Evaluation of the Heritage Emergency Fund

**Organisation The National Lottery Heritage Fund**

**Department** Business Innovation and Insight

**Title of procurement Heritage Emergency Fund Evaluation**

**Brief description of supply**  Evaluation

**Estimated value of tender** up to £75,000 including VAT

**Estimated duration** 5 months

**Name of the Fund Contact**  Amelia Robinson

**Timetable** Response deadline: Midday,24th June 2020

Clarification & Negotiation meetings: W/c 29th June 2020

 Confirmation of contract: W/c 6th July 2020

Completion of research: 30th November 2020

# 1. Overview

* 1. The National Lottery Heritage Fund, formerly the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF), was set up in 1994 under the National Lottery Act and distributes money raised by the National Lottery to support projects involving the national, regional and local heritage of the United Kingdom. We operate under the auspices of the National Heritage Memorial Fund (NHMF). In January 2019 we launched our current Strategic Framework: ‘Inspiring, leading and resourcing the UK’s heritage’. See The [Fund's website](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/publications/strategic-funding-framework-2019-2024) for more details.
	2. The Fund invests in the full breadth of the UK’s heritage and, through our funding, we aim to make a lasting difference for heritage and people. This is reflected in the outcomes for heritage, people and communities which underpin our grant-making.
	3. The Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic has impacted on all areas of our lives and for the heritage sector the impact has been great. At the start of the pandemic The Fund launched a survey to understand the immediate impact of COVID-19 for the sector. It demonstrated the impact is universal across the sector and is expected to affect organisations long-term viability. Full details of the findings can be found [here](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/publications/economic-insight-impact-covid-19-march-2020).

	Using this evidence, we launched the Heritage Emergency Fund. We now want to evaluate this Funding and the impact of COVID-19 for the sector to inform our future practice. The evaluation will also support The Fund to communicate the impact of the Heritage Emergency Fund and our broader role in responding to the Coronavirus pandemic.
	4. The Fund has made £50 million available for a Heritage Emergency Fund to support the UK heritage sector as an immediate response to the COVID-19 crisis. The £50 million is providing short-term funding for organisations delivering heritage projects or running previously funded projects, and safeguarding heritage sites we have previously invested to ensure they are not lost to the public. Other elements of the Heritage Emergency Fund are currently under development and may include innovative financing mechanisms to support organisations. See the [Fund's website](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/responding-coronavirus-covid-19) for up to date details.
	5. The aim of the evaluation is to understand whether The National Lottery Heritage Fund’s response to COVID-19 met the needs of organisations working in our sector and, in doing so, delivered The Fund’s three stated outcomes (economy, inclusion and wellbeing).

Our evaluation has been split into three strands and the objectives for each strand are detailed below.

**Strand one**: To assess the impact of our emergency funding, including:

* the financial impact for organisations who received funding.
* the outputs from the funding, such as, activities undertaken, number of organisations, beneficiaries, employees/jobs and volunteers sustained/saved from insolvency.
* how the funding has supported capacity to contribute to the three priority outcomes – economy, inclusion and wellbeing?
* the impact of the funding on employees, volunteers and other beneficiaries.
* the value of short-term emergency funding in providing stability for organisations, versus other types of support (such as investments in digital capability)

**Strand two**: To assess the potential medium- and long-term impact of COVID-19 on heritage organisations, in order to inform the Fund’s future strategy and operating model, including:

* how are organisations now operating post funding?
* how has or will organisation or organisation’s practice evolve as a result of the pandemic? E.g. innovating, merging
* how resilient are organisations post funding? E.g. governance and staffing structures, digital capabilities
* what challenges will organisations face or continue to face as a result of the pandemic, including future needs and support?
* to learn from the experiences of organisations we funded to improve the support we provide.
* the value of support and funding for organisations (as opposed to projects) and learn about the best approaches for delivering this support.
* what is the situation for organisations that were eligible but didn’t access the funding?

**Strand three**: To understand how the sector views The Fund’s response to the pandemic including:

* how well we have responded to the needs of the sector?
* the types of support that have been accessed – financial and non-financial.
* how well the Fund’s offer was aligned with other packages of support from other funders and central government?
* organisations experience of accessing different funding support alongside the Heritage Emergency Fund.
* the experience of having a grant application assessed through the Heritage Emergency Fund. This includes both applicants who were successful and unsuccessful.
* grantees experience of the process of working with the Heritage Fund following the award of the grant.
* grantees experience of the process of the non-financial support from The Fund as part of the Heritage Emergency Fund response.
	1. The evaluation should be delivered in a collaborative relationship with The Fund, as well as with grantees and other stakeholders.

	Key audiences for the evaluation include:
	 - The Fund’s staff
	 - Other funders, heritage stakeholders, policy makers and other interested parties

 The evaluation will also be used to inform strategy and policy development. We will expect the consultants to identify and feedback learnings throughout the evaluation that we can act on to make any changes to our support.

# Method

* 1. We would like consultants to set out in the proposal a methodology to achieve the aim and objectives of the study.
	2. The evaluation should draw on a range of quantitative evidence and alongside qualitative evidence to deepen understanding and capture the human stories. We would like consultants to set out proposals for a detailed methodology, but we anticipate that the work will include the following approaches:
* Data collection on grant completion through a survey to all recipients of the Heritage Emergency Fund to understand projects outputs. Chasing for this data needs to be factored into the approach.
* In-depth interviews with Heritage Fund Staff and Project Support Consultants (known as ROSS consultants). We envisage around 20 interviews being undertaken.
* In-depth interviews with a sample of organisations supported through the Heritage Emergency Fund from across the heritage sectors, countries and regions, grant sizes and the different organisational types. We envisage around 50 interviews being undertaken.
* In-depth interviews with a sample of organisations that were eligible but did not apply or utilise the Heritage Emergency Fund support.  We envisage around 10 interviews being undertaken.
* Case studies with a subset of projects. This sample would be based on findings from the in-depth interviews and should be decided upon in collaboration with The Fund. We envisage around 6-8 case studies.
* Secondary data review and analysis e.g. applications, completion reports and other project documentation etc. This would inform the approach to collecting of the output data as well as providing evidence for understanding the impact and for the case studies.
* Reference to existing research on the impact of COVID-19 across the UK, including information from sources such as ONS, BCIS, NPC, YouGov and other sector impact surveys you identify and the implications of these studies and survey findings for The Fund.

The collection of quantitative data may need to be standardised with other Lottery Distributor data.

We do not expect the research to be conducted using face to face fieldwork but instead via video conferencing or telephone.

Bidders undertaking the work will need to be committed to adapt to the evolving nature of the current situation and Heritage Emergency Fund programme.

All topic guides and other research materials need to be agreed with The Fund,

* 1. When sampling our grantees we would like the evaluation to include:

Qualitative data collected through in-depth remote interviews carried out with a large enough sample of our grantees to draw conclusions for the heritage sector. As a minimum we expect to see the sample to include:

* A range of award sizes from the Heritage Emergency Fund.
* The type of grantee (for example Local Authority, voluntary sector, quasi-public body)
* The heritage area being funded
* A good geographical spread, including all 4 nations.

We will provide the contact details to the winning bidder along with the above information for each award.

Case studies with a subset of organisations. This sample would be based on findings from the in-depth interviews and should be decided upon in collaboration with The Fund.

# Outputs

* 1. The following outputs will be required:
* An interim report in August.
* A final report and accompanying slide deck in December.
* A set of research data, to be stored in a readily accessible electronic format such as Excel.
* The evaluation will also be used to inform strategy and policy development. We will expect the consultants to identify learnings and feed these back throughout the evaluation so that we can act on to make any changes to our support.
* The successful bidder will be expected to discuss and present findings at appropriate times, to internal and external audiences, including our Board, our Senior Management Team, Grantees, policy makers and other external stakeholders.  The purpose of these presentations is to enable lessons to be learned and key policy and practice issues to be highlighted as the evaluation progresses.

# A project plan with specific deliverables\* and timetable will be agreed with the successful consultant/ies. However, The Fund expects the following deliverables in accordance with the following timetable as a minimum:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverable/Key Milestones\*** | **Due date** |
| Inception Meeting to agree plans, including reporting structures, learning events and a communication and dissemination strategy | July 2020 |
| Development of an evaluation framework (including data collection requirements and monitoring processes) developed in collaboration with the Fund | July 2002 |
| Short interim report (maximum 15 pages) | August 2020 |
| A final report, of 50 pages maximum, with structure agreed with the Fund, and accompanying slide deck | 11th December 2020 |

# The above represents our minimum requirements.

# \* The Fund reserves the right to amend this timetable where required.

* 1. All reports must adhere to The Fund’s accessibility and formatting guidance (appended). We also expect reports to follow the layout advised in our evaluation guidance.
	2. The initial findings will be confidential to The Fund. The Fund may prepare or commission summary reports and other materials for subsequent wider distribution, based on the results.
	3. All reports to include appendices as agreed between The Fund and the contractor. The contents and structure of the report to be agreed in advance of writing. All reports to be supplied in electronic format and hard copy if requested.
	4. The successful bidder must comply with all of the requirements of the Data Protection Act 2018 and shall ensure appropriate research consents from interviews or any data collection.
	5. The successful bidder will be expected to discuss and present findings at appropriate times, to internal and external audiences, including our Board, our Senior Management Team, Grantees, policy makers and other external stakeholders. The purpose of these presentations is to enable lessons to be learned and key policy and practice issues to be highlighted as the evaluation progresses.
	6. We expect the successful bidder to focus on improving, rather than just proving, including a mechanism for feeding back evidence that demonstrates the difference being made and enables changes to be made, based on learning, enabling the programme to maximises its impact. This will ensure the evaluation is flexible and can accommodate changes to the Emergency Fund.
	7. Bidders should be committed to adapt to the evolving nature of the programme.

3.9 We expect all projects we fund to adhere to the Social Research Association (SRA) ethical guidelines. If your proposal raises particular ethical issues, you must indicate what they are and what your strategy for addressing them is.

# Contract management

* 1. We expect the research/evaluation to begin week commencing 6th July 2020 and be completed by 30th November 2020. The final report shall be submitted to the Fund by 11th December 2020.
	2. The anticipated budget is up to £75,000 to include all expenses and VAT. The contract will be let by the National Heritage Memorial Fund.
	3. The payment schedule will be split into two equal payments; 50% on signing of contract and 50% on submission of final report.
	4. The contract will be based on The Fund’s standard terms and conditions.
	5. The research will be managed on a day to day basis for The Fund by Amelia Robinson.

# Award Criteria

* 1. A proposal for undertaking the work should be a maximum of 15 pages and include:
* a detailed method for undertaking the study;
* details of staff allocated to the project, together with experience of the contractor and staff members in carrying out similar projects. The project manager / lead contact should be identified;
* the allocation of days between members of the team;
* the daily charging rate of individual staff involved;
* a timescale for carrying out the project;
* an overall cost for the work.
	1. Your Bid will be scored out of 100%.

**70% of the marks will be awarded to Quality**

Each question will be scored using the methodology in the table below.

Tender responses submitted will be assessed by the Fund against the following Quality Questions:-

| Selection Criteria | Weighting |
| --- | --- |
| Demonstrated a clear understanding of the aims, objectives and main concerns of the evaluation | 25% |
| Demonstrated that the methods selected are appropriate to the research requirements set out in this brief? | 25% |
| Demonstrated an awareness of the different policy contexts, research and issues relating to COVID-19 | 20% |
| Demonstrated a clear and realistic project plan, showing phases of the evaluation, tasks for each phase and roles and responsibilities for each member of the team. Within this plan consideration should be given to survey response fatigue and plans to mitigate against this and keep grantees engaged with the evaluation, for its duration. | 20% |
| Demonstrated well considered plans for feeding back learning and dissemination of evaluation findings | 10% |

## Quality Questions scoring methodology

| Score | Word descriptor | Description |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | Poor | No response or partial response and poor evidence provided in support of it. Does not give the Fund confidence in the ability of the Bidder to deliver the Contract. |
| 1 | Weak | Response is supported by a weak standard of evidence in several areas giving rise to concern about the ability of the Bidder to deliver the Contract. |
| 2 | Satisfactory | Response is supported by a satisfactory standard of evidence in most areas but a few areas lacking detail/evidence giving rise to some concerns about the ability of the Bidder to deliver the Contract. |
| 3 | Good | Response is comprehensive and supported by good standard of evidence. Gives the Fund confidence in the ability of the Bidder to deliver the contract. Meets the Fund’s requirements. |
| 4 | Very good | Response is comprehensive and supported by a high standard of evidence. Gives the Fund a high level of confidence in the ability of the Bidder to deliver the contract. May exceed the Fund’s requirements in some respects.  |
| 5 | Excellent | Response is very comprehensive and supported by a very high standard of evidence. Gives the Fund a very high level of confidence the ability of the Bidder to deliver the contract. May exceed the Fund’s requirements in most respects. |

**30% of marks will be awarded for Price.**

The evaluation of price will be carried out on the Schedule of charges you provide in response to **Table A**

## Price Criterion at 30%

* 30 marks will be awarded to the lowest priced bid and the remaining bidders will be allocated scores based on their deviation from this figure. Your fixed and total costs figure in your schedule of charges table will be used to score this question.
* For example, if the lowest price is £100 and the second lowest price is £108 then the lowest priced bidder gets 30% (full marks) for price and the second placed bidder gets 27.6% and so on. (8/100 x 30 = 2.4 marks; 30-2.4 = 27.6 marks)
* The scores for quality and price will be added together to obtain the overall score for each Bidder.

## Table A - Schedule of Charges

Please show in your tender submission, the number of staff and the amount of time that will be scheduled to work on the contract with the daily charging rate.

Please complete the table below providing a detailed breakdown of costs against each capitalised description, detailing a total and full ‘Firm Fixed Cost’ for each element of the service provision for the total contract period. Bidders may extend the tables to detail additional elements/costs if required.

VAT is chargeable on the services to be provided and this will be taken into account in the overall cost of this contract.

As part of our wider approach to corporate social responsibility the National Heritage Memorial Fund/National Lottery Heritage Fund prefers our business partners to have similar values to our own. We pay all of our staff the living wage (in London and the rest of the UK) and we would like our suppliers and contractors to do likewise. Please highlight in you proposal/tender/bid whether you do pay your staff the living wage.

Bidders shall complete the schedule below, estimating the number of days, travel and subsistence costs associated with their tender submission.

**TABLE A: (firm and fixed costs)**

| **Cost** | **Post 1 @cost per day****(No of days)***e.g. Project Manager/ Director**@ £2* | **Post 2 @cost per day****(No of days)***e.g. Senior Consultant/manager/researcher**@£1.5* | **Post 3 @cost per day****(No of days)***Junior* *Consultant/equivalent* *e.g. £1* | **Total days** | **Total fees** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Inception meeting to agree plans and finalise requirements with the Fund | *Example 0.5* | *1* | *1.5* | *3* | *£4* |
| *[Add as necessary]* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *[Add as necessary]* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *[Add as necessary]* |  |  |  |  |  |

| Cost Type | Value (£) |
| --- | --- |
| Sub - Total  |  |
| VAT |  |
| Total\* |  |

\* (This must include all expenses as well as work costs; this figure will be used for the purposes of allocating your score for the price criterion and must cover the cost of meeting all our requirements set out in the ITT)

***Notes:* The Fund reserves the right to clarify quality and prices and to reject tenders that demonstrate an abnormally low quality response. The Fund also reserves the right to amend the timetable of work where required.**

*You should not submit additional assumptions with your pricing submission. If you submit assumptions you will be asked to withdraw them. Failure to withdraw them will lead to your exclusion from further participation in this competition.*

# Procurement Process

* 1. THE FUND reserves the right to reject abnormally low scoring tenders. The Fund reserves the right not to appoint and to achieve the outcomes of the research/evaluation through other methods.
	2. The procurement timetable will be:
* Deadline for clarification questions: Midday, Wednesday 10th June 2020
* Tender return deadline: Midday, Wednesday 24th June 2020
* Clarification meetings\*\* may be held with shortlisted consultants and would take place on week commencing: 29thJune 2020, by video call
* The Fund will notify bidders of our procurement decision week commencing: 6th July 2020
* \*The Fund will upload response to clarification on Contracts Finder.  Please note that we will make the anonymised questions, and our responses to them, available to everyone on the Fund website.
* \*\*We reserve the right to carry out clarifications if necessary; these may be carried out via email or by inviting bidders to attend a clarification meeting.  In order to ensure that both The Fund’s and Bidder’s resources are used appropriately, we will only invite up to three (the ultimate number will depend on the closeness of the scores) highest scoring bidders to attend a clarification meeting.  Scores will be moderated based on any clarifications provided during this meeting.  You are responsible for all your expenses when attending such meetings.
	1. Your tender proposals must be sent electronically via e-mail before the tender return deadline of midday, 24th June 2020 to the following contact:

Ruth Dench

The National Lottery Heritage Fund

Mezzanine Floor

International House

1 St Katharine’s Way

London E1W 1UN

Bii.Admin@heritagefund.org.uk

* 1. Please visit The [Fund's website](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/) for further information about the organisation.

**Appendix: Accessibility and formatting guidance**

The National Lottery Heritage Fund is committed to providing a website that is accessible to the widest possible audience. Our site is annually tested by accessibility auditors and we must meet a AA compliance level. Our accessibility testing encompasses not just site functionality and design but all of our content, including downloadable documents.

Reports and other documents created for The Fund (**including the tender submissions**) need to be clear, straightforward to use and ready to circulate internally, externally and online, as well as suitable for use by screen reading software. Best practice in accessibility is summarised below:

**Readability**

In the final report, and all other documents that may be published online including the tender application consultants should ensure that:

* The size of the font is at least 11pt;
* There is a strong contrast between the background colour and the colour of the text. Black text on a white background provides the best contrast. This also applies to any shading used in tables and/or diagrams;
* Italics are only used when quoting book titles for citations and items on the reference list should be arranged alphabetically by author
* Colour formatting and use of photos should be of a resolution size that is easily printable and does not compromise the printability of the document.

For further guidance on ensuring readability of printed materials, please refer to the RNIB Clear Print guidelines. These can be found on the [RNIB website](http://www.rnib.org.uk/Pages/Home.aspx).

**Accessibility**

Reports should adhere to the following guidelines:

**Formatting**

Headings and content in your document should be clearly identified and consistently formatted to allow easy navigation for users. Heading Styles should be used to convey both the structure of the document and the relationship between sections and sub-sections of the content. Heading styles should follow on from each other i.e. Heading 1 then Heading 2.

**Spacing**

Screen readers audibly represent spaces, tabs and paragraph breaks within copy, so it is best practice to avoid the repetitive use of manually inserted spaces. Instead, indenting and formatting should be used to create whitespace (e.g., use a page break to start a new page, as opposed to multiple paragraph breaks).

**Alternative text**

Alt text is additional information for images and tables. This extra information is essential for both document accessibility (screen reading software reads the Alt text aloud) and for the web. Alt text should be concise and descriptive, and should not begin with ‘Image of’ or ‘Picture of’.

**Images**

These should be formatted in-line with text, to support screen readers. Crediting pictures may be necessary, usually in response to a direct request from a third party.

**Tables**

These should be for used for presenting data and not for layout or design. They should be simple and include a descriptive title. The header row should be identified and there shouldn’t be more than one title row in a table. There should be no merged or blank cells.

**Additional documents**

Any additional information, separate to the report, for example proformas and transcripts which may be used as standalone documents must be fully referenced to the piece of work being submitting and therefore dated, formatted and numbered appropriately.

**Acknowledgement**

All reports should acknowledge The Fund. Our logo can be found on The Fund's website.

**Further resources**

Please refer to the WCAG 2.0 article on [PDF techniques](https://www.w3.org/TR/2014/NOTE-WCAG20-TECHS-20140408/pdf.html) for further information.

**Submitting your report to THE FUND**

Please check the accessibility of your document using the Word accessibility checker before submitting: File – Info – Check for Issues – Check Accessibility.

Please submit your document as a Word file.

The Fund retains the right to amend documents in order to create accessible versions for publishing.