

DPS FRAMEWORK SCHEDULE 4: LETTER OF APPOINTMENT AND CONTRACT TERMS

Part 1: Letter of Appointment



Dear Sir/Madam

Letter of Appointment

This letter of Appointment dated 12th July 2021, is issued in accordance with the provisions of the DPS Agreement (RM6018) between CCS and the Supplier.

Capitalised terms and expressions used in this letter have the same meanings as in the Contract Terms unless the context otherwise requires.

Order Number:	TBC	Contract No: con_19307
From:	Ministry of Justice Reducing Reoffending Monitoring and Evaluation, DASD 102 Petty France, Area 7.B, Westminster, London, SW1H 9AJ (" Customer ")	
To:	I.F.F Research Ltd 5th Floor	


	St Magnus House, 3 Lower Thames Street London EC3R 6HD ("Supplier")
--	--

Effective Date:	14 th July 2021
Expiry Date:	End date of Initial Period: 30 th June 2022 End date of Maximum Extension Period: 6 Months Minimum written notice to Supplier in respect of extension: 2 Weeks

Services required:	Set out in Section 2 , Part B (Specification) of the DPS Agreement and refined by: the Customer's Project Specification attached at Annex A and the Supplier's Proposal attached at Annex B
--------------------	---

Key Individuals:	REDACTED Head of Reducing Reoffending Investment Monitoring and Evaluation REDACTED Senior Researcher - Reducing Reoffending Investment Monitoring and Evaluation Head of Reoffending Business Partnering Team: REDACTED ("Customer") And IFF: REDACTED Sheffield Hallam University: REDACTED ("Supplier")
[Guarantor(s)]	N/A

Contract Charges (including any applicable discount(s), but excluding VAT): REDACTED These costs are commercially confidential and not to be disclosed for three years from the proposal submission date.

Insurance Requirements	Insurance As per terms (Clause 19 of the Contract Terms)
Liability Requirements	Suppliers limitation of Liability (Clause Error! Reference source not found. of the Contract Terms);
Reimbursable Expenses	<p>Not permitted unless approved in advance by the Customer and in line with MoJ Policy.</p>  <p>Travel and subsistence policy and</p>

GDPR	See Contract Terms Schedule 7 (Processing, Personal Data and Data Subjects
Alternative and/or additional provisions (including Schedule 8 (Additional clauses)):	N/A

FORMATION OF CONTRACT

BY SIGNING AND RETURNING THIS LETTER OF APPOINTMENT (which may be done by electronic means) the Supplier agrees to enter a Contract with the Customer to provide the Services in accordance with the terms of this letter and the Contract Terms.

The Parties hereby acknowledge and agree that they have read this letter and the Contract Terms.

The Parties hereby acknowledge and agree that this Contract shall be formed when the Customer acknowledges (which may be done by electronic means) the receipt of the signed copy of this letter from the Supplier within two (2) Working Days from such receipt

For and on behalf of the Customer: **Ministry of Justice**

Name	REDACTED
Title	REDACTED
Signature	REDACTED
Date	REDACTED

We accept the terms set out in this letter and its Annexes, including the Conditions.

For and on behalf of the Supplier: IFF Research Ltd

Name	REDACTED
Title	REDACTED
Signature	REDACTED
Date	REDACTED

ANNEX A

Customer Project Specification

Title of Request:	Process Evaluation of Investment Package to Reduce Reoffending
Estimated Total Value:	£250,000.00
Duration of Engagement:	12 Months
Required Commencement Date:	14th July 2021 (Contract signed by Supplier) “Subject to Change”

1. Introduction

The MoJ is a major government department, at the heart of the justice system. It is a ministerial department, supported by 34 agencies and public bodies. The organisation works together with other government departments and agencies to protect and advance the principles of justice. Our vision is to deliver a world-class justice system that works for everyone in society. HMPPS support the justice system, working with many agencies, organisations and partners to carrying out sentences given by the courts, either in custody or the community, making prisons safe and rehabilitating those in care through education and employment.

Each year millions of people use our combined services across the UK - including at courts, tribunals and prisons in England and Wales. We have a challenging agenda to provide a more effective, transparent, and responsive criminal justice system for victims and the public, as well as providing fair and simple routes to civil and family justice. We also work to protect the public and reduce re-offending, by managing offenders from the point at which they are charged to the end of their sentence, providing supervision and support as they are reintegrated into society.

Tackling crime is a top priority for this Government. In 2018/19, around 80% of those convicted or cautioned had already received at least one previous conviction or caution. The MoJ Sentencing White Paper, A Smarter Approach to Sentencing (September 2020), set out our priorities in addressing reoffending as accommodation, employment and substance misuse treatment for prison leavers.

Getting prison leavers into accommodation is key because it provides a strong foundation for individuals to access treatment for addictions and mental health problems if they need it, find work and access other services to help reduce the likelihood of reoffending. It also enables better management of offenders back into the community in a way which maximises public protection. Findings from a report published by HMIP in 2020 showed that for service users released to settled accommodation, the percentage recalled or resentenced to custody was almost half than of those without such accommodation on release.

REDACTED

The three stands of the package are:

- Community Accommodation Service -Tier 1 (CAS-1) Approved Premises (AP) Investment
 - Which aims to increase the effectiveness of public protection through workforce recruitment and professionalisation, continued prioritisation of maintenance provisions across the estate, and trialling the roll-out of a new drug testing regime with the view to improving accuracy and efficiency (anticipated to launch in the Midlands).
- Community Accommodation Service -Tier 3 (CAS-3) Provision
 - Which aims to house prison leavers, and those moving on from Approved Premises and Bail, Accommodation & Support Services (BASS) provision, across five probation regions, who are ‘at risk of homelessness’ into temporary accommodation for up to 84 days following release.

- This strand includes funding for Housing specialists (a custody-based role), to work with key accommodation related partners, including Commissioned Rehabilitation Services, Homelessness Prevention Teams and Local Authorities, to support the Head of Reducing Reoffending to be more strategic in their approach to reducing homelessness on release for prison leavers.
- Prisons trialling new approaches
 - This strand aims to enhance support within prison, and ‘through the gate’ by testing several new roles and initiatives designed to improve accommodation, education, employment, health, and substance misuse outcomes in a variety of combinations across 16 male and female prisons.

The 16 prisons trialling new approaches aim to support those who are still in custody (prisoners) whilst the Approved Premises Investment and the Community Accommodation Service Provision are strands looking to support those once they have left custody (prison leavers).

This specification sets out the requirements for a suitably qualified and experienced Supplier to conduct research and analysis around a process evaluation of the **REDACTED** reducing reoffending package (RRP) and subsequent three strands of work.

This project is being commissioned by the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) Data and Analytical Services Directorate (DASD), working in conjunction with Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS). This project is being commissioned through the CCS Research Marketplace Dynamic Purchasing System, framework ref: RM6018 Research Marketplace (DPS).

2. Background to the Requirement

The Reducing Reoffending Investment Package

Below provides an overview of the three strands of work within the overarching package, and the activities within each, with the overall aim to contribute towards reducing reoffending.

Each work strand of the RRP is supported by a theory of change (ToC) map (see **ANNEX 3 – Theory of Change Models**). The ToC starts by defining the inputs (e.g., more staff), outlining the activities that will result from these inputs (e.g., running a course), the expected outputs (e.g., offenders taking part in a course) and ending with the intermediate outcomes (e.g., improved skill levels) and longer-term impacts (e.g., improvement in employment rates).

The process evaluation is one strand of a larger evaluation strategy undertaken over a longer timescale by MoJ in-house analysts, to include monitoring of metrics/ management information data, and an impact feasibility study to explore the best possible methods for an impact evaluation.

1) Community Accommodation Service -Tier 1 (CAS-1) Approved Premises (AP) Investment

Approved Premises (APs) play an essential role in the supervision and management of offenders who pose the highest risk of harm to others and who can no longer be lawfully contained in prison. Priority is given to those who pose a risk of serious harm to children, known victims and the public, as well as to themselves. The key purpose of an AP is to safeguard public protection through management of risk, additional restrictions and supporting rehabilitative activities. There are approximately 2,200 bed spaces across 100 Approved Premises in England and Wales.

The AP investment looks to increase efficiency across four key components: upskilling the workforce; supporting the rehabilitation of residents; improving the quality, timeliness and placement of referrals and developing new Business

Systems to effectively and efficiently support operations. Additional workforce positions will fund both front-line and support roles to support staff development and take-up of training opportunities.

Another element of this strand looks to continue work on prioritising and coordinating maintenance provisions across all sites. Increasingly, the estate is in need of repair, and this includes some significant works. Without maintenance investment across APs, it is likely some sites will have to close for extended periods of time, thus reducing capacity to deliver vital public protection work. Therefore, this aspect of the strand looks to continue work on prioritising and coordinating maintenance provisions across the estate.

Additionally, selected sites (anticipated in the Midlands) will also trial roll-out of a revised drug testing regime as a proof of concept to improve efficiency in substance misuse supervision by switching from a saliva-based test to a urine-based test, known to have better accuracy. This has the aim to improve the enforcement of abstinence from substance misuse and offenders' accommodation outcomes.

There are some additional initiatives within the same space as the Approved Premises investment, however, are not funded by the **REDACTED**. Suppliers should factor in these activities when designing and conducting the evaluation but are not required to evaluate these additional activities. They are therefore considered out of scope:

- An increase in national capacity by 50-60 beds
- Provision and installation of a national Wi-Fi service for APs
- Enhancements to the security within the AP estate via better quality CCTV (Closed Circuit Television), body worn tech and related specialist training for staff.

2) **Community Accommodation Service – Tier 3 (CAS-3) Provision**

The CAS-3 provision looks to offer up to 84-days of temporary provision for prison leavers, along with individuals moving-on from Approved Premises or BASS provision, who are at risk of homelessness in the following five probation regions: Greater Manchester, Northwest, East of England, Yorkshire and Humber and Kent, Surrey, and Sussex. Note that the mechanism of delivery varies slightly for Greater Manchester. More details will be provided upon award of the contract.

Housing specialists will be recruited as part of this work strand (See **CAS-3 Provision and Prisons overlap text below**) paragraph 21 for further details.

Additionally, as part of the CAS-3 service, low level pastoral support will be provided to assist the individual to maintain the temporary accommodation. Overall, the activities within the CAS-3 strand of work aim to contribute towards delivering improved long-term accommodation outcomes for offenders.

3) **Prisons trailing new approaches**

There are 16 Prisons involved. Each prison will be operating one or more of the following initiatives in a variety of combinations (see **ANNEX 4**). There are six types of specialist roles across four work-strands. However, Accommodation and Employment are offered together under a resettlement theme so a prison will either have both or neither specialist roles.

The work strands and specialist roles are as follows:

- **Accommodation**
Reduce the number of prison leavers released with no fixed abode by introducing housing specialists, strengthening partnerships with key stakeholders.
 - Specialist role: Housing Specialists
- **Employment**
Develop an employment candidate matching system and provide greater strategic direction in ensuring prison leavers are matched to appropriate job vacancies. Prisoners will also be helped with preparation via CV writing support and mock interview sessions.
 - Specialist role: Employment Leads
- **Education**
Review and improve the prison education offer and expand learning beyond the classroom, including but not

limited to workshops and digital platforms. Strengthen assessment processes and related follow up support for those with neurodiversity needs, within the classroom and across the prison more broadly. These roles aim to increase the number of offenders in education and subsequently in employment post-release.

- Specialist roles: Curriculum and Learning Progression Leads, and Neurodiversity Support Managers

- **Health & Substance Misuse**

Strengthen the continuity of care by improving local pathways into substance misuse and health services through partnership working. These roles will look to drive forward delivery of the prisons Drug Strategy, with specific focus on reducing demand and supporting recovery across the prison and to improve staff training and provision of substance misuse and mental health services.

- Specialist roles: Drug Strategy Managers (custody based), and Health and Justice Partnership Coordinators (community based).

Each prison will lead on a single theme (i.e. Accommodation & Employment, Education, or Health & Substance Misuse) apart from HMP New Hall and HMP Berwyn who are leading all themes. Contracts for all specialist roles will end 31st March 2022, regardless of start date. The prisons will be employing a test, learn, adapt approach over the course of the programme lifecycle. This means there may be inconsistencies in the implementation between prisons. Further, subject to ministerial approval there is potential for additional strands of this work stream to be phased in over the lifetime of the project, where prisons are not already trialling the full package. Bidders will be expected to take these design features into account and build the appropriate level of flexibility into their approach to evaluation.

CAS-3 Provision and Prisons overlap

Several of the prisons trialling new approaches fall within the CAS-3 probation regions. Some prison leavers may be released from one of these prisons into a CAS-3 region, meaning there will be a cohort of prison leavers who have experienced both a prison trialling the new approaches and the CAS-3 service.

Twenty housing specialists will be recruited in total, spanning CAS-3 regions and prisons. Ten of these specialists are in the prisons trialling a new approach, of which seven are located in CAS-3 regions. A further ten will be recruited in other prisons within CAS-3 regions, but which not part of the 16 prisons trialling the new approach; these specialists will be recruited as part of the CAS-3 work strand. Recruiting housing specialists aims to strengthen collaborative working with Local Authorities and improve the quality of referrals made under the Homelessness Reduction Act (2017).

The overlap in prisons trialling the new approach and those releasing into CAS-3 regions, as well as additional factors which may affect the context of the delivery of work streams such as prison type, region of release and gender of prisoners/prison leavers are detailed in ***ANNEX 4 – Prisons Trialling New Approaches and CAS3 Regions***

Work Strand Delivery Timelines

It is important to note that different strands will be working to different timelines and therefore some strands may be less/further into implementation during fieldwork periods.

Table 1. Projected delivery timeline across the work strands

Strand	Projected Implementation and delivery
Approved Premises Investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • April 2021 – Key maintenance jobs identified for the first quarter and some jobs have commenced. Strategic planning board has met and begun to plan activity for second and third quarter • July 2021 – Anticipated recruitment to central teams complete; policy framework completed for drug strategy • August 2021 – Sessional staff hours increased to provide cover for permanent staff on training; Managing Violence training available; procurement of new drug testing kits • September 2021 – All training in place including for Probation Service Officers (PSOs) • October 2021 – Drug strategy leads in place; Trial urine-based drug testing begins • January 2022 – Interim review of drugs testing trial • End March 2022 – Funding ends
Community Accommodation Service – (CAS3) Provision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • April 2021 – Procurement of provision begins • July 2021 – Service provision begins • End March 2022 - Last day of accepting a Person on Probation onto this scheme • 22nd June 2022 – End of scheme (84 days after the last date a Person on Probation can be accepted)
Prisons Trialling New Approaches	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • April 2021 - Recruitment activities • June/July/August 2021 – Specialists in post • End of March 2022 – End of scheme

Other Initiatives

There are various other programmes and initiatives within the same space as the above work strands. For example, Project ADDER (Addiction, Diversion, Disruption, Enforcement and Recovery) involves coordinated drugs enforcement, diversion, and treatment activity in seven locations in England, Scotland, and Wales and there are several interventions within the Rough Sleeping strategy to help create a rapid rehousing pathway so that people who sleep rough are moved into permanent accommodation as quickly as possible.

Some programmes may also build on initiatives included within the RRP. For example, a Private Rented Sector (PRS) access programme for prison leavers across 2021/22 called 'Accommodation for Ex-Offenders' is being developed by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG). This will build on and support MoJ's transitional accommodation provision and the broader resettlement theme across the RRP with an objective to support offenders to secure settled accommodation. MHCLG are working closely with the MoJ specifically the CAS-3 delivery team to ensure join up on communications and practice between HMPSS and Local Authorities (LAs).

The Supplier should consider overlaps with other initiatives where possible when conducting the research and interpreting findings. Note the above does not constitute an exhaustive list of such initiatives.

1. Requirement

Purpose

The process evaluation will provide a greater understanding of what has happened and why, during roll out and early implementation; examining the barriers and facilitators that influence delivery within different contexts, how barriers can be overcome, and highlighting early success and good practice. The process evaluation will feed back emerging findings across all three strands to help improve delivery as they progress, it will also inform prospective designs and potential larger scale roll out of similar activities in the future.

Activity to be Undertaken

The process evaluation will require two phases of data collection. The first phase involves early data collection (within the first few months of activity rollout) and the second occurring approximately six months later, once processes have had an opportunity to bed in as business as usual.

The Supplier (successful bidder) will be required to ensure emerging findings are fed-back to the Authority during August and September 2021 for internal use. The Supplier will be required to deliver a comprehensive and robust evidence base within the timeframe set by the Authority. The provisional timetable following award is listed in section 11, 'Timetable' (Table 3).

The process evaluation will be separate from, but complementary to monitoring information collected regularly by the Authority over the lifecycle of the programme. The monitoring information will feed into an impact evaluation (subject to feasibility) operating over a longer timescale in-house. It is expected that aggregated monitoring information will be shared with the Supplier. Where appropriate, the process evaluation should provide a narrative to the data and trends captured over the monitoring period.

To respond to this tender, prospective suppliers (bidders) must provide information on how they will research aims 1-3 Detailed in section 4. This should include:

- a. A proposal for an appropriate methodological approach for the process evaluation, including how this will be delivered in practice across phases one and two of data collection, analysis methods and reporting;
- b. A plan for determining how they will work with the Authority and relevant partners; and
- c. A plan to meet the demand of the timeframe outlined in the timetable section of this document.

Bidders' abilities to meet the requirements above will be evaluated from the information and examples provided in their bid response using the Technical Criteria outlined in **Appendix D - ITT Response Guidance**. Please ensure these criteria are clearly addressed in the response.

Methodological Approach

It is important to note the different strands will be working to different timelines as outlined in Table 1 (Work Strand Delivery Timelines) and therefore, some strands may be less/further into implementation upon different data collection phases. Bidders must outline in full their proposed methods and what information each approach described will provide to the process evaluation. It is expected that the approach will be sensitive to potential geographical and contextual differences between the activity areas.

Care must be taken to coordinate fieldwork around any existing research and evaluation activities occurring within the same regions and sites in the same time frame, to minimise the risk of confusion about ongoing research, and the risk of overburdening participants.

The Authority will be collecting monitoring information from each work strand. Aggregate data will be available to provide to the supplier as an additional data source to understand the activities under each work strand. The Authority anticipates that this information will assist the Supplier in interpreting any data they collect. The Supplier should use the Theory of Change maps and any other supporting documentation provided by the Authority to assist them when developing

research materials, and when constructing a narrative to explain the mechanisms for change identified within this Process Evaluation.

Bidders should consider the best methodology (or mixture of methods) to capture all necessary aspects of research, to provide the most in-depth and robust data in the given time frames, whilst retaining confidentiality and minimising risk.

Bidders must set out the fieldwork methods to be used i.e. focus groups, interviews, surveys, and the expected methods of analyses as well as clearly setting out how their plans will minimise the burden on clients and ensure the research is interactive and collaborative. Qualitative in-depth interviews with staff, prisoners/ prison leavers, providers and other key stakeholders are anticipated at both phases of fieldwork. Bidders may wish to consider administering surveys at strategic points throughout the process evaluation period, as necessary.

Bidders should consider the logistics around remote fieldwork due to COVID-19 restrictions, and the implications on methods suggested.

Bidders may wish to consider the feasibility and merit of including follow up interviews with prisoners/ prison leavers after they have left the service or establishment, or upon refusal of service take-up (e.g. if eligible prison leavers do not take up the offer of CAS-3 provision). Bidders must provide details of how they will select an appropriate sample of prisons, CAS-3 regions and AP establishments for adequate coverage depending on combinations of work strands, geographical region, and any other relevant factors. Bidders must also provide details of the proposed sample size and sample frame at an individual level. The Authority will review and confirm a final sample with the Supplier once the contract is awarded.

The Supplier will be expected to work with the Authority to expand on, and tailor the research questions listed within this document towards each particular respondent type. The Authority will input into and sign off all data collection tools produced by the Supplier (including participant information sheets, and consent forms). The supplier must build in time to incorporate feedback from the Authority into material development timeline. Bidders must also describe how they will seek input from a range of different staff, prisoners, prison-leavers, and stakeholders to ensure they are able to answer the questions set out above.

Bidders must demonstrate expertise in completing research using the proposed methods, including details of previous similar research where appropriate. Possible COVID-19 pandemic restrictions must be taken into consideration when proposing the most appropriate methodology to data collection.

Ethical issues

Bidders must detail the ethical implications of the process evaluation design, fieldwork, data analysis and reporting of the process evaluation and how they will address these. Evaluation shall be in accordance with relevant professional guidelines on ethical evaluation practice (for example, Government Social Researcher (GSR) Professional Guidance: Ethical Assurance for Social Research in Government (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ethical-assurance-guidance-for-social-research-in-government>)).

Bidders will detail how they will address, at a minimum, the following:

- Honesty to practitioners and participants about the purpose, methods and uses of the process evaluation;
- Participant confidentiality and anonymity;
- The independence and impartiality of researchers in relation to the subject of evaluation; and
- Risks to researchers and subjects (e.g. health and safety)

Reporting and governance arrangements

The Authority will nominate a contract manager, who will be the Suppliers first point of contact during the project and will manage all administrative issues and contractual and technical matters. They, or a nominated replacement, will be available to deal with queries, be responsible for liaising with other colleagues during the course of the project, and ensure all parties are kept up to date on progress.

The Supplier will be obliged to keep the MoJ contract manager informed of progress by means of regular updates as required. Arrangements will be agreed by the MoJ project manager and the Supplier and will likely include a combination of telephone and email updates as well as face-to-face meeting (if/when appropriate). The project initiation meeting (if

not virtual) will be held at the Ministry of Justice HQ (Westminster or Canary Wharf, London). The Authority shall reserve the right to call additional meetings when deemed necessary.

The Authority will set up an evaluation steering group, comprising government officials from MoJ/HMPPS and other relevant stakeholders. It is crucial for the success of the process evaluation that the steering group is fully involved in the project as it develops, and the Supplier will be obliged to provide updates at steering group meetings. Any issues emerging between meetings will be discussed between the MoJ contract manager and the Supplier project manager.

Risks

Bidders must identify and assess the key risks associated with undertaking the research and propose how these may be managed and mitigated. The Supplier will be required to develop a full risk register on award of the contract, for sign off by the Authority.

Project Management

The project manager nominated by the Supplier must have sufficient experience, seniority and time allocated to manage the project effectively.

It is expected that following the project initiation meeting, regular contact will take place between the Supplier and the Authority by email, phone/video calls, and face to face meetings as appropriate. The frequency and format of contact will be agreed at the project inception meeting. This will be in addition to the three evaluation steering group meetings.

Quality assurance

All outputs shall be accurately drafted and proof-read before submission to the Authority. Poor quality outputs will be rejected by the Authority.

The Supplier must commit to undertaking quality assurance of all deliverables and provide details of the quality assurance procedures they have in place. The Supplier will guarantee the accuracy of all outputs, and detail what quality assurance processes have been undertaken. All research tools and project outputs will be agreed with the Authority.

2. Aims

Research Aims

The research aims of the process evaluation are to:

- 1) Provide evidence of the mechanisms of roll-out, implementation and delivery of the three work strands, and the overarching package. This includes:**
 - a. What has gone well, what the challenges have been, and what lessons have been identified for future adaptation and rollout; and**
 - b. What are the barriers and enablers, and what progress has been made towards activities moving into 'business as usual'.**
- 2) Capture evidence of prisoner and prison leavers' experiences and journeys through one or multiple work strands, activities, or initiatives**
- 3) Capture evidence of how (if at all) programmes, activities or initiatives have led to improved outcomes for staff and/or prisoners/ prison leavers.**

Two phases of data collection are envisaged; phase one within the first few months of rollout, phase two will take place approximately six months later. The main focus of the fieldwork is to explore the process of implementing and delivering the package (research aim 1). Phase one of the process evaluation aims to provide evidence on the early set-up of activities and the initial barriers and facilitators to implementation in each strand of work. Phase two will further explore implementation to determine how far the activities have successfully embedded into 'business as usual' considering new or persisting barriers and facilitators to this, and lessons learnt. In addition, experiences of the journey that

prisoners/ prison leavers take through the initiatives (research aim 2) should be explored throughout. Staff and prisoner/prison leavers outcomes (research aim 3) are likely to be explored mainly in the second phase of fieldwork.

It is anticipated that research aims one and two will be explored throughout both phases of data collection, with exploration of progress towards activity becoming 'business as usual' included in the second phase of fieldwork. Research aim three will mainly be explored in the second phase of fieldwork, once outcomes have started to emerge. Evidence collected on outcomes by the Supplier will be supplemented by additional monitoring work conducted in-house by MoJ analysts detailed in section 3 'Requirements'.

The work shall seek to meet the three research aims by answering the following research questions and collecting and analysing new data from MoJ and HMPPS staff, providers, key stakeholders, prisoners and prison leavers.

Bidders must outline how they will address the following research questions for each of the three work strands. The list of research questions is not exhaustive and will be finalised with the Supplier once the contract has been awarded, bidders must make explicit all assumptions underlying their methodology. The Supplier may suggest additional research questions however, any additional questions must remain within the specified budget.

Research Questions

Research aim 1a: Provide evidence of the mechanisms of roll-out, implementation and delivery of each individual strand and the overarching package. What has gone well, what the challenges have been, and what lessons have been identified for future adaptation and rollout?

- a) How much progress has been made in introducing and implementing the package as a whole?
- b) How are the services/activities being managed centrally?
 - I. What governance procedures are in place, and how successful are they in practice?
 - II. What mechanisms are there for delivery/implementation leads to feed back to central governance?
 - III. Have the strands and activities across the package been clearly aligned and sequenced, with clearly specified targets and goals?
 - IV. How successfully have the aims and broader context of the package been communicated centrally?
- c) How have activities within each work strand been introduced and implemented?
 - I. How far does implementation match the agreed service specifications (including where services have been procured)
 - II. What were the main enablers/ facilitators to implementing activities?
 - III. What, if any, barriers have there been to implementing activities as planned, and how have these been overcome?
 - IV. Have any activities been easier or harder to progress than expected?
 - V. How successful is partnership working in delivering intended activities?
 - VI. What is being done to understand and meet the needs of all prisoners and prison leavers?
 - VII. What considerations (if any) have been made to ensure the needs of prisoners and prison leavers with specific characteristics are being met; for example, females, individuals from a BAME background, the older population, those with health needs?
 - VIII. What are the main lessons learned for future implementation?
- d) What level of engagement has there been with activities and strands at each site/ region?
 - I. Are staff/ providers/ prisoners and prison leavers aware of activities and broader strand?
 - II. How has activity been communicated to staff/ providers/ prisoners and prison leavers?

- III. Do staff/ providers/ prisoners and prison leavers understand the objectives under each activity and broader strand?
 - IV. How do staff and providers feel about the new activities?
 - V. What feedback mechanisms are in place to ensure the provision of high-quality services/activities?
 - VI. What are the key reasons for uptake/ refusal of service or initiatives by prisoners/ prison leavers (for example, where CAS-3 provision is offered to eligible prisoners but not taken up)?
- e) How does the broader context such geographical differences, combined delivery of multiple strands, and delivery of other programmes or initiatives affect implementation of the package?
- I. What (if any) are the differences in implementation between regions/individual sites, and how does this affect success of implementation?
 - II. What mechanisms are there for sharing resources and learning between strands and regions/sites, and how effective are they?
 - III. Where multiple strands are delivered together, is there any added value for staff or prisoners/ prison leavers above the 'sum of their parts'?

Research aim 1b: Provide evidence of the mechanisms of roll-out, implementation and delivery of each individual strand and the overarching package. What are the barriers and enablers, and what progress has been made towards activities moving into 'business as usual'?

- f) How much progress has been made towards embedding activities from each work strand into 'business as usual'?
- I. How have existing processes changed?
 - II. Have any new barriers or facilitators emerged?
 - III. How have any existing barriers and facilitators affected integration into business as usual?
 - IV. What are staff, prisoners and prison leavers attitudes towards the activities beyond early implementation?
 - V. Where services are near to the end of their funding period, how far have the activities/initiatives got in working towards ensuring the different/combined strands impacts are sustained for prisoners and/or prison leavers?

Research aim 2: Capture evidence of prisoners and prison leavers experiences and journeys through one or multiple work strands, activities or initiatives:

- a) What are prisoners and/or prison leavers experiences from implementation of and participation in activities/services?
 - I. What do they identify as the barriers or enablers to accessing/participation in activities or services?
 - II. What is the perceived quality and level of support?
- b) To what extent have the strands' activities influenced prisoners and/or prison leavers confidence in and awareness of relevant services?
 - I. How accessible do prisoners and/or prison leavers perceive the activities/services to be?
- c) What have been the experiences of prisoners and/or prison leavers in locations with multiple/combined activities?
- d) Is the 'lived' prisoner and prison leaver journey aligned with the Authority's perceived/expected user journey (MoJ outputs on earlier work will be made available to the supplier once a contract is in place)?
 - I. If different, what are the reasons/causes for this?
 - II. Are any differences related to specific prisoner/prison leaver characteristics and how so?

- III. Do prisoners/ prison leavers attitudes toward the various activities or initiatives change over time?

Research aim 3: Capture how (if at all) programmes, activities or initiatives have led to improved outcomes for staff and/or prisoners/prison leavers:

- a) What are the outcomes for staff?
 - I. How confident are staff at navigating the activities?
 - II. Are the processes / pathways clearer or systems easier to navigate?
 - III. Do staff feel they have the appropriate training, knowledge and tools to support prisoners and/or prison leavers?
 - IV. How, if at all, have communication and relationships with wider partners changed?
 - V. How supported do staff feel within their roles?
- b) What do staff perceive the outcomes to be for prisoners and/or prison leavers?
 - I. Does the perceived outcome on prisoners/prison leavers differ across regions or sites?
 - II. What effect (if any) have the activities had on the 'rehabilitative culture' within prisons?
- c) What outcomes do prisoners and/or prison leavers identify as a result of the activities?
 - I. How, if at all, do outcomes differ across regions/specific sites?
 - II. How, if at all, do outcomes differ depending on prisoner/ prison leaver characteristics (e.g., gender, age, ethnicity, health status)?
 - III. Were there any elements of the strands which made prisoners and/or prison leavers more or less likely to engage?
- d) What were the outcomes for stakeholders and partnering bodies?
- e) How do staff and stakeholders feel the activities/initiatives have changed their ways of working?
- f) Were there any unintended consequences from the activities within the strands of work?
- g) What changes, if any, should be made to the package/ service specifications (including where services have been procured) to ensure anticipated outcomes are being met?

3. Objectives (Measurable Outputs)

Over the period of the contract the Supplier must deliver:

- a. Weekly progress updates (via telephone or email); frequency may be adjusted subject to agreement between the Supplier and Authority.
- b. A detailed research plan and project timeline (following a project initiation meeting with MoJ)
- c. Regularly updated Risk Register (reviewed monthly)
- d. Research tools prior to both phases of fieldwork, to be signed off by the Authority (e.g. data collection tools/ discussion guides/ surveys and protocols for consent in line with GDPR requirements)
- e. Recruitment, fieldwork, and analysis of the relevant samples across two phases of fieldwork
- f. Monthly updates for the wider evaluation steering group for the Reducing Reoffending Investment Package; to include emerging findings during fieldwork periods (this is essential during the early stages of Phase 1 fieldwork).
- g. Interim report for internal use of findings after phase one of fieldwork
- h. Presentation of findings from the interim report and final report; either remotely or in-person subject to COVID-19 restrictions. These are likely to take place within the three Evaluation Steering Group meetings.

- i. A final report of a publishable standard (maximum 25 pages unless agreed otherwise) covering the entire process evaluation findings and concise 'best practice' documents detailing practical delivery advice for use within each setting

The anticipated timelines for the outputs can be found in Section 11 'Timetable', Table 3. It is expected that data collection will need to start rapidly after the initiation meeting.

The Supplier will provide all written outputs in plain English. All written outputs must be quality assured and proofread by the Supplier before submission to the Authority. All outputs will be reviewed and cleared by the Authority. The structure of the final report must be agreed with the Authority prior to drafting. The final report must be produced in line with MoJ Publications Guidance for External Authors (**ANNEX 1 and 2**) and will undergo a peer review process. The Supplier will be required to amend the final report to address all reasonable comments provided via peer review, prior to the final report being agreed as the final output.

The final research report will be considered for publication on /GOV.UK. The Authority holds the final decision on the appropriate dissemination of findings. Findings must not be published or disseminated by the Supplier without permission from the Authority.

4. In Scope, Out of Scope

The following tasks are within the scope of requirement and the Supplier will:

- Co-design, with the Authority, and stakeholders (where appropriate/ feasible) the process evaluation methodology. This will include agreeing the final methodological approach for the process evaluation. It is expected that the approach will be sensitive to potential geographical and contextual differences between the sites participating in the various strands of work.
- In collaboration with the Authority, agree appropriate samples, and recruit respondents. The Authority will facilitate by providing contact details for establishments, and breakdowns of staff roles at each site/ region.
- Design qualitative data collection tools to collect evidence on experiences, perceptions, and attitudes across a range of sites and stakeholders including but not limited to prisoners, prison leavers, project delivery staff, prison and probation staff and senior leaders, providers of relevant prison and probation services, Local Authority (LA) staff, MoJ and HMPPS HQ staff, and other key stakeholders. Quantitative tools (such as surveys) may also be required where appropriate. All research materials must be signed off by the Authority. The Supplier will ensure that data is collected with due respect to ethical considerations, with minimal burden on the supplier and stakeholders.
- Consider methodological implications of data collection within the prison and probation estate while COVID-19 remains a factor. Whilst the Supplier will not be required to submit a National Research Council (NRC) application or NRC COVID-19 Risk Assessment, NRC guidance produced by MoJ and HMPPS should be considered when selecting appropriate research methodology. Research across the prison and probation estate is subject to COVID-19 Restrictions as detailed in the 'Data Collection Methods' section of **ANNEX 5 - The National Research Committee's Medium-Term Plan**.
- Conduct fieldwork and agreed analyses to gain insights on the implementation and delivery process across the three strands of work.

- Attend a project inception meeting with the Authority, provide regular project updates (including updated risk registers), provide summaries of emerging findings during fieldwork, and attend three Evaluation Steering Group Meetings.
- Produce an interim report for internal use covering phase one, and a final report of a publishable standard (maximum 25 pages unless agreed otherwise) covering the entire process evaluation findings. The Supplier will also be expected to produce concise 'best practice' documents for use within each setting, with practical advice outlining 'best practice'/'lessons learnt'.
- Consider the qualitative and quantitative data collected as part of the process evaluation alongside other available data sources to answer the research objectives such as the MI monitoring data routinely collected by the Authority as part of the wider evaluation strategy for RRP.

The following tasks are outside the scope of the requirement:

- Collection of Performance Management Information for ongoing monitoring of the programme
- An impact evaluation using performance MI data, or MoJ data on reoffending or other intermediate or long-term outcomes;
- An economic evaluation to determine the costs and benefits of implementing the various strands of work as part of reducing reoffending investment package.
- Evaluation of any activities within the APs, prisons trialling the new approach or CAS-3 regions which are not funded from the RRP.
- The process evaluation supplier will not be responsible for the holding and transferring of participants' personal details for the purposes of administrative data linking.

5. Location of Assignment

The research is to be carried out with probation services within CAS-3 regions, CAS-1 Approved Premises, across a selection of the 16 prisons trialling new approaches; in England and Wales. Whether this work is undertaken on-site, remotely, or through a combination of these two methods, will very much depend on national guidance around COVID-19. We also wish to ensure that whatever decision is made, that the MoJ/HMPPS staff, providers or partners taking part, prisoners/ prison leavers, as well as the contractors, are comfortable with the risk management procedures in place.

It would be preferable for at least some of the research to be conducted face-to-face, due to the inclusion of prisoners/ prison leavers in the sample, and sensitive topics such as health and substance misuse. However, we anticipate that with some thought, this could also be undertaken remotely without compromising on either the quality of the research or the wellbeing of respondents and contracted researchers.

Prison and probation services have continued to operate effectively during the pandemic, holding virtual meetings (via Skype, Zoom, Microsoft Teams etc) and engaging with service users via a variety of platforms.

We invite the bidders to clarify how they would anticipate working both on site and remotely.

We anticipate the Supplier working at their usual office or home working locations for the remainder of the project. The Supplier may be invited for in-person presentation of the results, depending on COVID-19 restrictions.

6. Regulatory requirements

Are there any regulatory requirements the need to be considered? Please list.

Contractors should as a minimum be able to comply with:

- The Government's Social Research Code and publications protocol <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-government-social-research-code-people-and-products>
- Ethical Assurance for Social Research in Government <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ethical-assurance-guidance-for-social-research-in-government>
- [Publishing Research and Analysis in Government](#)

7. Service Levels

This is a short-term contract with the following key deliverables:

- To provide emerging findings through two phases of fieldwork
- To produce an interim report for internal use
- To produce a high-quality research report to be considered for publication on /gov.uk
- To produce concise, practical 'best practice' guides for each setting

Once the contract is let the MoJ research team will work with the contractor to confirm the delivery dates for each stage of the project. Initial dates have been provided in the Requirements (section 3).

The MoJ research team will hold regular meetings with the Contractor to review progress, to ensure that milestones are met and to quality assure the final product to ensure it is of a high standard, meets the specification and is publishable. A draft payment schedule has been drawn up to reflect milestones (see Section 11) and will be reviewed prior to final sign off.

8. Security arrangements for Consultants

- Baseline Personnel Security Standards (of which Disclosure Scotland is a part) are a default requirement in any Research contract.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/government-baseline-personnel-security-standard>

- Please note if you require any additional/higher level security requirements

The Supplier must ensure that all staff working on the project must have or be willing/able to obtain a Baseline Personnel Security Standard (BPSS) check, as set out in '**Appendix J – Contractor personnel security requirements**' and must have, or be willing to obtain DBS clearance, should it be required by any establishments participating in the evaluation.

All data will be collated and stored in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998, Freedom of Information Act 2000, the General Data Protection Regulation (Regulation (EU) 2016/679) and Government Economic and Social Research Team guidelines - <http://www.civilservice.gov.uk/networks/gsr>. All published output from the process evaluation must be anonymous.

Bidders shall demonstrate their processes for dealing with data securely and as a minimum how they will comply with the Authority's data protection legislation in **Appendix G**. Proposals must cover how data will be transported / transferred, handled, analysed, and stored including retention schedules in line with the authority's policy on data security and use of IT equipment in **Appendix I**.

In addition to the above, the successful bidder must be willing to comply with any reasonable requests in relation to meeting the security requirements of other data controllers (e.g. agencies within the participating areas).

The Authority will own all research materials developed, data collected and outputs. Should for any reason the contract be terminated early, all research materials, data collected, analysis and outputs will be transferred to the project manager in DASD.

Bidders must detail how they will guarantee that all material considered as part of the proposed study shall be treated as confidential and that the anonymity of all parties involved shall be preserved entirely in any of the outputs. No material supplied to meet the objectives of the current study can be used by the contractor for any other purposes (e.g. newspaper, journal articles, interviews with or presentations to outside parties) unless express prior permission is granted by the Authority.

9. Timetable

- Lists key targets and/or milestones expected to be achieved
- can act as a performance indicator to enable stage or interim payments to be made against measurable deliverables.
- be specific on when you expect the outputs to be delivered
- if the completion date is fundamental to the success of the project, then say so

Table 2. Proposed Timetable up to Award (“Subject to change”)

Action	Date
eSourcing event opens, publication of ITT and clarification period commencement	7th May 2021
Deadline for submission of clarification questions	28th May 2021 - 12:00 noon
Deadline for the publication of responses to Tender Clarification questions	3rd June 2021 – 17:00
Deadline for submission of bids	11th June 2021 – 17:00
ITT responses checked for Compliance and forwarded to Evaluation Panel	15th June 2021 – 17:00
ITT responses Evaluated and forwarded back to Commercial for review	18th June 2021
Moderation Meeting	22nd June 2021 (TBC)
Notify Suppliers of Outcome and send letters via CCS DPS portal	25th June 2021
Finalise Contract Document and Letter of Appointment send via email for Adobe Signature	28th June 2021
Contract signed	14th July 2021
Project Inception Meeting	w/c 19th July 021
(HMPPS/MoJ will not be liable for any costs incurred by the supplier until the contract is signed by both parties)	

Table 3 below provides suggested milestones post-tender, with two phases of fieldwork. Different and innovative approaches are welcomed and encouraged to deliver the requirements within the maximum budget, if (a) they have benefit to answering the research questions, (b) robustness of approach is clearly demonstrated, and (c) bidders can illustrate their previous experience of utilising the approach to positive effect.

Bidders must confirm that they can meet the timetable below and outline how they will organise their team and research plan to do so. If bidders feel the milestones presented in the project specification are not feasible, they should provide their views of what can be delivered and by when. A final quality assured report must be delivered by June 2022.

Table 3: Suggested project milestones

DATE	SUGGESTED MILESTONES
WC July 5th 2021	Project Initiation meeting
By 16 th July 2021	Finalise supplier negotiations and contract signed
20 th July 2021	Attend an evaluation steering group meeting to discuss research approach/ plan.
July/ Aug 2021	Phase one research material development.
Aug/Sep 2021	Phase one data collection, feedback of findings from early implementation <i>[note a requirement for early findings from August for internal use]</i>
Oct/Nov 2021	Interim report submitted for phase one fieldwork. Attend an evaluation steering group meeting to present interim findings and discuss phase 2 fieldwork direction.
Dec 2021/Jan 2022	Phase two data collection material development
Feb/March 2022	Second wave of data collection <i>[note programme delivery ends on 31st March]</i> .
May 2022	Submit draft full report of the process evaluation, and practical guidance documents for Authority review. Present findings from the full process evaluation at an evaluation steering group meeting.
June 2022	Final draft of full report (to a publishable standard) submitted by the Supplier and cleared by the Authority.

Payment milestones

Payment milestones will be tied to achievement of key stages of the contract. An example is provided in Table 4 but this can be adapted depending on methodology. A payment by results approach will be used.

Table 4: Suggested payment milestones

Milestone and percentage of payment	Milestone	Expected date
REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED
REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED

REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED
REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED
REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED
REDACTED	REDACTED	REDACTED

10. Any other Key features

Please note down any other key features that need to be considered.

Project costs

The maximum budget allocated for the process evaluation is £250,000 (ex. VAT). This document has not specified the exact number of interviews/focus groups to be included in the research and analysis. Therefore, bids should outline within this range the best bid they can offer further to the tender requirements.

Bidders must submit clear costings for the project, including a breakdown for each phase of fieldwork, each output and project management. This must include a detailed breakdown of what activities each member of the research team will conduct with a specification of the time allocated and their daily rate; and any assumptions associated with the costs. Bidders should clearly outline costs associated with alternative research methods. Any additional costs such as travel, accommodation, subsistence, postage & printing, equipment costs must also be detailed. Bidders must demonstrate how their bid provides additional value in meeting the research aims while containing costs.

It is imperative that ALL costs are accounted for as the Authority will reserve the right to only honour payment of reasonable discrepancies and only when first agreed in advance in writing.

Cost proposals should be uploaded separately from the technical response using the Excel spreadsheet Rate Card template to the CCS portal. The pricing matrix spreadsheet can be found in the attachments for this ITT (**Appendix E – Pricing Matrix**).

Consortium Bids

Consortium bids are welcomed if the organisations are registered on the framework as a consortium, and bidders must clarify any relevant lines of responsibility among consortium members, and proposed arrangements for management and liaison with the project manager.

COVID-19 Considerations

Bidders should outline any COVID-19 transmission-related risks in conducting this research. For example, risks of conducting face-to-face interviews or circulating paper questionnaires. This includes:

- a) Any potential risks to staff and people accommodated in prison or on supervision in the community;
- b) Any potential risks to researchers;
- c) Listing the potential harms and persons potentially affected; and
- d) The control measures that will be in place to manage the risks identified.

Bidders should consider any contingency plans necessary (both in method of data collection, and timings) and build adequate flexibility into their methods design. Any alternative methods proposed as contingencies must fall within the same total costs.

11. Outcome

The measurable outputs are described in Section 5. The Supplier should deliver on these outputs within the specified time frame.

Escalation

The MoJ research team will agree more detailed milestones/timelines with the Supplier for the delivery of each stage of the project. The project will have an identified MoJ project manager who will be responsible for liaising with the Supplier and managing the project according to project management principles e.g. monitoring progress, managing risks and escalating risks and issues. The Supplier will actively manage risks, seek to mitigate them and develop contingency plans if necessary. The Supplier will be expected to nominate a lead person with overall responsibility for delivery with the same expectations around project and risk management.

As a first stage, if any difficulties arise, it is anticipated they would be resolved through the respective MoJ and Supplier's project managers. If concerns persist or become more serious, MoJ will escalate concerns to the Senior Management Team and seek guidance on the next steps.

Exit Strategy

This is a time limited piece of work intended to provide an interim and Final research report. The final report must be produced to a publishable standard to consider publication on gov.uk.

ANNEX B

Supplier Proposal

To be determined at Call for Competition stage

Copy of supplier proposal to be included here

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

Part 2: Contract Terms

To be Finalised by the Customer at Award Stage

Copy of completed T&C's to be included here

REDACTED