Community Renewal: Lifting Neighbourhoods Together
Evaluation Specification

Version: 2020 03 03 1500

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROGRAMME

Community Renewal: Lifting Neighbourhoods Together (CR:LNT) is a 5-year £3.5m programme by Community Renewal Trust and partners with £2.1m funding from the National Lottery Community Fund. It seeks to demonstrate that system and behavioural change among frontline public service staff can lift a neighbourhood out of poverty simply by integrating services at a neighbourhood level while developing expertise in case management and community engagement. We believe that deep down people in our communities know what they need and we will be building their own capacity to support themselves throughout this work.

Community Renewal Trust has spent twenty years working in deprived neighbourhoods and have observed through this experience that:

1) There is already significant investment through frontline workers in delivering public services (especially urgent/responsive services) to try to meet the needs of people in deprived areas plus billions more spent on physical regeneration.
2) People in deprived communities already know what is required to improve their lives – what they need is help with how to make it happen and to be at the heart of how we respond locally.
3) Proactively engaging, welcoming, really listening and then sticking with people for as long as it takes are key to delivering all local interventions.
4) Sustainable transformation in communities is possible but needs a long term commitment.
5) Community Renewal's teams already have processes, training and tools to improve the ability of public services to be effective in improving lives in a whole neighbourhood. These have been well tested individually and have measurably reduced poverty in neighbourhoods for a short-period during an intervention.

We now believe that we can get a neighbourhood to a tipping point where it is no longer stuck in a cycle of poverty. This may happen if a range of frontline workers from the third sector and public sector came together using the approaches we have developed to become:

- better able to engage people in the community *proactively*;
- better able to offer person-centred asset-based case management;
- more flexible to meet community and community member needs; and
- enable members of the community to lead in their own transformation.

The many frontline workers and service managers we have spoken to are very excited – they often know exactly how they could make a greater impact if they had more of these freedoms and abilities. This will enable local frontline workers to help local people help themselves.

The first main step to delivering this programme is to establish a Neighbourhood Transformation Team (NTT). This team will be hosted by a local partner already embedded in the neighbourhood In the Edinburgh neighbourhood this is Community

Renewal Trust and in the Newcastle neighbourhood it is Building Futures East. The members of the NTT are: frontline staff from public agencies who have some/all of their time donated to work within the team; frontline staff already working for the local hosting partner who have some/all of their time donated to work within the team; and a manager. The frontline workers are coming from specialities in youth work, employability, welfare advice, housing, social work, community food, and community development.

The team will then undertake ongoing training, reflection and development work so they can deliver community engagement and case management as well as continuing to deliver their existing specialism but better integrated with the team and local neighbourhood.

INTRODUCTION TO THE EVALUATION STRANDS

The evaluation will be a single contract with a single lead evaluation partner.

However, we recognise that there are three different aspects to the evaluation which may require different staff or organisations to be involved. We would encourage approaches which included partnership working or consortia (as long as there is a single lead partner).

The below tables sets out the three evaluation strands:

Evaluation Strand	Key Questions
Impact/cost benefit evaluation	- To what extend have we lifted a neighbourhood out of poverty? - In what ways has the neighbourhood and people's lives improved? - What is the ratio of cost to benefit when we look at financial benefit to people and to local/national governments?
Learning/ qualitative evaluation	- To what extent has can we evidence that the system of public service in the neighbourhood changed for the better? - To what extent can we evidence that staff behaviours have changed for the better? - How can other neighbourhoods replicate this model by learning from the developmental processes, system change, behavioural change and processes/approach?
Formative evaluation	- What possible early improvements can we learn from and implement after the first years of delivery?

INVITATION TO TENDER NOTICE

Community Renewal Trust are seeking a suitably qualified partner or consortium to be the evaluator for the Community Renewal Lifting Neighbourhoods Together programme. The budget for this work is £250,000 with the final reports due in 2024.

Responses to this Invitation to Tender should be sent by email by 10am on 14 April 2020 to karen.harkins@communityrenewal.org.uk .

Questions may be asked by email sent to karen.harkins@communityrenewal.org.uk but must be received before 10am 8 April 2020. Answers to questions will be sent out in batches to all those who have registered an interest in the Invitation to Tender.

EVALUATION STRAND 1: IMPACT AND COST-BENEFIT EVALUATION

- *To what extend have we lifted a neighbourhood out of poverty?*
- *In what ways has the neighbourhood and people's lives improved?*
- *What is the ratio of cost to benefit when we look at financial benefit to people and to local/national governments?*

Over the next few years, Community Renewal hopes to influence public bodies all across the United Kingdom[1] to adopt the approach and techniques of Community Renewal Lifting Neighbourhoods Together (CRLNT) to address poverty. Many policy makers, politicians and commissioners will be convinced by our asset-based person-centred place-based approach and our development approach to whole system change that can improve lives at a neighbourhood level. But for other such influential people, before they adopt such an approach they will want to understand the overall costs involved in delivery compared to the social/economic benefits.

The total costs of delivery are made up of programme costs and the in kind costs of frontline staff donated to the CRLNT team from public agencies. Calculating what the costs of replicating the programme would be is an important (and straightforward) first step for this evaluation. However, some of these costs may actually be offset by cost savings elsewhere – for example, while the programme has premises/IT costs, there may be reduced premises/IT from one of the public bodies donating staff time. Understanding and approximating these cost offsets will be important.

More importantly there are expected to be social/economic benefit to the public in the event that the programme is in any way successful at achieving change. For example, if our work with young people reduces antisocial behaviour and offending we should note savings to the criminal justice system. As another example, if there is an income rise for a local family we can record the raised income for the family and the reduced cost to DWP in benefits payments.

Due to the scale of the potential savings to different public bodies and the quantifiable benefits to residents, we anticipate that there will be a net positive cost-benefit. Approximating this figure in an appropriately conservative and robust manner will be complicated and require data gathering from residents, public bodies, staff and making analytical comparisons within UK/Scottish datasets. However, it is important for the programme to have an estimated total cost-benefit analysis as well as seeing a logical breakdown of this and the underlying assumptions. We are aware that there is some considerable debate around the degree to which an individual programme's contribution to overall change can be considered as quantifiable attribution – we are interested in working with an evaluator who can help navigate such issues towards quantifiable results wherever possible for this strand of the evaluation.

In addition to the cost-benefit analysis, it will be important to set out overall social impact. The impact should be set out for each of several different topics of interest (e.g. Antisocial behaviour, welfare). For each topic this should include assumptions about contribution and comparison against change in national figures for the same topic. All of the following topics need to be addressed:
- employment rate in neighbourhood;
- number of people whom we have supported who entered/sustained work;

---

[1] Exactly which audience we should seek to influence is a question we wish to look at with an evaluation partner.

- household incomes in neighbourhood;
- household benefit incomes in in neighbourhood (and impact on state finances);
- educational attainment of children in families we engage;
- antisocial behaviour and crime rates in neighbourhood;
- self-reported wellness of people we engage who have most complex need; and
- perception of loneliness/isolation among residents in the neighbourhood.

All written evaluation outputs should be formatted to be attractive and include well designed diagrams to aid understanding. Any longer reports should include a 3-8 page executive summary, a one page summary and a summary infographic/presentation. While we are open to evaluators suggesting alternate approaches, we anticipate three major reporting milestones fitting to our conference schedule: a framework/baseline, an interim report and a final report.

An Evaluation Framework report in the first year is an important milestone. It should exhaustively set out how the evaluation will proceed and set out the hypotheses, this should include both baselines data analysis (which may be a separate document if needed) against which progress will be measured and also a social impact forecast. This forecast should use interviews with team and literature review data only to broadly estimate what success will look like in terms of quantifiable impact (for example a short calculation might say that if we got 200 people into work that would generate £X economic impact).

The programme will be delivering in two neighbourhoods: Bingham & Magdalene in Edinburgh; and Walker in Newcastle. It is important that we understand the impact we have made in these small geographic areas. We have aligned the boundaries we are working in to datazones/LSOAs where we have data already on issues such as housing and ASB. We will support the evaluator to track down data from council, Scottish Government and NHS sources but we will also collaborate when there are data gaps to consider the best way to progress the evaluation.

There will be some need to get data from residents directly by the evaluator or by putting into place data collection that can be completed by the programme team. This will be a significant requirement and we are open to suggestions from evaluators about how to achieve it. We would like to see community members involved in the evaluation where possible but we would warn against methodologies relying on consulting (by interview or focus group) with residents[2] – hopefully there are more opportunities to gather data by embedding data collection into our processes in more subtle ways since our own teams are working long term in these neighbourhoods and will literally be engaging in some way with most residents in each neighbourhood each year.

Suggested milestones and evaluation outputs (to be agreed before contracting)
1) Framework Report setting out in detail hypotheses and calculation methodology to be used for report impacts and cost-benefit. Baseline Report showing dataset to be compared against in interim/final reports. 1 August 2020.
2) Interim Report setting out early impact data against baseline dataset. 1 August 2022.
3) Final Report including overall and breakdown figures for impact and cost-benefit analysis. Concludes whether neighbourhood is lifted out of poverty. 31 January 2024.
4) Annual work plans and regular project management meetings.
5) Evaluator's additional preferred milestones reflecting their approach

---

[2] Residents often tell us they are sick of "being consulted", being asked their needs without any subsequent follow up, or dislike being "treated like guinea pigs".

EVALUATION STRAND 2: LEARNING / SYSTEMS EVALUATION

- *To what extent has can we evidence that the system of public service in the neighbourhood changed for the better?*
- *To what extent can we evidence that staff behaviours have changed for the better?*
- *How can other neighbourhoods replicate this model by learning from the developmental processes, system change, behavioural change and processes/approach?*

This strand is really a learning partner role first and foremost. It is about applying a systems approach to the neighbourhood as a way to examine the sort of systems/behaviour change we are seeking to achieve.

The result of our programme's impact will be in lifting a neighbourhood out of poverty. But the primary impact of our programme is on the members of the Neighbourhood Transformation Team themselves and the changes to the system and behaviours around public services in this neighbourhood – we wish to understand and present these changes in detail. An example is that we wish the staff to fundamentally change how they see community members from "clients" to active participants in lifting the neighbourhood out of poverty.

While we are interested in recording the resulting impact of the programme on the neighbourhood through Evaluation Strand 1, that will not act either to explain *how* the impact was made nor how/whether others can replicate our approach. Therefore, the second evaluation strand is about having a learning partner for the programme looking at:

- Changing system dynamics in the neighbourhood.
- Changing behaviours in the way services are delivered in the neighbourhood[3].
- How the programme is viewed by various stakeholders and whether they feel it is successful.
- Whether there is external change we need to account for (e.g. national recession, local factory closure, decrease in external funding in neighbourhood due to our work crowding out others etc).

We look at a neighbourhood as a complex environment – people's individual lives are complex, as are their relationships and interactions within a neighbourhood. The reasons that complex lives result in poverty are even more complex still. So we are not looking to apply system thinking where the whole system is laid out in an orderly fashion on a page[4]. Rather we wish to accept this complexity as we apply some relatively simple principles that may start alleviating poverty – redirecting support resources, being more human in how we interact with people.

So we want to look at the system in terms of having a broad perspective rather than a narrow service-centred approach. We want to look at how people's roles and impacts can be seen as part of a wider neighbourhood system and the *dynamics* at play in the system.

We anticipate that there will be demand for this approach to be replicated in other neighbourhoods all across the UK. The evaluation should identify and record key development processes and capture *why* the approach may be working (or not).

---

[3] One minor note is that we have agreed to use the Lankelly Chase System Behaviours (https://lankellychase.org.uk/our-approach/system-behaviours/) as one way to track staff's changes in their perception of their behaviours/role, evaluators may wish to consider how this fits with their preferred data gathering.

[4] i.e. we are not seeking to apply whole systems thinking as one might in arranging a "lean" factory but we are in the sense of seeking to see the whole picture and integrate and act across all aspects.

As one part of capturing this, we anticipate the production of different Learning Materials[5], each on a different theme. Evaluators may wish to propose themes and these will be agreed in the annual workplans. We are aware however that this strand of the evaluation will need to be more agile and is likely to change as we together reflect on the best possible way to capture and record some of these developmental processes and approaches.

For this strand of activity we are aware that the journey is more important than the destination: that is to say that *how* this evaluation is conducted will be more important than the final documents. This is why we are describing this as a learning partner role. There could be a bigger role for community members or team members and group work is likely to be a useful aid to evidence gathering.

Some evaluations gather qualitative insights from staff and residents through focus groups, surveys or phone interviews. We think there is a risk that relying only on such tools will not sufficiently gather insights into the nuances of system change. We therefore would only want to see an evaluation where at least some evaluation/research staff spend time embedded in the teams in Edinburgh and Newcastle where possible, in addition to any more traditional data gathering methods. We are interested to here evaluators' ideas about engagement with each of community and staff and partners for this strand.

The way that the results are presented is important to us and we expect the reports and learning materials to be carefully tailored to be accessible and attention grabbing. We are interested in evaluators who may wish to take an approach involving video/illustration/imagery/diagrams.

Suggested milestones and evaluation outputs (to be agreed before contracting)

1) Reports setting out in detail an emerging understanding of the changing system dynamics, changing behaviours and whether this is contributing to lifting the neighbourhood out of poverty. A final report would contain a clear indication of whether the approach has been successful and should be replicated.
2) Learning Materials on a number of emerging themes (to be agreed in the annual workplans) which can be published and used as a guide in other neighbourhoods seeking to replicate this approach.
3) Annual work plans and regular project management meetings.
4) Evaluator's additional preferred milestones reflecting their approach

---

[5] The audience for these materials would be other organisations seeking to replicate what we have done. The Learning Materials should be combinations of papers and videos designed to help others understand what our approach is, what our developmental processes were, what they can do to deliver this new approach and how they will know it is successful. We should note that we would only expect others to replicate our approach with support from Community Renewal – so Learning Materials do not need to be stand alone guides with sufficient detail to replicate the approach based on those alone.

EVALUATION STRAND 3: FORMATIVE EVALUATION

What possible early improvements can we learn from and implement after the first years of delivery?

We wish to learn from what we are doing and improve the programme while we are delivering to respond to new ideas, best practices, recommendations and reflecting on what is working.

This is the smallest of the evaluation strands and for the purposes of the Invitation to Tender we consider it to be a sub-section of the second strand around learning and qualitative evaluation.

There is significant scope for the evaluators to inform how we go about learning from community members, partners and staff about how to refine our approach.

We anticipate in this strand, that the evaluators will lead workshops, action learning sets or similar facilitated sessions to both develop their ideas and present their recommendations which they have co-developed with us. A literature review will also be needed to gather comparative examples from other programmes, especially ones we might be able to visit or engage with.

Budget

The budget is fixed at £250,000 including any VAT and including any expenses.

The below table outlines one approach for the schedule of payments, although we are flexible where alternate suitable deliverables, dates and values can be identified. This table is not intended to limit when or what the evaluators set out in their response to the Invitation to Tender, however, it does set out some key deliverables which are essential for payments to be made.

There is some flexibility to adjust the payment schedule depending on the details of the workplans outlined in the tender. Any major changes must be agreed before the contract is signed.

Earliest Payment Date	Deliverables required in advance of payment	Payment
1 April 2020	Contract and data sharing agreement signed. Workplan agreed for coming 12 months.	£20,000
14 July 2020	Draft version of Evaluation Framework and Baseline Report(s)	£20,000
1 August 2020	Final version of Evaluation Framework and Baseline Report(s)	£20,000
1 April 2021*	Workplan agreed for coming 12 months year. Evidence that last year's workplan has been completed. Submission of timesheet report for past 12 months.	£20,000
1 August 2021	Formative Evaluation Report and Workshops.	£10,000
1 August 2021	First set of Learning Materials published. Delivery of any Formative and Learning activities outlined in tender.	£20,000
1 April 2022*	Workplan agreed for coming 12 months year. Evidence that last year's workplan has been completed. Submission of timesheet report for past 12 months.	£10,000
14 July 2022	Draft Version of Interim Evaluation Report	£20,000
1 August 2022	Final Version of Interim Evaluation Report	£10,000
1 April 2023*	Workplan agreed for coming 12 months year. Evidence that last year's workplan has been completed. Submission of timesheet report for past 12 months.	£20,000
31 January 2024	Draft version of Final Evaluation Report	£30,000
1 April 2024	Final version of Final Evaluation Report	£20,000
1 April 2024	All remaining agreed Learning Materials published as agreed in annual workplan. Delivery of any outstanding evaluation activities outlined in tender.	£20,000
1 August 2024	Attendance as required at conferences and events throughout contract. Delivery of any sharing or influencing activities outlined in tender.	£10,000

Further information

A series of conferences and learning dissemination events will take place throughout the programme which will be organised by Community Renewal Trust across the UK. Suitably qualified members of the evaluation team are expected to be represented at these events to make presentations and share findings. As a minimum, ten days should be set aside for this. The budget for these events is from another source and not expected to come from the evaluation budget (except travel and staff time for evaluators to attend).

We are interested in an evaluation partner who is agile and flexible as we know that there will be challenges to overcome in delivering this evaluation. We will need to meet regularly. While reports will form some of the deadlines, we are keen to ensure there are sufficient project management meetings held (in Edinburgh), often in person or by video conference where necessary.

Annual Work Plans must be agreed each year by both Parties each year setting out for each milestones to be achieved:
- Details about what has been decided about the content and format associated with that milestone
- Details of any alterations to deadlines agreed by both Parties
- Which staff will spend how many days on which tasks in the next 12 months

There must be an Annual Work Plan set out each year (according to the schedule in the Budget Schedule) and it must be agreed by both Parties.
At the end of the year the Contractor must report on actual delivery against last year's Annual Work Plan. These will effectively become annual updated project plans.

Final Reports should be submitted electronically in Word and PDF format as well as two bound hard copies being posted to Community Renewal Trust.

Evaluators will need to consider safeguarding and disclosure checks (or similar) if they anticipate their staff having contact with members of the public. Responsibility for this rests with the evaluators.

We anticipate that we will already be purchasing CACI Acorn or Experian Mosaic data for the neighbourhood from a different budget – this will aid un us understanding whether a neighbourhood has been lifted out of poverty. Community Renewal will pay for this data.

Responses should be sent in PDF or MS Word and should not exceed 20MB.

You may respond in your own format if you wish but you must stay within the page limits (in Arial 11pt), any information exceeding the page limit will be disregarded.

Responses already submitted may be amended up to the deadline by emailing
karen.harkins@communityrenewal.org.uk

If necessary, clarification interviews may take place in the week of 6 April 2020.

Helpful References

Those interested in conducting this evaluation may find the following resources helpful.

A brochure made by Community Renewal Trust summarising our experience and the origins of this programme is available here:
https://www.communityrenewal.org.uk/projects/20-years-of-transformation/

A report by Vanguard/Locality which continues to influence our thinking is the *Local by Default: Diseconomies of Scale*.

The "Fifth Wave Approach" to health care and "Three Horizons" work by those involved in the International Futures Forum has greatly informed our thinking over the last decade and applicants may wish to refer to those sources.

We believe that some of our ideas are related to thinking being done by Participle / Hillary Cottam ("Radical Help") and also by Collaborate CIC ("Human, Learning, Systems")

Tender Conditions

The contract will consist of this Specification Document, the Invitation to Tender document, the successful Tender, and a signed Partnership Agreement.

The final Terms and Conditions documents will be based on these Tender Conditions but Community Renewal Trust reserve the right to make amends before the final Terms and Conditions document is shared with the successful tenderer.

No contract shall be entered into until there has been an inception meeting and the contract is signed by both parties.

Where the Tender document disagrees with the Specification, the Specification shall be considered as superseding the Tender.

Payments will only be made on or after the dates outlined and only once the deliverables have been met. No payments may be made after August 2024 as that is the ned of the grant funding period – all deliverables must have been completed before the end of that year.

The maximum delay on a deliverable is 2 months unless explicitly otherwise agreed in writing by Community Renewal.

The Contractor must have suitable insurances at all times during delivery.

The Contractor must sign and at all times abide by a Data Protection Agreement with Community Renewal Trust.

The Contractor must sign and at all times abide by a Confidentiality Agreement with Community Renewal Trust.

Community Renewal Trust accepts no liability for expenses resulting from breaches by the Contractor of the Data Protection Agreement, Contract, or Confidentiality Agreement.

The Contractor must have and enforce an environmental sustainability policy and quality management policy at all times during delivery.

Community Renewal Trust retains the right to not appoint any applicant without giving reasons.

Community Renewal Trust may provide feedback to applicants but have no obligation to do so.

A response received will be considered binding on the part of the sender for a period of 90 days from the deadline for submissions.

Any disagreement about Partnership Agreement Terms must be raised by the Tenderer in advance of the award notice.

Possible timeline – to be revised before contracting but which may help identify key timescale requirements	Sep 19	Oct 19	Nov 19	Dec 19	Jan 20	Feb 20	Mar 20	Apr 20	May 20	Jun 20	Jul 20	Aug 20	Sep 20	Oct 20	Nov 20	Dec 20	Jan 21	Feb 21	Mar 21	Apr 21	May 21	Jun 21	Jul 21	Aug 21	Sep 21	Oct 21	Nov 21	Dec 21	Jan 22	Feb 22	Mar 22	Apr 22	May 22	Jun 22	Jul 22	Aug 22	Sep 22	Oct 22	Nov 22	Dec 22	Jan 23	Feb 23	Mar 23	Apr 23	May 23	Jun 23	Jul 23	Aug 23	Sep 23	Oct 23	Nov 23	Dec 23	Jan 24	Feb 24	Mar 24	Apr 24	May 24	Jun 24	Jul 24	Aug 24
Evaluation ITT Issued						X																																																						
Evaluation Tender Deadline							X																																																					
Evaluation Contract Signed								X																																																				
Evaluation Inception Meeting								X																																																				
Evaluation Management Meetings								X		X		X		X			X			X			X			X						X			X			X						X						X			X			X			X	
Evaluation Framework												X																																																
Evaluation Baseline Report												X																																																
Formative Evaluation Report																								X																																				
Interim Evaluation Report																																				X																								
Final Evaluation Report																																																					X							
Learning Materials Published																									X																												X						X	
Conferences/external events																	X	X																		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Application Questions

1) Track record conducting cost benefit analysis for similar projects

Please set out in detail between two and five examples of past cost-benefit analysis research undertaken by the people or organisation(s) submitting this application. It will be helpful if the examples are similar in terms of being around the same policy areas or same approach. It will also be helpful if the examples are either evaluations with a similar evaluation budget or evaluations of projects where the overall project budget is similar/larger.

In *each case* you should set out as a minimum: programme name, contract funder, approx contract value, approx start/end dates, lead researcher names (to check they are also involved in this evaluation), nature of the intervention being researched (to check whether it is similar in nature/scale), which aspects of cost/benefit analysis were considered, and a summary of the findings.

Max 4 A4 pages in Arial 11pt including any diagrams/images/charts

The following assessment criteria will apply giving a score of 0-10:
0: Very limited evidence of relevant examples from the people/organisation applying
6: At least one clearly relevant example of a similar nature or scale from the people/organisation applying
12: At least two clearly relevant examples of a similar nature or scale from the people/organisation applying
18: At least two clearly relevant examples of a similar nature and scale from the people/organisation applying and no basic information missing

This question is weighted 20 out of 100.

2) Track record in *formative/qualitative* evaluations and learning partner roles for similar projects

Please set out in detail between two and five examples of past qualitative evaluation and learning partner roles undertaken by the people or organisation(s) submitting this application. These should be relevant to the nature or scale of the evaluation proposed in this application.

In *each case* you should set out as a minimum: programme name, contract funder, approx contract value, approx start/end dates, lead researcher names (to check they are also involved in this evaluation), nature of the intervention being researched (to check whether it is similar in nature/scale), what sort of evaluation and learning role was undertaken, whether reports/how-to guides were written, and what difference the evaluation made.

Please remember that we are most interested in observing system change and behaviour change. We are also interested in being able to provide materials/resources that will support others to replicate our approach.

Max 4 A4 pages in Arial 11pt including any diagrams/images/charts

The following assessment criteria will apply giving a score of 0-10:
0: Very limited evidence of relevant examples from the people/organisation applying
6: At least one clearly relevant example of a similar nature or scale from the people/organisation applying
12: At least two clearly relevant examples of a similar nature or scale from the people/organisation applying
18: At least two clearly relevant examples of a similar nature and scale from the people/organisation applying and no basic information missing

This question is weighted 20 out of 100.

3) Personnel

Please provide CVs (or similar) for each team member who will be involved for more than 10 days on this work. While other staff may have more minor roles (less than 10 days) in the evaluation, there is no need to attach a CV for them.

For full marks all of the following expertise will need to be observed across various team members who are clearly set out as having a significant role in those aspects of the evaluation:
- Cost benefit analysis (or similar)
- Qualitative evaluation and acting as a learning partner (or similar)
- Project management
- Writing accessible and well presented research reports or how-to guides
- Communicating research findings in media, within their networks or in presentations

No page limit

The following assessment criteria will apply giving a score of 0-10:
0: Very limited evidence of team members with relevant experience
3: Limited evidence of team members with relevant experience
6: Very good evidence of team members with relevant experience
9: At least two team members have excellent evidence of expertise needed in each area of expertise

This question is weighted 10 out of 100.

4) Evidence for your reputation/influence

While our primary concern is the quality of the evaluation work itself, we also consider that a report written by people/organisations with a reputation for excellence and influencing policy will have a greater impact.

To what extent can you evidence that your organisation(s) and staff have a reputation for publishing research which goes on to have a high impact on policy makers across the UK?

We are interested in specific examples of your research making an impact as well as insight into which influential networks you are part of and whether your work has received positive media exposure in the past.

Max 2 A4 pages in Arial 11pt including any diagrams/images/charts

The following assessment criteria will apply giving a score of 0-10:
0: Very limited evidence of relevant examples around reputation or influence
3: Limited evidence of relevant examples around reputation or influence
6: Evidence of good reputation nationally or relevant examples of influence
9: Evidence of excellent reputation and influence nationally

This question is weighted 10 out of 100.

5) Methodology to be used for cost-benefit analysis and impact evaluation

Please set out a description of how you would go about undertaking the cost-benefit analysis for this intervention.

For full marks you will need to cover:
- Details of which staff would be involved for how long on which tasks over the five year programme.
- How you will consider the costs of the programme
- Which aspects of benefits you anticipate being able to financially quantify and why
- How you will consider the net financial benefits of the programme to people in the community from income changes
- How you will consider the net financial benefits of the programme to national and local government
- Approaches you would take around determining attribution (e.g. comparing with national data sets, survey data, or collecting estimates of attribution through primary research)
- How you will engage the community in an appropriate and empowering way.
- How you will report on impact that is best left without financially quantifying the benefits, such as wellbeing and sense of community.
- Details of how you will write up the report to be both thorough and accessible to a wider audience.

Please note that:

- We anticipate that we will already be purchasing CACI Acorn or Experian Mosaic data for the neighbourhood from a different budget.
- The neighbourhoods we have chosen align with LSOA and Datazone boundaries as there is national data (e.g. SIMD underlying dataset) released at those geographical levels.

Max 5 A4 pages in Arial 11pt including any diagrams/images/charts

The following assessment criteria will apply giving a score of 0-10:
0: Very limited evidence of plans that will make these aspects of the evaluation achievable
3: Limited evidence of plans that will make these aspects of the evaluation achievable
6: Evidence of plans that will make these aspects of the evaluation achievable
9: Evidence of plans that will make these aspects of the evaluation achievable and high quality

This question is weighted 10 out of 100.

6) Methodology to be used for learning/systems evaluation

Please set out a description of how you would go about undertaking the learning/systems evaluation which we see as a learning partner role.

Please remember that we are most interested in observing system change and behaviour change. We hope that the evaluation will help inform and improve our delivery during the programme. We are also interested in being able to provide materials/resources that will support others to replicate our approach.

For full marks you will need to cover:
- Details of which staff would be involved for how long on which tasks over the five year programme.
- How you will analyse and consider system dynamics affecting the neighbourhood and the programme.
- Your plans to collect data and insight are practical
- Any ways you plan to move beyond simple data collection (e.g. annual surveys or interviews) with residents/beneficiaries/staff towards a more embedded approach where you can better understand the nuance of the system and behaviours.
- What you will do to help the programme learn and improve
- What you will produce that can help others replicate our approach

Please note that in addition to any approach the evaluator wishes to use they must also report on whether there is evidence of progress among the Neighbourhood Transformation Team towards the Lankelly Chase System Behaviours (https://lankellychase.org.uk/our-approach/system-behaviours/).

Please note that a series of conferences and dissemination events will take place which will be funded from a different budget but at which will require representation from the evaluation team (we require a minimum 10 days for such activities in total).

Max 5 A4 pages in Arial 11pt including any diagrams/images/charts

The following assessment criteria will apply giving a score of 0-10:
0: Very limited evidence of plans that will make these aspects of the evaluation achievable
3: Limited evidence of plans that will make these aspects of the evaluation achievable
6: Evidence of plans that will make these aspects of the evaluation achievable
9: Evidence of plans that will make these aspects of the evaluation achievable and high quality

This question is weighted 10 out of 100.

7) Value for money and added value

Please describe what added value you will bring to this evaluation. Specifically, we are interested in:

- Working with organisations where profit, staff time or resources are demonstrably used for social value / community benefits.
- In kind contributions or match funding for the evaluation.
- Evaluators who will commit to high proportion of staff time from senior (e.g. director-level) staff with expertise.

Max 1 A4 pages in Arial 11pt including any diagrams/images/charts

You must include the following two template tables:

Total MINIMUM number of staff days that will be spent on this evaluation by all staff in your team(s)	*Total days:*

Total MINIMUM number of staff days that will be spent on this evaluation by named staff with over 10 years' experience of evaluation in related policy areas	
Name 1	*Days:*
Name 2	*Days:*
[add rows as required]	

The following assessment criteria will apply giving a score of 0-10 and will be based on comparison with other tenders received for this evaluation:
0: Very limited evidence of added value
3: Evidence of some value in terms of in kind contribution OR seniority of staff OR social value
6: Credible offer of value in terms of in kind contribution AND/OR seniority of staff OR social value
9: Credible offer of significant value in terms of in kind contribution OR seniority of staff

This question is weighted 10 out of 100.

8) Risk Assessment

Please detail the risks you feel are most relevant to this evaluation and the mitigating actions that you will take to reduce the likelihood of those risks occurring. We are interested in seeing that you have considered all obvious risks and that the mitigating actions mean that there are no obvious areas where realistically there remains a high risk.

Please include:
- Key staff absent or unavailable at critical times
- Key staff leaving the evaluation team who have critical knowledge
- Data needed for impact assessment not collected or available in time for final report
- Data not appropriately processed by evaluator
- Reports not written to appropriate standards or not containing required information
- Ethics/consent
- Any other risks you wish to consider

Rather than use your own scoring system please use the template format to use for risk assessment is shown below. A risk score is calculated by scoring the likelihood on a scale of 1(low)-5(high), then the severity on a scale of 1(low)-5(high); the risk score is Likelihood multiplied by Severity. Scores less than 8 are low risk and scores of 16 or over are high risk. You may wish to change the headers, columns or orientation but please keep the same approach.

Outline of risk	Risk score before mitigations	Mitigating actions	Risk score after mitigations
	Likelihood: Severity: Risk score:		Likelihood: Severity: Risk score:

Max 2 A4 pages in Arial 11pt including any diagrams/images/charts

The following assessment criteria will apply giving a score of 0-10:
0: The applicant has not provided an adequate risk assessment covering the basic risks
3: The scorer can think of at least two obvious examples of areas in which, in their opinion, there realistically remains high risk without sufficient credible mitigating actions detailed in the table
6: The scorer can think of only one obvious example of an area in which, in their opinion, there realistically remains high risk without sufficient credible mitigating actions detailed in the table
9: The scorer can think of no obvious examples of areas in which, in their opinion, there realistically remains high risk without sufficient credible mitigating actions detailed in the table

This question is weighted 10 out of 100.