Heritage Horizon Awards Evaluation

NHMF 304

**Organisation The National Lottery Heritage Fund**

**Department** Business Innovation and Insight

**Title of procurement Heritage Horizon Awards Evaluation**

**Brief description of supply** Research to monitor and support the development phase of the Heritage Horizon Awards.

**Estimated value of tender** up to £45,000 (inc. VAT)

**Estimated duration** 15 months

**Heritage Fund Contact** Vanessa Moore

**Timetable** Clarification questions deadline: Midday 13th December 2021

Response deadline: Midday 7th January 2022

Clarification & Negotiation meetings: week commencing 17th January 2022

Confirmation of contract: week commencing 24th January 2022

Completion of research: End of March 2023

# 1. Overview

* 1. The National Lottery Heritage Fund (the 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 [Heritage Fund website](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/publications/strategic-funding-framework-2019-2024) for more details.
	2. The Heritage 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. In 2019 the National Lottery Heritage Fund (the Heritage Fund) announced the creation of [Heritage Horizon Awards](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/our-work/heritage-horizon-awards) (HHA) to provide major investment for ambitious projects that will transform the UK’s heritage. The concept behind the Heritage Horizon Awards is “backing big ideas, unlocking possibilities” and applications were encouraged from projects that embodied the requirement to be transformative, innovative, and collaborative. Applicants were invited to trial new ways of working and reimagine their heritage work. In 2021, funding has been awarded to [five projects from across the breadth of the UK](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/news/heritage-horizon-awards-ps50million-five-life-changing-projects) to support the development of their proposals. Following the development phase, the projects will submit an application for funding for a delivery phase.
	4. Each of the five projects is unique and the project teams have interpreted the programme concept – the requirement to be transformative, innovative, and collaborative – in ways that are appropriate to their circumstances and to the needs of their communities and stakeholders. This formative evaluation will examine the role of the HHA programme in context of the changed environment following the Covid-19 pandemic, and with greater specificity to the selected projects.
	5. The research will involve an in-depth review of the HHA programme aims, offering an opportunity to explore and gain a deeper understanding of ‘transformation’, ‘innovation’ and ‘collaboration’ in practice. This research will review and monitor the projects throughout the development phase, tracking progress and drawing our recommendations that will inform the delivery and evaluation of the HHA programme as a whole and inform the Heritage Fund’s long-term approach to large-scale investment.
	6. This research will require a highly collaborative approach. The appointed consultant will need to work closely with Heritage Fund staff and with key contacts within the five funded projects (including ROSS consultants, evaluation consultants for each project, and partners where applicable) to design approaches to monitoring and evaluation that can support the projects through their development phase and to understand the Heritage Horizon Awards programme in context with the wider work of the Heritage Fund.
	7. Communication throughout the research process to ensure the effective dissemination of research findings – to feedback learning internally and to ensure monitoring informs external communications – will be an essential component of this contract.

# Aims

* 1. The aim of this formative evaluation is monitor and learn lessons from the development phase of Heritage Horizon Awards that will inform the delivery and evaluation throughout the full project durations and inform the Heritage Fund’s long-term approach to large-scale investment.
	2. The evaluation will include three strands of research:

**Strand 1: Process evaluation:** to understand the most effective mechanisms and resourcing requirements for delivering cohort support, drawing evidence from past programmes to inform the delivery of the Heritage Horizon Awards.

**Strand 2:** **Support to design the HHA programme monitoring approach:** to collaborate with the cohort to design an approach to monitoring and tracking that will chart progress, enhance understanding of the deliverables, and assesses changes to outputs throughout the development and delivery phases.

**Strand 3: HHA outcomes mapping and evaluation design**: to inform the overall design of the Heritage Horizon Awards programme – including definition of its outcomes and a Theory of Change – and the approach to the evaluation of the long-term impact of the funded projects.

Further detail on each of the three strands is included below.

* + 1. **Strand 1: Process evaluation**

This research should examine the process for supporting projects through cohort delivery models and identify recommendations to ensure best practice. The research will draw on evidence from past programmes to provide recommendations to inform the delivery of support for the Heritage Horizon Awards. The process should be examined from the perspective of project staff (grantees) and cohort managers (programme delivery teams) at the Heritage Fund. We are particularly interested in understanding which elements of support have worked well and which were challenging and why this was the case, and resourcing implications for successful models. The findings should include recommendations that can be implemented within the development phase for the HHA programme.

The evaluation should assess:

* What elements of the cohort support have been most successful and how have these enhanced project development?
* What elements have been least successful and how could these be improved?
* What delivery formats for support are most valuable to project staff? (for example; guidance notes, knowledge sharing webinars, online discussion groups, and meetings and workshops with Heritage Fund stakeholders)
* How well has the Heritage Fund responded to grantees needs?
* What are the barriers to sharing and implementing learning?
* Is knowledge from within the heritage sector sufficient to support projects with their learning? (for example; considering the inter-disciplinary nature of many projects)
* Have cohort delivery approaches provided opportunities for learning for Heritage Fund staff?
* How can the HHA projects be supported through their development and delivery phases?
	+ 1. **Strand 2: Support to design the HHA programme monitoring approach**

This research should support the Heritage Fund to track the progress made by the Heritage Horizon Awards as project plans are developed in preparation for the applications for funding for delivery. Programme-level monitoring should assess progress and track changes to aims and outputs over the course of the development phase, evaluating the effectiveness of Heritage Fund processes in relation to accommodating and supporting the evolution of proposals. It should also identify common successes and challenges where cohort support may be beneficial (sharing learning to further achievements or address skills gaps).

This research will need to draw on the monitoring activity undertaken by individual projects, the evaluation consultant will need to work closely with project staff (grantees) to agree processes for monitoring project outputs in the development phase and design a monitoring framework for the delivery phase. We anticipate the need to deliver guidance and training to ensure the alignment of processes across the cohort, this work will be facilitated by the HHA team and Insight Manager, with support from the evaluation consultant.

The monitoring activity, working with project staff, should include:

* Design of overall programme monitoring, and alignment across projects where applicable
* Identification of successes and challenges that are common to the cohort
* Analysis of changes to project scope
* Collation and analysis of baseline data that is common to all 5 projects during their development phase (e.g. activity, engagement)
* Support for the Heritage Fund to implement monitoring during the development phase of HHA.
* Design of a monitoring framework for the delivery phase of HHA
	+ 1. **Strand 3: HHA Programme outcomes mapping and evaluation design**

This research should assess the feasibility of a programme-level evaluation of the impact for the Heritage Horizon Awards. This will include the development of a Theory of Change for the programme, working collaboratively with project staff (grantees) and the HHA team and Policy team to identify common outcomes across the cohort. This strand of research should make recommendations – for shared outcomes, indicators, research questions, and an evaluation framework – to inform the approach to the evaluation of impact.

We are interested in further understanding and defining ‘transformation’, ‘innovation’ and ‘collaboration’, with a particular focus on how innovation can be identified and embedded within projects across the breadth of our funding programmes and what this will mean for the impact of our funding.

The research should assess:

* What are the different approaches that projects have taken to the interpretation of the programme criteria: collaboration, innovation, and transformation?
* What shared outcomes for these criteria can be identified and how can these be defined and communicated to projects?
* How can the shared outcomes be put into context within the framework of the [National Lottery Heritage Fund outcomes](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/funding/outcomes) for funded projects?
* How do the approaches and outcomes compare to the expectations for the programme from Heritage Fund staff?
* What would be the benefits and challenges of evaluating the Heritage Horizon Awards projects against common outcomes?
* Are there any additional considerations for the design of funding programmes that invest at this scale? (specifically; considerations for a second round of the Heritage Horizon Awards)

# Method

* 1. The evaluative research should be conducted with:

National Lottery Heritage Fund staff including:

* HHA team (HHA programme lead and Senior Investment Managers)
* Cohort managers (from relevant past funding programmes)
* Stakeholders

Project staff (grantees) and relevant contractors including:

* Project delivery teams
* Evaluation consultants working on project-level evaluation
* ROSS consultants working with project delivery teams

We would like consultants to set out proposals for a detailed methodology.

* + 1. For Strand 1: Process Evaluation will provide access to relevant evaluation reports and internal process reviews however we anticipate the majority of this research will be conducted through interviews or focus groups with Heritage Fund staff. There is potential to invite additional perspectives from relevant individuals outside of Heritage Fund staff – for example: grantees participating in cohort delivery programmes, grantees acting as cohort managers, or cohort managers from other related funding programmes (National Lottery Community Fund programmes) – and to use surveying if appropriate.
* Interviews with Heritage Fund cohort managers (approx. 6-8 individuals)
* Additional interviews or focus groups (approx. 8-10 individuals)
* Surveys (if appropriate)
	+ 1. For Strand 2 and Strand 3 we anticipate that the work will draw on quantitative evidence for programme monitoring and collaborative workshops to undertake outcome mapping and inform recommendations for the next stage for the programme delivery and evaluation.
	1. We expect the successful bidder to take a collaborative approach; working closely with the HHA team and project staff (grantees) to define the approaches to monitoring and evaluation, and creating opportunities for wider stakeholder engagement through interviews or workshops to understand the HHA programme in context with the wider work of the Heritage Fund. Collaborative work will be facilitated and supported by the HHA team and Insight Manager.

# Outputs

* 1. The following outputs will be required from the research:

(Strand 1) Recommendations for cohort working in March 2022, including for the current HHA programme and more broadly for future programmes

(Strand 2) Framework and guidance notes to support monitoring of project outputs

(Strand 3) A Theory of Change with accompanying recommendations for indicators, research questions, and an evaluation framework in September 2022.

(Strand 2 & 3) Interim reports and slide decks

(Strand 2 & 3) A final report with structure agreed with the Heritage Fund, and slide deck in March 2023.

The deliverables will be agreed with the successful bidder on appointment.

* 1. The research will be used to inform the delivery of the Heritage Horizon Awards. We will expect the consultants to identify learnings and provide feedback throughout the duration of the contract so that we can act to make any changes to our support for the Heritage Horizon Awards cohort.
	2. 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.
	3. **A project plan with specific deliverables and timetable will be agreed with the appointed consultant. However, the Heritage Fund expects these deliverables in accordance with the following timetable:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverables/Key Milestones**  | **Due date**   |
| Procurement  | Nov -Dec 2021  |
| Inception Meeting to agree plans, including outline methodology and approach to communication  | January 2022  |
| Development of detailed methodology (including detailed proposal for working with grantees) developed in collaboration with Heritage Horizons Awards team | January 2022  |
| (Strand 1) Recommendations for cohort working, including for the current HHA programme and more broadly for future programmes | March 2022 |
| (Strand 2) Framework and guidance notes | To be agreed on appointment  |
| (Strand 3) Theory of Change development | To be agreed on appointment |
| (Strand 2 & 3) Interim report and slide deck | September 2022 |
| (Strand 2 & 3) A final report with structure agreed with the Heritage Fund, and slide deck  | March 2023  |

* 1. All reports must adhere to the Heritage Fund’s accessibility and formatting guidance (appended). We also expect reports to follow the layout advised in our evaluation guidance.
	2. 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.
	3. The initial findings will be confidential to the Heritage Fund. The Heritage Fund may prepare or commission summary reports and other materials for subsequent wider distribution, based on the results. Subsequent outputs from this contract will be published on the Fund’s website (see Appendix regarding our accessibility requirements for project reports).
	4. All reports to include appendices as agreed between the Heritage 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.
	5. The successful bidder must comply with all of the requirements of UK and European Data Protection Laws and shall ensure appropriate research consents from interviews or any data collection.
	6. 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 the week commencing the 24th January 2022 and be completed by the end of March 2023. The final report shall be submitted to the Heritage Fund by 31 March 2023.
	2. The budget for this research is up to £45,000 to include all expenses, payment to participants and VAT. The contract will be let by the National Heritage Memorial Fund.
	3. The payment schedule will be split into four payments; 25% on signing of contract, 25% on completion of Strand 1 (March 2022), 25% on the interim report (September 2022) and 25% on submission of final report in March 2023.
	4. The contract will be based on the Heritage Fund’s standard terms and conditions.
	5. The research will be managed on a day to day basis for the Heritage Fund by Vanessa Moore, Insight Manager.

# Award Criteria

* 1. A proposal for undertaking the work should be a maximum of 18 pages and include:
* a detailed method for undertaking the three strands of research;
* details of proposed mechanisms for working with Heritage Fund staff and HHA project staff
* 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; CV’s, along with any other relevant information can be provided in appendices
* 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, outlining the approach to each of the three strands of research. | 20% |
| Demonstrated relevant experience delivering collaborative, iterative research and excellent facilitation skills (e.g. experience in delivering learning events) to support dissemination of guidance and findings with various stakeholders. | 20% |
| Demonstrated relevant experience evaluating complex interdisciplinary projects within the not-for-profit setting. | 20% |
| Demonstrated that the methods selected are appropriate to the research requirements set out in this brief. | 25% |
| 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 | 15% |

## 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 Heritage 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 Heritage 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: Midday 13th December 2021
* Tender return deadline: Midday 7th January 2021
* Clarification meetings\*\* may be held with shortlisted consultants and would take place on week commencing: 17th January 2022
* The Heritage Fund will notify bidders of our procurement decision week commencing: 17th January 2022
* \*The Heritage Fund will upload responses to clarification questions on Contracts Finder.  Please note that we will make the anonymised questions, and our responses to them, available to everyone on the Heritage 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 Heritage 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 7th January 2022** to the following contact:

Diane La Rosa at Bii.Admin@heritagefund.org.uk

* 1. Please visit the [Heritage Fund's website](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/) for further information about the organisation.

**Appendix: 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 Heritage Fund. Our logo can be found on the Heritage Fund's website.

**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 Heritage 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 Heritage Fund retains the right to amend documents in order to create accessible versions for publishing.