

1) Are you anticipating that the evaluation includes a synthesis of findings from the phase 1 user testing?

Yes—at a minimum, the evaluation is expected to build on and be informed by Phase 1 findings, but not to re-evaluate Phase 1 itself.

- Phase 1 outputs “will be shared with the successful supplier/s... and will directly inform the work commissioned through Lots 1 and 2.”
- Lot 2 is expected to “collect and synthesise data across all phases,” which implies incorporating Phase 1 insights into the overall evidence base.

So, while Phase 1 is out of scope for delivery, its findings should be integrated and used contextually within the overall synthesis and interpretation of programme outcomes

2) Should the evaluation examine the process of testing the support offer/tool at the six case study sites, as well as the outcomes/impacts of the testing?

Yes—the evaluation should cover both process (implementation) and outcomes/impact.

Requirements explicitly include assessing “the extent to which the support offer and tool were delivered as intended and detail any adaptations” (process evaluation).

It must also explore “what difference the programme made” and assess “outcomes... and impacts” including workforce, organisational and system-level effects.

We will require a mixed process and impact evaluation, including the experiences of the six test sites.

3) Regarding the requirement to ‘involve lived experience and workforce voices wherever possible,’ are you expecting primary data collection during the evaluation, or will people’s views be gathered by the Lot 1 provider in phases 2 and 3, and synthesised by the Lot 2 provider?

Both are expected.

Lot 2 must “collect and synthesise data across all phases” and “capture qualitative and quantitative data.”

At the same time, Lot 1 will be gathering substantial data (e.g. site assessments, feedback, observations, workshops), which Lot 2 is expected to access and synthesise.

The evaluation must also “involve lived experience and workforce voices wherever possible,” which requires direct engagement by Lot 2 where needed.

Therefore, Lot 2 should design a proportionate primary data collection approach, complemented by use of data generated through Lot 1 activities.

The successful suppliers for Lot 1 and 2 will need to work collaboratively with one another to agree and design what relevant and effective data is to be collected throughout the delivery process to measure the impact of the support offer

4) The brief mentions a need for the Lot 2 provider to 'collect and synthesise data across all phases' and 'capture qualitative and quantitative data across all programme phases and test sites'. What data collection are you expecting the Lot 2 provider to undertake in phases 2 and 3?

Lot 2 is expected to undertake targeted, complementary data collection, aligned with its evaluation framework.

This likely includes:

- Collecting qualitative data (e.g. interviews, focus groups, case studies) to explore experiences, behaviour change and system factors
- Collecting or validating quantitative data (e.g. surveys, outcome measures, culture indicators)
- Ensuring baseline, mid-point, and end-point assessments are analysed (in collaboration with Lot 1, who gathers these)

Capturing data to support:

- Outcomes and impact measurement
- Contribution analysis and Theory of Change testing
- Cross-site comparison and synthesis

The specification emphasises working with Lot 1 to ensure "effective monitoring data is collected throughout the delivery process", meaning Lot 2 helps shape what is collected as well as undertaking its own collection.

5) At the end of the brief it mentions the need for a final bilingual evaluation report and slide deck presentation of findings for stakeholders by June 2028. Should that be 2027?

No, this is correct as June 2028. It appears the project timeline in section 1.3(c) contains some misalignment; we have amended this and reuploaded a new version within the specification document. Apologise for the oversight.

6) Will any Theory of Change or logic model outputs already exist from Phase 1? If so will these be shared with successful bidders?

No formal Theory of Change from is available from Phase 1 User Research.

Phase 1 produces "evidence-based proposals" for the future support service, not a Theory of Change.

A Theory of Change is instead expected to be developed during Phases 2 and 3, collaboratively between both suppliers.

However, Phase 1 findings will be shared and should inform the Theory of Change development process.

7) Who owns development of the Theory of Change? The specification refers to collaboration between Lots 1 and 2 on the Theory of Change. Is Lot 2 expected to lead its development, facilitate a joint process, or refine a draft developed by Lot 1?

The Theory of Change is a joint responsibility between Suppliers for Lot 1 and Lot 2, with Lot 2 playing a key role in shaping and applying it for evaluation.

- Lot 1: “Collaboratively develop a theory of change for guiding the design and testing”
- Lot 2: “Develop theory of change alongside the programme provider... using contribution analysis”

We require both suppliers to have shared ownership and co-development of The Theory of Change with the Supplier for:

- Lot 1 focusing on the design and operational relevance
- Lot 2 focusing on the evaluation, testing and analytical robustness

In practice, the supplier for Lot 2 would be expected to:

- Facilitate refinement and evaluability
- Ensure alignment with outcomes and metrics
- Use it as the backbone for the evaluation framework