# Invitation to Tender

**Architects Registration Board:**

**Review of architects’ competence – stakeholder research**

# Introduction and summary

The Architects Registration Board (ARB) is undertaking a Review to ensure that architects have the knowledge, skills and competencies required in the 21st Century – ‘Review of architect’s competence’ (the Review). The aim of this Review is to develop a proportionate, effective regulatory model which ensures that only competent architects are eligible to join and remain on the Architects Register and provides assurance and confidence to the public.

The current [Criteria for prescribing qualifications](http://www.arb.org.uk/information-for-schools-of-architecture/arb-criteria/) in architecture have been in place since 2010. However, technological, material, environmental, educational and political contexts are constantly evolving, impacting on the skills and competencies required of architects.

The first stage of the Review comprises a) a literature review of national and international practice in the registration and regulation of architects and other registered or regulated professions in the UK and b) a Call for Evidence. The ARB is conducting this stage.

The second stage is the subject of this Invitation to Tender: a complementary review of literature; data analysis and research with a wide range of stakeholders on the role of the architect; the competencies required for entry to the Register now and in the future and how we assure the public that they have maintained their competence over their working lives. The research is expected to comprise different methodologies dependent on the stakeholder. The research will commence in May 2020 with final outputs in December 2020, and will form a vital underpinning of the next stages of the Review. The outcome of the stakeholder research must provide a robust and defensible evidence base for the development/refining of competencies, and how they are obtained and maintained, within an effective regulatory model.

# Background

## ARB and the registration of architects

ARB’s aims are to protect the users and potential users of architects’ services, and to support architects through regulation. At the core of these aims is the public expectation that those on the Architects Register will be properly qualified and competent.

Architects find themselves in the unique position of being the only statutorily regulated profession in the construction industry, which is currently subject to rapid change. It is vital that the regulatory system aids, not hampers, the profession’s ability to meet the demands of the 21st century marketplace, which has raised challenges in respect of producing safer, sustainable architecture. Those challenges have to be met in a way that both provides the public with confidence in the profession, but is proportionate and does not restrict fair access to the profession.

Statutory protection of the title ‘architect’ was first introduced in 1931 and has subsequently been maintained and developed by Government in consultation with the profession. The Architecture Registration Board (ARB) is the regulator which maintains the register of suitably qualified architects. Following the latest [Government-led Periodic Review](http://www.arb.org.uk/about-arb/dclg/periodic-review/) of the regulation of architects and the ARB (March 2017), there was a recommendation that the ARB should proceed with a review of the routes to registration to:

* Explore opportunities to streamline the prescription of qualifications in architecture;
* Consider a reduced frequency of renewing prescription and monitoring where qualifications are unchanged;
* Consider the flexibility in length and structure of architecture qualifications.

Registration is currently dependent on the successful completion of 3 stages of education and practical experience (Part 1, Part 2 and Part 3) which have been in place since 1958. Part 1 is typically a three or four year undergraduate degree; Part 2 is typically a two year second degree and Part 3 is attained on completion of 2 years practical training experience and professional examinations. In June 2018, the Institute for Apprenticeships (now the Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education) approved the standard and end point assessment for a Level 7 Degree Architect Apprenticeship, which typically encompasses a four-year programme which includes Parts 2 and 3 of the requirements for registration. At the same time, the Institute for Apprenticeships also approved the standard and end point assessment for a Level 6 degree apprenticeship (the Architectural Assistant apprenticeship). This typically encompasses a four-year programme which includes Part 1 of the requirements for registration.

## A changing context

The minimum criteria that individuals must achieve and are used for the prescription of qualifications have been in place since 2010 . There is a question of whether those criteria remain fit for purpose in a modern labour market. Technology is changing the nature of jobs across the economy. For architects, technologies such as BIM are becoming increasingly embedded as ways of working. Environmental considerations are becoming ever more urgent and not necessarily fully addressed in other laws and regulations (e.g. Building Regulations or planning legislation), whether this is about flood defence mechanisms or sustainable buildings. Client and Public expectation of the built environment are shaped by these factors.

As well as these general drivers of change, the Government’s Periodic Review highlighted that the UK’s decision to leave the EU provided an opportunity to review the requirements and the UK route to registration. [The EU’s Mutual Recognition of Professional Qualifications Directive](https://ec.europa.eu/growth/single-market/services/free-movement-professionals/policy/legislation_en) defines architects as a ‘sectoral’ profession and sets out minimum qualification requirements that enable architects to operate in any Member State. Some of ARB’s minimum requirements for registration in the UK are based on the requirements set out in the Directive. Whilst the implications of exiting the EU are still to be realised, and requirements are known to be more exacting and valued in the UK than the minimum set out, there is an opportunity to review the requirements.

Further the [‘Independent Review of Building Regulations and Fire Safety’](https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/independent-review-of-building-regulations-and-fire-safety-hackitt-review), or the ‘Hackitt Review’ instigated following the Grenfell Tower fire in 2017, called for major reform and a change of culture, with greater risk management and clearer responsibilities for everyone involved at every stage of the design, build and occupation of High Rise Residential Buildings (HRRBs). Improving competence of those in the construction and fire safety sectors is one of the many actions resulting from the Hackitt Review and ARB is working with industry on the enhanced competencies of architects and other building designers in the specific context of HRRBs.

Whilst there is the potential for demands to be increasing, there are also calls for reducing the time required to access the profession due to the rising costs of higher education and calls for wider access to the profession and different ways of qualifying to promote diversity.

Further, while people remain in the labour market longer and until they are older, there are no specified requirements for Continuous Professional Development as condition of being on the Register, other than a general expectation under the [Architects Code](http://www.arb.org.uk/architect-information/architects-code-standards-of-conduct-and-practice/) to maintain competence. An architect needs to re-register annually, but retention on the Register does not come with any requirements to demonstrate that competence has been maintained.

### Review to Ensure the Competence of Architects

In this context, ARB is embarking on a review of architects’ competences. The Aim of the Review is to **develop a proportionate and effective regulatory model which ensures that only competent architects are eligible to join and remain on the Architect’s Register and provides assurance and confidence to the public.**

The Review itself comprises a number of stages, , as shown in the diagram below and described in the following paragraphs.

**Review of Architects’ Competence**

Stage 3

Agree core competences for entry to the Register

Agree core competences for maintaining Registration

Develop new Criteria for meeting the competences

Agree pathways to registration

Consult

Work with Government to update legislation if required

Stage 1:

Review of Architect’s registration systems internationally and other UK registered occupations

Call for Evidence

Stage 4

Devise a competence monitoring regime

Develop processes to provide assurance that those entering the Register have acquired the appropriate competences (e.g. prescription processes)

Create curricula for maintaining competence as necessary

Consult

**Stage 2: This commission**

Additional literature review/data analysis

Stakeholder research

Develop analytical framework

**Stage 1 of the Review** is a desk-based literature review which is being conducted in-house by ARB. The objectives of this literature review are:

* Review the history of qualifications in architecture and access to the Architects Register in the UK
* Review the routes to registration/qualification for architects in other countries and how their registration is renewed [e.g.EU/ Australia/New Zealand/USA/Canada/South Africa]
* Review the routes to registration for selected other professions under the EU’s Mutual Recognition of Professional Qualifications Directive [e.g. Doctors/Chartered Surveyors/Engineers];
* Review a sample of qualification/accreditation/registration of other professions in UK (and internationally) [e.g. Doctors/Chartered Surveyors/Engineers]
* Identify roles of comparable regulators: duties, roles, funding
* Review the methods used by comparable regulators to ensure the quality of the qualifications being used for the purposes of registration
* Review the proportion of other regulators’ expenditure is spent on validation of qualifications/registration/promoting professional standards/fitness to practice
* Review the requirements for maintaining competence amongst other professions in the UK
* Review the requirements for maintaining competence amongst architects internationally
* Review the different models used by comparable regulators and professional bodies to monitor the ongoing competence of their registrants/members

This report will be made available to the Supplier.

The ARB is issuing a Call for Evidence – an open invitation to any interested party to submit responses to critical questions. This will enable us to gather views from a wide group of stakeholders relatively efficiently and allow us to identify potential sample for the stakeholder research commissioned here. The ARB will analyse responses to the Call for Evidence and make the analysis and, if appropriate, contact details, available to the Supplier.

**Stage 2 of the Review** is the stakeholder research commissioned in this Invitation to Tender. It is described in greater detail in the remaining sections of the Invitation to Tender. This will also include a review of literature to inform the stakeholder research and the evidence base for the Review. This will be broader than the Stage 1 literature review as illustrated in the Methodology section below.

After this first year of listening and engaging, ARB will then consider how best to reform two key areas of our work, which are setting the standards for entry to the Register and setting the standards for maintaining registration.

At this point, we will review the most appropriate model for ensuring only those with an appropriate level of competence gain access to the Register in a way that is robust, fair and proportionate.

We will also consider how best we can ensure that architects’ competence is maintained throughout their working lives in a way that is proportionate but effective. This will include the development of appropriate processes to achieve our aims.

# Aims and Objectives

## Aim

The aim of this project is to develop the evidence base for the ‘Review of architects’ competence’ and provide recommendations to the ARB on what the competencies should be for the registration of Architects; how they should be acquired and how the ARB can assure the public that architects have maintained their competence over their working lives, within a proportionate and effective regulatory model.

### Objectives

* Familiarise with ARB desk research on practices of other nations with regard to registration and regulation of architects; other regulated professions in the UK and results of Call for Evidence;
* Review of the evidence of the effectiveness of the UK Architects Registration system through available evidence and secondary data analysis. This will include a review of data sources on, for example, the role, employment and skills deficiencies of Architects. It will also include a review of negligence/failures in the architectural profession, to assess why they have occurred;
* Deliver robust research with stakeholders to gather their perspectives, and additional objective evidence, on the Research Questions below;
* Provide an objective evidence base to ARB for the development of competencies; routes; standards and the regulatory processes in the next stages of the Review.

### ARB stakeholders

ARB wish to engage with a number of different stakeholder groups across the UK to inform the evidence base, gaining a broad perspective to inform the evidence base. This includes:

* Architects Registration Board members
* Architects
* Architect practices and other employers of architects
* Consumers/clients and representative bodies
* Higher Education Institutions/Architecture Schools/ Standing Conference of Heads of Schools of Architecture/ and QA bodies (e.g. Office for Students, QAA)
* Students and graduates
* Professional bodies across the sector and allied disciplines, (e.g. RIBA, RICS, Royal Town Planning Institute)
* Other stakeholders, such as Government and associated bodies (e.g. Institute for Apprenticeships and Technical Education) and Professional Regulatory Bodies. e.g., General Medical Council
* Insurance industry
* Special Interest Groups across the UK, e.g. Historic England; Cadw; Conversation UK; Shelter; Build Offsite and CITB
* Organisations which advocate for under-represented groups within the construction sector

### Research Questions

The research will address 3 core questions:

* What skills and competencies does a 21st century architect require?
* How should those competencies be obtained and demonstrated?
* How should competencies be maintained and demonstrated?

The following is an inexhaustive list of detailed questions to consider in the design of the research. It is not expected that all stakeholder groups will be asked the same questions, or to the same depth, but this represents key questions ARB wish to address in this research.

Part A: Competences of an architect

* What is the role and function of an architect?
* What are the key competences that an architect should have today?
* What new competences are likely to be required in the next 30 years?
* Will the current Criteria provide those competences?
* Are the current Criteria sufficiently detailed to ensure consistency in skills and knowledge of architects?
* What skills and knowledge are lacking currently in the profession?
* When do/should architects accede to other specialist building professionals?
* Should architects be held to a higher ethical standard than others in the construction industry?
* What are the key ethical qualities required of an architect?
* What are the consequences of failings by architects in the current regulatory landscape?
* Would the public interest benefit from restriction of function, or introducing reserved activities?
* How should architects maintain and develop their competence?
* Should maintenance of competence be a requirement of continued registration?
* How should the maintenance of competence be monitored?

Part B: Routes to Registration

* Should the primary UK route to registration be through University education and practical experience?
* What other appropriate routes to the Register might there be?
* Are the current UK routes to registration discriminatory?
* How could access to the Register be made fairer?
* Is seven years an appropriate period of education and training before gaining access to the Register?
* How could it be made shorter?
* Should the UK route to registration align with international routes? Should the standard required be the same, or higher?
* What standard should overseas architects have to meet in order to be registered if they immigrate from a jurisdiction with differing requirements?
* Should knowledge of UK practice be tested before allowing overseas architects access to the UK Register?
* Should an undergraduate qualification in design be a requirement for registration?
* What might the costs of any changes to the registration process be? What would be the regulatory implications?

# Methodology

Below is a suggested approach. The tenderer is welcome to suggest alternative methodologies which meet the objectives and tackle methodological difficulties. **In light of the Coronavirus pandemic, we recognise that undertaking face to face research, either one to one or in focus groups, may be impossible or at least undesirable, and that there are challenges of costing a research project, where at least some face to face discussion is desirable. If possible, please provide estimates for where some face to face research is possible and where not. Details will be discussed with the Supplier throughout the project as the situation evolves over the coming months.**

Literature Review and data analysis

To complement the literature review being conducted by ARB, and as described in paragraph 16, the Supplier will conduct a review of literature and data analysis to inform the Research Questions (paragraphs 25 and 26). This is expected to draw on existing subjective and objective evidence on:

* the role of Architects in the UK (drawing on sources such as O\*NET[[1]](#footnote-1), job vacancy data and think pieces);
* employment and unemployment of Architects (e.g. Labour Force Survey);
* evidence of deficiencies in the skills, knowledge and behaviours of architects (including evidence from available sources such as Employers Skills Survey);
* ARB record of complaints and outcomes which will be made available to the Supplier;
* Data gathered from Insurers, local authorities, or other sources of design failures ;
* assessments of the quality of routes to registration, including relevant analysis of HESA destinations data, National Student Satisfaction Survey, Teaching Excellence Framework, formal evaluation and commentary;
* assessments of the quality of post registration CPD;
* the development of the Degree Apprenticeship Standards and End Point Assessments [[2]](#footnote-2) - why developed and initial take-up;
* and views from partner organisations, such as RIBA, on the questions raised.

## Primary Research

ARB wishes to engage the stakeholders listed in paragraph 24, across the UK, to inform the Review. Due to the different size of these groups and levels of expertise on the questions posed, we expect a tailored approach to researching the topic with each stakeholder group and according to the method used. The questions raised will differ, as will the depth covered.

Some groups may warrant a quantitative survey approach (on-line or telephone); others a qualitative approach (depth interviews, workshops, attending existing events) and others both.

Additionally, it may be useful to test the initial conclusions later in the research process, through some form of Deliberative Inquiry. We expect this latter to be relatively small scale, compared to other stages of the research, and, if conducted as an event, for some groups to share the same event.

Our initial thinking on this is indicated in the table below, though **Tenderers are invited to suggest and explain alternative methodologies.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Stakeholder Group** | ***Call for Evidence*** | **Initial qualitative**  | **Survey** | **Deliberative Enquiry** |
| Architects Registration Board |  | √ |  |  |
| Architects | *√* | √ | √ | √ |
| Architect employers (in sector and outside) | *√* | √ | √ | √ |
| Students | *√* | √ |  |  |
| Schools of Architecture | *√* | √ |  | √ |
| Client organisations | *√* | √ |  | √ |
| Other stakeholders | *√* | √ |  | √ (one event for these groups) |
| Interest groups | *√* | √ |  |
| Insurers | *√* | √ |  |
| Professional bodies | *√* | √ |  |
| Other related professionals | *√* | Via professional bodies |
| Private clients | *√* |  |  |  |
| Public | *√* |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

### Sampling for qualitative and quantitative research

**Architects** and **Architect employers** are key and we would expect a comprehensive approach to research with these stakeholders.

The register of **Architects** currently contains name and address details of 42,000 architects. While the Register does not contain the following information, It will be valuable to be able to analyse differences between:

* those employed in different sized firms (as sole practitioners, small, medium or large practices; or multidisciplinary practices);
* those engaged in domestic or commercial work and
* those employed in architecture-only or non-architecture-only firms.

Tenderers are invited to consider how we can maximise the value of the analysis *if* the Register is used as a sampling source for Architects, or to suggest alternative sampling sources.

RIBA report 2,805 Architecture Practices in 2012-13. However, not all Architects will be employed in Architect practices and will be employed in Construction companies or Local Authorities etc. It will be important to include all types of employer of architects within the research. Tenderers are invited to suggest how to sample **employers of architects** within the Architecture industrial sector (SIC 71.1) and outside.

In 2015/16, there were 15,500 students in the UK’s Schools of Architecture[[3]](#footnote-3) attending around 60 Institutions. The institutions that currently offer ARB-prescribed qualifications are listed at <http://www.arb.org.uk/student-information/schools-institutions-architecture/>

There are a number of different types of **clients/procurers of architect’s services.** Our expectation is to focus on large-scale clients and representative bodies in the primary research. Individual, private clients will be covered in the Call for Evidence. Tenderers are invited to suggest how to define and sample large-scale clients/procurers for the research to ensure the research captures the nature of the demand and future demand for architect’s services and competencies.

ARB will work with the Supplier to identify relevant **stakeholders** including Government departments across the UK, Interest Groups, Professional Bodies and Insurers (particularly those providing Professional Indemnity for Architects or similar occupations).

### Mode of administration

ARB does not wish to prescribe specific approaches to the qualitative and quantitative research. Tendering organisations are invited to submit proposals in keeping with the requirements of the research and the budget and thus we expect proposals may include a mix of face to face and telephone one to one interviews; virtual or live focus groups; on-line or telephone surveys and for this to vary by stakeholder group, but we also recognise that the restrictions imposed by Coronavirus, and how long they will remain in place, are unknown at this time.

The approach to Deliberative Inquiry, if included, should be similarly detailed.

ARB offices in Central London are available for hosting events/ workshops where up to 40 people can be accommodated, depending on the format.

### Research Tools

All questionnaires and topic guides etc will be produced in consultation with ARB Steering Group (see below)

### Analysis

Tenderers should indicate how they will analyse data gathered through the literature and data review and ensure quality standards.

Tenderers should indicate how they will analyse qualitative and quantitative primary data and ensure quality standards.

The Supplier will be expected to proportionately draw on all sources of evidence used to provide a balanced, robust evidence base for further stages of the Review.

# Reporting and Dissemination

A draft report will be produced and presented to the ARB with a final report following within 2 weeks from feedback. The report will include an analysis of the results of the literature review and research, with the Research Questions clearly responded to, and recommendations for further stages of the Review.

The Final Report should include, but not be limited to:

1. an executive summary
2. Methodology section describing the methodology used in depth
3. Analysis and presentation of results including illustrative graphs
4. Conclusion and recommendations for next stages of the Review
5. Annex with the most important data tables, questionnaires

The Final Report must be well-structured, succinct and written in plain English.

The Supplier will be expected to prepare and deliver a presentation of the final results to the Steering Group and to the ARB Board.

# Timing

An outline timetable is provided below. Tendering organisations should provide a detailed timetable for the research.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Expected dates** |
| Invitation to Tender issued | By 27th March |
| Closing date for questions for ITT | 16th April |
| Closing date for Tenders | 20th April |
| Tendering organisations to be available for interview |  May 6th |
| Induction meeting with Steering Group | May 13th |
| Literature Review and preparation for primary research (sampling etc) | May/June |
| Steering Group meeting – review research tools, methodologies and Lit Review | June, tbc. |
| Primary Research (including Deliberative Inquiry) | June to October |
| Steering Group (pre Deliberative Inquiry (if applicable) | Tbc |
| Draft report | 13th November |
| Steering Group meeting | w/c 15th November |
| All outputs complete | 11th December 2020 |

# Budget

The ARB has a budget of up to £100,000 (including VAT and all expenses) for this research.

# Issues/Risks

For some of the stakeholder groups we want to reach, there is not necessarily a clear source for sampling respondents, as seen above. Tendering Organisations are expected to give this full consideration in the Tender.

It is possible that the views of stakeholders and partners may lead to conflicting positions, e.g. on what the criteria covers or on length, mode of study or study content. The Supplier will identify these tensions and work with ARB to produce recommendations, drawing also on objective evidence gathered to add weight to the conclusions.

The situation and context will likely change during the course of the project – e.g., as implications of the Referendum on the EU’s Mutual Recognition of Professional Qualifications Directive are known, of the Grenfell Inquiry and of the Coronavirus.

The ARB Review is concerned to ensure the competence of architects – what competencies are required and how they are obtained and maintained. It is possible that the research will raise broader questions such as whether there is a requirement for regulation of function, as opposed to registration of title; how the regulatory regime for Architects interplays with other aspects of building safety and quality and whether the current balance is adequate; whether and how other professions conducting architect activities should come within the regulatory regime, which activities and why and whether there should be different tiers of registration depending on the exact role undertaken by different types of Architect. These issues should all be considered in addressing the core questions of what competencies are needed by the Architect profession and how obtained.

There are unknown issues and risks associated with the Coronavirus pandemic and we recognise this. Please be as comprehensive as possible in outlining how you will conduct robust research and ensure a quality output.

# Project management

The Supplier is required to appoint a lead Project Manager, responsible for all components of the research. The project manager must have sufficient experience, seniority and time allocated to manage the project effectively.

The ARB has appointed a Project Manager to work with the Supplier in delivering the project.

There will be an internal Steering Group of ARB staff which will meet at least 3 times during the course of the project (as indicated above). These meetings will take place at ARB offices in London.

It is expected that following the project initiation meeting, regular contact will take place between the Supplier and ARB by telephone, email and face to face meetings. The frequency of contact will be agreed at the project inception meeting however weekly project update meetings are required during fieldwork and a minimum of every 2 weeks at other times.

# Data security

The Supplier is required to implement appropriate arrangements for data security at all times. Such procedures must meet the standards outlined in the framework terms and conditions, General Data Protection Regulation and the Data Protection Act.

Processes should be in place for data being returned by interviewers and safeguard against data loss, including appropriate risk management procedures.

The Supplier should confirm that such procedures will be implemented and outline the technical measures to be put in place to meet such requirements.

# Ethical conduct

The Supplier must have a clear approach for ensuring that the work is compliant with relevant ethical codes of conduct, as the Supplier is responsible for the ethical conduct of the research. The Supplier is required to set out any potential ethical issues presented by the research along with details of the arrangements for ethical scrutiny to ensure the day-to-day management of these risks. The Supplier will need to clearly explain how the information they provide will be stored, reported and protected and inform ARB if this changes.

The Supplier must obtain consent from participants that makes it clear to participants that their data will be shared and used for research purposes.

The commissioning and management of the research should be carried out in accordance with Government Social Research ethics guidance7 and the Data Protection Act 2018.

# Contract Award Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation criteria is detailed in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria – Written Tender**  | **Weighting (%)** |
| **1.** | **Demonstration of a clear understanding of the context and need for the research.** Word Count limit: 1500 words Guidance to tenderers: Outline your understanding of the rationale for undertaking the research.  | **20** |
| **2.** | **Proposed methodology, which clearly outlines a detailed research design and demonstrates how the aims of this study will be met. Suitability of the methodology – quality and appropriateness of the approach. Demonstration of understanding of the challenges and priorities of the contract.** Word Count limit: 2500 words Guidance to tenderers: The tender should set out a detailed account of the methodology to be used in the project and rationale for the approach.Include detail on approach to literature review. Include which sources will be used for secondary data analysis, how accessed and what information will be obtained.Include information on sampling frames, sampling methods, mode of administration, expected sample sizes and response rates (as well as methods used to improve these). Set out how the data gathered will be analysed. Detail approach to Deliberative Inquiry (if included). | **30** |
| **3.** | **Staff roles and suitability of staff for those roles:** Word Count limit: 1700 words Guidance to tenderers: Provide a list of the staff that will be involved in the project at all levels, their specific role in this project, their relevant experience and expertise (e.g. with reference to similar projects they have been involved in), their estimated time to be spent on the project and the length of time they have been working with your organisation.State the name of the project manager and a designated deputy.Designate a quality assurer and detail how they will ensure that all the deliverables are delivered to standard. | **20** |
| **4.** | **Understanding of, and ability to meet, project timetable and dependencies/risks to the highest quality:** Word Count limit: 2000 words Guidance to tenderers: Provide a detailed timetable for carrying out the work based on the proposed approach and method and the milestones set out in the specification. Highlight in particular any deadlines you identify as critical from the specification. Describe how this project will be managed to ensure quality at all stages.An initial risk assessment should be provided covering the main risks to the project and how these risks will be managed. Provide information on the data security processes, including storage and transmission of personal data and data protection that will be followed (where appropriate).  | **10** |
| **5.** | **Value for money based on the costs in the submitted detailed price schedule**Guidance to tenderers: The total cost should be quoted in sterling (excl. and incl. VAT). Separate aspects of the study (literature review/secondary analysis/initial interviews/survey [including cost per interview]/deliberative inquiry/analysis and reporting/project management) are to be individually priced and attributed to specific members of the project team along with the estimated number of days clearly stated and day rates for project team included (exc. VAT). Fees should be inclusive of the time and travel costs for meetings, face-to-face interviews, etc. | **20** |

The scoring rationale is detailed below:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|     | **Evidence Provided**    | **Score**    | **Remark**    |
| Bidder is likely to be able to meet the needs of the Organisation.    | Evidence of relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to provide the services relative to the contract is consistent, comprehensive, compelling, directly relevant to the contract in all respects and highly credible.  | **5**    | **High****Confidence**    |
| Evidence of relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to provide the services relative to the contract is sufficient (in qualitative terms), convincing, and credible.    | **4**    | **Confidence**    |
| Small risk that bidder will not be able to meet the needs of the Organisation.    | Evidence of relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to provide the services relative to the contract has minor gaps, or to a small extent is unconvincing, lacks credibility or irrelevant to the contract.    | **3**    | **Minor Concerns**    |
| Moderate risk that the bidder will not be able to meet the needs of the Organisation    | Evidence of relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to provide the services relative to the contract has moderate gaps, is unconvincing.    | **2**    | **Moderate Concerns**    |
| Significant risk that the bidder will not be able to meet the needs of the Organisation.   | Evidence of relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to provide the services relative to the contract has major gaps, is unconvincing in many respects, lacks credibility, or largely irrelevant to the contract.    | **1**    | **Major Concerns**    |
| Bidder will not be able to meet the needs of the Organisation.    | No evidence or misleading evidence.    | **0**    | **Not acceptable**    |

1. <https://www.onetonline.org/link/summary/17-1011.00> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <https://www.instituteforapprenticeships.org/apprenticeship-standards/architect-degree/> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. https://www.thecreativeindustries.co.uk/industries/architecture/architecture-facts-and-figures [↑](#footnote-ref-3)