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# **1.0 Introduction**

## **1.1 Overview and background**

The Mayor of Newham is committed to children and young people in the borough, and as such the first priority in the Corporate Plan is to support children and young people’s aspirations, keep them safe and remove barriers to success. The Plan includes the specific commitment to develop a high-quality, co-produced youth offer that provides a varied and inclusive range of activities. To achieve this commitment, the Council increased our youth service budget provision by £1.4 million from April 2019, with a further increase of £1.2 million from April 2020.

A recent APPG Inquiry into Youth Work found that universal youth services have reduced dramatically over the last decade. Taking a long-term view, the Inquiry found that although spending on young people has remained largely constant, focus has moved away from universal services, to protected statutory services, such as education and protecting Looked After Children. As responsibility has shifted on to local authorities, youth work and related services have been cut dramatically; spending has reduced from £1.028bn in 2008/09 to £0.388bn in 2016/17.

In Newham, the youth services budget went from £2,107,310 annually in 2010/11 to £400,000 annually in 2017/18, an 81% decrease. This resulted in just four operating youth centres in the borough with limited staff and opening hours. In 2018/19, Newham was one of only four London boroughs to report budget increases for youth services.

The Inquiry’s call for greater provision of universal services came ahead of the COVID-19 outbreak and subsequent lockdown. The crisis has illuminated the dire impacts of years of cuts to youth services, leading both national and international to call for effective and universal youth services as a priority for recovery.

## **1.2 Corporate Direction**

Newham has recently developed new Corporate Outcomes Framework where we measure our success by the happiness, health and well-being of our residents. Specifically the strategic outcomes listed in the second pillar, to which the work of the Youth Empowerment Service (YES) contribute alongside other partners across the Council.

* Children and young people are cared for, safe and protected from harm
* Children and young people are happy and enjoy improved wellbeing
* Children and young people reach their full potential

## **1.3 Offer increase**

The London Borough of Newham (LBN) is increasing our universal offer of youth services in two phases. These services will address the shortfall in youth work over the last decade. The service will be accessible for those between the ages of 9 and 25 across the borough, with additional focus on Stratford provided through a detached youth work team, active from late 2019.

Phase one of the service expansion is already underway. Before lockdown our four centres were able to open every evening of the week, at weekends and during school holidays across four Zones. As part of this process, a Theory of Change model has been developed within the service.

Due to Youth Empowerment Service (YES) campaigning early on in the pandemic, LBN changed the status of youth workers to key workers in April 2020. That decision enabled the team to undertake socially distanced youth work through its detached and outreach teams. In parallel to this, the YES team also designed, developed and built a digital service which went live in April 2020.

In May 2020, the YES worked with its partner at HeadStart (school and community based mental health service) to set up a ‘Your Time’ befriending service to offer one-to-one telephone sessions for young people requiring additional support.

In August of 2020, youth workers received key worker status nationally and so youth zones were able to reopen their building terms of service to deliver socially distanced bubble work. The service is current assessing how this new way of working will be carried on once social restrictions are lifted fully.

The service is also developing dedicated sessions for young people (9-13), and has recruited additional staff forming a participation team who will reach out and work with young carers, looked after and care-experienced young people, young people with SEND, and LGBTQ young people. We are providing Duke of Edinburgh awards programmes through a dedicated team. This initial phase is being funded by a £1.4 million increase in the youth service’s annual budget.

Phase two involves the council working collaboratively with partners to provide a wider range of services and activities. It will allow the Council to deliver services across an additional four Zones. This is motivated by the need to take on more SEND and disability related youth work in advance of the Positive Activities for Young People (PAYP) commission ending on 31st March 2020. The objective of phase two is to make our youth offer more widely available across the borough. It is funded by an additional £1.2 million from the 2020/21 budget onwards. The commissioning process is expected to be completed by March 2021.

## **1.4 Research aims and objectives**

The aim is to improve the quality of the service and inform future service development and help to understand best practice in universal youth services.

The research objectives are:

1. To assess the current Theory of Change, and:
   1. Ensure that its conclusions are shared across all relevant stakeholder groups (service users, elected members, senior managers, partner organisations and other relevant stakeholders to be identified)
   2. That the Theory of Change is effective in encouraging positive service provision and a learning culture incorporating positive change and improvement
2. To understand how the service has been implemented particularly in terms of the following:
   1. The development of internal and external networks and partnerships
   2. Which aspects are working well and which can be improved
   3. Any barriers or challenges facing the service
   4. How the above are affected by the COVID-19 crisis, and the resulting lockdown
3. To develop potential solutions where improvement is needed
4. To understand who is using the expanded service, who isn’t, and the barriers to access young people face and how that is changing
5. To design methodology for the phase two impact evaluation

Research questions will need to be drafted by the evaluator in conversation with the council’s research team and the service.

We intend for this evaluation to inform the effectiveness of the council’s service as well as the national evidence base for universal youth provision. We therefore want the results of the project to be clear and understandable.

# **2.0 Methodology and outputs**

## **2.1 Research methodology**

The evaluation process of the successful candidate must align with the intended corporate strategic outcomes that sit within the second pillar, outlined above (see Section 1.2).

We expect the successful bidder to have a strong track record in research and service evaluations with a particular focus and expertise specifically in evaluating youth empowerment services (or youth services).

Additionally, where possible, we would like the successful bidder to have experience in creating, running and successfully engaging young people in impact assessments during the pandemic. The successful bidder will need to demonstrate and evidence an enhanced knowledge of evaluating social and emotional learning outcomes.

We require a rapid assessment of the current position of the service, with key findings outlined in an interim report. This is necessary to provide an understanding of young people’s and the service’s constant state of change since the start of the COVID-19 crisis, and the YES’s response to it.

Finally, we require a proposed methodology for an impact evaluation. This proposal should outline what data needs to be collected and how this data could be analysed to demonstrate the impact of the phase 2 expansion.

Operational data for the service will be available, including monitoring and theory of change model information, subject to legal and ethical considerations.

In this project, we want:

* Ethical considerations and positive consent necessary for the participation of young people below the age of 16
* The evaluation process to complement the work of the service with as little disruption to their work as possible
* An understanding of the service’s role in young people’s lives during lockdown
* Clear conclusions which might contribute to an understanding of universal youth services’ best practice

The research team working directly with young people must have enhanced DBS in place and ideally have knowledge of safeguarding. Additional relevant DBS checks will be required of other research staff members depending on their level of engagement with young people or their personal information.

## **2.2 Minimum research outputs**

The outputs created will be used to improve the service and our understanding of it, and to inform other local authorities across London and nationally. This will require the process evaluation report at minimum to be published.

The project will require the supplier to provide the following:

1. Interim report: the lockdown has resulted in constant change and adaptation within the service. As such, we will require a rapid assessment to be undertaken as soon as possible from the contract start to take stock of the current position of the service. The results of this assessment will be included in an interim report.
2. Process evaluation report: this should include executive summary, methodology, results, conclusions and recommendations sections.
3. Proposal for an impact evaluation: this proposal should outline what data needs to be collected and how this data should be analysed.

The outputs from this work should be accessible and useful for a wide audience, including practitioners, policymakers and young people.

# **3.0 Project management**

The contract is to be managed by Research Officer Colin Forber. He will manage LBN’s signoff at key points throughout the evaluation process.

An inception meeting will be held via Zoom or other convenient video conference software. We will agree a time and date once the contactor is appointed.

We will require weekly updates. Once fieldwork has begun, information about those activities will be required. This information should include:

* The number of meetings, focus groups or other data gathering interactions, the number of participants, with whom the interactions took place (where applicable)
* A general update as to the progress of the evaluation
* Project risks and appropriate measures for mitigation
* Anything else agreed upon by LBN and the contractor during a previous meeting or update

CVs of all key staff will be required. The relevant level of DBS check will be required of all staff handling personal information or engaging with young people depending on the anticipated role of the individual research staff member. As per statutory requirements, basic DBS checks will be the minimum requirement, and enhanced DBS checks will be required for team members who might require unsupervised access to young people. DBS numbers and date of issue will be required prior to fieldwork or the collecting or processing of young people’s data. Any changes to personnel following the contract start must meet the same DBS check requirements and will be subject to LBN signoff.

## **3.1 Project milestones**

As explained above, the timeline of the project is subject to change due to restrictions imposed by COVID-19 precautions. As such, we encourage data collection remotely, if possible, for the initial run of the project, with fieldwork to commence once that is possible. The project will run for 12 months. Changes or other considerations with regards to the milestone dates will require signoff from both the contracted evaluator and the council.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Date | Milestone |
| tbd | Tender live. |
| tbd | Deadline for questions. |
| tbd | Tender closes. |
| tbd | Evaluation interviews (if necessary) |
| tbd | Contract awarded. |
| May 2021 | Inception meeting and contract start. |
| tbd | Submission of interim report. |
| May 2022 | Submission of process evaluation report. |
| May 2022 | Submission of impact evaluation proposal. |

## **3.2 Payment milestones**

1. Invoice at contract start
   * 50% of total costs
2. Invoice on LBN signoff of all outputs
   * 50% of total costs

# **4.0 Budget**

The Budget for this research is up to £35,000.

Please set out your quote in the price schedule document provided. Note that the data collection, and analysis and reporting for the both stages of the evaluation is itemised separately in the pricing schedule, such that LBN will only pay for those works that are carried out with agreement from LBN.

LBN will notify the successful tenderer with a purchase order (PO) number for the full amount of the contract. The final invoice is requested and paid following satisfactory completion of the work. Invoices must detail the PO number and be submitted to Newham’s electronic payment system (One Oracle) with the project manager copied in to e-mails. Invoices are paid within 30 days of receipt.

# **5.0 Submitting the Proposal**

We process tenders through the CapitalEsourcing platform. Please submit your proposal there by 17:00pm on *date to be decided*. We will not consider proposals received after this time and date. All proposals will only be opened by the council after the deadline has passed.

If you require further clarification, you can send a message via the CapitalEsourcing platform no later than *date to be decided*. Other inquiries can be sent to [Colin.Forber@Newham.gov.uk](mailto:Colin.Forber@Newham.gov.uk). All clarification and queries answered will be sent to all contractors.

# **6.0 Terms and Conditions**

Identify specific issues of your bid submission that are business confidential. Please note it is not sufficient to state all parts of the submission are confidential.

# **Evaluation model- Quality and Price**

## **Evaluation and scoring methodology**

This section explains the basis on which the tender will be evaluated. The successful Contractor will be appointed on the basis of the most economically advantageous tender (MEAT) for the contract in accordance with the evaluation and scoring methodology detailed below:

The evaluation criteria are:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **CRITERIA** | **EVALUATION METHOD** | **PERCENTAGE**  **SCORE** |
| Price | Pricing Submission | 30% |
| Quality | Quality assessment of the Method Statement | 70% |

## **Allocation of Scores**

A panel of Local Authority staff will individually score each tender submission and the final score allocated to each Method Statement response will be the average of the aggregate score achieved.

The purpose of the questions are to satisfy the Council that the Tenderer has the ability, capacity and management controls in place to operate the Contract in an efficient and cost effective manner. Responses should be precise with references to accompanying literature kept to a minimum. If the Tenderer is unable to comply with any aspect of the requirement it should say so and provide a brief explanation of why it cannot be met.

Once agreed, the responses to the questions will form part of the Contract. These will be monitored throughout the Contract to ensure compliance and shall define how the Contractor will manage and deliver the service throughout the Contract.

All questions are weighted according to the relative importance of the criteria to the Service. The weighting range is:-

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Importance to the success of the contract** | **Weighting** |
| Low Priority | **1** |
| Medium Priority | **2** |
| High Priority | **3** |
| Very High Priority | **4** |
| Essential | **5** |

The score will be multiplied by the weighting.

Each Method Statement response will be scored in line with the table below:

| **Score range** | **Basis of score** |
| --- | --- |
| 5 | **Excellent:** A more than comprehensive response submitted in terms of detail and relevance and clearly meets or exceeds the project aims with no negative indications or inconsistencies |
| 4 | **Good:** A comprehensive response submitted in terms of detail and relevance and clearly meets the project aims with no negative indicators or inconsistencies |
| 3 | **Satisfactory:** An acceptable response submitted in terms of level of detail, accuracy and relevance. The response is good but there are either some omissions of important factors or negative indications that reduce the extent to which the project aims will be achieved. |
| 2 | **Below expectations:** Response only partially addresses the question. |
| 1 | **Poor:** Limited response provided or a response that is inadequate, substantially irrelevant, inaccurate or misleading. |
| 0 | **Unacceptable:** No response to the question or the response is highly inaccurate. |

## **Evaluation of Method Statements**

The overall score on the Method Statements will form 70% of the final evaluation.

Each Method Statement shows maximum marks available for statement. Tenderers will be given a score ranging from zero (0) to five (5) for each Method Statement. This will then be multiplied by the weighting for each Method Statement to give the weighted score.

Tenderer’s average quality score will be worked out by adding up the total weighted scores given by each appraiser and dividing it by the number of appraisers. The tenderer with the highest average quality score will get overall quality score of 70% (The total score on the Method Statements will form 70% of the final evaluation.)

Other Tenderer’s overall quality score will then be calculated as an appropriate percentage in relation to the highest average quality score (it will be divided by the highest quality score and then multiplied by 70 as shown in the formula below).

Overall Quality score = Tenderer’s Average Quality Score X 70

Highest Average Quality Score

Assuming for demonstration purposes only 3 companies were bidding:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Company 1**  **Score** | **Company 2**  **Score** | **Company 3**  **Score** |
| **Moderated Quality Score** | **103** | **121** | **130** |
| **Total Quality Score out of a possible score of 70** | **55.46** | **65.15** | **70** |

**Price (Commercial) Evaluation – This will be based on the price of the surveys combined (see Price Schedule)**

The price element of the Bid submission will be evaluated on the basis of the lowest price bid being awarded 30 marks. The scores will be allocated to the other tenderers according to the following formula:-

Lowest price bid divided by the Tenderer’s bid and then multiplied by 30.

Lowest Price Bid X 30

Tenderer’s Bid

**Example** - Assuming for demonstration purposes only 3 companies were bidding:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Company 1** | **Company 2** | **Company 3** |
| Total Cost on which evaluation will be based | £150,000 | £160,000 | £170,000 |
| **Total Price Score out of a possible score of 30** | **30** | **28.13** | **26.47** |

The contract will be awarded on the basis of the most economically advantageous tender. The total quality score and total price score will then be combined to give the Tenderer’s overall score.

**Example –** combining Total Quality Score and Total Price Score, using the examples above.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Company 1** | **Company 2** | **Company 3** |
| Total Quality Score | 55.46 | 65.15 | 70 |
| Total Price Scores | 30 | 28.13 | 26.47 |
| Overall Score | **85.46** | **93.28** | **96.47** |
| Rank | **3** | **2** | **1** |

The tender will be awarded to Company 3, the highest ranked tenderer in this example.

## **Quality (Technical) Evaluation Criteria**

| **Method statement Question** | **Evaluation Criteria** | **Word Limit** | **Weighting:**  **(% of total quality score)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Research methodology:**   Please provide a detailed description of your proposed methodology that will capture the required data and meet the objectives of this study in Section 1.3 of the Service Specification. Please explain why you have chosen your methodology, how it will help meet the research objectives, and where you will add value to the research objectives. Please clearly indicate which elements are essential for the delivery of the objectives and outputs, and which elements are optional.  Your response should include:   * The data collection methods you propose to use and, where appropriate, how many of each you will deliver, and how you will include service, other Council officers or representatives, and young people in that collection at the following research stages:   + Project design;   + Impact evaluation proposal;   + Process evaluation; * Sampling and recruitment methodology. Please describe in detail how and why your proposed methodologies would be the best approach to balance cost, validity, robustness, participation, and ethics; * Details of procedures for designing and testing research tools; * If and how participants will be incentivised to take part; * Procedures for engagement with detached youth worker teams and youth hubs; * Procedures for monitoring and improving response and participation rates during fieldwork; * The number of research staff who will deliver the data collection methods; * Inputs required from the Council; * How you will ensure research ethics such as anonymity and confidentiality, and how you will involve young people under the age of 16 in your research. | **Extent to which:**   * **The response addresses the method statement question, and;** * **The proposed research methodology addresses the research objectives.** | 3000  If a response exceeds the word limit, only the first 3000 words can be considered | 17% |
| 1. **Analysis and reporting:**   Please provide details of data inputting, how the data will be prepared, analysed, and the findings reported. Your response should include:   * Your arrangements for data entry; * How you intend to undertake the analysis of the data; * How the findings will be reported in the rapid assessment, process evaluation report and impact evaluation proposal; * How you plan on making those findings accessible to the borough’s diverse population; * Full details of the analytical methods you will use. | **Extent to which:**   * **The response addresses the method statement question, and;** * **The response addresses the analysis and reporting requirements of the research objectives and outputs.** | 2000  If a response exceeds the word limit, only the first 2000 words can be considered | 17% |
| 1. **Youth work:**   Please provide details of your understanding of the last ten years of youth work innovation and the ways in which your approach addresses the needs of a universal service. Your responses should include:   * An explanation of the current position of universal youth services in London and/or England. This should demonstrate an understanding of the impacts of the response to and recovery from the pandemic; * How your knowledge of universal youth work will inform how you will assess the theory of change model and generate research questions. | **Extent to which:**   * **The response addresses the method statement question, and;**   **The response satisfies the specific needs of an innovative, universal approach to youth work.** | 2000  If a response exceeds the word limit, only the first 2000 words can be considered | 17% |
| 1. **Quality and security:**   Please provide details on how the quality of the data and outputs will be ensured and all current data protection regulations will be met, including the General Data Protection Regulation.Your response should include:   * Control measures for data security at all stages of the project; * How you will ensure data quality (including data reliability and validity) from collection of data to the final data set; * The quality systems and standards you have in place; * Details of the sign off process for outputs including quality checks, proof reading and checking of statistics; * How you will ensure outputs are fully complete with no missing sections; * Membership of relevant bodies who oversee code of conduct matters for researchers, fieldwork staff, and data controllers. | **Extent to which:**   * **The response addresses the method statement question, and;** * **The response addresses the quality and security requirements of the research objectives and outputs** | 2000  If a response exceeds the word limit, only the first 2000 words can be considered | 16% |
| 1. **Project management and risk:**   Please provide details of how the project will be managed, giving details on progress updates and risk management. Your response should include:   * Who has overall responsibility for the research and reporting, who will be responsible for the day to day management of the project, key staff contacts and their role in the project; * The relevant level of DBS check for each key member, depending on the level of direct interaction with young people expected of each; * How much time each team member will be actively involved in the project; * Commitment to at least weekly updates on progress; * How updates on progress and risk will be provided; * A full risk register and plan to manage and mitigate each risk over the lifetime of the project. | **Extent to which:**   * **The response addresses the method statement question, and;** * **The response addresses the project management and risk requirements of the research objectives and outputs** | 1000 (not including risk register)  If a response exceeds the word limit, only the first 1000 words can be considered | 11% |
| 1. **Timetable**:   Please comment on the feasibility of the timeline and your ability to carry out work within the timescales, making suggestions regarding timing from the inception meeting to receiving the final report.  Please detail your proposed timetable using a Gantt chart, including scoping the project, expected fieldwork period, reporting according to the methodology you propose, and when face-to-face visits with LBN or the service provider would need to happen. | **Extent to which:**   * **The response addresses the method statement question;** * **The project plan to deliver the study to highlighted deadlines is feasible;** * **The project plan agrees with the proposed methodology and resources.** | 500 (not including Gantt chart)  If a response exceeds the word limit, only the first 500 words can be considered | 11% |
| 1. **Relevant Experience**:   Please provide**:**   * Discussion of relevant experience for your team members, making clear which disciplines were used within each piece of work and how the skills and experience of key individuals in the team will deliver the research objectives, proposed methodology, and research outputs; * CVs of the staff who will work on this project that detail relevant experience in undertaking similar projects for local authorities or relevant public sector / private sector organisations. * Where possible, your experience of youth work in 2020-21 during Covid and the learning you have gathered or pieces of work you have delivered during this time. | **Extent to which:**   * **The response addresses the method statement question;** * **Previous organisational experience and range of work undertaken is similar and relevant;** * **Previous experience of staff working on the project is similar and relevant.** | 1000 (not including CVs)  If a response exceeds the word limit, only the first 1000 words can be considered | 11% |