**Further Project Information**

**Process Evaluation**

We would expect the successful supplier to conduct a multi-method approach to answering these research questions. This could include:

* Surveys of providers and learners
* In-depth qualitative interviews
* Focus groups
* Data analysis of management information

We also welcome innovative methodological ideas from suppliers.

**Impact Evaluation**

The near universality of the 16-19 Tuition Fund makes designing an impact evaluation challenging as there is no significant control or comparison group. Another challenge is that schools and colleges can decide how to use the money, for example through what tutors they will use and what learners they will put forward for tutoring. Given the many subjects the 16-19 Tuition Fund can be used for (as well as the opportunity to use the fund for enrichment activities) we believe samples will be too small to explore all subjects and uses of the fund. We therefore propose that the impact evaluation focuses on outcomes in English and Maths.

We have begun exploring some impact evaluation options and will be inviting bidders to consider these and propose their own approaches for quasi-experimental or non-experimental methods. As part of this, bidders will be asked to build a feasibility testing phase into the research to test the viability of an impact evaluation alongside the process evaluation element. We would be interested in approaches that triangulate findings by combining multiple methods, which may help to overcome the weakness caused by the absence of a robust counterfactual. Our initial ideas for potential impact methods are:

* + 1. Recruitment of an intervention group of providers who opted into the fund alongside a comparison group from those providers who did not opt in. The comparison group would need to be a balanced sample that was broadly in line with the intervention group in terms of characteristics.
		2. Constructing a counterfactual from those eligible learners in England who have not been chosen to receive tutoring. Note that this would introduce significant learner selection bias into the evaluation, through unobserved factors such as their motivation or engagement with learning that are likely to influence provider decisions about which learners are offered tutoring.
		3. Constructing a counterfactual through modelling using past attainment data for similar groups of learners to predict likely attainment outcomes in the absence of the intervention.
		4. Using dosage of tutoring to explore impact, for example comparing academic outcomes for students receiving 5 hours of tutoring vs 12 hours. Note that this data would have to be collected separately from providers as this information won’t be available in the pupil census or individualised learner record in academic year 2021/22.