Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Research

**Organisation The National Lottery Heritage Fund**

**Department**  Business Innovation and Insight

**Title of procurement** Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Research

**Brief description of supply**  Research

**Estimated value of tender**  up to £25,000 including expenses and VAT

**Estimated duration**  4 months

**Name of the Fund Contact**  Faruk Barabhuiya

**Timetable**  **Response deadline: 1 pm on 16 Nov 2020**

Clarification Question: 5 Nov 2020

Clarification Answers: 9 November 2020

Possible Interviews/ further

Clarifications: 23 November 2020

Confirmation of contract: 25 Nov 20

Start Contract: 7th December 2020

Completion of research: 26 Feb 2021

# Overview

The National Lottery 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 [Fund's website](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/publications/strategic-funding-framework-2019-2024) for more details.

The 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.

In June 2020 The National Lottery Heritage Fund (The Fund) announced a wide-ranging Review of our approach to equality, diversity and inclusion. The Review covers The Fund’s Culture, Governance, Investment and Workforce. An interim report (will be made available to the successful bidder) was produced in October 2020 and a final report is due December 2020.

The interim report emphasises the need for evidence to support The Fund’s review of its approach to diversity and inclusion. Specifically, it stated it would:

* Use data and insight to inform our thinking, using quantitative and qualitative research to understand our current approaches to grant applications from groups representing people with protected characteristics, to our staff and to our approach to committee/Board recruitment and membership.
* Commission additional research as needed to help inform our approach.

To date there has been limited data and research carried out by The Fund to support The Review. It is proposed that we conduct research to support the detailed planning when the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) workgroups form in February and to support the delivery of The Review’s objectives, specifically:

* Define an ambitious vision of inclusive heritage to guide the Fund’s activities across our workforce, our grant-making, governance and in developing our culture.
* Set out our recommendations and actions to address inequality and barriers to inclusion.

This piece of research will provide evidence to feed into the investment strand of the EDI Review.

# Aims and objectives

The aim of the research is to provide insight that can support the Fund to become a more inclusive and equitable funder. We would like to find out how organisations and groups view and define heritage and culture and their views on the Fund and its role.

This phase of the research will focus on groups currently and historically underrepresented in the Fund’s portfolio, so will focus as much as possible on **race and ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation, socio-economic background and age** and involve those **organisations and groups that may have engaged with the Fund in some way** in the past five years (more details about this in the Level of Engagement section below). There are two areas of focus.

1. Perceptions of heritage

* What aspects of heritage and culture are important and relevant to different groups?
* How well is this heritage currently supported?
* How could the heritage and culture sector be more inclusive?

1. Perceptions of The Fund

* How relevant is The Fund to under-represented groups and their heritage?
* How could The Fund support changing perceptions of heritage for these groups?
* How could The Fund’s work change and improve to be more inclusive?
* What role could the Fund play in how heritage and culture contribute to building community cohesion and supporting social justice.

We hope to eventually engage organisations and groups along the full spectrum of engagement from fully engaged to not at all, however due to time constraints there is a need to phase the work. Similarly, we would like to cover all UK countries but will limit it in this first phase to England.

Level of engagement

The Fund thinks about organisations in the sector based on the extent that they have applied for and received funding.



We propose to initially focus on medium engagement organisations and community groups that have applied for funding and been unsuccessful, have had only one grant or have had contact with an engagement manager and not applied, completed or submitted an application on The Fund’s online system.

Intersectionality

We acknowledge that individuals and groups characteristics cannot be viewed in isolation and create overlapping and interdependent systems of discrimination or disadvantage, therefore, where these overlaps arise they should be considered.

# Method

We anticipate research will draw on a range of evidence and we would like consultants with experience in Equality, Diversity and Inclusion work to set out proposals for a detailed methodology. We do not want to prescribe specific methods, instead we welcome proposal from suppliers that could fit within the timescales for the project and we are open to bidders including additional suggestions including the number and composition of focus groups. We anticipate that the work will involve qualitative methods that include, as a minimum:

* Focus groups with representatives from organisations and community groups.
* Interviews with The Fund’s staff to understand the context of the work.
* Reference to existing research on heritage/culture and diversity and inclusion - sectoral and academic including survey data, such as, Taking Part and the Social Attitudes Survey.
* A review of what other UK funders have done around equality, diversity and inclusion and positive action.

Given the current situation with COVID-19 and varying restrictions across the country, we do not expect the research to be conducted face to face but instead via video conferencing or telephone.

Sampling Data

The Fund will provide a data set from which to pick organisations and community groups. In the last five years we have 14,000 applications from 9,600 different organisations and have funded 7,000 projects run by 5,700 different organisations. Many have applied only once others multiple times.

All topic guides and other research materials need to be agreed with The Fund.

# Outputs

Audiences

The outputs of any research should take into account the intended audiences to ensure the information is conveyed in the most appropriate way.The results of the research will be read by:

Primary: Research & Insight team, Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Steering Group, Senior Management Team

Secondary: Business Delivery Teams (which Investment and Engagement Managers), All staff

The EDI Steering Group operates on the principle of transparency so it should be assumed that all documentation produced will be made available to all The Fund’s staff.

Deliverables

* A focus group summary report in slidedeck format
* Focus group supplementary report in Word format
* Slidedeck on desk research (reviewing existing research and UK funders)

We aim to ensure the results of the research are read by everyone, whether they are actively involved in the work or not. We believe this work is relevant to all staff and would therefore require reporting in formats which provide the appropriate amount of detail and insight while remaining concise, digestible, accessible and engaging.

# A project plan with specific deliverables and timetable will be agreed with the successful consultant/ies. However, The Fund expects these deliverables in accordance with the following timetable:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Deliverable/Key Milestones** | **Due date** |
| Inception Meeting to agree plans | w/c 30 Nov |
| Devise project plan and start research prep | Dec 2020 |
| Focus groups/research | Jan 2021 |
| Final Reporting: Slidedeck and Word Report | 26 Feb 2021 |

* + Regular check-in meetings at key milestones will be agreed once the workplan is finalised.
* All reports must adhere to the Fund’s accessibility and formatting guidance (appended). In all outputs, the creative use of design and visualisation to increase comprehension and conciseness will be valued.
  + The initial findings will be confidential to the Fund. The Fund may prepare or commission summary reports and other materials for subsequent wider distribution, based on the results.
  + All reports to include appendices as agreed between the 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.
  + The successful bidder must comply with all of the requirements of the Data Protection Act 2018 and shall ensure appropriate research consents from interviews or any data collection.
  + The successful bidder will be expected to discuss and present findings at appropriate times, to internal audiences, including our Board and our Senior Management Team,. The purpose of these presentations is to enable lessons to be learned and key policy and practice issues to be highlighted.
  + 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

* + We expect the research to begin 7 December 2020 and be completed by 26 February 2021. The final report shall be submitted to the Fund by 26 February 2021.
* **Response deadline: 1 pm on 16 Nov 2020**
* Clarification Question: 5 Nov 2020
* Clarification Answers: 9 November 2020
* Possible Interviews/ further Clarifications: 23 November 2020
* Confirmation of contract: 25 Nov 20
* Start Contract: 7th December 2020
* Completion of research: 26 Feb 2021
  + The anticipated budget is £25,000 to include all expenses and VAT. The contract will be let by the National Heritage Memorial Fund.
  + The payment schedule will be split into two equal payments; 50% on signing of contract and 50% on submission of final report.
  + The contract will be based on the Fund’s standard terms and conditions.
  + The research will be managed on a day to day basis for the Fund by Faruk Barabhuiya, Insight Manager.

# Award Criteria

* + A proposal for undertaking the work should be a maximum of 10 pages and include:
* a detailed method for undertaking the study;
* 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;
* 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.
  + 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

| Selection Criteria | Weighting |
| --- | --- |
| Demonstrates a record of working on equality, diversity and inclusion issues and an awareness of the different policy contexts, research and issues. | 25% |
| Demonstrates that the methods selected are appropriate to the research requirements set out in this brief as they relate to challenges that may be present when conducting qualitative research related to equality, diversity and inclusion. | 25% |
| Demonstrates a knowledge of the UK funding landscape and the issues and responsibilities of distributing public funding. | 25% |
| Demonstrates a record of producing high quality research outputs in a range of formats to support policy and practice development, with a track record of communicating findings in a creative and concise way, appropriate to their intended audiences. | 25% |

## 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 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

* + THE 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.
  + The procurement timetable will be:
* **Response deadline: 1 pm on 16 Nov 2020**
* Clarification Question: 5 Nov 2020
* Clarification Answers: 9 November 2020
* Possible Interviews/ further Clarifications: 23 November 2020
* Confirmation of contract: 25 Nov 20
* Start Contract: 7th December 2020
* Completion of research: 26 Feb 2021
* \*The Fund will upload response to clarification on Contracts Finder.  Please note that we will make the anonymised questions, and our responses to them, available to everyone on the 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 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.
  + Your tender proposals must be sent electronically via e-mail before the tender return deadline of 16 November 2020, 1 PM to the following contact:

Faruk Barabhuiya

faruk.barabhuiya@heritagefund.org.uk

* + Please visit the [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 Fund. Our logo can be found on the [Fund's website](ttps://www.heritagefund.org.uk/search?keys=Logos).

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

**Appendix 2: Further information**

* + Our [corporate strategy](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/about/our-corporate-strategy-2018-21)
  + The Fund’s [strategic funding framework](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/about/strategic-funding-framework-2019-2024#heading-3)
  + [Annual report 2017-2018](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/publications/hlf-annual-report-2017-2018)
  + On the Fund’s [Inclusion work](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/our-work/inclusion)
  + [Guidance](https://www.heritagefund.org.uk/publications/inclusion) for grantees to help address inclusion in projects

**Under-represented groups**

In terms of under representation of people with protected characteristics in our funding, our data shows consistent under representation of (in order) LGBT+ communities,

disability and what we currently name BAME communities.

We have not collected longitudinal data on socioeconomic status in our funding, however, using measures of our spend per capita and standard indices of deprivation, we have identified 13 local authority areas that fulfil both criteria, 9 of them are in England.

The 13 areas are:

* Brent (Greater London)
* Corby (Northamptonshire)
* Enfield (Greater London)
* Knowsley (Merseyside)
* Inverclyde (Scotland)
* Luton (Bedfordshire)
* Newham (Greater London)
* North East Lincolnshire
* North Lanarkshire (Scotland)
* Neath Port Talbot (Wales)
* Rhondda Cynon Taff (Wales)
* Tendring (Essex)
* Walsall (West Midlands)