

# Guidance for completing the FEPDG pilot application form

We have developed this application form to gather evidence of experience and capacity to act as a lead partner and providers in the FE Professional Development Grants (FEPDG) programme pilot. You should read the full guidance published on Gov.uk and the application guidance included throughout this form to support you with completing your application. Where a word limit is indicated, **any text that exceeds this limit will not be assessed**. The word limit provided is an upper limit and you will not be penalised if your answer is shorter, provided there is sufficient evidence to fulfil the assessment criteria.

Please answer the questions in the stipulated format. In the interest of equity, only written information provided in this document will be assessed. We do not expect diagrams/pictures to be submitted. Additional information, including links to websites or attached documents, will not be considered.

The Department for Education (DfE) also reserves the right to contact cited parties to confirm information given in this application and any other party we consider to be relevant to your application for ongoing information should the application be successful.

DfE will not score applications which do not meet the eligibility criteria.

DfE will not offer a right to appeal any decision to reject a FEPDG pilot applicant.

Please ensure that you complete all sections of this form.

Information provided in this form will be included in the conditions of funding and grant funding agreement for successful bids.

Please note that information provided on this form, including personal information, may be subject to publication or disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes, primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Data Protection Act 1998.

Completed applications must be returned by email to [FEPDG.pilot@education.gov.uk](mailto:FEPDG.pilot@education.gov.uk), using the subject line ‘FEPDG pilot application’ no later than 10am on 26 July 2021.

## Section One: Applicant Details

In order to be assessed for funding, all applicants must meet the eligibility criteria specified in the guidance.

### Lead applicant information

You cannot apply as an individual provider if you operate as part of a provider group structure (for example an application must be in the name of a college group and not an individual college).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name of lead applicant provider** |  |
| **UKPRN of lead applicant provider** |  |
| **Charities Commission or Companies House Registration number of lead applicant provider (if applicable)** |  |
| **Name of principal** |  |
| **Contact details of principal – email** |  |
| **Contact details of principal – Tel no** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Main contact for the application if not the principal – name** |  |
| **Main contact for the application if not the principal – position** |  |
| **Main contact for the application if not the principal – email** |  |
| **Main contact for the application if not the principal – Tel no** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Accounting officer at lead provider – name** |  |
| **Accounting officer at lead provider – email** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Are you the lead provider for more than one bid?** | Yes/No |
| **If above answered “yes”, please indicate the priority of this bid vs others to be submitted** | For example 1,2,3 |

### Lead provider eligibility

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **State the lead applicant provider type** | *Lead applicant provider is required to be from the following permitted provider types:*   * ***Public and private sector FE providers****, with the following exceptions:*   + *you cannot apply if you are a school, academy or employer provider*   + *providers only in receipt of budgets associated with the functions transferred from the Secretary of State for Education to Combined Authorities by way of orders under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 are ineligible*   + *sixth form colleges that are currently in the process of, or planning conversion to an academy in 2021 to 2022 academic year are also excluded and are not eligible to apply for the fund* |  |
| **State the ESFA aggregate funding level of the lead applicant** | *Lead applicant must be in receipt of a minimum aggregate value of ESFA funding of £2.5m from the eligible funding streams listed below in the 2021 to 2022 funding year. ESFA budget streams not listed are not eligible and must not be included.* |  |
| **State which ESFA funding stream(s) the lead applicant receives.   All providers must not have received a notice of termination from the ESFA at any point during the application process.** | *All FE providers in an application must have a direct relationship with the Education and Skills Funding Agency and be in receipt of at least one of the following eligible funding streams:*   * *16 to 19 study programme* * *adult education budget* * *advanced learner loan facility* * *European Social Fund* * *16 to 18 traineeships*   *Schools, academies and employer providers are ineligible.* |  |
| **Does the lead applicant provider confirm that all activities in the project are for the primary benefit of FE staff delivering ESFA-funded provision for FE learners in at least one of the eligible funding streams?** | *Lead applicant must confirm that all primary beneficiaries of FE Professional Development Grants funding are staff delivering provision funded by one of the eligible funding streams:*   * *16 to 19 study programme* * *adult education budget* * *advanced learner loan facility* * *European Social Fund* * *16 to 18 traineeships* | Yes/No |
| **Provide the Ofsted grade for overall effectiveness from most recent Ofsted inspection of the lead applicant** | *Lead applicant providers must hold an Ofsted grade 1 or 2 from its* [*most recent inspection*](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/further-education-and-skills-inspections-and-outcomes-management-information-from-september-2020-to-august-2021)*.*  *Newly merged colleges currently ungraded are eligible to apply as a lead provider if one of the previous colleges met the criteria for Ofsted grades at its most recent inspection before the merger.* | 1,2,3,4 |
| **Provide the date and grade of lead applicant provider’s most recent ESFA Financial Health assessment** | *Lead applicant providers must have a ESFA financial health grade of Good or Outstanding.*  *English universities financially monitored by the Office for Students and local authorities are exempt from this requirement. This exemption is in line with ESFA financial health assessment policy for FE providers.* | Date, grade |
| **Is lead applicant provider in formal intervention with ESFA? (Yes / No)** | *We can only offer funding to providers who meet the following criteria:*   * *lead applicant provider is not under notice for inadequate inspection or financial control* * *lead applicant provider is not in formal intervention with the ESFA and not under additional conditions of funding or additional contractual obligations* | Yes/No |
| **What is the total bid value?** | *Only bids between £100,000 and £500,000 will be assessed.* | £ |
| **To which programme theme does this bid relate?** | *Applicants should identify which of the three FEPDG pilot priority themes their application focuses on. Each bid should address one theme. Multiple bids from lead providers will be accepted (maximum of one bid per priority theme from a lead provider, up to a total of three bids), but should be ranked by priority. The programme themes are:*   * *workforce capability and confidence to use technology effectively in education* * *subject-specific professional development* * *support for new or inexperienced teachers*   *Note: Please detail the specific activity under your chosen theme in* [*Section 2, Q1 (Programme Theme)*](#_Q1:_Programme_theme) |  |

### Partner provider details and eligibility (add additional rows as required)

Please provide details for all partner providers in order that we can assess eligibility. Be aware that:

* all proposals must include at least one partner provider
* there is no upper limit to the number of partners, however additional stringent testing for capacity will be applied during the assessment process (see [section 2, Q4](#_Q4:_Deliverability))
* at least one partner provider must have a Ofsted 3 or 4 (RI or Inadequate) as its [most recent inspection](https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/further-education-and-skills-inspections-and-outcomes-management-information-from-september-2020-to-august-2021) or a Insufficient Progress determination for new providers at most recent New Provider Monitoring Visit
* All providers in an application must not have received a notice of termination from the ESFA at any point during the application and assessment process
* all FE providers in an application must have a direct relationship with the Education and Skills Funding Agency and be in receipt of at least one of the following funding streams: 16 to 19 study programme; adult education budget; advanced learner loan facility; European Social Fund; 16 to 18 traineeships. Schools, academies and employer providers are ineligible.
* providers only in receipt of budgets associated with the functions transferred from the Secretary of State for Education to Combined Authorities by way of orders under the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 are not eligible to apply for the fund.
* Sixth Form Colleges that are currently in the process or planning conversion to an academy in 2021 to 2022 academic year are also excluded and are not eligible to apply for the fund
* individual providers that are part of a provider group structure cannot be included (for example an application must be in the name of a college group and not an individual college)
* the department welcomes proposals that include a mix of different eligible provider types, although this is not essential.

| **Provider partner name** | **Provider**  **UKPRN** | **Ofsted grade for overall effectiveness** | **ESFA funding stream(s)** | **Is partner provider in formal intervention with ESFA? (Yes / No)** | **Name of main contact** | **Position of main contact** (for example Principal) | **Email address and telephone number of main contact** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [Partner provider name] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| [Partner provider name] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Add more rows if required |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### Details of other third-party support organisations

Please provide details for any third-party partners included in your proposal, eg. a school or academy, or a sector organisation.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Partner name** | **Partner UKPRN** (where appropriate) | **Role partner will play in the proposal.** Note the value they will add | **Name of main contact** | **Position of main contact** (eg Principal) | **Email address and telephone number of main contact** |
| [Third-party partner name] |  |  |  |  |  |
| Add more rows if required |  |  |  |  |  |

## Section Two: Details of your proposal

### Please provide an outline of the programme of work you have developed with your partners, and how these will address the assessment criteria

### Q1: Programme theme and activity

Your proposal must address just one of the priority workforce development themes identified by DfE, however you may submit multiple bids if you wish to address more than one priority theme (see “[Applicant Details, Lead applicant information](#_Lead_applicant_information)” above, where you must declare multiple bids and place them in priority order). You must draw from the activity areas stipulated for the activity detailed in your proposal (but may draw from more than one activity in each theme). The priority workforce development themes are listed below along with suggested projects in defined areas of activity which we have drawn from previous initiatives or relevant research. Please note this list is not exhaustive and we encourage applicants to consider other relevant sources of effective practice when designing their proposal. We do expect applicants to demonstrate how their proposal builds on effective practice. Where examples or research relate to schools, we expect applications to demonstrate how proposed activity will be adapted so that it’s relevant for the Further Education sector.

| **Priority theme** | **Priority theme objective** | **Activity area** | **Examples of successful initiatives or supporting evidence** | **Activity included in proposal?** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1: Workforce capability and confidence to use technology effectively in education** | Training and support for staff to strengthen skills and confidence to use technology effectively in educational delivery | Collaborative peer-to-peer support | Provision of ongoing support through access to trained blended learning champions (The LTE Group [College Collaboration Fund (CCF) project](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/college-collaboration-fund-ccf-projects/project-summaries-college-collaboration-fund-ccf)) | [Yes/No] |
|  |  | Evidence-based training/CPD to improve practice | Structured CPD offer to improve quality of online/blended teaching, learning and assessment ([Walsall College remote education case study](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/966511/FE_remote_and_blended_learning_case_studies.pdf). Note: this link contains case studies f effective remote and blended learning that you may wish to draw on when designing the activity in your application)  Development of a digital induction programme for staff along with a training schedule package to improve workforce capability and capacity with remote and blended delivery (Lincoln College [CCF project](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/college-collaboration-fund-ccf-projects/project-summaries-college-collaboration-fund-ccf)) | [Yes/No] |
|  |  | Development of online and blended pedagogy | Research and development to identify effective strategies in the delivery of online lessons by staff (Plumpton College [CCF project](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/college-collaboration-fund-ccf-projects/project-summaries-college-collaboration-fund-ccf))  Creation of an online synchronous teaching and learning toolkit and guidance for FE teachers (Walsall College [CCF project](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/college-collaboration-fund-ccf-projects/project-summaries-college-collaboration-fund-ccf)) | [Yes/No] |
| **2: Subject specific professional development** | Support for staff to improve subject and pedagogic content knowledge in order to improve the quality of curriculum design and teaching, learning and assessment | Evidence-based approaches to improve subject knowledge and pedagogy | Subject specific training and CPD focused on improving teachers subject knowledge and pedagogy ([T Level Professional Development Programme](https://www.et-foundation.co.uk/supporting/professional-development/technical-education/t-levels/#:~:text=The%20T%20Level%20Professional%20Development%20%28TLPD%29%20offer%20supports,through%20the%20doors%20of%20a%20classroom%20or%20workshop.))    Use of expert practitioners to drive effective practice through peer observations, mentoring and embedding research ([evidence base underpinning national standard for teacher’s professional development and relevant Ofsted research](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/926366/Educational_effectiveness_research_and_FES.pdf). See also the the relevant sections within the [inspection handbook](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/further-education-and-skills-inspection-handbook-eif/further-education-and-skills-handbook) for FE and skills providers.) | [Yes/No] |
|  |  | Application/adaption of generic pedagogic practices to specific subject areas | Support for staff to understand how general pedagogic issues and approaches apply to their specific learning contexts (evidence base underpinning national standard for teachers’ professional development. Please see this [implementation guidance](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/537031/160712_-_PD_Expert_Group_Guidance.pdf) and the research highlighted in the bibliography at the end of the document)  Creation of guidance and resources to exemplify excellent teaching, learning and assessment in a subject area (evidence base underpinning [national standard](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/537031/160712_-_PD_Expert_Group_Guidance.pdf) for teacher’s professional development) | [Yes/No] |
|  |  | Collaborative peer-to-peer support and subject networks | Subject networks and expert groups to research, identify and disseminate effective teaching, learning and assessment approaches ([T Level Professional Development networks](https://www.et-foundation.co.uk/supporting/professional-development/technical-education/t-levels/networks/)) | [Yes/No] |
| **3: Supporting new or inexperienced teachers** | Tailored support and professional development for new or inexperienced teachers to aid career progression and improve teacher retention | Covering costs of additional teacher time to provide intensive support such as paired teaching/work shadowing and reduced workload | Covering costs of additional teacher time to provide intensive support such as paired teaching/work shadowing and reduced workload ([Taking Teaching Further programme](https://www.et-foundation.co.uk/supporting/support-for-teacher-recruitment/taking-teaching-further/#:~:text=The%20Taking%20Teaching%20Further%20programme%20is%20a%20national,and%20skills%20to%20work%20in%20Further%20Education%20%28FE%29.), [schools early career framework and support package](https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/early-career-framework-reforms)) | [Yes/No] |
|  |  | Core induction programmes covering key areas of practice essential for new or inexperienced teachers to develop | Core induction programmes covering key areas of practice essential for new or inexperienced teachers to develop ([schools early career framework induction packages](https://www.early-career-framework.education.gov.uk/)) | [Yes/No] |
|  |  | Support for newly qualified teachers to broaden their experience of face-to-face teaching plus strengthen skills and confidence to undertake classroom and in-person delivery | Support for newly qualified teachers to broaden their experience of face-to-face teaching plus strengthen skills and confidence to undertake classroom and in-person delivery\* | [Yes/No] |

\* There are well-established means of supporting newly qualified teachers which we will expect applications to build on but we will be testing approaches in a new context of responding to disruption caused by the pandemic

### Q1a: Proposal overview

Tell us what your proposal will achieve, and how it will address the programme theme. You should demonstrate how you have selected from the suggested areas of activity and how the proposal will meet the overall objective for each priority theme.

A strong application will demonstrate an understanding of need, and supplement this with information from other sources, such as internal analyses, or student surveys. We are particularly interested in proposals that utilise digital forms of delivery, which will allow greater reach once disseminated more widely.

We will not approve proposals that duplicate existing government-funded support and training that is already available through, for example, the Education and Training Foundation, the EdTech Demonstrator programme or the College Collaboration Fund. We do however welcome proposals that build on existing support and training, possibly through the scaling up, or widening sector coverage, of previous successful activity.

Providers that have been successful in other government bidding applications, for example the CCF are not prohibited from applying. However, providers must provide evidence of sufficient resources to deliver the proposals contained in their application alongside any other funded commitments (such as CCF), and we will robustly test these throughout the assessment process.

|  |
| --- |
| [Free text, max 300 words] |

### Q2: Quality of proposed workforce development activity

Detail how your proposed activity is consistent with the following principles of high-quality professional development as laid out in the [national standard](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/537031/160712_-_PD_Expert_Group_Guidance.pdf)(Note that the wording of the principles within the standard has been slightly amended above to ensure relevance to the FE Sector)

* focus on improving learner outcomes
* evidence-based
* collaborative and includes expert challenge
* sustained over time
* supported by leadership

We also expect you to indicate how the activity and workstreams in your proposal build on effective practice within the priority theme by using previous successful initiatives or drawing on relevant research.

You should demonstrate how your proposal, including resulting benefits, will support organisational priorities and wider quality improvement needs. This could include alignment with educational recovery work to respond to disruption caused by the Covid pandemic or implementation of reforms to the FE sector as outlined in Skills for Jobs White Paper.

Please make appropriate use of supporting evidence (including quantitative forms of evidence where relevant) to support your application.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **How will proposed activity meet the principles of high quality professional development for teachers as laid out in the** [**national standard**](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/537031/160712_-_PD_Expert_Group_Guidance.pdf)**?** | [Free text, max 250 words] |
| **Provide evidence and rationale for why the project will successfully address one of the three priority areas and how it builds on effective practice** | [Free text, max 250 words] |
| **How will the project support wider organisational priorities/improvement needs, such as education recovery work?** | [Free text, max 250 words] |

### Q3: Expected benefits for providers, staff and learners

Detail the expected benefits and short-term outputs for providers and staff resulting from your proposal and how these are expected to support longer-term outcomes, including for learners. Your response should complement the detailed breakdown of your work program in [section 3](#_Section_Three:_Program).

Applicants should use the standard and any bespoke Key Performance Indicators to quantify benefits and outline the expected reach of the project. We will benchmark KPIs and compare them with similar applications during the assessment process ([see Q3a below](#_Q3a:_Key_performance)).

You should clearly demonstrate the proposed approach for collecting, monitoring and reporting outputs and impacts resulting from the project. This should include evidence they have the appropriate systems and processes in place.

Your proposal should identify the outputs and products generated and demonstrate how they will support dissemination of these to the FE sector, so that improvement can be sustained over time, and be used by and support other FE providers.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Briefly describe the expected benefits, outputs and longer term outcomes of the project** | [Free text, max 300 words] |
| **Detail how you will collect, monitor and report the impacts of the project** | [Free text, max 200 words] |
| **Detail how outputs (for example shared resources) and learnings will be disseminated following project end** | [Free text, max 200 words] |
| **As lead applicant provider, do you commit to collecting and reporting against all relevant KPIs detailed in section Q3a below?** | Yes/No |

### Q3a: Key performance indicators

To help assess your application and monitor outputs from funded projects, we have provided a set of common KPIs which are listed below. Common KPIs are divided into three categories:

* common mandatory KPIs that you must include in all applications
* required KPIs which you should include where relevant to the priority workforce development theme the proposal is addressing
* recommended survey KPIs

In addition, you should include KPIs bespoke to the programme of work you have detailed in your proposal.

DfE will centrally collect mandatory and required KPIs, whereas lead providers will collect survey KPIs and report them to DfE. All KPIs will form part of the conditions of funding and grant funding agreement for successful proposals, and will be regularly monitored by DfE.

Where a KPI is measured at provider level, please ensure that you reference the lead provider and all partner providers for the KPI, include the current status (for example a baseline) and targets (where appropriate). The KPI collection process requires you to submit provider-level KPI data for all participant partners.

Providing evidence of the current status for each KPI will help you to attribute improvements to the activity included in your proposal. Collecting and reporting on this same data throughout and at the end of the project will allow you to measure your progress.

| **(1) Mandatory KPIs** | **Level** | **Current status (include date)** | **Target** | **Target date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Estimated cost per participant of accessing training, support or professional development | Project |  |  |  |
| Number of parties actively engaging in the project:  a) providers  b) third party organisations | Project |  |  |  |
| Increased hours of training, support or professional development provided by the funding: a) delivered (see note below)   * Provider 1 [name] * Provider 2 [name] * [Add additional lines for all participant providers] | Provider |  |  |  |
| Increased hours of training, support or professional development provided by the funding: b) accessed (see note below)   * Provider 1 [name] * Provider 2 [name] * [Add additional lines for all participant providers] | Provider |  |  |  |
| Increased number of staff: a) accessing training   * Provider 1 [name] * Provider 2 [name] * [Add additional lines for all participant providers] | Provider |  |  |  |
| Increased number of staff: b) completing training, support or professional development directly provided by the funding   * Provider 1 [name] * Provider 2 [name] * [Add additional lines for all participant providers] | Provider |  |  |  |
| Number of learners reached through project   * Provider 1 [name] * Provider 2 [name] * [Add additional lines for all participant providers] | Provider |  |  |  |

Notes on above mandatory KPIs:

* Hours of training, support or professional development delivered is measured at an event level – for example, a 1 hour training course delivered to 20 participants = 1 hour of training delivered
* Hours of training, support or professional development accessed is measured at an individual level – for example, a 1 hour training course delivered to 20 participants = 20 hours of training accessed

| **(2) KPIs, required based on the acitivites that your bid will deliver – refer back to** [**Q1: Programme theme and activity**](#_Q1:_Programme_theme)**. Delete as appropriate** | **Level** | **Current status (include date)** | **Target** | **Target date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of employers involved in the development of training, support or professional development | Project |  |  |  |
| Number of resources (training courses/guidance etc) created | Project |  |  |  |
| Increased hours of training, support or professional development provided by staff for other staff   * Provider 1 [name] * Provider 2 [name] * [Add additional lines for all participant providers] | Provider |  |  |  |
| Increased number of staff providing training, support or professional development for other staff   * Provider 1 [name] * Provider 2 [name] * [Add additional lines for all participant providers] | Provider |  |  |  |
| Increased number of staff who: a) have identified training needs   * Provider 1 [name] * Provider 2 [name] * [Add additional lines for all participant providers] | Provider |  |  |  |
| Increased number of staff who: b) have a development plan in place   * Provider 1 [name] * Provider 2 [name] * [Add additional lines for all participant providers] | Provider |  |  |  |
| Increased number of staff who: c) receive training as a result of a) and or b)   * Provider 1 [name] * Provider 2 [name] * [Add additional lines for all participant providers] | Provider |  |  |  |
| Number of hours of reduced timetabling accessed   * Provider 1 [name] * Provider 2 [name] * [Add additional lines for all participant providers] | Provider |  |  |  |
| Number of staff accessing training or resources created through the project   * Provider 1 [name] * Provider 2 [name] * [Add additional lines for all participant providers] | Provider |  |  |  |
| Number of teachers accessing remission and reduced timetabling   * Provider 1 [name] * Provider 2 [name] * [Add additional lines for all participant providers] | Provider |  |  |  |
| Number of part time staff accessing out of contract hours payments to participate in CPD activities (equivalent to remission funding for full time staff)   * Provider 1 [name] * Provider 2 [name] * [Add additional lines for all participant providers] |  |  |  |  |
| Number/range of subject areas in which training is sought as a result of training needs analysis   * Provider 1 [name] * Provider 2 [name] * [Add additional lines for all participant providers] | Provider |  |  |  |

| **(3) Other recommended survey KPIs** | **Level** | **Current status (include date)** | **Target** | **Target date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicators of collaboration, for example dissemination of outputs (possibly through the sharing of resources or learnings), or development of professional communities of practice | Project |  |  |  |
| Indicators of positive changes to teacher confidence as a result of the project (in, for example, teaching practice; pedagogy; subject specific skills; digital/technological) | Project |  |  |  |
| Indicators of positive changes to teacher job satisfaction levels | Project |  |  |  |
| Indicators of positive changes to teacher knowledge as a result of the project (in, for example teaching practice; pedagogy; subject specific knowledge; digital/technological) | Project |  |  |  |

Your proposal should include sufficient KPIs to provide a full understanding of impact at the close of the project. Where these are not met by KPIs in tables (1), (2) or (3) above, please detail these in table (4). You should consider both short-term/interim measures and long-term measures to help you to track and report on progress. Interim measures allow for the collection of proxy data over a short-time period where longer-term measures may not be available. Long-term measures should be KPIs/measures that you expect the FEPDG pilot project to affect over a longer period, for example changes that the FEPDG pilot may expect to influence over one academic year. All KPIs should be SMART:

Specific

Is the activity and desired outcome clearly specified?

Measurable

Can the achievement of the activity be quantified and measured?

Achievable

Is the activity appropriately related to the project’s aims, and what can the consortia bring to the project (background knowledge and experience) in order to achieve it?

Realistic

Can the activity realistically be achieved with the available resources?

Time-Bound

In what time-period will the activity be achieved?

| **(4) KPIs bespoke to the programme of work you have detailed in your proposal** | **Level** | **Current status (include date)** | **Target** | **Target date** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| *Add additional lines, as required* |  |  |  |  |

### Q4: Deliverability

Tell us how your proposal demonstrates deliverability. The lead applicant needs to outline how they have additional experience, expertise and capacity to lead and deliver a collaborative project of the funding value sought, including:

* experience of delivering improvement projects of a similar size/value previously and preferably workforce development projects
* evidence of supporting other providers and leading collaborative activity in the past
* availability of staff and other resources required for successful project delivery

Lead applicants should outline how they will support providers’ partners’ leadership, teaching staff and other key stakeholders to deliver activity. Your proposal should describe the financial, human, and other resources needed to successfully implement the project for all applicant providers, and should link clearly to the action plans included in [section three: program of work, and risk](#_Section_Three:_Program) as we will assess both sections together. Your proposal should demonstrate that all provider partners also have the expertise, knowledge and capability required to collaborate effectively and deliver a shared project.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Provide evidence the lead provider has sufficient capacity and capabilities to lead the proposal** | [Free text, max 200 words] |
| **Provide evidence other applicants have sufficient capacity and capability to deliver proposal and all are playing an active role** | [Free text, max 200 words] |
| **Does each provider’s governing body support the quality improvement program outlined in this application?** | Yes / No |
| **Detail the governance structure that will oversee the funded activity, including roles and responsibilities and how progress (including against** [**KPIs**](#_Q3a:_Key_performance) **and** [**program of work, financial profile and risk**](#_Section_Three:_Program)**) will be monitored** | [Free text, max 200 words] |

### Q5: Value for money and use of funding

Tell us how your proposal will deliver value for money. Your response should include evidence that the costs for the specific activities of your program of work are reasonable and proportionate. You need to provide evidence to support the specific costs of the activities in your program of work. You should show, for instance, the basis on which day rates have been calculated and how management costs are proportionate. You should also evidence the value for money that will be derived from your program of work in terms of savings from costs, efficiencies or effectiveness and show how this will be measured.

You should demonstrate how the proposal will fund additional activity within providers (such as expansion or acceleration of activities that have already been planned; additional activities beyond those that are planned), and provide evidence that proposed activity will not duplicate or replace government-funded professional development, training or support already available for the FE workforce.

Your response should reference the financial profile included in [section 3](#_Section_Three:_Program) as both sections will be assessed together, and provide proof that all activity is compliant eligible grant expenditure, and that costs will be controlled during the project lifecycle with measures to ensure spend is within the agreed grant amount.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Detail how the project will represent good value for money. Provide supporting evidence that sufficient financial controls will be put in place** | [Free text, max 500 words] |
| **Provide evidence that projects will complement and not duplicate or replace existing CPD provision or workforce support** | [Free text, max 200 words] |

### Q6: Collaboration

Tell us how your proposal is collaborative in nature. Your response should evidence how funding will extend, deepen or result in new and sustainable forms of collaborative working between staff in providers and between providers. You should clearly identify the roles and responsibilities of all providers in your application, and how each will add value to the project through their involvement and contribution.

Applications should demonstrate how identified third parties supporting an application will add value through their involvement

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Detail how the funding will build new, or strengthen existing, collaborative working relationships between providers and staff** | [Free text, max 300 words] |
| **Provide evidence that all providers in a project will add value and benefit through participation, and how the lead partner will co-ordinate this across the project** | [Free text, max 150 words] |

### Q7: Sustainability

Tell us how the benefits of your project will be sustained beyond the period of the FEPDG pilot grant. You should indicate how you will sustain the improvements and collaboration achieved beyond the period of the fundingfor example, through embedding improved practices, behaviours and resources more widely.

You should indicate how you and your partners plan to build on the results of the program, for example,potential scalability of products and approaches for use by wider sector. We are particularly interested in proposals that utilise digital forms of delivery, which will allow greater reach once disseminated more widely.

The department is looking for projects that generate outputs and produce resources that will benefit other FE providers. You will be required to disseminate your outputs and resources via the FEPDG pilot Gov.uk website and at events as required by DfE.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Detail the continued benefits of the project beyond the grant period** | [Free text, max 200 words] |
| **Detail how you will document the outputs of the FEPDG pilot or share learnings/effective practice to provide other FE Providers with tangible resources, extending the reach of the programme?** | [Free text, max 200 words] |

# Section Three: Program of work, and risk

Your proposal needs to provide a project plan detailing inputs, resources, responsibilities of the lead and provider partners. This will also include an identification of key risks and relevant mitigations. Please note the requirements detailed under [Q4: Deliverability](#_Q4:_Deliverability) with regards to the action plan, and [Q5: Value for money and use of funding](#_Q5:_Value_for) with regards to the financial profile.

Breakdown the outline programme of work detailed in Q1 above into a list of specific activities by completing the table(s) below. If this proposal includes more than one workstream, please duplicate the Action Plan and Financial Profile tables. If you are submitting more than one bid, you do not need to include action plans and financial profiles for your other bid(s) as part of this section. You should also refer to the KPIs included in Q3a that will support monitoring of progress and the final evaluation of your project. All detailed activity should be SMART – see definition in [Q3a Key performance indicators](#_Q3a:_Key_performance) section above.

Please insert additional rows and tables as required.

### Activities to be funded

Workstream #1:

1. Action Plan

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description of activity** | **How will this activity address the programme theme?** | **What is the output(s) and product(s) you expect from the activity?** | **How will you measure whether the activity has been successful in achieving its goals?**  Please reference Key Performance Indicators (KPI’s) from [section Q3a](#_Q3a:_Key_performance) above | **What is the timeline of the activity, from development to delivery?** | **Who is responsible for delivering it?** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. Financial profile

Please ensure that you include a row for each area of cost, including as a minimum (where appropriate):

* development
* procurement
* staffing (including any recruitment, backfill, out-of-hours, or remission costs)
* training delivery
* travel
* activity cost (such as administrative cost in establishing a new community of practice)

Include day rates where available to enable effective benchmarking of your proposal.

### Example financial profile tables are included with a green header – delete these from your submission

#### All projects

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Oct-21** | **Nov-21** | **Dec-21** | **Jan-21** | **Feb-21** | **Mar-21** | **Total** |
| **Start up/lead in costs** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recruitment/staffing (breakdown of posts) | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* |
| Digital Champion | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* |
| Procurement activities | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* |

#### Theme: Workforce capability and confidence to use technology effectively in education

#### Project delivery

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Oct-21** | **Nov-21** | **Dec-21** | **Jan-21** | **Feb-21** | **Mar-21** | **Total** |
| Establish digital education team | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* |
| Staffing (breakdown) | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* |
| Developing training programme | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* |
| Delivery of action learning sets/training programme | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* |

#### Beneficiary costs

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Oct-21** | **Nov-21** | **Dec-21** | **Jan-21** | **Feb-21** | **Mar-21** | **Total** |
| Remission funding | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* |
| \*Out of hours payments | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* |
| Backfiling costs | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* |

\*For p/t staff required to attend/access training outside of contracted hours.

### Financial Profile template for use in your submission:

Project Name: [insert name here]

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Aug-21** | **Sep-21** | **Oct-21** | **Nov-21** | **Dec-21** | **Jan-21** | **Feb-21** | **Mar-21** | **Total** |
|  | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* |
|  | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* |
| *Add additional rows as required* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* | *£* |

Add additional Workstream tables as required.

### What are the main risks to the success of your program of work, and how will you mitigate these? (400 words maximum)

Please include all significant risks to your project and the approaches you will take to effectively mitigate these. In determining your risks, you should ensure that you consider all risk categories. A summary is provided below to support your risk identification process.

| **Description of risk** | **What actions will you take to mitigate this risk?** You should consider the full risk management process:   * identification * treatment * monitoring * reporting | **After mitigation what is the likelihood of risk materialising during the lifetime of the project?**   * likely >70% * possible 70% – 30% * unlikely <30% | **After mitigation what would be the impact of this risk if it materialised?**   * high – significant impact or project unable to deliver * medium – delivery compromised for example project delayed or over budget * low – minor or no impact on project delivery |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
| *Add additional rows as required* |  |  |  |

#### Risk categories:

Strategy   
Risks arising from identifying and pursuing a strategy, which is poorly defined, is based on flawed or inaccurate data or fails to support the delivery of commitments, plans or objectives due to a changing macro-environment (for example political, economic, social, technological, environment and legislative change).

Governance   
Risks arising from unclear plans, priorities, authorities and accountabilities, and/or ineffective or disproportionate oversight of decision-making and/or performance.

Operations   
Risks arising from inadequate, poorly designed or ineffective/inefficient internal processes resulting in fraud, error, impaired customer service (quality and/or quantity of service), non-compliance and/or poor value for money.

Legal   
Risks arising from a defective transaction, a claim being made (including a defence to a claim or a counterclaim) or some other legal event occurring that results in a liability or other loss, or a failure to take appropriate measures to meet legal or regulatory requirements or to protect assets (for example, intellectual property).

Property   
Risks arising from property deficiencies or poorly designed or ineffective/inefficient safety management resulting in non-compliance and/or harm and suffering to employees, contractors, service users or the public.

Financial   
Risks arising from not managing finances in accordance with requirements and financial constraints resulting in poor returns from investments, failure to manage assets/liabilities or to obtain value for money from the resources deployed, and/or non-compliant financial reporting.

Commercial   
Risks arising from weaknesses in the management of commercial partnerships, supply chains and contractual requirements, resulting in poor performance, inefficiency, poor value for money, fraud, and /or failure to meet business requirements/objectives.

People   
Risks arising from ineffective leadership and engagement, suboptimal culture, inappropriate behaviours, the unavailability of sufficient capacity and capability, industrial action and/or non-compliance with relevant employment legislation/HR policies resulting in negative impact on performance.

Technology   
Risks arising from technology not delivering the expected services due to inadequate or deficient system/process development and performance or inadequate resilience. Information risks – risks arising from a failure to produce robust, suitable and appropriate data/information and to exploit data/information to its full potential. Security risks – risks arising from a failure to prevent unauthorised and/or inappropriate access to the estate and information, including cyber security and non-compliance with General Data Protection Regulation requirements.

Project/Programme   
Risks that change programmes and projects are not aligned with strategic priorities and do not successfully and safely deliver requirements and intended benefits to time, cost and quality.

Reputational   
Risks arising from adverse events, including ethical violations, a lack of sustainability, systemic or repeated failures or poor quality or a lack of innovation, leading to damages to reputation and or destruction of trust and relations.

Failure to manage risks in any of these categories may lead to financial, reputational, legal, regulatory, safety, security, environmental, employee, customer and operational consequences.

## Section Four: Declaration of the Principal, the chief executive or equivalent of the Lead Provider

As the lead provider you will act as the accountable body and submit this application on behalf of the group of providers that are applying. By submitting this application, you confirm:

* all the information included is true and accurate to the best of your knowledge
* you have read the full FEPDG pilot guidance and understand these will be conditions of funding
* you have the authority of your governing body (or equivalent) to make this application
* your partner provider(s) support this application, and is/are committed to work with your provider throughout the full FEPDG pilot funded programme of work
* you will provide the ESFA with any requested reports about the use of the grant funds that your provider is awarded
* you will submit regular monitoring reports and an end of project monitoring report to the ESFA to timescales required by DfE
* you will support the dissemination of learning as requested by DfE and ESFA – this will involve providing case studies, contributing to webinars and other activity as identified
* you are aware that any materials and products produced that are funded by the FEPDG pilot will be available for DfE use and in accordance with the Open Governance Licence – ownership of software or other intellectual property rights to deliver services shall remain with the relevant third party
* you will consider compliance with the [accessibility regulation](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/accessibility-requirements-for-public-sector-websites-and-apps) when producing any online materials
* you understand that the grant will become repayable: if the grant funding is not spent by the end of March 2022; if the grant funding is not spent on eligible activities; if your provider does not provide its required contribution; if reports on expenditures and outcomes are not submitted; and if the quality improvement program (or variant thereof agreed with DfE and ESFA) is not delivered within the planned timescale
* you will ensure value for money, seeking competitive costs for all activities and complying with the procurement governance as set out by your governing body
* the program of work developed is additional or complimentary to other current activities
* you accept that total eligible costs may include irrecoverable VAT, no further monies will be issued to cover VAT
* you accept that DfE and ESFA may ask for any additional information as they see fit to assess your application and that as a condition of funding, you shall provide such information
* should we find any information presented in this application to be false or misleading, we may reject your application– if we have already paid grant monies, you must return them to the ESFA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Principal, chief executive or equivalent’s name**  **Signature** |  |
| **Date (DD/MM/YYYY)** |  |

## Declaration of the Principal, the chief executive or equivalent of the Partner Providers

By signing this application, you confirm:

* all the information included is true and accurate to the best of your knowledge
* you have read the published FEPDG pilot guidance and understand these conditions will be conditions of funding
* your provider (including its governing body or equivalent) supports this application, and is committed to working with the applicant college throughout the full funded program of work
* you accept that the DfE and ESFA may ask for any additional information as they see fit to assess this application, and that you shall provide such information
* you will ensure value for money in all services that you provide

*(E-Signatures are accepted for this section)*

*(Please insert additional columns as required)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Partner provider 1** | **Partner provider 2** |
| **Principal, chief executive or equivalent’s name**  **Signature** |  |  |
| **Date when form was completed** |  |  |

Please send your completed application form to [FEPDG.pilot@education.gov.uk](mailto:FEPDG.pilot@education.gov.uk), using the subject line ‘FEPDG pilot application’ no later than 10am on 26 July 2021. We will acknowledge receipt of your application within three working days. In most cases, applicants will receive notice of whether their application is successful after 6 September 2021.

## Annex A: Application Scoring

DfE officials will undertake relevant checks to verify details and assure eligibility, both through published and internal data. We will score all applications which meet the minimum eligibility criteria based on information and data provided by the applicant. Assessors may also take account of specialist advice (for example ESFA, FE Commissioner’s Office) where appropriate and may seek the views of interested parties to verify the information in an application.

We will disqualify proposals that do not meet the minimum eligibility criteria set out in section one from the process and will not assess them.

### **To note**

The Secretariat may contact the lead applicant for clarification or amendment as it works to determine eligibility.

We will assess scoring for sections two and three in line with the following descriptors. Please note that we will score deliverability across [Section 2 Q4](#_Q4:_Deliverability), and [Section 3: activities to be funded](#_Activities_to_be), and we will score value for money across [Section 2 Q5](#_Q5:_Value_for) and [Section 3: financial profile](#_Activities_to_be). Benchmarking of relevant information will be used as part of scoring applications. We will moderate responses to ensure scoring is consistent and in line with the published scoring criteria.

We will assess and sift all applications which meet the eligibility criteria. Applications must score at least 2 for all criteria to be considered for funding.

We will generally base decisions about successful bids on the highest scoring applications, although we will notionally ringfence a minimum of 15% of the total budget for each of the three priority areas. Providing there are applications in a priority area that meet the minimum pass mark, we will prioritise them over higher-scoring bids in another area until we have met the ringfenced amount. We will then allocate all remaining budget according to application scores until we have exhausted funding. If we receive insufficient quality bids for a given priority area to spend 15% of the budget, we will release this back into the main funding pot.

We will also take into account applicants’ priority scoring if they have submitted multiple applications, as well as other relevant considerations such as geography and the mix of provider types, to ensure there is a suitable mix of projects.

Ministers will make final decisions about applications and there will be no right to an appeal.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **Judgement** | **Definition** |
| **4** | Clearly exceeds requirements | The response provided fully satisfies and exceeds the criteria detailed in the question, offering additional and clearly recognisable benefits or evidence over and above the level required in the specification.  The applicant has submitted a response which fully and successfully demonstrates that they meet the criteria detailed, and in addition has identified and demonstrated factors that will offer additional benefits. |
| **3** | Strong demonstration against requirements/some evidence of exceeding requirements | The response provided fully satisfies the criteria detailed in the question, with some evidence that exceeds requirements.  The applicant has submitted a response which fully and successfully demonstrates that they meet the criteria detailed. |
| **2** | Meets requirements | The response satisfies the minimum criteria detailed in the question.  The applicant has provided some evidence to support their response. However, this is lacking in detail in one or more respects. |
| **1** | Narrowly fails to meet requirements | The response fails to meet several criteria detailed in the question.  The applicant has submitted a response which exhibits clear and significant omissions regarding meeting the criteria. |
| **0** | Nil response | No response provided. |

### Overall scoring

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section number – see application for full question** | **Available marks** |
| Lead applicant eligibility  Provider partner(s) eligibility | Pass/Fail  Pass/Fail |
| Quality and relevance of proposed activity | 0 – 4 |
| Expected benefits for providers, staff and learners | 0 – 4 |
| Provider capability and capacity | 0 – 4 |
| Value for money and use of funding | 0 – 4 |
| Collaboration | 0 – 4 |
| Sustainability | 0 – 4 |

|  |
| --- |
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