**Evaluation criteria**

**Introduction**

This document sets out the evaluation methodology for the National Education Nature Park and Climate Leaders Award programme procurement.

Evaluation will take place in the following stages.

1. Compliance checks
2. Mandatory questions
3. Quality (**65%**) a minimum score of 3 is required for each of the quality section questions to be taken into stage 3.
4. Cost/Value for money (**25%**)
5. Social value (**10%**) included in Quality area

Compliance checks are outlined in document 5 of the ITT. Certain declarations are grounds for mandatory exclusion from the tender process.

Mandatory questions are designed to ensure that the bidding organisation can deliver the full scope of works.

In the quality, value for money and social value stages, weightings are attributed to each of the questions asked of each supplier and are scored according to the table below.

There are also specific word counts for each question. Charts, images or tables can be used or attached and words in these are also included in the word limit. If your response exceeds this limit, your response will be assessed up to the number of words permitted only.

References to ‘you’ or ‘your’ refer to, where applicable, all members of your consortium and where applicable the most relevant member of your consortium.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Mark | Comment |
| 0 | No response provided.  |
| 1 | Failed to provide confidence that the proposal will meet the requirements. An unacceptable response with serious reservations. |
| 2 | A Poor response with reservations. The response lacks convincing detail with risk that the proposal will not be successful in meeting all the requirements. |
| 3 | Meets the requirements – the response generally meets the requirements but lacks sufficient detail to warrant a higher mark. |
| 4 | A Good response that meets the requirements with good supporting evidence. Demonstrates good understanding. |
| 5 | An Excellent comprehensive response that meets the requirements. Indicates an excellent response with detailed supporting evidence and no weaknesses resulting in a high level of confidence.  |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Mandatory questions**
 |
| * 1. Are you bidding as an organisation or consortium that is able to deliver all of the requirements as detailed within the specification document?
 |
| If yes, proceed. If no, exclude on the basis that we are looking for a single contractual arrangement, potentially with an umbrella organisation that encompasses multiple suppliers. |
| * 1. Are you bidding as an organisation or consortium that is able to deliver these initiatives initially across all of England?
 |
| If yes, proceed.If no, exclude on the basis that we need a supplier who is able to provide national coverage. |
| * 1. Does your organisation or consortium have experience of working with educational settings and/or children and young people?
 |
| If yes, proceed.If no, exclude on the basis that we require a provider with substantial experience and expertise of working with our target audience. |
|  |
| **Quality** | **Weighting: 65%** |
| **Tenderers must respond to the following questions as part of their tender submission and read Document 3 (Specification) of the ITT before responding** |
| 1. Experience and expertise
 |
| * 1. Sustainability and Climate Change Education
 | Weighting/words: 10%/1500 |
| Please set out your experience and expertise in delivering sustainability and climate education for children and young people at scale. Your response should include:* How you have delivered specific climate education to children and young people from early years to higher education
* How you have improved skills alongside including numeracy, mapping analysis in the context of climate education.

**Word limit is 1500, please attach a word formatted document for your response. Words in excess of this limit will not be counted, please note headers and footers will be included in the total.** |
| * 1. User needs
 | Weighting/words: 8%/1000 |
| Please set out your experience of meeting the needs of users to fully engage and participate in the programme, with particular attention paid to accessibility, protected characteristics, and disadvantage. Please set out how you will apply that to this programme.Your response should include how you will co-design this programme with children and young people and the education sector. **Word limit is 1000, please attach a word formatted document for your response. Words in excess of this limit will not be counted, please note headers and footers will be included in the total.** |
| * 1. Sector leadership
 | Weighting/words: 6%/1,000 |
| Please set out how will you work with other stakeholders and providers to ensure the programme achieves the depth and reach required. Please detail processes and governance structures you would establish to enable this, including but not limited to partnership working, but also in how you might secure external sponsorship, private funding and reciprocal relationships.Your response should also include how you engage with employers to give recognition to the Climate Leaders Award.**Word limit is 1000, please attach a word formatted document for your response. Words in excess of this limit will not be counted, please note headers and footers will be included in the total.** |
| * 1. Programme planning
 | Weighting/words: 6%/1,000 |
| Given the deliverables in the ITT, please set out an indicative delivery plan for the programme over 2, 3 and 5 years, including dependencies, assumptions and risks for the whole programme.Your response should include: * How you intend to make connections between the four workstreams (National Education Nature Park, Climate Leaders Award, curriculum resources and grants management function) over the course of the contract period to form a coherent, credible and engaging offer to the sector.
* Specific references to any assumptions regarding charging models, and whether you intend to charge participants (institutions or individuals) to engage with any of the deliverables

**Word limit is 1000, please attach a word formatted document for your response. Words in excess of this limit will not be counted, please note headers and footers will be included in the total.** |
| * 1. Participation and engagement
 | Weighting/words: 6%/1000 |
| Please set out how you have driven participation and engagement of children and young people, including the use of data to inform targeted initiatives to reach harder to reach groups. Please include how you have used stakeholder networks in similar programmes and how you would apply that to the Park and Award.Your response should include your proposed definitions of participation and engagement for children, young people and institutions for both the Nature Park and Climate Leaders Award, as required in the cost matrix template. Projections on participation and engagement should be included for each deliverable in section 3.**Word limit is 1000, please attach a word formatted document for your response. Words in excess of this limit will not be counted, please note headers and footers will be included in the total.** |
| * 1. Resourcing
 | Weighting/words: 4%/N/A |
| Please set out your resourcing plan, including structures, FTE, CVs and role profiles, with specific reference to who will be your lead public facing figure for the programme.*Note: No word count for this question due to potential inclusion of CVs.* |
|  |
| 1. Programme Delivery
 |
| * 1. National Education Nature Park
 | Weighting/words: 9%/750 |
| Based on the overarching delivery plan outlined in your response to question 2.4, please set out how you would deliver the National Education Nature Park.Your response should include projections for engagement in the National Education Nature Park.**Word limit is 750, please attach a word formatted document for your response. Words in excess of this limit will not be counted, please note headers and footers will be included in the total.** |
| * 1. Climate Leaders Award
 | Weighting/words: 9%/750 |
| Based on the overarching delivery plan outlined in your response to question 2.4, please set out how you would deliver the Climate Leaders Award.Your response should include projections for participation in the Climate Leaders Award.**Word limit is 750, please attach a word formatted document for your response. Words in excess of this limit will not be counted, please note headers and footers will be included in the total.** |
| * 1. Curriculum resources
 | Weighting/words: 4%/750 |
| Based on the overarching delivery plan outlined in your response to question 2.4, please set out how you would compile new and/or quality assure existing sustainability and climate change curriculum resources to meet the requirements set out in the specification document.Your response should include how you:* Will deliver a substantial proportion of the subjects from the list provided in the specification section of the ITT e.g. list which ones you would prioritise first and why, and where applicable, which resources you or your consortia would already have available
* Ensure materials of high-quality
* Provide sufficient material in each subject (e.g. 6h per year per subject is considered a benchmark)
* Ensure adaptability of materials for different situations.
* Ensure consideration is made for how teachers will make use of materials as part of their normal workflow, in combination with existing LMS and non-electronic working practices.
* Fulfilment of requirements for any digital resources:
* Accessibility
* User friendliness
* End-user testing

**Word limit is 750, please attach a word formatted document for your response. Words in excess of this limit will not be counted, please note headers and footers will be included in the total.** |
| * 1. Grant management
 | Weighting/words: 3%/500 |
| Based on the overarching delivery plan outlined in your response to question 2.4, please set out how you would deliver a grants management function.**Word limit is 500, please attach a word formatted document for your response. Words in excess of this limit will not be counted, please note headers and footers will be included in the total.** |
|  |
| 1. **Cost/Value for Money**
 | **Weighting: 25%** |
| Please use the attached cost matrix document to complete this section. |
| **4.1: Park engagement over initial 2 years** | Weighting: 10% |
| * Value for money for the Park will be determined by dividing the projected number of education settings engaged in the park by the total cost of delivering the park. This will give a cost per engagement for the Park. This will be evaluated over your initial 3-year projections and split by engagement by phase. The expectation is that younger participation will be at class or institution level. **(5% EY and Primary + 5% Secondary and above)**
 |
| **4.2: Award engagement over 5 years, given the length of time required to both develop the framework and complete award activities** | Weighting: 10% |
| * Value for money for the Award will be determined by dividing the projected number of awards by the total cost of delivering the award. This will give a cost per award. This will be evaluated over a 5 year projection and split by awards at early years and primary level, and secondary and above given the difference in award types. The expectation is that younger participation will be at class or institution level. **(5% EY and Primary + 5% Secondary and above)**
 |
| **4.3: Curriculum resources development** | Weighting: 3% |
| For curriculum resources, you will be scored by the number of subjects and school years a sufficient amount of material (6 hours per the benchmark in the specification) is produced for divided by the total cost of producing the entire suite of materials.  |
| **4.4: Grants management** | Weighting: 2% |
| For the grants management function, a score will be awarded based upon the percentage management fee the bidder would charge to administer grant funding allocated to the programme by the Department to support these initiatives. |
| **4.5 Cost** | Weighting: See below |
| Please also attach/insert an annual cost model by year and activity. An example table with potential cost lines is listed below. This can be sent in any format but must show indicative total contract cost over 2, 3 and 5 years to demonstrate how the programme will be delivered within the initial 3-year funding envelope. **This cost model must not include costs incurred by users or participants, as it represents only costs incurred by the Department.**Given that value for money will be assessed based on variable factors that potentially include funding that does not come from the Department, overall cost will be assessed only on whether it is affordable within Departmental funding. |
|  |
| 1. **Social Value**
 | **Weighting: 10%** |
| Tenderers should refer to the social value guidance[[1]](#footnote-2) before responding to these questions, referring specifically to ‘Theme 3: Fighting Climate Change’ |
| * 1. Sustainable operations
 | Weighting/words: 5%/500 |
| Please set out how you are working towards becoming Net Zero, with specific reference to how deliverables in the specification will be delivered in this way.Your response should include:* how deliverables and activity will be carried out, as well as other activities undertaken by you, in a way that is at or move towards the Net Zero target
* how you operate internally to reduce your environmental impact
* specific measures for the above

**Word limit is 500, please attach a word formatted document for your response. Words in excess of this limit will not be counted, please note headers and footers will be included in the total.** |
| * 1. Environmental Awareness and Influence
 | Weighting/words: 5%/500 |
| Please set out how you use your position to raise awareness of environmental issues and engage stakeholders to be more aware of and reduce their environmental impact.Your response should include:* how you work with the rest of your supply chain to minimise your environmental impact
* how you engage with the community to raise awareness and encourage positive behaviours
 |

1. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/procurement-policy-note-0620-taking-account-of-social-value-in-the-award-of-central-government-contracts [↑](#footnote-ref-2)