

Invitation to Tender

Evaluation of the RGT Harm Minimisation Programmes

Wednesday 16th December 2015

1. About Responsible Gambling Trust (RGT)

- 1.1 RGT is the leading charity in the UK committed to minimising gambling-related harm. As an independent national charity funded by donations from the gambling industry, RGT funds education, prevention and treatment services and commissions research to broaden public understanding of gambling-related harm. RGT's aim is to stop people getting into problems with their gambling, and ensure that those that do develop problems receive fast and effective treatment and support.
- 1.2 RGT develops its commissioning plans in collaboration with the Responsible Gambling Strategy Board (RGSB) and the Gambling Commission. These arrangements are underpinned by an 'assurance and governance framework' agreed between the three parties and rely on openness, transparency and partnership to deliver results.

2 Background

- 2.1 This invitation to tender for evaluation relates to the funding for a programme of Gambling-Related Harm Minimisation first advertised by RGT in June 2015 via its website: www.responsiblegamblingtrust.org.uk/Harm-Minimisation-programme.
- 2.2 Following a competitive tender process, RGT has agreed to fund a number of advice and education projects that aim to reduce demonstrably the impact of gambling-related harm, particularly on vulnerable populations such as young people. The programme will provide funding over a period of two years and will form an important element of RGT's ambitions for an effective and integrated response to gambling-related harm delivered by public and third sector service providers.
- 2.3 Each of the projects to be funded has the potential to be delivered nationally and offers strong local partnerships with public bodies, charitable organisations and other services. This invitation to tender for evaluation relates to four of those projects:
 - Two projects will develop curriculum-based materials and interventions to be used in secondary schools; Fast Forward will deliver a programme in Scotland, and Demos, in partnership with Mentor, the PSHE Association, and CNWL Foundation NHS Trust will deliver a programme in England and Wales.
 - Newport Citizens Advice will lead on the delivery of a programme to raise awareness of gambling-related harm, equipping other professionals and the wider CAB network to effectively identify those presenting for debt advice for

gambling problems, and provide early intervention and signposting for those in need of additional support.

- The Professional Player's Federation will lead a programme of education for sports men and women to raise awareness of gambling-related harm, with its member associations partially funding this work.

2.4 Projects will run to different timetables but funding for each starts in January 2016 and most projects will last for the two year duration.

2.5 Summary details on each of the projects outlined above are included within Appendix A. Full details including bidding documentation will be provided to the successful tenderer(s).

3 Purpose and Scope of the 'Invitation to Tender' (ITT)

3.1 This document relates to the ITT for "Evaluation of the RGT Harm Minimisation programmes" advertised by the RGT via its website www.responsiblegamblingtrust.org.uk dated Wednesday 16th December 2015.

3.2 The purpose and scope of this document is to:

- Outline the tendering process and timetable
- Provide applicants with sufficient information to enable them to consider the appropriateness of this invitation and to respond
- Outline the information required in the responses
- Set out the administrative arrangements for the receipt of proposals.

4 Work requirements

4.1 This tendering exercise relates to the appointment by RGT of one or more independent evaluators to review these projects. Tendering organisations may bid for evaluation of one, two three or all of the funded projects. Bids must make it clear which of the individual projects are the focus of bids, and bids will be required for each. RGT wishes to encourage bids to evaluate youth projects together.

4.2 RGT recognises that to date there is no agreed understanding of what gambling-related harm is, or how it can be measured and monitored. In commissioning the series of projects which are the focus for this evaluation, RGT expected each to explore the nature and characteristics of 'harm' and effective harm minimisation initiatives and using action-research and related models from the projects to identify how best to measure effectiveness and impact.

4.3 The aim of the evaluation(s) is to provide an independent assessment of the extent to which the projects individually have met these expectations.

4.4 More specifically the objectives of evaluation(s) will be to independently assess the extent to which the funded activity has:

- Provided for a better informed and improved understanding of the nature and characteristics of gambling-related harm and the scope for its measurement.

- Established effective monitoring and evaluating of the effectiveness and impact of the funded harm minimisation initiatives.
 - Developed evidenced approaches to reduce the impact of gambling-related harm, particularly on vulnerable populations.
 - Assessed the likely scalability of this experience, including any implications for the measurement of impact for wider harm minimisation initiatives.
- 4.5 RGT encourages a formative approach to the evaluation so that individual projects can benefit from early evidence and assessment from the independent evaluators.
- 4.6 By the end of this evaluation we will have a clearer picture across the projects of the effectiveness and consequences of the actions taken. We will better understand aspects of gambling-related harm and how this can be addressed in specific contexts, and we will have a clearer idea of the scalability of these actions and implications for other harm minimisation actions.

5 Methodological Approach

- 5.1 Each of the funded projects is distinctive in their focus, scope and coverage, and will be putting in place their own measures and measurement of effectiveness and impact and reporting these as part of their contractual obligation to RGT. Each is at different stages of maturity in their current proposals and plans for self-evaluating their impact, and in the scale of the activities proposed.
- 5.2 Successful tendering organisation(s) will support RGT in providing a critical assessment of these plans and proposals (which will be shared with the projects) as well as an independent assessment of their effectiveness and impacts. More specifically, it is expected the successful tenderer(s) will work with the individual project(s) to provide for:
- a) Critical review of the evaluation proposals early in the project(s) with particular relevance to the measurement of early and longer term outcomes and impacts.
 - b) Building on this early review by providing briefing and feedback to the project(s) with the aim of informing improvement of the quality of their evaluation measures and measurement proposals to better meet RGT's needs and expectations of the overall programme.
 - c) Conduct a proportionate review of the delivery processes, engagement and experiences of any delivery partners and key stakeholders across the project. It is expected this will include a small number of interviews with key staff and partners/stakeholders.
 - d) Conduct a systematic review of the available management and monitoring information for the project set against its proposed activities, outputs and outcomes.
 - e) Provide an independent interim and end of project evaluation of the progress and achievements of the project(s) harnessing project-level evidence (as collected by project managers) supplemented as appropriate with additional evaluation evidence to verify the project-level evaluations.

- 5.3 At all stages the role of the contracted evaluator(s) will be to support RGT's understanding of the effectiveness and emerging impacts across the programme. Liaison and all deliverables will be provided direct to RGT with the exception of the briefing or feedback proposals which will be provided direct to the project manager(s).
- 5.4 RGT expects evaluation proposals to be proportionate and cost-effective. As far as possible we would expect the evaluators to be working with the monitoring and management information and evaluation evidence to be collected by the individual projects within their contractual commitments to RGT, with the independent evaluator collecting additional evaluation evidence only for the purposes of the review of effectiveness and/or for understanding the quality of impact of project activities.

Tendering organisations are asked to note the proposals for the inputs to the evaluation approach suggested above and outline how they would implement an evaluation strategy incorporating these suggestions. An outline work plan is also needed with proposals and to include key interim milestones.

Tendering organisations are welcome to suggest fully costed alternative or additional methods that meet the aims and objectives of the evaluation, and need for independent assessment, within the budget and timetable. Where alternative proposals are provided a clear rationale for their inclusion should be set out.

Details are required also of how participants to the evaluation and others contributing evidence will be engaged, any supplementary fieldwork methods, and how they would ensure quality of analysis and reporting. Tendering organisations should include information in their proposal about how they would approach any recruitment/sampling needs, target sample sizes for qualitative and quantitative research and modes of data collection as appropriate.

6 Programme Schedule

- 6.1 The overall timescale for this work will be approximately 24 months with the following indicative key deliverables and milestones:
- Evaluation inception meetings – **February 2016**
 - Short report to provide a critical review of projects evaluation proposals – **May 2016**
 - Interim reports – **January 2017**
 - Final report – **February 2018**
 - Regular (e.g. monthly) progress reports by email will also be expected and these may be followed up by clarifications if required by the RGT contracts manager(s).

7. Tendering Process and Timetable

- 7.1 On receipt of the proposals, an independent review panel will undertake an assessment of proposals, with a view to selecting one or more organisations to perform the evaluation(s). The awarding criteria are outlined in Appendix B.
- 7.2 Applicants may be required to attend a meeting to clarify any aspect of proposals.

- 7.3 You may submit, by no later than 17.00hrs GMT on Monday 11th January 2015 any queries that you have relating to this ITT. Please submit such queries by email to **HMeval@responsiblegamblingtrust.org.uk**.
- 7.4 Any queries should clearly reference any appropriate paragraph in the documentation. As far as is reasonably possible, RGT will respond to all reasonable requests for clarification of any aspect of this ITT and supporting documents, if made before the above deadline.
- 7.5 Proposals must be submitted by 17.00hrs GMT on Monday 18th January 2016 to the following e-mail address **HMeval@responsiblegamblingtrust.org.uk**. Receipt of tenders will be acknowledged by email by RGT. RGT reserves the right to extend any deadline. Any extension granted will apply to all applicants.
- 7.6 RGT reserves the right to reject any proposals:
- (a) received after the deadline; and/or
 - (b) which do not comply with the conditions and requirements set out in this ITT.
- 7.7 All documents and all correspondence relating to the tender must be written in English. You should consider only the information contained within this ITT and supporting documents, or otherwise formally communicated to you in writing when making your offer.
- 7.8 The tender documentation should be provided in the following format:
- A cover page which details the tendering organisation, principal evaluator and contact details, and also to which of the funded projects the evaluation bid relates.
 - Section 1: List of contents.
 - Section 2: Background including your understanding of the evaluation objectives and work requirements and how this will support the wider RGT programme.
 - Section 3: A statement of proposed methodology to conduct the evaluation with a justification for proposed methods. This should include a timetable or workplan linked to key activities (e.g., GANTT chart).
 - Section 4: A summary of the evaluation team, its relevant experience and expertise and the respective roles and contributions of team members to the evaluation. Summary CV's can also be provided as an annex to the bid.
 - Section 5: A statement of your proposed approach to managing and quality assuring the evaluation, to include a brief risk assessment with proposed remedies relating to identified risks, set out as per the pro forma in Appendix C.
 - Section 6: A summary of any proprietary intellectual property which will be used to carry out the evaluation.
 - Section 7: Costs and charging to provide full disclosure of costs, including number of days required for each task, day rates for different members of the research team, VAT (as relevant) and anticipated expenses, set out as per the pro forma in Appendix D. This section should also include a short statement of how the proposed approach to the evaluation/team will add value to RGT and its requirements.
 - Section 8: Contact details for two referees.

8 Intellectual Property

- 8.1 RGT is committed to delivering an independently commissioned research programme that focuses on gambling behaviour and the effectiveness of various treatment, prevention and education strategies in minimising gambling-related harm. This is intended to improve knowledge amongst all those involved in this issue, so the RGT will wish to publish the results of the research it funds. Our requirements below in respect of intellectual property and confidentiality are intended to promote good project management, quality assurance and research integrity, and are not included in order to influence the independent conclusions of this research or its presentation.
- 8.2 The successful researcher will be required to assign to RGT all rights in and to any intellectual property created or arising from the work carried out by the researcher (or by the researcher's employees or agents).
- 8.3 In the case of academic researchers, RGT will however grant to the researcher a royalty-free, non-exclusive license to exercise such intellectual property rights in relation to project materials for the purposes of the researcher's wider research activities.
- 8.4 RGT acknowledges that the researcher may own proprietary software, analytic tools and techniques which may not be assigned to RGT. Where such software, tools or techniques exist and will be used by the researcher in the proposed research, the researcher should provide details in its tender of the methodology, to be used in the proposed research highlighting clearly where such software, tools or techniques will not be assigned to RGT and/or may not be shared with the public.

9 Confidentiality and publicity

- 9.1 The successful researcher will be required to enter into a legally binding agreement with RGT which will contain, inter alia, confidentiality provisions pursuant to which the researcher will be required to:
- (a) keep confidential all intellectual property and know-how, including confidential commercial and financial information, disclosed by RGT to the researcher during the course of the research project;
 - (b) not disclose to third parties without the express prior written consent of RGT any information arising from the work performed as part of the research project; and
 - (c) ensure that all proposed publications are submitted to RGT for approval prior to publication with the expectation that approval will be given unless there are reasonable grounds not to do so.
- 9.2 RGT may from time to time require that the successful researcher's employees and/or other person working on the research project enter into a confidentiality agreement with RGT.

10 Budget

- 10.1 The gambling-related harm minimisation evaluation program will have a total overall budget up to £80,000. The distribution of this budget across the four projects will not be directly proportionate to RGTs project investments but value for money and justification for project costs will be among the key assessment criteria. RGT is committed to fund the right evaluation for each project. The value of each of the projects should be taken into account when costing your proposal to ensure proportionate evaluation. We encourage bids not to exceed 17.5% of the total cost of the project to be evaluated (including VAT and expenses) See Appendix A for project costs. Where tendering organisations propose to bid for more than one of the project evaluations they should cost each separately but provide an indication of any economies that would come from commissioning two (or more) from the same organisation. Any cost efficiencies would be negotiated by RGT pre-contracting.

11 Eligibility

- 11.1 Applications will be accepted from all locations; however, preference will be given to teams based in Great Britain to facilitate meetings with RGT, delivery organisations and other stakeholders. Those teams located outside Great Britain must ensure they specify, in their proposal, how they will manage communication during the project.

12 Conditions of Tender

- 12.1 RGT reserves the right to issue the response to any clarification request made by you to all applicants unless you expressly require it to be kept confidential at the time the request is made.
- 12.2 The information contained in this ITT and the supporting documents and in any related written or oral communication is believed to be correct at the time of issue but RGT does not accept any liability for its accuracy, adequacy or completeness and no warranty is given as such. This exclusion does not extend to any fraudulent misrepresentation made by or on behalf of RGT or to any other liability which cannot be excluded at law.
- 12.3 By issuing this ITT, RGT is not bound in any way to enter into any contractual or other arrangement with you or any other party.
- 12.4 It is intended that the remainder of this procurement will take place in accordance with the provisions of this ITT but RGT reserves the right to terminate, amend or vary the tendering process by notice to all tendering organisations in writing. RGT does not accept any liability for any losses caused to you as a result of such termination, amendment or variation.
- 12.5 You will not be entitled to claim from RGT any cost or expenses that you may incur in preparing your proposal irrespective of whether or not your tender is successful.
- 12.6 All information supplied to you by RGT, either in writing or orally, must be treated in confidence and not disclosed to any third party (save to your professional advisers) unless the information is already in the public domain.

- 12.7 There must be no publicity by you regarding the project or the future award of any contract unless RGT has given express written consent to the relevant communication.
- 12.8 You must declare any conflicts of interest within your proposal and state how these would be managed. RGT reserves the right to refuse any application based on such conflicts.

Appendix A – Project Descriptions

Project A: Gambling-related Harm Minimisation in Professional Sport

Supplier: Professional Players Federation

Timing: Start – January 2016; End – December 2017.

Cost of Project: £70,406 over two years, on a matched-funding basis (£56,325 from RGT and £14,081 from member associations).

Background: Professional sportsmen and women are an ‘at-risk’ group for problem gambling, with rates of problem gambling around three times higher in this group than in the general population. There are 15,000 professional sportsmen and women in the UK, and the group is supported by a strong network of player associations who are committed to educating and supporting their athletes on problem gambling. The sector can also influence wider society through its media profile.

Aims:

1. To reduce gambling-related harm amongst professional sportsmen and women by improving the education on responsible and problem gambling that they receive.
2. To review and research the existing responsible gambling education of professional athletes in the UK and internationally in order to develop a world class leading programme.
3. To ensure that sportsmen and women (typically aged from aged 16 to 35) are made aware that they are an “at-risk” group and then provided with improved information on problem gambling and responsible gambling in a player friendly manner.

Project Methods:

- Literature reviews: to identify existing problem gambling education for sportsmen and women across the world, focusing on what is available and its efficacy; to identify effective education for at-risk groups, including problem gambling but also drawing on evidence from alcohol and drug education.
- Eight focus groups to explore awareness and experience of gambling and problem gambling, helpful educational experiences, and receptivity to a range of evidence based approaches to education.
- Telephone interviews with up to 10 of those with personal experience of gambling problems to explore how they manage their problem and what would be helpful in terms of education and support.
- Interviews with key stakeholders, e.g. player association staff and treatment providers.

Project Outputs:

- An eLearning resource
- National training conference
- Communications through a variety of channels including social media, newsletters, and team visits.

Notes: The PPF is very aware of the high profile nature of professional sport and the media attention it can attract. The aim is to work with the national media to raise the profile of the

project, problem gambling and the RGT. The project is not in itself involved in the delivery of education to athletes but rather reviewing the existing educational offering and developing an improved resource for the player associations to then deliver to their athletes. The involvement of the player associations will provide a significant multiplier effect to the outcomes of the project and will ensure the sustainability of the use of the developed educational programme.

Suggested Evaluation Methodology: Tendering organisations are invited to propose suitable approaches to conduct the independent evaluation of the PPF project to meet RGT's overarching requirements as set out in section 4.4. We welcome suggestions for an evaluation methodology which is proportionate to the scale and focus of the project and consistent with the RGTs general approach as set out in sections 5.1-5.4.

For this project this will need to take account of project proposals which propose light touch monitoring centred on delivery through the players federations, but which have yet to formulate specific proposals for measuring its impact or effectiveness. It is likely that the evaluators' initial critical appraisal of these proposals, and feedback to the PPF project team, will need to outline possible impact indicators and possible measurement options to enable the project to produce suitable evidence on which the evaluators will subsequently draw. Creative formative approaches are sought which can combine expert guidance to the project team with retaining a fully independent focus for the evaluation.

Project B: Citizens Advice Bureau: Gambling-related Harm Minimisation

Supplier: Newport Citizens Advice Bureau

Timing: Start – January 2016; End – December 2017.

Cost of Project: £269,544 over two years.

Background: Problem gambling remains difficult to detect and clients often present with other issues rather than the actual gambling problem. Clients who approached Newport CAB for problem gambling support also reported debt. Although other co-morbidity conditions were frequently presented (depression, anxiety and stress), debt was reported amongst all clients. This evidences the link between gambling and debt and shows the role debt agencies such as CAB can play in offering early intervention.

Aims:

- To reduce gambling-related harm by engaging with those people who are most vulnerable and their service providers.
- To offer an integrated approach to harm prevention raising awareness of gambling and its risks through education, awareness raising and training to service providers and their users.
- To provide, accessible, early intervention and holistic support to clients who are affected by problem gambling or at risk of developing a problem.

Project Methods:

- Events and presentations: both open forum and closed sessions aimed at public or professional audiences.(Targets: 40 open and 30 closed events per year); national conferences and events.
- Social media engagement.
- eLearning development using the CABlink training resource and in-house training to the wider CAB network.
- Support for problem gamblers through early brief interventions (Targets: 400 'teachable moments'; 50 Brief Interventions; 100 1:1 support).

Project Outputs:

- Monthly and quarterly reporting
- eLearning package.

Notes: The brief intervention aspect of this work will comply with the RGT's Data Reporting Framework requirements.

Suggested Evaluation Methodology: Tendering organisations are invited to propose suitable approaches to conduct the independent evaluation of the Newport CAB project to meet RGT's overarching requirements as set out in section 4.4. We welcome suggestions for an evaluation methodology which is consistent with the RGTs general approach as set out in sections 5.1-5.4. The CAB project is ambitious in its scale and scope, its focus both on practitioners and also direct beneficiaries, and in its use of different modes of delivery across multiple stakeholders. The evaluation proposals are expected to reflect this complexity and scale.

This project has developed a substantial monitoring framework for project delivery and assessing progress. Its approach to measuring and assessing its impacts is expected to focus on raised awareness among practitioners and gamblers at risk of harm or need of support, changed behaviours across both audiences, more extensive recognition of risk and harm behaviours, and enhanced capacity across stakeholders to provide support. It is expected that the initial critical appraisal of evaluation proposals by the evaluators, and feedback to the CAB project team, will play an important role in refining viable impact indicators and possible measurement options. The evaluators will subsequently be expected to draw on substantial in-project monitoring data, other event and participant evidence expected from the project. It is likely this will need to be supplemented with appropriate qualitative methods to review effectiveness, experiences and impacts across key stakeholders to provide the inputs and deliverables required by RGT (as in 5.1-5.4 above).

Project C: Youth Problem Gambling Initiative: Scotland

Supplier: Fast Forward

Timing: Start – January 2016; End – December 2017.

Cost of Project: £99,331 over two years.

Background: Fast Forward is a charity and a Scottish national voluntary organisation which works to promote young people's health and well-being. Since 1987 Fast Forward has worked directly with young people to enhance their personal development and increase their individual ability to make positive life choices. Fast Forward also has a commitment to training professionals who work with young people and has a strong record in delivering this to a range of professional groups including teachers, youth, community and health practitioners. This proposal builds on Fast Forward's 15-month pilot Phase 1, which concludes in December 2015. The pilot phase of the Youth Problem Gambling Initiative was funded through the Lothian Health Foundation and NHS Lothian from 2014 to 2015. Underpinning the project was the belief that the staff and agencies currently working with young people are well placed to further develop and incorporate gambling issues into their existing practice.

Aims:

- To improve the awareness and expertise of youth problem gambling among a range of professionals working with young people.
- To develop, provide and distribute educational resources that enable practitioners to develop their own harm-reduction and prevention sessions on youth problem gambling.
- To increase trainers' capacity in local areas to deliver training to staff.

Project Methods:

- Free face-to-face training and CPD sessions for youth workers, teachers and practitioners who work with young people, staff from the third sector, youth work and informal learning sectors, leisure and sport organisations and local authorities. The training sessions will be open as well to trainers willing to then train others.
- Production and dissemination of a toolkit on youth problem gambling.
- The pilot phase 3 areas will be selected based on areas' demography, social deprivation, possible needs and/or gaps in provision, requests and opportunities of collaboration with other agencies.

Project Outputs:

- A draft toolkit on youth problem gambling, to be developed during year 2 into an online toolkit for dissemination.
- Face-to-face training and CPD sessions for youth workers, teachers and practitioners who work with young people, staff from the third sector, youth work and informal learning sectors, leisure and sport organisations and local authorities (around 20 per year). The training sessions will be open as well to trainers willing to then train other teachers and youth work practitioners using the toolkit provided by Fast Forward.

- Free consultancy and support to youth work projects wishing to develop their own sessions on youth problem gambling. This can be provided via phone, email, skype or in person, depending on circumstances and location.
- Monthly and quarterly reporting.

Notes: The toolkit developed will link closely and explicitly to Scotland's Curriculum for Excellence.

Suggested Evaluation Methodology: Tendering organisations are invited to propose suitable approaches to conduct the independent evaluation of the Fast Forward project to meet RGT's overarching requirements as set out in section 4.4. Unusually among these projects, the YPGI project builds on earlier activity (Phase 1 above) by this project team which is expected to provide some baseline evidence for the evaluation. The RGT funding supports Phase 2 and wider roll-out of the project activities in Phase 3; and Phase 2 and 3 will be the focus for the evaluation. The project is expected to work with diverse practitioners groups to meet its aims and the evaluation approach will need to be sensitive to these different user groups to provide for the inputs (and deliverables) expected for RGT as set out in sections 5.1-5.4 above.

The project has relatively mature proposals for monitoring of inputs and outputs in Phase 2 and 3, building on experience from its Phase 1 piloting. Its impact is likely to centre on raised awareness among practitioners, increased confidence in both identifying signs of harm and also in delivery of harm minimisation education and support, and substantially extended capacity including 'cascade' training of other practitioners. Proposals for impact indicators and measurement to assess the extent and nature of these changes and wider lessons are less well developed than for project monitoring, and the early critical review will need to play an important formative contribution to the evolution of the approach. RGT will welcome creative approaches from evaluators which can combine guidance to the project team with retaining a fully independent focus for the evaluation of effectiveness, impacts against expectations, and transferability of the actions.

Project D: Gambling Intervention in Secondary Schools: England and Wales

Supplier: Demos

Timing: Start – January 2016; End – December 2017.

Cost of Project: £77,900 over two years.

Background: Demos is an independent think tank, specialising in undertaking research and developing evidence-based policy solutions in a range of areas, from education to housing and social care. In our methods and principles, Demos is devoted to ensuring that all citizens – especially those from disadvantaged backgrounds – have the capabilities and opportunities to lead powerful and meaningful lives. Demos has a long-standing interest in education and considerable expertise in running evaluations. They are currently in the final stages of a two year education pilot in four secondary schools across the country which is exploring the potential for ‘coproduction’ to tackle educational disengagement and truancy. Building on our previous work on ‘character’ in education, Demos has also recently published a series of short reports on the topic, and secured funding from the Department for Education to run a pilot in primary schools in conjunction with the Scouts Association.

Aims:

- To have a measurable impact on the incidence of ‘at-risk’ gambling behaviours amongst pupils subject to the intervention.
- To equip young people with the information to approach gambling in a considered manner and help to develop healthy attitudes/norms.
- To help equip young people with the life skills to be able to identify and deal with a range of risks and promote their own wellbeing.
- To complement learning on related subjects, including numeracy, financial management, digital literacy and online safety, and so on.
- Participating teachers to recognise the value of the intervention.
- Pilot schools to continue to deliver gambling education beyond the life of the pilot.
- Other (non-pilot) schools to use the project’s resources following the pilot.

Project Methods:

- Project team to produce lesson plans/exercises related to gambling (2-3 lessons worth approx.). These will be designed to map onto existing PSHE curricula.
- Materials scrutinised in focus groups with teachers/teenagers prior to pilot launch.
- Once schools are recruited content will be delivered by trained PSHE teachers.

Project Outputs:

- Literature review
- Development of curriculum-mapped educational materials for use in schools
- Production of pamphlet and Westminster launch event
- Outreach to promote uptake of materials.

Suggested Evaluation Methodology: Tendering organisations are invited to propose suitable approaches to conduct the independent evaluation of the Demos project to meet RGT’s

overarching requirements as set out in section 4.4. The Demos project has already put forward a mature approach to monitoring and evaluation, with substantial evidence collation. It has also set out a 'theory of change' for the intervention and logic model for the input-output-outcomes expectations from which specific impact indicators are proposed.

RGT welcomes creative approaches from tendering organisations which test the theory of change expectations and also reflect this relative maturity in the projects measurement proposals and evidence capture. This will need to be sensitive to the particular focus of the Demos project on secondary schools and to minimising any demands on participants schools and practitioners. Methodological proposals will need to be consistent with RGT's need for an independent assessment of effectiveness and impact (separate from the Demos self-assessment). This may include modest and proportionate proposals for additional evidence needs recognising RGT's overarching expectations of evaluation inputs and deliverables as set out in sections 5.1-5.4.

Appendix B – Awarding Criteria

Tendering organisations are required to respond to **ALL** of the criteria below. To assist our evaluation of your tender submission, please ensure you clearly cross-refer your responses in the tender to the criteria.

Quality Criteria: 65 marks will be allocated to your response to the award criteria shown in Table 1 below:

Table 1:

Quality Criteria	Weighting
A demonstrated understanding of the background to the evaluation, project and RGT aims and objectives.	x1
Quality and appropriateness of the evaluation methodology and work plan for meeting all of the requirements set out above.	x3
Quality and appropriateness of the project management proposals including arrangements for quality assurance through the project. Coverage of the risk register and appropriateness of counter-measures.	x1
Quality of relevant expertise and experience of the key personnel proposed for this contract in impact evaluation in harm minimisation or similar social contexts.	x1.5
Added value that the proposed evaluation approach/team brings to RGT and its needs.	x1

Award criteria will be scored using the indicators set out in table 2 below:

Table 2:

Scoring Methodology		
0	Very Poor	No response or partial response and poor evidence provided in support of it. Does not give confidence in the ability of the Bidder to deliver the Contract and/or our requirements are not met in most respects.
1	Weak	Response is supported by a weak standard of evidence in some areas giving rise to concern about the ability of the Bidder to deliver the Contract and/or our requirements are not met in some respects.
2	Satisfactory	Response is satisfactory and supported by a satisfactory standard of evidence. Gives moderate confidence in the ability of the Bidder to deliver the contract, meets the requirements in most respects.
3	Good	Response is comprehensive and supported by a good standard of evidence. Gives a higher level of confidence in the ability of the Bidder to deliver and meets requirements.
4	Very Good	Response is comprehensive and supported by a very good standard of evidence meeting requirements and may exceed them in some respects. Gives a high level of confidence in the ability of the Bidder to

		deliver the contract.
5	Exceptional	Response is very comprehensive and supported by a high standard of evidence. Gives very high level of confidence in the ability of the Bidder to deliver the contract. May exceed requirements in several respects.

The assessed overall score for each question will be calculated by multiplying the quality score received with the weighting for that question, set out below. This score will then be divided by the total maximum available score for the Quality Criteria and multiplied by 65% to get your final score for that question. NB – Although the criteria are numbered, this does not relate to any order of importance.

Price criteria: 35 marks will be awarded to the lowest priced bid and the remaining bidders will be allocated scores based on their deviation from this figure. Your total costs figure including VAT and expenses in the schedule of charges will be used to score this question.

For example, if the lowest price is £100, and the second lowest price is £125, then the lowest priced bidder gets 35% (full marks) for price and the second placed bidder gets 26.2% and so on ($25/100 \times 35 = 8.75$ marks; $35 - 8.75 = 26.25$ marks).

Overall quality and price scores will be aggregated to provide the final bidding assessment score. This will be used to shortlist bidders. Scores will be moderated across assessors and may be further adjusted after (any) clarification meetings and/or responses. The highest scoring overall bidder after (any) clarification will be the preferred supplier.

Appendix C: Risk Register pro forma

Risk/factor	Likelihood and likely effect	Contingency
<i>Brief statement of considerations/factors which might significantly impact on effective/on time delivery ...</i>	<i>Likelihood of risk occurring (EG: High; Moderate or Low); Brief statement of likely effect on delivery/quality.</i>	<i>Brief statement of how you might avoid or minimise likelihood of risk and/or the effects.</i>
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		

NB Please add further rows if necessary.

