Heritage and Place Research

**Organisation The National Lottery Heritage Fund**

**Department** Business Innovation and Insight

**Title of procurement Heritage and place research**

**Brief description of supply** Research

**Estimated value of tender** £25,000

**Estimated duration** 4 months

**Name of the Fund Contact** Diane La Rosa

**Timetable** Response deadline: 21st June 2021

Confirmation of contract: 23rd June 2021

Completion of research: 22ND OCTOBER 2021

**Please Note: If you are interested in this Project it would be very helpful if you could email us before the 25th May 2021 to let us know?**

**Diane LaRosa**

[**Bii.Admin@heritagefund.org.uk**](mailto:Bii.Admin@heritagefund.org.uk) **Thank you.**

# 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. Heritage has an essential role to play in making communities better places to live and in creating local economic prosperity. This is reflected in the National Lottery Heritage Fund’s [Strategic Funding Framework 2019-2024](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/sites/default/files/media/attachments/Heritage%20Fund%20-%20Strategic%20Funding%20Framework%202019-2024.pdf) which includes a strategic objective **to demonstrate how heritage helps people and places to thrive.**
  4. In 2020-21, the Fund paused our open grants programme (National Lottery Grants for Heritage) in order to deliver a number of emergency and recovery funds to the heritage sector, including the Government’s Culture Recovery Fund for heritage.
  5. The Fund has now re-opened our open grants programme for project grants up to £5 million. In response to the impacts of Covid-19, [the Fund’s priority outcomes for 2021-22](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/sites/default/files/media/attachments/Priorities%20for%20National%20Lottery%20Grants%20for%20Heritage%202021-22_1.pdf) continue to prioritise the role of heritage in building better places and supporting local recovery. This includes priority outcomes that ‘the local area will be a better place to live, work and visit’ and ‘the local economy will be boosted’.
  6. Beyond funding places and communities through open grants programme, the Fund has also invested in place-based campaigns and strategic place initiatives . These include the Great Place Scheme, Future Parks Accelerator, Areas of Focus, Landscape Partnerships and the Townscape Heritage Initiative.
  7. This is now a critical moment to examine the evidence on place-based funding, to understand effective approaches and what the options for a place-based approach should be for The Fund, throughout the rest of the Strategic Funding Framework period and beyond.
  8. We are looking to commission research that informs how The Fund delivers on its strategic objective to “demonstrate how heritage helps people and places to thrive”, through our approach to our open grants programme and strategic funding (e.g. campaigns, bid solicitation, Areas of Focus).
  9. Findings must be consistent with the Fund’s strategic focus and capacity, and reflect the unique nature of the Fund’s heritage remit as an Arm’s Length Body (ALB) and distributor of Lottery Funds.
  10. The aim of this research is to understand how the evidence on place based funding can inform The National Lottery Heritage Fund’s approach to meeting its strategic objective to demonstrate how heritage helps people and places to thrive.

There are three strands to the research and the objectives for each strand are detailed below.

**Strand 1: How effectively is the Fund delivering on our strategic place priorities?**

* With the aim of informing strand 2 what does the grant funding data show us about place based funding in recent years? Subject to data availability and quality, this may include:
  + Number of grants awarded/rejected on place based projects
  + The activity of the awarded place based projects
  + Geographical spread
  + Number of grants awarded to areas of deprivation
  + Partnership funding situation for grantees
* What do the evaluations of the Fund’s recent place-based programmes show us about The Fund’s place-based role and impact?
* What do the evaluations tell us about what have been the key benefits and challenges of the more holistic, geographic or partnership approach fostered through these programmes?

**Strand 2: What does the evidence tell us about how The Fund should advance its place priorities through financial and non-financial approaches?**

This should be informed by external evidence, the evidence established in Strand 1 and the Fund’s strategic focus and capacity. Areas that should be explored include:

* **Investment** – what are the most effective approaches and mechanisms to invest in place at the appropriate scale?
* **Partnerships** – how can place-based partnership working be most effective? This could include consideration of alignment with local strategies, national funding and collaboration with other funders.
* **Non-financial support** – what activity beyond financial support would be beneficial at a national and local level to maximise the impact of our investment within places? This could include consideration of our national policy and advocacy work on place, or the provision of non-financial support to projects to enhance their impact on place.
* **Data** - using our current grant management system, and the benchmark established in Strand 1, what should we be measuring to inform The Fund’s Key Performance Indicators on place?

When analysing the evidence for each of these areas the consultant should consider:

* The wider evidence and learning from past campaigns and programmes can be embedded within our current funding approach of an open grants programme.
* How the findings would support delivery of our strategic priorities and build on the current position set out in Strand 1.
* The wider evidence about what works within these areas and what this tells us about how we should prioritise and focus. Where relevant, this should include case study examples.
* The political and economic context of Covid-19, and any policy differences that need to be considered for the different nations.
* Alignment with the strategic priorities of other national partners and funders.

**Strand 3: What options are open to the Fund to advance its place priorities through our investment in the short, medium and longer term?**

These should be informed by engagement with the Fund and could be presented as part of a menu of short, medium and long-term options to act on based on the evidence highlighted in **Strand 2**. Options should be consistent with The Fund’s strategic priorities, current funding approaches (including open grant funding) and capacity.

Short-term is defined as business planning for the next 12 months. Medium-term is defined as the remaining Strategic Funding Framework period to 2024. Long-term is defined as the next SFF period (2024 – 2029).

* 1. The research will be used to support the Fund’s strategic planning and policy development. Key audiences for the research include:
* The Fund’s staff
* Other funders, heritage stakeholders, policy makers and interested parties
  1. All outputs should be prepared on the basis that they could be published externally.

# Method

* 1. A method for the work is open for consultants to propose. However, we anticipate that it will include some or all of the following:
     1. Conduct quantitative analysis of The Fund’s grant data to understand and benchmark our place-based funding to date.
     2. Review a sub sample of place based funded projects to understand in more detail the types of activity funded to deliver our place based strategy through reviewing qualitative application form data.
     3. Use relevant external and internal research to conduct a review of place-based research to look at the effectiveness and considerations for successful place-based funding, which could be adapted for funding Heritage place based projects. This would include examining The Fund’s own evaluations of recent and ongoing place-based initiatives (see Appendix B).
     4. Consult with a small group of key national stakeholders (approx. 10) to understand their priorities, perceptions of the Fund’s place based approach and opportunities to strengthen this. The Fund will suggest some of the interviewees and the list will be compiled collaboratively.
     5. Engage with the Fund’s staff to understand The Fund’s context and current approach to place based investment.
     6. Present on emerging findings to enable the co-creation of options to support The Fund to integrate place-based funding into the open grants programme and strategic funding in the short, medium, and longer term (**Strand 3**).

# Outputs

* 1. The following outputs will be required:
     1. Short interim findings report provided in August.
     2. a draft final report in Word September
     3. a final report in Word containing key evidence and the cocreated options for The Fund’s to meet its strategic objective on place in September.
     4. a slide deck summarising the findings.
     5. a set of research data, to be stored in a readily accessible format such as Excel.
  2. 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.
  3. 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
  4. 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.
  5. 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.
  6. The successful bidder must comply with all of the requirements of the Data Protection Act 2018 and shall ensure appropriate research consents from interviews or any data collection.
  7. 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.
  8. 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 late June and be completed by 22ND OCTOBER. The final report shall be submitted to the Fund by 22ND OCTOBER.
  2. The anticipated budget is £25,000 to include all expenses and VAT. The contract will be let by the National Heritage Memorial Fund.
  3. The payment schedule will be split into two equal payments; 50% on signing of contract and 50% on submission of final report.
  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;
* 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 evaluation | 25% |
| Demonstrated that the methods selected are appropriate to the research requirements set out in this brief | 20% |
| Demonstrated a record of producing high quality evaluation reports to support policy and practice development in the Heritage and Cultural sector, and to do so concisely | 15% |
| Demonstrated an awareness of the different policy contexts, research and issues relating to place-based investment and the role of heritage in places. | 20% |
| 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 | 20% |

## 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: 28th May 2021/ Answers 2nd June
* Tender return deadline: 21st June 2021
* The Fund will notify bidders of our procurement decision week commencing: 23rd June 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 on Monday 21st June** to the following contact:

Diane LaRosa

[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 A: 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.

**Appendix B –** list of evaluations of recent and ongoing place-based initiatives

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation / Report** |
| [Parks for People: case study research (October 2020)](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/publications/parks-people-case-study-research) |
| [Great Place Scheme evaluation report(s) (October 2019)](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/publications/great-place-scheme-evaluation-england) |
| [20 years in 12 places (2015)](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/sites/default/files/media/attachments/final_4-hlf_20-years_12-places-access_0.pdf) |
| Local authority in-house analysis and consultation (2021) |
| Future Parks Accelerator (2020 and 2021) |
| Delivering the SFF Priorities for 2021-22 – findings (2020) |
| [Putting good ingredients in the mix: Lessons and opportunities for place-based working and funding](https://hfund365.sharepoint.com/sites/Placepolicydevelopmentandproposition/Shared%20Documents/General/TNLCF_KL18-11-Place-Based-Funding.pdf) (2018) |
| [RSA Heritage Index](https://www.thersa.org/globalassets/_foundation/new-site-blocks-and-images/reports/pride-in-place-rsa-heritage-index-2020.pdf) (2020) |
| [Heritage for inclusive growth, RSA](https://www.thersa.org/globalassets/reports/2020/the-rsa-heritage-for-inclusive-growth.pdf) (2020) |
| Areas of Focus (2021) |
| [Townscape Heritage Initiative Schemes Evaluation](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/sites/default/files/media/attachments/thi_2013_10-year_report.pdf) (2013) |
| [Landscape Partnerships evaluation](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/sites/default/files/media/research/landscapepartnerships_evaluation2011.pdf) (2011) |