



Invitation to Tender

Evaluation of Digital Campaign

Ref: NHMF 0320

Schedule 4: Evaluation Model

1 Overarching Award Criteria

Your proposal for undertaking the work will be evaluated as follows –

- Price = 30%
- Quality = 70%
- The scores for quality and price will be added together to obtain the overall score for each Bidder.

2 Price

Your bid price will be evaluated as follows –

- 100% will be awarded to the lowest priced bid
- All remaining bidders will be allocated scores based on their deviation from this figure. Your fixed and total costs figures (if any) will be used to score this question.
- For example, if the lowest price is £50 and the second lowest price is £100 then the lowest priced bidder gets 100% (full marks) for price and the second placed bidder gets 50%.
- The scores for price will be multiplied by the weighting (30%)

3 Quality

3.1 Quality criteria are provided below. Each will be scored out of 5. The percentage weightings are also shown against each criteria.

Table 1: Quality Criteria & Percentage weightings

Tender Response	Quality question	Weighting (%)
Section 1 – Method Statement	Demonstrates a clear understanding of the aims, objectives and main concerns of the research.	10
Section 1 – Method Statement	Demonstrates that the methods selected are appropriate to the research requirements in the brief.	20
Section 1 – Method Statement	Demonstrates an awareness of the different policy contexts, research and issues relating to digital literacy (max 500)	20
Section 2 – Statement regarding Previous Experience	Demonstrates, via links to previous reports, a record of producing high quality evaluation reports to support	15

	policy and practice development in the Heritage and Cultural sector.	
Section 3 – Project Plan	Demonstrates well considered plans for feeding back learning and dissemination of evaluation findings	10
Section 4 – Staffing Statement	Demonstrates the clear allocation of appropriate resources, with detail on roles and responsibilities for each member of the team	20
Section 6 – Carbon Net Zero	Demonstrates a commitment to environmental sustainability and CNZ	5

3.2 The 0 to 5 scores for each question will be awarded as follows -

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.

