ANNEX A

STATEMENT OF REQUIREMENTS

Feasibility study: Approaches to evaluating the design and delivery of e-safety education in schools

1.   Introduction

1.1.   The Research and Analysis team at the Independent Inquiry into Child Sexual Abuse (hereafter IICSA) is seeking to commission a feasibility study to identify potential approaches to conducting a large-scale process and impact evaluation of e-safety education[1] delivered in schools in England and Wales.

1.2.   Hereafter, the feasibility study which is the subject of this Contract is referred to as 'the feasibility study'. The large-scale process and impact evaluation, which will be informed by the feasibility study, is referred to as 'the subsequent evaluation'.

1.3.   IICSA is seeking a Contractor that can demonstrate:

   1.3.1.   very good knowledge of the subject area of risk to children and young people from online-facilitated child sexual abuse[2]
   1.3.2.   good knowledge of the existing landscape of e-safety education provision
   1.3.3.   extensive knowledge and experience of a range of evaluation methods in the school / educational context
   1.3.4.   a proven track record of delivering high quality evaluation feasibility studies
   1.3.5.   a proven track record of delivering high quality large-scale evaluations, including for government

1.4.   The requirements of the feasibility study are described in further detail below, but the main elements are:

   1.4.1.   To provide an overview of the current context of e-safety education provision

---

[1] For the purposes of this Specification, 'e-safety education' refers to programmes or initiatives that are delivered in a school setting, with the aim of educating children about online safety.

[2] 'Online-facilitated child sexual abuse' is defined as child sexual abuse where the online environment is involved at any stage of the offence. This includes the sharing of child sexual abuse material; viewing or directing the abuse of children via online streaming or video conferencing; grooming or otherwise coordinating contact offences against children.

in England and Wales (e.g. number and type of providers, format and content of programmes)

    1.4.2.   To define a sample of providers and programmes for inclusion in the subsequent evaluation

    1.4.3.   To provide a detailed outline of alternative approaches to evaluating a sample of e-safety programmes

    1.4.4.   To make a clear and reasoned recommendation for one of the approaches outlined

2. Background

2.1.   IICSA was established in 2015 to investigate whether public bodies and other, non-state institutions have taken seriously their duty of care to protect children from sexual abuse in England and Wales, and to make meaningful recommendations for change, to help ensure that children now and in the future are better protected from sexual abuse.

2.2.   IICSA is composed of three strands: Public Hearings, the Truth Project and Research and Analysis.

2.3.   Research and Analysis generates new insight into both current and non-recent child sexual abuse that will help to inform IICSA's recommendations, as well as leaving a legacy of research reports and tools/approaches on which other researchers and practitioners can build. This is achieved through a combination of drawing learning together from existing research; conducting secondary analysis of existing datasets; and undertaking primary research to fill key evidence gaps about child sexual abuse.

2.4.   IICSA currently has thirteen active investigations.[3] The Internet investigation focuses on the institutional responses to child sexual abuse including child sexual exploitation facilitated by the internet and other digital communications technologies.

2.5.   The Internet investigation is exploring the nature and extent of online CSA; the adequacy of government policy and statutory and regulatory frameworks to protect children from online CSA; and the response of law enforcement agencies, the criminal justice system and the technology industry (including internet service providers, providers of online platforms, and other relevant software companies) to online CSA.

3. Context and aim of the evaluation

3.1.   The Internet investigation will consider the effectiveness of e-safety education delivered in schools in England and Wales in protecting children from online CSA.

---

[3] See https://www.iicsa.org.uk/investigations

3.2.   To inform this element of the Internet investigation, IICSA wishes to commission a feasibility study to scope different approaches to conducting a large-scale process and impact evaluation of the delivery of e-safety education in schools in England and Wales.

3.3.   The outcome of the feasibility study will inform a subsequent evaluation, to be commissioned by IICSA in 2018. The subsequent evaluation will have a budget in the region of £300,000 and will report in 2019.

3.4.   The award of the subsequent evaluation work will be conducted as a separate procurement. It will be open to the appointed Contractor for the feasibility study to take part in the competitive tender exercise for the subsequent evaluation, but no preference will be given to the feasibility Contractor over other Tenderers in that exercise.

3.5.   The e-safety education programmes considered by the feasibility study for inclusion in the subsequent evaluation:

    3.5.1.   <u>must</u> be delivered within a school setting, either by internal or external staff. Programmes that are delivered solely as 'virtual learning' would be out of scope.

    3.5.2.   <u>must</u> involve a 'taught' element, although materials such as posters, leaflets, videos, apps and games / quizzes may form a part of programmes

    3.5.3.   <u>must</u> <u>not</u> be aimed solely at school staff or parents / caregivers (although programmes aimed at one or both of these groups as well as at children would be acceptable)

    3.5.4.   <u>must</u> focus either partly or wholly on safety from online sexual harm; where programmes cover online safety in general, they must include substantial, specific reference to, or modules dedicated to, online CSA.

    3.5.5.   <u>are</u> <u>expected</u> <u>to</u> be limited to those delivered to children within the age range 9-16 (school years 5-11). The feasibility study <u>may</u> wish to consider the viability of including programmes for a wider age range, if a clear justification for this can be provided.

4.   Approach

4.1.   IICSA recognises that there are many possible approaches to this feasibility study. IICSA is therefore open to Tenderers' proposals regarding an appropriate scope and methodology that meets the requirements as set out in this Specification.

4.2.   It is critical that the feasibility study is:

    4.2.1.   Comprehensive - thorough consideration is given to a range of approaches

and evaluation methodologies

    4.2.2.   Robust and defensible - assessments of feasibility are based on the best available evidence; the feasibility study adheres strictly to the highest ethical standards

    4.2.3.   Timely - can be completed in the time specified in this document

4.3.   The feasibility study must consider, in detail, at least two alternative approaches to conducting a subsequent process and impact evaluation of e-safety, with consideration of associated cost, resourcing, risks and benefits. It should make a clear, evidence based recommendation for one of the alternative approaches outlined.

4.4.   The recommendation for the approach to the subsequent evaluation must avoid making any assumptions or recommendations about the Contractor that will be appointed to deliver that evaluation (see 3.4 above) and should not preclude the subsequent evaluation from being undertaken by a new supplier of IICSA's appointment (subject to a secondary competitive tender exercise).

4.5.   The feasibility study should consider how the subsequent evaluation of e-safety education can achieve the highest possible evidence standards.[4]

4.6.   In addition, the feasibility study is expected to address the following considerations, with regard to the subsequent evaluation:

    4.6.1.   An overview of the current context of e-safety education provision in England and Wales (e.g. number and type of providers, format and content of programmes). The overview should take into account any e-safety education provided outside a school context (e.g. in residential care settings, youth associations, out-of-school clubs and community groups), as well as any other e-safety messages (e.g. children's charity campaigns) to which children may be exposed.

    4.6.2.   On the basis of the above overview, the proposed approach to determining how many and what type of programmes or programme providers will be in scope for the subsequent evaluation, and the rationale for this.

    4.6.3.   The extent to which it is possible to construct a typology of different models of e-safety education delivery, and for the subsequent evaluation to examine the outcomes associated with different types.

    4.6.4.   The proposed approach to determining outcomes of e-safety education in the subsequent evaluation. This should include an assessment of what outcomes data, if any, is routinely collected by e-safety education providers or their

---

[4] Examples of evidence standards for evaluations include the Maryland Scale of Scientific Methods (MSM) (Sherman et al. 1998), and the HM Treasury Guide to Quality in Policy Impact Evaluation (QPIE) (HM Treasury, 2012)

commissioners (i.e. schools), as identified from published evaluations or other sources. Outcomes may relate to children and young people receiving e-safety education, other students, staff, parents and families, and the wider school community.

4.6.5. An assessment of an appropriate time-period in which to set the baseline for the subsequent evaluation.

4.6.6. An assessment of whether it is possible to include a control or comparison group in the subsequent evaluation and how this might be achieved. This must take into account any ethical considerations (see 5.2.4).

4.6.7. An assessment of whether it is possible to isolate programme outcomes (i.e. from the effect of other e-safety messages to which children and young people are exposed) and how this might be achieved.

4.6.8. The budgetary costs involved in conducting the subsequent evaluation.

4.6.9. The timetable associated with delivering the subsequent evaluation.

4.6.10. Definition of the stakeholders in the subsequent evaluation, and an outline plan for how to engage them.

5. Ethics

5.1. Tenderers must demonstrate compliance with the IICSA Research Code of Ethics (see Appendix A of this Specification).

5.2. Tenderers should take care to show that they have considered all relevant ethical implications of conducting both this feasibility study and the subsequent evaluation. These should include, but are not limited to:

5.2.1. Gaining access to schools (e.g. DBS checks for research staff; use (if any) of incentives for participation)

5.2.2. Data protection, anonymity and confidentiality

5.2.3. Processes and procedures for safeguarding and handling a disclosure (including how to manage compliance with agreed research processes and procedures as well as those of individual school settings)

5.2.4. Mitigation of any potential adverse impacts of the research on: individual research participants, participating schools, participating e-safety education providers, and victims / survivors of CSA. This should include the ethical implications of using any control or comparison group (see 4.5.5).

5.2.5. Access to support (for both participants and the team conducting the feasibility study or subsequent evaluation)

5.3. IICSA also expects the appointed Contractor to follow their own organisation's internal ethics approval process before delivery of the feasibility study commences, and to submit evidence of internal ethical approval to IICSA.

6. Outputs and Performance Measures

6.1.   The main outputs of this contract will be as follows:

　　6.1.1.   Work plan (methodology, timeline, resourcing plan, risk register).
　　6.1.2.   Presentation of initial scoping exercise at IICSA's London offices..
　　6.1.3.   A detailed report structure for approval by the IICSA Project Lead prior to the report writing phase.
　　6.1.4.   A draft written report for submission to the IICSA internal review process. This must be a near-final version, with all sections (see 6.1.5 below) complete. unless discussed and agreed with the IICSA Project Lead beforehand.
　　6.1.5.   A full written report, containing:
　　　　● an executive summary
　　　　● a description of the methodology used in the feasibility study, making clear any assumptions made
　　　　● a detailed presentation of at least two alternative approaches to conducting a subsequent process and impact evaluation of e-safety, with consideration of associated cost, resourcing, risks and benefits
　　　　● a clear recommendation for one of the approaches outlined
　　　　● research tools and/or technical information as appendices (e.g. any stimuli or sample frames used)
　　　　● references and bibliography
　　6.1.6.   Presentation of findings at IICSA's London offices, including a slide deck for internal use.

6.2.   The full report must be of a publishable standard, and must have undergone professional proofreading, copy editing and typesetting.

6.3.   IICSA will provide the appointed Contractor with guidance on the report format and style, but the report will be branded with the Contractor's branding, and its authorship fully attributed.

6.4.   IICSA reserves the right to make any decisions relating to publication of the report, and the timing thereof. If published, the report will be Crown Copyright and licensed under the Open Government Licence.

6.5.   IICSA has an established quality assurance process for research and evaluation reports which involves three review stages. The stages and associated turnaround times are outlined below. Tenderers <u>must</u> take into account these timings, as well as the additional time required to action feedback from each review stage, in their work plan:

    6.5.1. first round feedback from IICSA Research Team (1 week)

    6.5.2. second round feedback from IICSA Research Team and wider IICSA staff (2 weeks)

    6.5.3. external peer review (3 weeks)

    6.5.4. feedback from IICSA Chair and Panel (3 weeks)

 6.6. IICSA requires the appointed Contractor to provide a sufficient level of resource throughout the duration of the contract in order to consistently deliver a quality service.

7. Partnership working and project management

 7.1. The IICSA Research Team takes a collaborative, partnership approach to working with its providers in order to ensure the project outputs meet its needs and are of the highest possible quality. IICSA therefore expects to have the opportunity to provide advice and guidance at every stage of project delivery, as well as to sign off key elements of the methodology and outputs before use (including presentation slides, as well as the final report).

 7.2. The IICSA Research Team will share details of research already undertaken, in progress, or planned internally with the appointed Contractor as appropriate. The appointed Contractor will be expected to treat any such details of unpublished research confidentially.

 7.3. The project will be managed on the IICSA side by a member of the Research Team (the 'Project Lead') who will also be the primary day-to-day contact for the appointed Contractor. The appointed Contractor will be expected to provide weekly updates to the Project Lead. This will likely be a brief weekly written report, followed up by a phone call as necessary. The precise format of updates will be agreed at project inception.

 7.4. In addition to the interview, Tenderers are required to factor in at least four face-to-face meetings at IICSA's London offices for the inception meeting, presentations of interim and final findings, and a wrap-up meeting.

 7.5. With the exception of the face-to-face meetings described above, the location of the Services will be at the appointed Contractor's premises and any fieldwork sites, as appropriate.

8. Provider skills and experience

 8.1. IICSA is seeking a provider with good knowledge of the subject area of online CSA, demonstrable expertise in a range of evaluative methods, experience of conducting feasibility studies - ideally for government clients - and a proven track record of

delivering high quality evaluations of educational programmes or comparable interventions.

8.2. Tenderers should state the qualifications of all members of the project team. It is expected that all staff nominated to deliver this Contract have at least a Masters level qualification in a relevant subject and/or that they can demonstrate equivalent relevant experience.

9. Consortium bids

9.1. IICSA encourages tenders from consortia which bring together subject matter expertise with strong project delivery experience.

9.2. Where two or more organisations wish to tender for this project as a consortium, one must be designated as the Lead Contractor. The Lead Contractor will be the main point of contact for IICSA.

9.3. The proposal should make clear how responsibilities will be split between the Lead Contractor and members of the consortium, and should outline how effective partnership delivery will be managed.

9.4. Consortium members will be required to attend the project inception meeting, presentation of findings and wrap-up meeting.

9.5. As outlined in the Instruction to Tenderers, the Lead Contractor must declare conflicts of interest that may apply to both itself and / or any consortium member, and also confirm that they adhere to the requirements outlined in the IICSA Research Code of Ethics (Appendix A of this Specification).

10. Payment milestones

10.1. Tender prices should be exclusive of travel and subsistence (T&S) and exclusive of Value Added Tax (VAT). T&S costs are payable at the rates shown at Annex D of this Invitation to Tender (ITT), all travel expenses must be approved by IICSA prior to booking.

10.2. Payment by IICSA will be in accordance with the successful delivery of outputs at the particular milestones outlined in the table below. Subject to paragraph 10.3 Tenderers must adhere to these milestones in their proposal.

10.3. If for any reason Tenderers feel that it will not be possible to deliver the Contract within the timescales indicated below, they may propose an alternative timescale for

consideration by IICSA, provided that (i) they have made every effort to align the proposed timescale as closely as possible to the original final delivery date (end March 2018), and (ii) the rationale for any divergence is clearly outlined in their bid.

10.4. To be deemed successful, the outputs must be delivered within agreed timescales, demonstrate due attention to ethical considerations, and be of a quality acceptable to IICSA. Final decisions about whether appropriate quality thresholds have been met will be the responsibility of IICSA. Payment will not be made until these thresholds are met.

10.5. Before payment can be made, invoices must be compliant with any guidance provided by IICSA.

Milestone	Description of Milestone Activity	Timescale	Payment
1	Inception meeting followed by submission and approval of detailed work plan.	mid October 2017	10%
2	Results of initial scoping exercise presented to IICSA.	mid November 2017	20%
3	Outline report submitted to IICSA.	December 2017	10%
4	First draft of full report submitted to IICSA.	Jan 2018	40%
5	Report accepted by IICSA to be satisfactory and of publishable quality.	end March 2018	20%

11. Definitions

11.1. For details of definitions and terms, Tenderers should have reference to the IICSA glossary.[5]

---

[5] https://www.iicsa.org.uk/sites/default/files/glossary.pdf