HLF Heritage Grants Outcomes Review

**Organisation Heritage Lottery Fund**

**Department** Strategy & Business Development

**Title of procurement HLF Heritage Grants Outcomes Review**

**Brief description of supply** Evaluation Services

**Estimated value of tender** £40-£45,000 inc VAT and expenses

**Estimated duration** September 2017 to March 2018

**Name of HLF Contact**  **Kion Ahadi**

Head of Evaluation

Heritage Lottery Fund

7 Holbein Place

London SW1W 8NR

Phone: 020 7591 6073

Email: Kion.Ahadi@hlf.org.uk

Website: [www.hlf.org.uk](http://www.hlf.org.uk/)

**Timetable** Response deadline: **21 August 2017**

Clarification meetings if needed: Week beginning **28 August 2017**

Confirmation of contract: **Week beginning 4 September 2017**

Completion of research: **5 March 2018**

# 1. Overview

* 1. 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). From April 2013 we have been operating under our Strategic Framework: ‘A lasting difference for heritage and people’. See the [HLF website](http://www.hlf.org.uk/aboutus/whatwedo/Pages/StrategicFramework2013to2018.aspx) for more details.
  2. HLF 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](http://www.hlf.org.uk/HowToApply/Pages/Outcomes.aspx) that underpin our grant-making.
  3. Heritage Grants is HLF’s largest open programme, and funds projects related to any part of the national, regional, or local heritage of the UK – ranging from the conservation of historic buildings, to museum redevelopments, natural heritage and landscape schemes, and community projects.
  4. We wish to conduct an evaluation of the Heritage Grants projects funded under HLF’s 3rd Strategic Plan (SP3), which ran from December 2008 to March 2013. Under SP3 HLF awarded over £964m to 777 Heritage Grants, ranging in size from £50,000 to over £5m. Of these 777 projects, 375 are now complete.
  5. Organisations awarded funding under SP3 were required to submit a self-evaluation of their project work upon completion of the project. When they apply for a grant, we ask applicants to tell us the ’story’ of their project, by explaining:
* Why they want to do their project – the need or opportunity that exists.
* What they will do – both capital works and activities.
* What difference the project will make for heritage and for people.

In their evaluation, we ask grantees to repeat this exercise, comparing what they hoped or expected their project to achieve with what actually happened. HLF does not prescribe how grantees should carry out their evaluation, though we do outline various evaluation tools in our [Evaluation Guidance](http://www.hlf.org.uk/HowToApply/goodpractice/Pages/Evaluation_guidance.aspx). HLF can contribute up to 3% of the total grant amount towards the cost of evaluation.

* 1. This study will involve a comprehensive review of the self-evaluation reports and the outcomes achieved by 150-175 Heritage Grants projects completed since July 2016, and which were funded under SP3. There are three key tasks:

1. To assess the quality of the 150-175 completed project self-evaluations, using the methodology and grading developed from a prior evaluation of 200 completed projects - see <https://www.hlf.org.uk/about-us/research-evaluation/programme-evaluation/review-grantee-evaluations>.
2. To use the self-evaluations, alongside other assessment and monitoring material, to establish the range and success of activities and outcomes achieved by SP3 Heritage Grants projects, and to map these findings onto HLF’s outcomes framework that has been in use since 2012.
3. To build on the Excel dataset already developed as part of the prior review of 200 self-evaluations, both enabling the results to be aggregated with this study, as well as for comparison between the two studies.
   1. There are a number of overarching questions which this review will need to address such as, but not limited to:

* Who did the programme reach? What types of organisations were funded, what was the sector and geographical distribution of projects?
* Did certain sectors (e.g. buildings and monuments) have better evaluation methods than other sectors (e.g. Land and natural heritage)?
* Are there differences in the outcomes delivered by different types of projects?
  1. The first audience for the evaluation is HLF, where it will inform our policy and decision making. However, the results will be made publicly available and may be of interest to other policy makers, funders and practitioners in the heritage sector.

# Methodology

* 1. Self-evaluation review

This task will primarily involve reviewing material held by HLF. Consultants should use the methodology already developed to assess the quality of the project self-evaluations (see: <https://www.hlf.org.uk/about-us/research-evaluation/programme-evaluation/review-grantee-evaluations>).

Outcomes review

In the second part of the research, consultants should use the assessment, monitoring and evaluation information held by HLF to review and summarise the type, range and quality of activities and outcomes achieved by completed projects, and to map these onto HLF’s [14 outcomes for heritage, people and communities](http://www.hlf.org.uk/HowToApply/Pages/Outcomes.aspx).

This will be a retrospective exercise, since projects funded under SP3 were not required to address this framework. As well as helping to quantify and evaluate the achievements of completed Heritage Grants projects, this task will support the design of future evaluation of HLF’s programmes.

* 1. HLF will make available the data it holds on the Heritage Grants programme and the 150-175 projects completed since July 2016. As well as programme-level funding data and completed self-evaluations, this includes application forms (where applicants are asked a specific question about how they intend to evaluate their project), project budget information, and project completion reports.

# Outputs

* 1. The following outputs will be required:
* a draft final report;
* a final report with a short standalone executive summary;
* a slide deck summarising key findings;
* a set of research data, to be stored in a readily accessible electronic format such as Excel
  1. Any final reports should adhere to HLF’s accessibility and formatting guidance (appended).
  2. The results will be confidential to HLF. HLF 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 HLF and the contractor. The contents and structure of the report to be agreed in advance of writing. All reports to be supplied in both hard copy and electronic format.
  4. All bidders are required to adhere to all appropriate regulations and guidelines on the collection, storage, transmission and destruction of personal data ([MRS/SRA, Data Protection Act 1998: Guidelines for Social Research, April 2013](https://www.mrs.org.uk/pdf/2013-04-23%20MRS%20SRA%20-%20DP%20Guidelines%20updated.pdf)).

# Research management

* 1. We expect the research to begin **mid-September 2017** and be completed by the end of **March 2018**. The final report shall be submitted to HLF by **5 March 2018**.
  2. The anticipated budget is £40,000-45,000 to include all expenses and VAT. The contract will be let by the National Heritage Memorial Fund.
  3. The payment schedule will be 20% at start up after contract exchange; other payments will be agreed with the contractor based on completion of agreed milestones, with 10% to be paid after approval of the final report.
  4. The contract will be based on the HLF standard terms and conditions
  5. The research will be managed on a day to day basis for HLF by **Kion Ahadi**.

# Award Criteria

* 1. A proposal for undertaking the work should include:
* a detailed methodology 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 allocated to your response to the Quality Questions below. Each question will be scored using the methodology in the table below.

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

1. To what extent does the tender response demonstrate an understanding of the issues related to this evaluation brief?
2. To what extent is the methodology appropriate to the evaluation requirements set out in this brief?
3. What is the extent of the experience of similar heritage evaluation?
4. How well has the tenderer structured a research team in order to successfully manage the contract and deliver the required work to the budget and timetable required by HLF?

## 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 HLF 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 HLF confidence in the ability of the Bidder to deliver the contract. Meets the HLF’s requirements. |
| 4 | Very good | Response is comprehensive and supported by a high standard of evidence. Gives the HLF a high level of confidence in the ability of the Bidder to deliver the contract. May exceed the HLF’s requirements in some respects. |
| 5 | Excellent | Response is very comprehensive and supported by a very high standard of evidence. Gives the HLF a very high level of confidence the ability of the Bidder to deliver the contract. May exceed the HLF’s requirements in most respects. |

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

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/Heritage Lottery 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*  *@ £500* | **Post 2 @cost per day**  **(No of days)**  *e.g. Senior Consultant/manager/researcher*  *@£300* | **Post 3 @cost per day**  **(No of days)**  *Junior*  *Consultant/equivalent*  *e.g. £200* | **Total days** | **Total fees** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Inception meeting to agree plans and finalise requirements with the Fund | *e.g. 0.5* | *1* | *1.5* | *3* | *850* |
| *[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: HLF reserves the right to reject abnormally low tenders. HLF 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. HLF reserves the right to reject abnormally low tenders. HLF reserves the right not to appoint and to achieve the outcomes of the evaluation through other methods
  2. The procurement timetable will be:

Tender return deadline: completed proposal to be returned to HLF by **9am** **21 August 2017**.

Clarification meetings may be held and would take place the week beginning **28 August 2017** HLF will notify bidders of our procurement decision on the week commencing **4 September 2017**.

* 1. Your tender proposals must be sent electronically via e-mail before the tender return deadline of **9am 21 August 2017** to the following contact:

**Emily Griffiths**

Research and Evaluation Support Officer

Heritage Lottery Fund

Holbein Place

London

SW1W 8NL

[emily.griffiths@hlf.org.uk](mailto:emily.griffiths@hlf.org.uk)

* 1. Please visit the [HLF website](http://www.hlf.org.uk/Pages/Home.aspx) for further information about the organisation.

# Appendix: Accessibility and formatting guidance

Reports and other documents created for HLF 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.

## 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 also be simple, and include a descriptive title.

## 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 HLF. Our logo can be found on the [HLF website](http://www.hlf.org.uk/grantholders/acknowledgement/Pages/Logosandacknowledgement.aspx).