# Evaluation Criteria

Overall, this will be weighted 70% towards technical and quality aspects, with 20% to commercial considerations such as cost and 10% dedicated to Social Value

All of the technical and quality details (references A1-A5) must be contained within the main proposal. The evaluation will be conducted blind to price, so bidders must ensure that any cost information (B1) is included in a separate document which is only to be shared with Commercial team. This will be added to the technical and quality scores afterwards.

Qualification requirements:

|  |
| --- |
| **QUALIFICATION - KEY PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS****Response Guidance**The following questions are ‘Pass/Fail’ questions. If Potential Bidders are unwilling or unable to answer “Yes”, their submission will be deemed non-compliant and shall be rejected. Potential Bidders should confirm their answer by selecting the appropriate option from the drop down menu. |
| **Question Number** | **Question** | **Your Response** |
| 1.1 | Do you accept the competition rules as described in Attachment 1 – About the Procurement? | Yes/No |
| 1.2 | Have you read, understood and accepted the Bid Pack and all associated attachments, specifically Attachment 3 - Statement of Requirements? | Yes/No |
| 1.3 | Do you agree, without caveats or limitations, that in the event that you are successful, Attachment 5 - Terms and Conditions will govern the provision of this contract? | Yes/No |
| 1.4 | Do you confirm your Organisation’s e-Sourcing suite profile/submitted documents is complete and accurate at the time the bid closed and that any amendments made following acceptance of this event will be notified to the buyer in writing? | Yes/No |
| 1.5 | Do you confirm that you have read, understood, and agree to comply with all regulatory requirements listed in section 11 of the Statement of Requirements?  | Yes/No |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Reference Number | Details | Weighting |
|  A1 | **Objective 1: Understanding of the research and analysis requirement**Bidders will be expected to show a clear understanding of the evaluation context, the need for this work, and ideally, how this work fits within CPS strategy and the wider CJS context.**Evaluation Criteria:**1. The proposal shows evidence of understanding the contextual factors, including knowledge of the subject area, the CPS and CJS context.
2. Evaluation aims are clearly laid out in the bid.

  |  5%  |
|  A2 | **Objective 2: Methodological and analytical approach**Bidders will be expected to demonstrate a sound and rationale methodological and analytical approach. We expect to see a strong learning approach to the evaluation, and we would appreciate innovative and creative approaches to supporting the team to learn and adapt during piloting.1. Evaluation is designed to address all 4 requirement areas outlined in the ITT, appropriately and with rigour.
2. Prior track record of a collaborative learning approach that supports the adaptation and improvement of piloting.
3. Collaborative learning approach is realistic, valuable, and innovative.
4. Clear description of how the evaluation integrates A/B testing and includes comparator groups and counterfactuals to illustrate causality to the outcomes set out in the Victim Transformation Programme Outcome Framework and theory of change.
5. A clear articulation of a trauma-informed research approach to both quantitative and qualitative elements of the evaluation.
6. A clear approach as to how protected characteristics and intersectionality will be analysed, measured, and explored to demonstrate effect on victim outcomes and experience.
7. Approach to the cost-benefit analysis (or other proposed economic analysis) clearly outlined; and is feasible and realistic.
8. Description of how the bidder will approach data cleansing.
 |   25%      |
| A3 | **Objective 3: Project management** Bidders will be expected to show how their project plan will address and deliver the outputs in good time. We will expect the project plan to show a high-quality process and outputs outlined below. **Evaluation Criteria:**1. A criterion to inform sampling of the pilots within the CPS areas, within the budget envelope. This should also include the likely number of CPS areas and police forces that would be included in the evaluation.
2. Clear consideration of victim representativeness within the approach. Specifically, how the bidder will reach groups that may be harder to reach or are more vulnerable due to protected characteristics.
3. Reflection on how the key evaluation questions will be addressed, and how this will inform evaluation design, and methodology (there is no need to take each evaluation question and explain how you will answer it in this bid, merely a reflection on the how you will address the main themes).
4. A plan to meet the timeframe outlined in the tender with a GANTT chart.
5. A risk register outlining risks and mitigation for the evaluation.
6. Specify the project management techniques that will be used.
7. Clear outline of how the bidder will quality assure the work (process and outputs) to a high standard.
8. An outline of how the bidder will keep the CPS updated on the progress of the project.
 | 10% |
|   A4 | **Objective 4: Evaluation Team**Bidders will be expected to demonstrate how the proposed team possess the appropriate level of skills and expertise to deliver a high-quality process and products. **Evaluation Criteria:*** 1. Evidence of expertise in completing evaluations with similar requirements. Specifically, a collaborative learning approach, evidencing outcomes using theories of change, and a cost benefit analysis (or similar approach). These are distinct skills, and we would expect to see a multi-disciplinary team with the appropriate skills to deliver on all 4 requirements, set out in the tender.
	2. Presentation of the people working on the project, outlining their seniority, number of days on the project, skills, experience, and nature of their involvement in the evaluation.
	3. An outline of the team’s resilience and contingency plans.

   |   20%   |
| A5 | **Objective 5: Data protection**Bidders are expected to show expert knowledge of data protection protocols, ethics and good practice. **Evaluation Criteria:**1. Details of your approach to data security, transport, and management, and retention schedules
2. Data protection and ethics concerns should be integrated into the risk register which demonstrates consideration of the expected risks and challenges and mitigation techniques.
3. Ethical considerations related to victim data (including both qualitative and quantitative work). Specifically, there should be sufficient detail around how the bidder will reduce the physical and psychological risks associated with providing feedback. This should include safeguarding risks of contacting victims, safeguarding protocols if a participant wants to raise a concern/issue about the service or the evaluation process.
4. Details pertaining to the use and storage of data through any third-party software (e.g., analysis software).
5. Willingness to undertake relevant security clearances and checks if required by the CPS.
 |    10%  |
| B1 | **Social Value**   Using a maximum of 500 characters, describe the commitment your organisation will make to ensure that opportunities under the contract deliver the Policy Outcomes listed below;   Please include:  ● your ‘Method Statement’, stating how you will achieve this and how your commitment meets the Award Criteria, and  ● a timed project plan and process, including how you will implement your commitment and by when.  ● how you will monitor, measure and report on your commitments/the impact of your proposals.  You should include but not be limited to:  ○ timed action plan  ○ use of metrics  ○ tools/processes used to gather data  ○ reporting  ○ feedback and improvement  ○ transparency    **Equal Opportunity – 5%** Policy Outcome: Demonstrate action to increase the representation of disabled people in the contract workforce.  Demonstrate action to identify and tackle inequality in employment, skills and pay in the contract workforce.   **Wellbeing - 5%** Policy Outcome: Demonstrate action to support health and wellbeing, including physical and mental health, in the contract workforce.  Influence staff, suppliers, customers and communities through the delivery of the contract to support health and wellbeing, including physical and mental health.  | 10% |
| C1 |  **Cost**Tenderers will provide costing information in the format set out in the Commercial Costing Template (Appendix D in the Bravo Suppliers attachment tab). The tenderer to upload the completed attachment to the commercial envelope and must complete all required fields.  Cost breakdown to be provided in the following format: * Project Management (expected number and grades of staff, expected number of hours worked and a breakdown of cost per hour). This should include regular progress updates, as well as the inception meeting.
* Evaluation Methods (costs for the analysis plan and analysis of the data, including breakdown of analyst time for the initial plan, cleaning data, analysis, and quality assurance processes)
* Reporting Methods (proposed method and frequency of reporting for interim and final presentation and reports, and breakdown of cost for report, including at least two revisions)
* Ad hoc costs (additional foreseen costs not listed elsewhere)
 | 20% |

Tenderers will be marked in respect of each quality criterion on a scale of 0 to 100 points, in accordance with the following scheme:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Score**  | **Assessment**  | **Definition**  |
| 0 | Unacceptable | No response has been provided or the response fails to answer the question provided; all elements of the response are not justified or unsupported by evidence where required; fails to demonstrate any understanding of the question or the context. |
| 20 | Serious Reservations | The response is generally poor and/or with little or no relevance to the question. The response has significant gaps and/or a lack of justification/evidence in response to the question; responses given are very generic in whole or part; fails to demonstrate considerable understanding of the question or context. |
| 40 | Minor Reservations | The response is mostly relevant to the question. The response lacks content, detail or explanation in one or more aspects of the question; gaps or lack of justification/evidence in response where required. Overall key aspects lack sufficient detail or explanation. |
| 60 | Acceptable  | The response is broadly satisfactory and is relevant to the question. The response addresses a broad understanding of any requirements and, where relevant, how any requirements will be fulfilled. |
| 80 | Good | The response is relevant and a good response overall to the question. The response is sufficiently detailed and demonstrates a good understanding and provides clear details on how the requirements, where required, will be fulfilled. |
| 100 | Excellent | The response is relevant, precise and excellent overall. The response is comprehensive, unambiguous and, where relevant, demonstrates a thorough understanding of any requirements and provides details of how the requirement will be met in full. |

An example as to how this will work in principle is as follows:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Method Statement/****Sub-criterion** | **Weighting** | **Tenderer Mark** | **Tenderer Weighted Score** (weighting x Tenderer mark/maximum mark available) |
| A1 | 5 | 60 | 6 |
| A2 | 30 | 40 | 10 |
| A3 | 10 | 80 | 8 |
| A4 | 25 | 80 | 12 |
| A5 | 10 | 60 | 6 |
| B1 | 10 | 60 | 6 |
| C1 | 20 | 60 | 12 |
| **Totals** | **100** | 440 | **61** |

Price scores will be calculated based on the lowest overall price submitted by Tenderers. The Tenderer with the lowest overall price will be awarded the maximum score available (20%), with the remaining Tenderers gaining pro-rated scores in relation to how much higher their overall prices are compared to the lowest overall price.

The following example illustrates how this methodology will work where the total score available is 20 per cent: \*The prices shown are for illustration only.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tenderer** | **\*Overall price** | **Formula**= Lowest overall price / Tenderers overall price x maximum available score | **Price Score** |
| Company A | £30,000 | = £30,000 / £30,000 x 20 | 20% |
| Company B | £37,000 | = £30,000 / £37,000 x 20 | 16.22% |
| Company C | £42,000 | = £30,000 / £42,000 x 20 | 14.29% |