Invitation to Tender

**Evaluation of Digital Skills for Heritage Initiative**

**Ref: NHMF 0324**

**Schedule 4: Evaluation Model**

# Overarching Award Criteria

Your proposal for undertaking the work will be evaluated as follows –

* Price = 30%
* Quality = 70%
* The scores for quality and price will be added together to obtain the overall score for each Bidder.

# Price

Your bid price will be evaluated as follows –

* 100% will be awarded to the lowest priced bid
* All remaining bidders will be allocated scores based on their deviation from this figure. Your fixed and total costs figures (if any) will be used to score this question.
* For example, if the lowest price is £50 and the second lowest price is £100 then the lowest priced bidder gets 100% (full marks) for price and the second placed bidder gets 50%.
* The scores for price will be multiplied by the weighting (30%)

# Quality

* 1. Quality criteria are provided below. Each will be scored out of 5. The percentage weightings are also shown against each criteria.

**Table 1: Quality Criteria & Percentage weightings**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tender Response | Quality question  | Weighting (%)  |
| Section 1 – Method Statement | Demonstrates a clear understanding of the research and potential risks. | 15 |
| Section 1 – Method Statement | Demonstrates that the methods selected are appropriate to the research requirements in the brief. | 20 |
| Section 1 – Method Statement | Demonstrates an awareness of the different policy contexts, research and issues relating to digital literacy (max 500) | 20 |
| Section 2 – Statement regarding Previous Experience | Demonstrates a record, via links to previous reports, of producing high quality evaluation reports to support policy and practice development in the Heritage and Cultural sector. | 15 |
| Section 3 – Project Plan | Demonstrates well considered plans for feeding back learning and dissemination of evaluation findings | 15 |
| Section 4 – Staffing Statement | Demonstrates the clear allocation of appropriate resources, with detail on roles and responsibilities for each member of the team  | 10 |
| Section 6 – Carbon Net Zero | Demonstrates a commitment to environmental sustainability and CNZ  | 5 |

* 1. The 0 to 5 scores for each question will be awarded as follows -

| 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. |