grounded.]

2. Impact and effectiveness (20 points)

The impact and sustainability of project results including:

- The extent to which the project demonstrates its potential impacts including identification of target groups in consideration of gender equality and inclusive and non-discriminating practices. [The analysis here covers the project objectives, implementation arrangements, staffing and budgeting.]
- The extent to which relevant expected outcomes and outputs for the project have been identified and will be met by the project during its period of implementation. [The clarity of the focus is well communicated and based on realistic schedule and budgeting]
- Quality of risk analysis including mitigation measures and the extent to which these are incorporated in the project management activities.

3. Quality of partnership (20 points)

The quality of partnership including:

- The extent to which the project is jointly developed by the partner institutions. [Evidence on joint planning events.]
- The level of formalized commitment between partners in a mutually beneficial manner.
- The extent to which the project addresses the particular needs of the target country(ies) and partnering HEIs (including synergy with other initiatives of the partners institutions and avoidance of duplication).
- The inclusion of the less experienced/more fragile HEIs as partners in a meaningful manner.

4. Implementation (20 points)

The quality of implementation plan including:

- The extent to which project management structures and division of responsibilities are adequate and support mutual commitment.
- The extent of complementarity, experience, and expertise of the project team.
- The extent to which adequate measures to monitor and evaluate project results have been identified.
- The extent to which the project implementation addresses gender equality and inclusive practices (and climate/biodiversity whenever relevant). [Definition of the project objectives as well as implementation modalities.]
- The extent to which the project demonstrates cost-effectiveness. [Evidence that cost-effectiveness has been taken into account and has influenced project planning.]

5. Clarity and complementarity (20 points)

- The fit of the inter-related aspects of project design (results orientation, HRBA, crosscutting objectives, partnership arrangements, administrative practices, scheduling and budgeting) to create a coherent and realistic project. Assessment of the project as a whole. [Considering implementation arrangements, will the project reach its results—or is there a critical aspect lacking in the overall design?]
- The correspondence of the project with the overall goals of the MFA and the complementarity of the project with other Finnish activities in the selected country, and in the selected sector.