Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Research Phase 2

**Organisation The National Lottery Heritage Fund**

**Department** Business Innovation and Insight

**Title of procurement Equality Diversity and Inclusion Research**

**Brief description of supply** Research to help The Fund become a more equitable funder.

**Estimated value of tender** £40,000 (inc. VAT)

**Estimated duration** 4 months

**Name of the Fund Contact** Amelia Robinson

**Timetable** Response deadline: Midday 19th October 2021

Clarification & Negotiation meetings: 25th October 2021

Confirmation of contract: 8th November 2021

Completion of research: End of February 2022

# 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 National Lottery Heritage Fund (The Fund) has recently conducted an Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) Review covering four workstreams; Culture, Governance, Investment and Workforce. The [Review’s report](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/news/how-were-working-towards-ambitious-vision-inclusive-heritage) summarises what has been learned over the past 12 months, what has been achieved already, and sets out key actions The Fund will take throughout 2021-2022 to be a more equitable funder.
  4. There was a need for evidence to support The Fund’s review of its approach to diversity and inclusion and during November 2020 – February 2021 The Fund carried out [Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) research](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/about/insight/research/how-can-heritage-fund-be-more-inclusive-under-represented-groups).

The research sought to answer three main research questions:

* How do under-served grantees perceive The Fund and its role?
* How do under-served grantees perceive heritage?
* What could The Fund do to become more inclusive and engage with a wider range of organisations?

The research looked at organisations that were working with people from under-served groups. The focus was on five characteristics; race and ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation, socio-economic background and young people.

* 1. The outputs from the research offer a strong basis on which to start to plan in detail the changes that are needed to inform The Fund’s approach to inclusion and diversity. This detailed planning has started and an initial response to the recommendations was developed in May 2021 (this will be shared with the successful bidder).
  2. The plan includes an action to conduct this second phase of the research to address two limitations of the original research; it was undertaken with grantees from the past five years and it was England only. Specifically, we want to broaden the research to include rejected and potential applicants in England as well as organisations, working in heritage led by or working with underserved groups, across the devolved administrations.

# Aims

* 1. The aim of the second phase of the research is to build on the findings and recommendations from the first phase of EDI research and provide insight to support The Fund to be a more inclusive and equitable funder.
  2. The research questions are similar to the first phase of EDI research. The emphasis will be on identifying any new findings that are specific to one or more of the devolved administrations, or that arise from speaking to organisations that have not received funding from us in the past.
  3. The overall themes and questions for the research are:

Perceptions of heritage

* What aspects of heritage and culture are important and relevant to different groups?
* How well is this heritage currently supported?
* How perceptions of heritage and culture could change to be more inclusive.

Perceptions of The Fund

* How relevant is the Fund to under-served/protected groups and their heritage?
* How could The Fund support changing perceptions of heritage?
* How could The Fund’s work change and improve to be more inclusive?  (This includes, but is not limited, to examining our whole end-to-end investment processes.)
* What role could the Fund play in how heritage and culture contributes to having a social impact such as improved equity in heritage, individual wellbeing, building community cohesion and supporting social equity.

What are the recommendations for The Fund to become an inclusive funder

* What are the opportunities and challenges for The Fund to become a more equitable funder?
* Do the recommendations from the first phase of the research need to change?
  + - Are there additional recommendations for the research needed to reflect the experiences of the different Nations and their policy contexts?
    - Are there additional recommendations needed to reflect the experiences of non-applicants/potential applicants and rejected applicants?

# Method

* 1. To answer these research questions effectively the research needs to be conducted with:
* Grantees from the Nations (Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland)
* UK wide: rejected applicants
* UK wide: potential/non applicants.
  1. As in the previous phase of work, sampling will be from the following underrepresented characteristics in The Fund’s portfolio; race and ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation, socio-economic background and young people.
  2. One key difference is that we will sample for under-represented characteristics amongst both applicants and also amongst the beneficiaries they serve. For example by speaking to someone with one of the protected characteristics who has applied to us for funding, *or* to a project that runs projects for people from under-represented groups. This new approach is possible due to the data that is collected through IMS and is explained in Sampling, below.
  3. The evaluation will draw on a range of evidence and we would like consultants with experience in EDI work to set out proposals for a detailed methodology, but we anticipate that the work will build on the findings and recommendations from the EDI research we did earlier this year and will include methods such as:
* In-depth interviews (approx. 60)
* Workshops (approx. 4)
* Surveys with grantees from different nations and rejected applicants
* Staff feedback workshops (approx. 5)
  1. The research would involve a steering group and the consultants would be expected to attend, present and support decision making on the research with the steering group.

1. The aim is for the updated findings to be ready to inform the March Board meeting and interim findings for December 2021.
2. **Sampling**
   1. As in phase 1 of the work, The Fund will provide data to support the sampling of grantees and rejected applicants, based on the historic ‘tagging’ dataset, which identifies the projects that aim to benefit certain groups. These will then be reviewed and approved by Investment Managers.
   2. The Fund would work with engagement managers to support the identification of non-applicants/potential applicants, as well as developing a communications plan to reach out to organisations that may not regularly engage with our organisation.

In addition to this we expect the consultants undertaking the work to support the identification of non-applicant/potential applicants and explain how they will do this within their methodology.

* 1. Finally, in April 2021 the Service Design team launched a new approach to equalities monitoring, based on a survey of applicants to the IMS. This has now received 250 responses and we intend to use the records from the survey to identify applicants with the relevant protected characteristics. A full re-contact and consent process will need to be developed before the sample can be used in this way, but we believe this presents a more accurate dataset for sampling organisations that are run by individuals from underrepresented groups than the ‘tagging’ dataset.

# Outputs

* 1. The primary audience for this research is an internal one specifically the reports will be read and inform the work of the Strategy and Policy team and the Senior Management Team. It should be assumed that all documentation produced will be made available to all The Fund’s staff and we aim to ensure the results of the research are read by everyone, whether they are actively involved in the work or not.
  2. The following deliverables will be required:
* Project Initiation Document
* Interim report – by December 2021
* Report on the findings and recommendations – by February 2021
* Slide deck on the findings and recommendations
* Recorded video presentation of the findings and recommendations to share on the intranet
  1. **A project plan with specific deliverables and timetable will be agreed with the successful consultant/ies. However, The Fund expects these deliverables in accordance with the following timetable:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverables/Key Milestones** | **Due date** |
| Inception Meeting to agree plans, including methodology, reporting structures, and a communication and dissemination strategy | Nov 2021 |
| Fieldwork/Data collection | Nov - Jan 2021 |
| Interim reporting | Dec 2021 |
| A final report in agreed format | Feb 2021 |

* 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. We expect all our evaluations and research projects to generate evidence about the inclusivity of our funding and our performance in addressing inequality. Bidders must be committed to this principle and ensure evidence gathering addresses this requirement.
  3. 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.
  4. 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.
  5. The successful bidder must comply with all of the requirements of UK and European Data Protection Laws and shall ensure appropriate research consents from interviews or any data collection.
  6. 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.
  7. 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 to begin 8th November 2021 and be completed by End of February 2022. The final report shall be submitted to the Fund by 28th February 2022.
  2. The anticipated budget is £40,000 to include all expenses, payment to participants and VAT. The contract will be let by the National Heritage Memorial Fund.
  3. The payment schedule will be 50% at the start and 50% on completion.
  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; CV’s, along with any other relevant information can be provided in appendices
* 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 research | 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 equality, diversity and inclusion | 25% |
| Demonstrated a clear and realistic project plan, showing phases of the evaluation, tasks for each phases and roles and responsibilities for each member of the team | 15% |
| Demonstrated well considered plans for feeding back learning and dissemination of research 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: 6th October 2021
* Tender return deadline: Midday 19th October 2021
* Clarification meetings\*\* may be held with shortlisted consultants and would take place on week commencing: 25th October 2021
* The Fund will notify bidders of our procurement decision week commencing: 8th November 2021
* \*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 19st October 2021** to the following contact:

Diane La Rosa - [Bii.Admin@heritagefund.org.uk](mailto: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](ttps://www.heritagefund.org.uk/search?keys=Logos).

**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.