Scoring Criteria				
Criterion	**Factors to Take into Account**	**Weight (%)**	**Score (0-4)**	**Weighted Score**
Finance and value for money	Will the proposal achieve good value for money? How much does the programme cost? Is match funding being drawn in? Does the proposal demonstrate: o That costs, and costs per output, present the best use of money o That financial risks are identified and managed o That costs and any other funding are profiled in a sensible way *See Section 2.2 (a) and Section 3.3 in specification*	20		
Impact	Does the proposal show evidence of the prospective provider's capacity to reach faith communities, especially those where there is no similar training provision already in place? Will the proposal have a positive impact on faith leaders' understanding of the core topics, so they can apply their learning in a ministerial / pastoral context and provide stronger support to their communities? Will the following topics be covered? o Safeguarding (including domestic abuse, mental health, forced marriage, FGM & child sexual exploitation) o Hate crime, equalities and marriage legislation o Shared values Does the applicant propose to work in partnership with other organisations (e.g. partnering with existing programmes / linking with a national organisation for specialist training?) *See Section 2.2 (b) and Section 2.3 in specification*	40		
Measurement and evaluation	Is there a clear and effective plan to measure the progress and impact of the programme throughout its life? Will both quantitative and qualitative data be included? Will an independent evaluation be carried out? Will the measures and evaluation make clear what worked and what could be improved for future programmes? Will evaluation data include the following: o Level of knowledge of participants at the start, immediate end and 3-6 months after completion of the course; o Evidence that participants can independently successfully assess safeguarding concerns and identify a positive course of action (for example, through scenario training); o Feedback from faith leaders, their congregations, and other members of institutions supported within 3-6 months of training delivery on the extent to which learning on safeguarding issues has been applied in the setting of faith institutions and communities; o Case studies from trainees demonstrating an understanding of the core topics and the interrelationship between safeguarding, legislation and shared values. Will monitoring data include the following: o Number of individuals trained in person; o Number of people accessing (and completing where appropriate) online training provision; o Number of faith denominations supported; o Number of people accessing 'further support' sections of the webpage. *See Section 2.2 (c) in the specification*	20		
Sustainability	Are sustainability considerations built into the proposal? What plans are in place to ensure the benefits of the initiative continue to be felt after the expiry of Government funding on 31st March 2020? *See Section 2.2 (d) in specification*	20		

Scoring Guide

Score	Rating	Description
0	**Unacceptable**	A proposal at this rating: · Builds very little or no confidence that the bidder can deliver the requirements due to insufficient evidence of relevant ability, understanding, skills, resources and quality measures; · Builds very little or no confidence that the bidder's approach/solution will deliver the requirements due to insufficient evidence or an inappropriate approach/solution.
1	**Reservations**	A proposal at this rating: · Raises reservations that the bidder can deliver the requirements due to insufficient evidence of relevant ability, understanding, skills, resources and quality measures; · Raises reservations that the bidder's approach/solution will deliver the requirements due to insufficient evidence or an inappropriate approach/solution. Note: a response at this rating includes reservations which cannot be easily resolved with the bidder pre-contract award (i.e. changes which would distort the competition) or during the contract term without impacting time, quality or cost.
2	**Acceptable**	A proposal at this rating: · Confirms that the bidder can deliver the requirements through evidence of relevant ability, understanding, skills, resources and quality measures; · Provides an acceptable approach/solution to delivering the requirements utilising standard strategies, plans, tools, methods or technologies. Note: an acceptable response may include minor reservations that can easily be resolved with the bidder pre-contract award (i.e. changes which would not distort the competition) or during the contract term without impacting time, quality or cost.
3	**Good**	A proposal at this rating: · Builds confidence that the bidder can deliver the requirements through evidence of relevant ability, understanding, skills, resources and quality measures; · Provides a good approach/solution to delivering the requirements utilising appropriately tailored strategies, plans, tools, methods or technologies. Note: a good response may include a small number of minor reservations that can easily be resolved with the bidder pre-contract award (i.e. changes which would not distort the competition) or during the contract term without impacting time, quality or cost.
4	**Excellent**	A proposal at this rating: · Builds a high level of confidence that the bidder can deliver the requirements through evidence of relevant ability, understanding, skills, resources and quality measures; · Provides an exceptional approach/solution to delivering the requirements utilising appropriately tailored and at times innovative strategies, plans, tools, methods or technologies. Note: an excellent response should not include any reservations.