

DPS FRAMEWORK SCHEDULE 4: LETTER OF APPOINTMENT AND CONTRACT TERMS

Part 1: Letter of Appointment

Dear [REDACTED]

Letter of Appointment

This letter of Appointment dated Wednesday, 4th August 2021, is issued in accordance with the provisions of the DPS Agreement (RM6018) between CCS and the Supplier.

Capitalised terms and expressions used in this letter have the same meanings as in the Contract Terms unless the context otherwise requires.

Order Number:	PS21069
From:	Department of Business Energy and Industrial Strategy , 1 Victoria St, Westminster, London, SW1H 0ET ("Customer")
To:	Market & Opinion Research International Limited, Ipsos MORI 3 Thomas More Square, London E1W 1YW ("Supplier")

Effective Date:	Monday, 9 th August 2021
Expiry Date:	Tuesday, 31 st December 2024

Services required:	Set out in Section 2, Part B (Specification) of the DPS Agreement and refined by: The Customer's Project Specification attached at Appendix A and the Supplier's Proposal attached at Appendix B.
--------------------	--

Key Individuals:	[REDACTED], BEIS [REDACTED], Ipsos MORI
------------------	--

Contract Charges (including any applicable discount(s), but excluding VAT):	As per AW5.2 Price Schedule response highlighted within the RM6018 Contract Terms, section; Annex 1 – Contract Charges. The total value of this contract shall not exceed £1,039,505.00 excluding VAT.
---	--

Insurance Requirements	<p>Additional public liability insurance to cover all risks in the performance of the Contract, with a minimum limit of £5 million for each individual claim.</p> <p>Additional employers' liability insurance with a minimum limit of £5 million indemnity.</p> <p>Additional professional indemnity insurance adequate to cover all risks in the performance of the Contract with a minimum limit of indemnity of £2 million for each individual claim.</p> <p>Product liability insurance cover all risks in the provision of Deliverables under the Contract, with a minimum limit of £5 million for each individual claim.</p>
Liability Requirements	Suppliers limitation of Liability (Clause 18.2 of the Contract Terms);
Special Clause	This programme will run over four financial years up to December 2024 (Y21/22, Y22/23, Y23/24, Y24/25). There will be break clauses at the end of each financial year to take into account future budget decisions. Depending on budget certainty and business need.
GDPR	As per Contract Terms Schedule 7 (Processing, Personal Data and Data Subjects.

FORMATION OF CONTRACT

BY SIGNING AND RETURNING THIS LETTER OF APPOINTMENT (which may be done by electronic means) the Supplier agrees to enter a Contract with the Customer to provide the Services in accordance with the terms of this letter and the Contract Terms.

The Parties hereby acknowledge and agree that they have read this letter and the Contract Terms.

The Parties hereby acknowledge and agree that this Contract shall be formed when the Customer acknowledges (which may be done by electronic means) the receipt of the signed copy of this letter from the Supplier within two (2) Working Days from such receipt

For and on behalf of the Supplier:


Name and Title: 
Managing Director

Signature: 

Date: 05.08.2021

For and on behalf of the Customer:

Name and Title: 
Director, Business Growth

Signature: 

Date: 06.08.2021

APPENDIX A

Customer Project Specification

1. Background

This research project will evaluate the Help to Grow – Management scheme. The UK has a long-standing productivity gap compared with major competitors in the G7. In 2016 the ONS estimated that labour productivity is on average 18% higher in the other six members of the G7 relative to the UK¹. SMEs are more likely to have low productivity, and less likely to adopt modern management techniques and business technologies². The Business Productivity Review we conducted with Treasury also found that leadership and management skills are a critical factor in determining firm productivity³. SMEs also tend to have the lowest scores on surveys designed to measure the quality of business management and leadership. Low quality management is a primary factor associated with lower productivity in the UK^{4,5}.

The Help to Grow Management programme will deliver an intensive national training programme to improve SME leadership and management skills and address firm level productivity challenges. The programme has a whole life cost of £224 million.

The programme aims are to:

1. **Improve firm level productivity amongst UK SMEs**, by providing and encouraging access to high quality, consistent and easily accessible management and leadership training.
2. **Support SME business leaders to develop and implement an action plan**, identifying potential productivity enhancing measures they could adopt in their businesses.
3. **Support participating SMEs to increase turnover** following the COVID19 quarantine, relative other similar sized firms.

Within 2-3 years of completing the programme:

1. firms should experience an average of 0.85% increase in the productivity per worker.
2. at least 90% of participants should adopt 1 new structured management technique.
3. Turnover should be an average of 9.5% higher, relative to similar sized firms.

It will be designed and delivered by the UK's leading Business Schools and coordinated by the Chartered Association of Business Schools (CABS). The programme will provide 50 hours of structured learning, mentoring and peer networking, through a blend of online and face to face (once Covid restrictions allow). The programme aims to support 30,000 SME businesses to improve their productivity over the course of three years.

This four year evaluation work will evaluate the delivery and early impacts of the programme in order to feed into decision making throughout the programme (so an agile approach will be needed). This is so as to inform future programme design and funding

¹ Tenreyro, s., (2018) The fall in productivity growth: causes and implications. Bank of England

² BIS 2012, Leadership and management in the UK – The key to sustainable growth

³ The Business Productivity Review: <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/business-productivity-review-call-for-evidence>

⁴ ONS (2018), Management practices and productivity in British production and services industries - initial results from the Management and Expectations Survey: 2016

⁵ Andy Haldane Speech, Productivity puzzles, 2017

decisions, strengthen the evidence base on business support, and inform longer-term strategy on business support policy. The evaluation will also produce evidence on the impacts of wider factors such as the Covid-19 pandemic. The evaluation also seeks to build on monitoring practices to enable longer term impact evaluation to be conducted on growth in value added and productivity. A key component of this work will be the effective collection of baseline data.

This programme will run over four financial years up to December 2024 (Y21/22, Y22/23, Y23/24, Y24/25). There will be break clauses at the end of each financial year to take into account future budget decisions. Depending on budget certainty and business need.

2. Aims and Objectives of the Project

The overarching objective of the Help to Grow: Management programme evaluation is to support 30,000 SME businesses to improve their productivity.

The evaluation will have **four key aims**:

- To understand how to improve delivery (process evaluation).
- To measure the early impacts of the programme (e.g. adoption of new practices)
- To generate evidence to inform future programme design and funding (strategic question).
- To embed effective data collection practices to enable longer-term impact evaluation.
- To evaluate the programme's impacts on productivity and recovery using administrative data.
- To understand the impacts of Covid-19 on both delivery and businesses over time (strategic question)

The evaluation consists of five high-level evaluation questions:

HLQ 1 - How effective is the programme in recruiting businesses and ensuring they complete the programme?

- What are the most effective ways to drive awareness of scheme and recruitment of participants? And does this differ by sector, size, region, characteristics of the business etc?
- To what extent do SMEs find the branding and marketing strategy relevant, clear and relatable, and how does this affect their decision to apply for the programme? If yes/no, why?
- Do the participants see the training as a unique offer? (e.g. they aren't part of or aware of other leadership training that provides the same offer/benefits)?
- Did the programme engage with and select the target beneficiaries? Were the right procedures and criteria in place to ensure effective targeting?
- Will SMEs in the target group be equally likely to apply for support (e.g. are there any unique barriers to particular sectors/sizes of businesses applying)?
- Does the programme attract and retain participants from protected groups?
- Are Business Schools recruiting a mixture of known and unknown SMEs, i.e. those who have or have never considered taking up training? If yes/no, how?
- Are participants attending all sessions? Does attendance/engagement change across sessions/across the different elements of the programme? If so why?
- Are participants completing the training? If not, why not?
- Is there an impact of COVID-19 on recruitment and compliance with the intervention?

- Are there any other factors which predict non-attendance/non-compliance?
- Does the mode of delivery (i.e. remote or face to face delivery) of the programme affect compliance/attendance/participation/engagement with the programme?
- Does this change if delivery method changes?

HLQ 2 – To what extent is the programme successfully delivering high quality business support?

- Was the programme well managed? Were the right governance and management structures in place and did they operate in the way they were expected to?
- Has the programme delivered its intended activities to a high standard?
- How are project activities perceived by stakeholders and beneficiaries? What are their perceptions of the quality of activities / delivery?
- Is the programme consistent across cohorts? What has been done to ensure this. If it is not, why not?
- Is regional delivery through Business Schools an effective way of delivering this support?
- Is online delivery perceived to be an effective and engaging way of delivering this support?
- How does online delivery compare in effectiveness to face-to-face/blended delivery?
- Has the programme been sufficient in building up trust to initiate intensive knowledge transfer?
- To what extent does Virtual Learning Environment increase the user experience and effectiveness of the programme, and why?
- What are the most important/effective behaviours of those delivering support (including lecturers, facilitators, mentors)?
- Are the peer group calls an effective way of keeping in touch with participants in between webinar/workshop sessions?
- Does the 1:1 support deliver high quality, relevant advice/support and/or support the implementation of learning from other aspects of the programme?
- What is the optimal frequency and duration of sessions?
- Could the delivery of the programme have been improved in any way?

HLQ 3 – To what extent is the programme effective at teaching new skills and encouraging business leaders to adopt new practices?

- Is the curriculum flexible and relevant for all beneficiaries?
- Do SMEs think the webinars, workshops, and events are being delivered effectively? If yes/no why? (e.g. the quality of information, clarity of teaching)
- Do the key curriculum topics address the leadership issues SMEs are facing? Does this feedback differ e.g. by region/sector/size etc?
- Are the participants raising relevant and real issues during peer group calls, taking elements of what they learnt during the course (e.g. are they aware of business issues?) If not, what are the issues they are raising?
- What aspects of the programme are viewed as being most effective by Business schools and participants?
- Is the make-up of the cohorts effective? If yes, what makes them effective (e.g. mixture of experience, non-competitors)
- Are all aspects of the programme important to the programme's effectiveness? Which are most/least effective? Does this apply across all participants/business types? What makes some aspects more effective than others if this is the case.

- Are the effects of the different strands of the programme cumulative, are they better delivered as a whole, or would elements be effective on their own?
- Do aspects of the programme suit being delivered remotely? If yes/no, why/why not?

HLQ 4 - What early changes are businesses making as a result of participating in the programme?

- Are SMEs making changes to their businesses? If yes, what types of changes and what can we learn about their implementation?
- Do business owners plan on making any future changes after completing the course? If yes, what, when and how?
- Has the programme supported the SMEs in recovering from the impacts of COVID-19?
- What are the costs and benefits associated with the course, and what can we learn about the VFM?
- If business owners are making/planning changes to their businesses, are these strategic changes? i.e. entering new markets, internationalising etc. If not, what changes are they making?
- How confident can we be that the programme will lead to firm-level productivity improvements?
- Were there any negative and/or unintended consequences of the training?
- Do participants who have taken up business support previously behave differently compared to those who haven't? (e.g. encouraging others)

HLQ 5 – What other factors influence how and what changes businesses are making after they complete the programme?

- How does the programme differ by region in terms of recruitment, delivery, outcomes and impact?
- Do participants stay in the business for a long enough time to have the desired changes? If not, are there spill over effects?
- Are the outcomes proportionate to the amount of time the participants dedicate for attendance?
- Are participants taking up any other business support schemes (e.g. ERDF)? If yes, how does this influence the impact evaluation?
- What share of participants would have gone to other business training but chose this one instead?
- Are businesses seeking other forms of advice and support as well as this programme?
- Do wider contextual factors e.g. COVID-19 or other economic conditions affect what changes businesses are making after they complete the programme?

3. Suggested Methodology

<p>If applicable:</p> <p>Total number of Participants on programme</p> <p>Total number of Interviews (survey)</p> <p>Total number of Interviews (qualitative)</p> <p>Total number of Focus Groups</p> <p>Total number of Case Studies</p>	<p>Insert numbers:</p> <p>30,000 total (Year 1 - 8,000; Years 2 & 3 – 11,000/ annum)</p> <p>~2000</p> <p>~40/ annum</p> <p>0</p> <p>0-15</p>
<p>Any other specific requirements</p>	<p>The above numbers are indicative numbers per annum depending on the evaluation approach and timing proposed. Contractors should suggest and justify their sample sizes based on what is realistic within the budget, and what they think will deliver a high quality evaluation.</p>
<p>See Annex 1 for Draft Theory of Change.</p> <p>Approach & Methodology</p> <p>The evaluation will seek to measure and understand the delivery of the programme and the early outcomes and impacts. Productivity and GVA improvements can take 3-7 years to materialise and be measurable⁶. Therefore, this evaluation will focus on measuring the early outcomes and proxies for productivity improvements. This evaluation will also need to reinforce good monitoring practices to enable a longer term impact evaluation to be conducted (following the principles in the BEIS Business Support Evaluation Framework⁷).</p> <p>The evaluation contractors will need to collect primary data through surveys, qualitative interviews and workshops to conduct a process and an early impact evaluation. The early impact evaluation will seek to measure outcomes and proxies for productivity improvements (e.g. adoption or embedding of new leadership and management practices) with beneficiaries, and if appropriate with a counterfactual group.</p> <p>The evaluation contractor will be required to work alongside delivery partners to collect, collate and analyse monitoring data. This includes working with the Chartered Association of Business Schools (CABS) and business schools to ensure that consistent monitoring data is collected and to ensure that there is sufficient access to the participants for</p>	

⁶ Drews, C., & Hart, M. (2015). Feasibility Study – Exploring the Long-Term Impact of Business Support Services. Research Paper. <https://www.enterpriseresearch.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/ERC-Research-Paper-LT-Impact.-Research-PaperNo29.-Final-02APR15.pdf>

⁷ BEIS Business support evaluation framework. (2019) <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/business-support-evaluation-framework>.

N.B. See also BEIS monitoring and evaluation framework. (2021).

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/beis-monitoring-and-evaluation-framework>.

evaluation purposes such as conducting interviews, etc. The evaluation contractor will need to be live to any process improvements made over the course of the programme.

Though the existing evaluation and suggested timelines are outlined below, the exact period of the evaluation is to be determined by the contractor. The bidder will be asked to provide indicative timings for the proposed work based on the programme timeline.

A theory of change developed and tested developed through the insights of previous management and business support programmes is included in the annex. Bidders are welcome to make suggestions on adjustments either in their bid or once awarded if necessary.

As the successful bidder will be joining the Help to Grow: Management programme after the launch date, some baseline data collection instruments such as registration and diagnostic forms will have been formulated. These are marked and can be adjusted where needed.

Each year, a maximum of 10,000 businesses can take part in the Help to Grow: Management programme. To take part in the programme, businesses must:

- Have between 5- 249 employees
- Have been in operation for at least a year
- Select a decision maker in the business e.g. CEO/ finance director as the attendee
- Have at least one line management in business employment structure

The eligibility criteria is selected to ensure businesses are capable of enacting changes. Participants will also need to pay £750 to get onto the course.

Businesses can apply directly to the programme via the national website at (<https://smallbusinesscharter.org/help-to-grow-management/>). Participants currently complete an expression of interest form. When the programme launches, participants, including those that expressed an EOI, can then select a cohort date from the website and complete a full registration form. All registrations are sent to their nearest participating business school to review. If successful, businesses are offered a place on the course along with payment details. Business Schools will report data back on both successful and ineligible businesses. Full data sharing details will be discussed with the successful bidder

Participants will be recruited on a rolling basis and will receive 32 hours of formal training. The programme will be delivered in a blended learning format. Modules will be delivered online via a Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) and take part in workshops, webinars and peer group calls and face to face (as covid restrictions ease). Businesses will also be assigned to a mentor where they can seek longer term one-to-one support. Participants will also benefit from access to an alumni community to continue their learning after their course.

Curriculum

The programme currently consists of 4 parts, of which there are four modules in each (or 12 modules in total):

- Part 1 - Strategies for Growth and Innovation
 - Strategy and innovation
 - Digital adoption

- Internationalisation case study
- Part 2 - Engaging with Customers
 - Vision, Mission and values
 - Developing a Marketing Strategy
 - Building a Brand Case Study
- Part 3 – Building a Sustainable and Agile Business
 - Organisational Design
 - Employee Engagement and Leading Change
 - High Performance Workplace Case Study
- Part 4 – Operations and Financial Strategies
 - Efficient Operations
 - Finance and Financial Management
 - Implementing Growth Plans Case Study

There are also three cross-cutting themes throughout the programme:

- Equality, Diversity and Inclusion
- Productivity
- Responsible business

CABS will lead further development of the curriculum with input from an Expert Advisory Council (EAC), the panel will bring together senior figures from business and academia. CABS then coordinate curriculum development and programme delivery through Business Schools. Business Schools will be proactively managed through monitoring and coordination via CABS, to ensure successful delivery against KPIs.

Evaluation Design

Impact Evaluation

For the impact evaluation methodology, bidders should outline their proposed quasi-experimental method and counterfactual approach, including how the counterfactual group will be set up, what processes would ensure high quality, and what implications this may have on wider delivery. Currently, our preferred approach is propensity score matching (PSM).

Bidders should be aware that a randomised control trial feasibility study will be conducted in parallel to the evaluation and we expect recommendations to feed into potential trials as a separate piece to the overall evaluation. This will need to be taken into account in the collection of data for example so as not to close down any possible trial options.

Theory based evaluation

We recognise that there are some unobservable characteristics and nuances that cannot easily be captured when evaluating the early to intermediate impacts of business support for different businesses. Therefore we encourage innovative bids that include a theory-based evaluation component (such as Contribution Analysis) to increase understanding on the impact of the intervention, including whether or not there is a causal link, given the wider complexity of the business support system and changing economic environment. Bidders should propose the method and how this will work alongside the quasi-experimental design

to maximise the learnings from the research, including what deliverables such as case studies may look like.

Process Evaluation

The **process evaluation** will seek to understand how the programme is delivered in practice and inform how delivery can be improved across the lifespan of the programme. The contractors will draw on monitoring data, for example on recruitment, diversity, attendance, and satisfaction scores, and conduct a process evaluation survey for beneficiaries completing the programme, as well as surveying those that have dropped out of the programme. They will also conduct qualitative research with delivery partners, beneficiaries, and wider stakeholders to better understand delivery and the impacts of wider factors such as Covid.

The evaluation contractor will work with the Chartered Association for Business Schools (CABS), the business schools delivering the programme, a sample of beneficiaries and a sample of SMEs who do not complete the programme (this will include those that drop out, ineligible participants and possibly a matched comparison group). Data collection processes will also be embedded to enable a longer-term impact evaluation to be conducted.

Data collection will be weaved into current reporting mechanisms and ways of working where possible. As part of this we are already feeding in monitoring data requirements onto the delivery platform for the business support.

The project plan and deliverables are detailed below. Bidders should outline their approach to the below with justification, and are invited to suggest changes.

Scoping Stage - July 2021 (Month 1)

The evaluation contractor(s) will conduct a scoping exercise to refine the evaluation plan (including revising the theory of change and evaluation questions) and reviewing counterfactual group options.

We have found that an early peer review of the evaluation plan reduces concerns with the methodology and reduces the need for retrospective data collection/ analysis. Where appropriate and where timings allow, the evaluation plan may be put forward to be peer reviewed by external academics and contractors may be expected to take part in an informal discussion with peer reviewers to address comments.

Data collection – July 2021 - ongoing

Baseline data collection

- Registration form
 - Baseline data collection will be done at registration for all potential beneficiaries and will be a requirement to take part in the programme. Data collection includes unique identifiers (e.g. CRNs), company name and address, etc. This data includes those who are ineligible. Suppliers will review the existing registration form and work with BEIS colleagues to enact changes if necessary.
- Diagnostic
 - Businesses are required to take part in a diagnostic with Business Schools where additional questions will be asked to understand their reasons for

applying and some information on their existing management practices. Suppliers will review the existing diagnostic questions and work with CABs and the Business Schools to make changes where needed.

Feedback Surveys/ interim data collection

- Interim data collection will be done with all beneficiaries and for each element of the programme. These will provide BEIS with timely evidence of how the programme is operating in practice and the quality of the programme (i.e. process evaluation questions). We would expect questions to address both the modules and the user experience of the virtual learning environment (VLE). Surveys with mentors may also be beneficial.
- We anticipate that the data collection will be administered by the business schools, with a view to build them into the VLE. The successful bidder will review and input into what data is collected.
- The evaluation contractor will be asked to recommend an approach, timings and frequency of data collection and analysis. They will work with the delivery partners where needed and to maximise response rates. Bidders are also invited to suggest an alternative method of collecting interim data.

Participant Post Completion Survey

- After the final session, a longer survey asks businesses about their experience and what changes they intend to make (i.e. what are the anticipated outcomes). This can then be compared with the follow up survey/interviews that will be conducted after 6 months to see whether or not they made those changes and how/why. As businesses will finish the course at different times, the survey will be designed during the early stages and completed as and when participants finish. Participants will complete the course on a rolling basis, and potentially in waves if over time demand exceeds supply.
- We suggest that the post completion survey for beneficiaries will be done online as this will be most cost-effective however bidders are free to suggest an alternative approach. The survey should be short to maximise response rates (around 15 minutes for participants and could be shorter for dropouts). Please indicate suggested survey sample size (including whether you would do a census if online), response rate, and expected number of achieved interviews. And detail how you will ensure good response rates to this survey.
- The contractors will be responsible for working with business schools to collect and analyse this data for interim evaluation reports (see below) and for the final report. We are exploring the option for the post-completion survey to be administered via the VLE, but for the purposes of this bid contractors should expect to administer the survey.

Interim evaluation report – March, Annually

- The contractor will provide BEIS with publishable annual evaluation reports which outline key findings and trends at national level. The content of the report may evolve over the course of the evaluation. The report would be targeted towards policy-makers, delivery partners (Business schools) and key stakeholders. Contractors are expected to present the findings to the evaluation working and steering groups (see governance section).
- While earlier findings may be required for the programme's agile approach (see policy life changes and programme review points), this report will form a standalone product at the end of each financial year.

- BEIS will publish the reports on GOV.UK annually and so each report will go through the BEIS Peer Review Group (for external peer review) before being published. Please allow time to respond to and address peer review comments in the timeline set out in bids.

Drop out survey (telephone preferable, timings flexible)

- As participants complete baseline data at the start, we will have data on those who drop out. Bidders are invited to propose an approach for those that do not complete the programme or begin following registration and payment.
- Bidders should detail their approach to this, including sample sizes, timing and efforts to maximise response rates. While we would prefer for drop out surveys to happen as close as possible to businesses dropping out, we recognise that this may put resourcing constraints on bidders depending on the approach taken.

As mentioned above, the bidder should state the survey mode, the associated cost and why the approach was chosen. This will include considering factors such as costs, response rates and practicalities. A mixed approach may be chosen (e.g. telephone for dropouts and online for participants). The bidder will also have to provide information on how they will maximise response rates and ensure the quality of the survey (e.g. piloting, testing questions). Using questions from existing surveys will be encouraged. As participants will finish the programme at different times, the contractor is asked to provide indicative timelines of when this survey work will occur and how they will manage this.

The contractors will be responsible for analysing and reporting the survey findings. This includes producing descriptive statistics, cross-tabulations and producing a summary of the aggregated data to be published, as well as assessing early outcomes and impacts from the follow-up surveys.

In-depth interviews (two rounds, mode variable, timings flexible)

- Qualitative interviews will be conducted with beneficiaries, delivery partners and stakeholders to understand how delivery can be improved and to interrogate why there were or were not any early impacts based on the programme and their reflections on the programme. Bidders may also consider the option to also conduct qualitative interviews with the counterfactual group at this stage.
- Bidders should outline their approach, including whether their approach would be used for process/ impact evaluation, number of interviews, suggesting timings, for example whether these would be more beneficial during, immediately after or 6 months after participation. Bidders may work with business schools, CABS to recruit businesses/ stakeholders.
- We have suggested two rounds of qualitative interviews (1x Autumn, to capture early delivery insights and recommendations ahead of reviews, however bidders may suggest an alternative approach if they wish.

Phase 2 – Ongoing September 2021 – December 2025

This phase will begin once the first cohort has completed the programme (likely September/ October) and may run on an ongoing basis. The final cycle of this phase will finish roughly 8-9 months after the final cohort has completed the programme (December 2025).

6-month post-completion survey (rolling basis, telephone preferable)

- Participants will be followed up around 6 months after they have completed the programme. This survey will provide fundamental evidence for understanding the programme's early impacts. This survey will seek to follow up on data collected during earlier phases (e.g. intended actions as specified in the feedback survey). It

will seek to gain an understanding of what businesses have done since completing the programme and to answer wider research questions. Related to HLQ 3, 4 & 5, the survey will collect information such as:

- What support the businesses actually received (as they may have dropped out/not attended all sessions)
- Whether in hindsight there's anything about the programme they would like to see improved
- Whether attitudes/behaviours have changed regarding business operation
- Whether they are aware of changes they can make to their business
- Whether they have or are planning on making any changes to their business
- Whether they are experiencing any barriers to implementing change
- Whether they have shared their knowledge more widely (e.g. with other businesses, their networks etc.)
- Some understanding of the costs and benefits associated with the programme from the business's perspective.
- The evaluation contractors will be responsible for designing and conducting the survey. A six-month on participant survey will be a sample of beneficiaries. Surveying a sample will likely be more cost-effective and reduce overall respondent burden. Please propose your expected sample size and number of interviews you will achieve. Please indicate how you will ensure a representative sample for example using stratification and if so which variables you intend to stratify by (e.g. sector, size, location). As this data will not be available until baseline data has been collected, please provide indicative sample sizes and costs, and target number of achieved interviews. Please include your underlying rationale and assumptions underpinning these, including power calculations if planning to make comparisons with a counterfactual group. Once baseline data is available (during the first phase), the evaluation contractors will be asked to provide a more comprehensive sample frame.
- The survey should be short to maximise response rates (around 15 minutes for participants and could be shorter for dropouts). Please indicate suggested survey sample size. And detail how you will ensure good response rates to this survey.

Identifying the comparison group/ counterfactual survey (mode variable, timing flexible)

- Bidders should suggest how they will identify or construct the comparison group, providing reasons, timings and wider implications. Bidders will have an opportunity to explore this further during the scoping phase and to refine this later.
- Bidders should state whether they would carry out counterfactual surveys and their approach for this, including the volume of surveys undertaken, timings and sampling method. The bidder may suggest alternative methods, again providing reasons why. To minimise response burden, we suggest the survey is designed to gather data efficiently and administrative data is used where possible to avoid unnecessary questions.
- Depending on the counterfactual approach taken, surveying both beneficiary and counterfactual groups as part of the evaluation may give us a) some shorter term indicators of programme impact and b) additional data about both sets of firms to include in longer term analysis using administrative data.

Quantitative analysis and identifying the comparison group

- We expect quantitative analysis between the treatment and comparison group to be quasi-experimental, using difference-in difference-analysis. This will be

conducted by the evaluation contractors based on the data collected through the programme and linking to admin or commercial databases (e.g. HMRC data, IDBR, FAME). Bidders should outline their chosen approach and explain why. The contractor will provide a full clean dataset each year.

Full evaluation report

- The evaluation contractor will be responsible for producing an evaluation report summarising all of the evidence over the lifetime of the programme. This will be of publishable standard. The report will be signed off by members of the evaluation working group and steering group. The report will also go through the BEIS Peer Review Group (for external peer review) before being published.
- Bidders are encouraged to propose supporting deliverables to accompany the report such as case studies or other dissemination materials.
- Contractors should produce a technical report outlining the methodology and quantitative analysis in more detail. This report should be of sufficient detail that the research could be replicated by someone not involved in the project.

Harmonisation and Data Sharing with other business support programmes

There are other business support programmes which will be running concurrently with Help to Grow – Management which will need to be factored into evaluation plans.

Including:

- There is likely to be overlap in businesses taking part in the programmes. Please consider how this will affect the analysis, data sharing etc that may be required.
- Harmonisation of data collection and metrics between the programmes will be required (balanced with the evaluation requirements for this programme).
- This may require working with the evaluators of the other programmes.

The primary programmes to be considered are:

- Help to Grow – Digital: Launching in Autumn 2020, this programme supports the adoption of technology by offering SMEs free impartial advice on technology and discounts on approved software.
- Peer Networks: This programme brings businesses together to build networks, share ideas and address issues to increase business growth and productivity.

There is also a programme of small randomised control trials - Business Basics⁸ - which may need to be considered, however the smaller nature of the trials means the overlap will be much smaller too.

There are also other existing forms of business support and advice for example from Growth Hubs, Local Authorities, Trade Associations, the private sector which you should factor into evaluation plans.

Programme/Policy Changes

Over the Lifecycle of the programme there may be changes to the content and delivery of the programme. For example, the content linked to as part of the wrap-around support and alumni network may develop and change over the three years, and new case studies may be added to the curriculum as the course develops to reflect year 1 process evaluation findings.

Please consider how you will factor these into the evaluation of the programme as a whole and what will be required.

⁸ <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/business-basics-programme>

Contractors will be required to work flexibly with BEIS analysts and the policy team to ensure that the evaluation continues to reflect any programme changes and to update the evaluation over the programme duration as required.

Programme Review Points

The programme will be reviewed after 6 months, with further review points to be confirmed. Monitoring evidence will be required to feed into this review. Due to the high-profile nature of the programme, the successful bidder should expect to produce and feed in ad hoc findings for policy/delivery partners where feasible, including for this milestone.

Covid and other contextual Factors

Please consider how you will try to assess the impact of Covid 19 and other macro or contextual factors which might affect programme take up and outcomes.

GDPR

The successful bidder will need to handle personal data, including protected characteristics of participants. All research and outputs must meet GDPR requirements. Bidders should state whether they have sufficient privacy policies in place to satisfy GDPR regulation. BEIS will be the data controller of all data collected and deliverables produced as part of the contract.

Quality Assurance

All deliverables are to be quality assured by the contractor before delivery. The contractor will also respond to comments by BEIS officials and peer reviewers, and undertake to improve outputs which do not meet BEIS standards.

Contractors are asked to provide information on their own quality assurance processes as part of their tender response.

The reports will also go through BEIS's quality assurance processes, for example reviewed by analysts and policy officials, with senior analyst and policy sign-off. As already mentioned all reports will also be subject to peer review by external experts. This will include initial plans/scoping report.

All research and outputs are required to meet standards set out in the Magenta Book⁹, the BEIS Monitoring and Evaluation Framework¹⁰, The BEIS Business Support Evaluation Framework¹¹, the Government Social Research code¹² and the Market Research Society Code of Conduct¹³.

Dissemination

There is likely to be high demand from policymakers and organisations involved in business support to understand the key findings over the course of the Help to Grow: Management Programme. Effective dissemination will ensure that delivery partners will better understand what areas they are doing well in, and areas that need to be improved going forward.

Contractors are invited to propose a dissemination strategy or resources to communicate key learnings and the impact of the programme to key stakeholders. This may include producing summary infographics or conducting periodic workshops with business schools annually or at the end of the programme's contract.

Governance

Governance of the Help to Grow: Management programme currently consists of a weekly project board with Cross-Whitehall analysts, policy colleagues, Business Schools and CABS. The board agenda considers project progress, expenditure, the effect of external factors on the project, potential improvements to the delivery (content and administration)

⁹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-magenta-book>

¹⁰ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/beis-monitoring-and-evaluation-framework>

¹¹ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/business-support-evaluation-framework>

¹² <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-government-social-research-code-people-and-products>

¹³ <https://www.mrs.org.uk/standards/code-of-conduct>

of the project and the evaluation approach. Contractors will be expected to attend when necessary to provide updates.

The contractor should expect to attend regular evaluation catch ups with BEIS colleagues to address progress, emerging deliverables and risks, and an Evaluation Governance Board with a wider cast list. The exact frequency of meetings and attendance will be agreed with the successful contractor.

Timetable

The indicative timings are that the project will last for 4 years and involve three 'cycles' of two phases (phase 1 and phase 2). We anticipate the maximum time frame for each 'cycle' of the programme (P1 & P2) would be 21 months (e.g. March 2022-December 2023). This means there will be overlap between cycles i.e. Cycle 1 Phase 2 will overlap with cycle 2 phase 1. The bidder is welcome to propose alternative timings.

This programme will run over four financial years up to December 2024 (Y21/22, Y22/23, Y23/24, Y24/25). There will be break clauses at the end of each financial year to take into account future budget decisions. Depending on budget certainty and business need.

Indicative timings

- The baseline feedback, post-completion and drop-out surveys will be conducted on a rolling basis – month 1-12 (March-March)
- Interviews – timings for supplier to confirm
- 6-month and drop out survey – Rolling basis
- Write up - Month 20-21 (November- December)

The below gives a breakdown of the timings and budget allocations for each year

	Year 1 (21/22) £250,000	Year 2 (22/23) £300,000	Year 3 (23/24) £300,000	Year 4 (24/25) £200,000
Cycle 1	P1	P2		
Cycle 2		P1	P2	
Cycle 3			P1	P2

Social Value

As part of the government's commitment to consider how procurement of services can increase social value, suppliers are required to explain how social value has been considered in what they have outlined to deliver, and in how they will deliver.

Examples of how suppliers may exhibit social value within their bids could be:

- Internal commitment to environmental sustainability
- Skills and employment initiatives such as increased apprenticeships within the company, or;
- Commitments to safe and secure supply chains such as how Modern Slavery will be avoided and prompt payments

4. Deliverables

A summary of reports with timings below:

Contractors are welcome to suggest amendments to the timetable, with an accompanying rationale.

Year	Reports	Analysis
------	---------	----------

1	Scoping report (including evaluation plan and updated theory of change) Interim report at end of FY (and potential for additional analysis/short report for 6 month review point if significantly different timing to end FY)	Process evaluation
2	Interim report Full clean dataset	Early impact findings for year 1 + additional process data
3	Interim report Full clean dataset	Early impact findings for year 2 + additional process data
4	Final report including detailed technical annex	Early impact findings for years 1 - 3, and complete process evaluation

All reports should be quality assured by the contractors.

The list of deliverables expected for this project are:

- Data collection tools such as baseline survey, feedback surveys, process evaluation survey, drop-out survey, 6-month follow up survey, topic guides, survey data tables
- Published annual interim evaluation reports
- Full clean dataset to enable longer term impact evaluation to be carried out – this will include contact details of firms (for re-contacting) and information about participants (and non-participants where relevant) e.g. unique business identifiers to enable data linking.
- Quality-assured, replicable technical report
- Published full final evaluation report including synthesis of findings across methods.
- Presentation of results to Programme Board including slide pack summary and (desirable) Dissemination resources for example summary poster/ Infographic.

Part 2: Contract Terms



Contract Terms v6.0