

OFFICIAL

Clarification Questions Enrichment Partnerships Pilot

Delivery timeline

Q: The guidance indicates that there will be 6-7 months of delivery (between September 2024 - March 2025), is that right?

- Yes - we are hoping to appoint the delivery partner by mid-September 2023, and then they will begin administering onward grants between then and January 2024. We are envisioning that the partnerships between local organisations and schools will be set up from the start of the next academic year (September 24) and that the new enrichment programme will be in place, running to March 2025.

Q: When are schools expecting this activity to start?

- We anticipate activity will start in schools from September 2024.

Q: Are you expecting work in/with schools during school holidays or just term time?

- There might be some work needed with schools outside of term time due to the tight schedule, but we anticipate the enrichment activity will take place in term time.

Q: Is there going to be a timeline for when the enrichment activities are going to start? So that we can keep an eye out to bid to be a recipient of the grant as a local authority.

- We expect the time to bid to be a recipient of the grant to local organisations to be between September 2023 (when the delivery partner is appointed) and December 2023/January 2024. However, we would also look to the delivery partner to suggest a possible timeframe as well.

Delivery partner

Q: Please can you provide a definitive list of organisations which can apply to deliver this pilot i.e. a local authority, secondary school, VCSE organisation etc.

- There is no definitive list of organisations which can apply to deliver this pilot. We have set out in the guidance the requirements for the delivery partner. They need to be a legal entity, a single organisation or joint delivery body, with experience in grant making and local partnership building to deliver this pilot.

Q: Are you looking for one partner to administer the grant or several?

- It can be either a consortium or a single organisation. We would expect there to be one named 'lead' for funding to flow through, instead of multiple grant contracts. So for an application from a consortium, there should be one main point of contact/lead organisation.

Q: Based on the guidance, DCMS are looking to award the whole amount to one delivery partner and for them to disperse that, is that correct?

- Yes, that is correct.

OFFICIAL

Q: Will that delivery partner choose where within 55 investment areas they're going to offer that enrichment?

- Yes. It will be up to the delivery partner, once in post, how the competition will work for the onward grant recipient within the framework that DCMS have set out.
- We hope that the delivery partner will have a bit more of a role than just being the grant maker.

Q: Seeing as the deadline is under 3 weeks, and there might be a need to deliver in partnership, how developed does the partnership need to be at the point of application?

- A written letter of support that shows you have a commitment from the other organisation, even if the details haven't been fine tuned, will be fine.
- DCMS/DfE just need assurance that if you were awarded the grant that you would be doing it in partnership with other organisations.

Q: If we don't need a delivery partner to administer the grant but are using delivery partners to execute the grant once it's been awarded to different people, do we need to name them at the first part of the application process?

- We wouldn't expect you to name the onward grant recipients (e.g. LAs, Local Academy Trusts etc.) in the application.

Q: Once the onward grants have been made, will it be a centralised coordinating role across the project or would you consider having a hub coordinator bringing that together in cluster areas and that would be part of that delivery partners role or would that be too staff heavy?

- DCMS would look to the delivery partner to be involved in helping to share their learning across the different areas to ensure that there is sharing of best practice across the organisations regarding what is working to engage with schools/young people and how they are setting up those partnerships etc.

Q: How light touch do you perceive the delivery partner to be in those areas once the onward grants have been made?

- We want the delivery partner to be more involved than just administering the grant, and we would want them to have some sort of expertise for those enrichment partnerships.

Q: Does this mean that you (DCMS/DfE) would consider a model whereby say 3 or 4 cluster areas were brought together with a coordinator in that space, and having 3 or 4 coordinators across England, or would you see it more across the entire project that you would have that support?

- As this isn't just a grant awarding process, we are open to different models as to how the bodies who receive the grants locally will be supported.
- There will be a question about the balance of the resource as there is a real interest in the local community reach, to ensure that the resources isn't going just centrally to a national organisation.
- A proposed model would be up to the grant organisation to show what that would look like.

Q: Are single organisation applicants (i.e., those not working in a Consortium, joint venture, unincorporated association, partnership) required to name their current supply chain partners (for this project), in section 1.17 of the application form?

Should all potential grant recipients', within the existing supply chain, be named?

- If you are applying as a single organisation, but intend to deliver the project in partnership with others, such as those in your current supply chain, do name them on the application form.
- We would not look for you to list organisations you envisage making onward grants to as this will be determined via a competition.

Q: Would DCMS/DfE consider a delivery model where the delivery partner would as part of the wraparound support package for local organisations put in place capacity locally (staff employed by the delivery partner) to support intelligence gathering/sharing of best practice, networking at the local level, best practice around youth voice and inclusion. This wraparound local support would also support the most effective commissioning/grant making of local organisations who would be delivery pilot partners for the Enrichment Coordination. They would also be responsible for supporting centralised resources around best practice development and partnership development within the wider context of the project as a whole? They would not be delivering enrichment coordination but supporting the commissioned partners.

- Yes - we would consider this type of delivery model.

Q: Would DCMS/DfE consider a proposal that placed the increased meaningful enrichment activities within the 10-15 EIA this pilot is seeking to enable, within an accredited programme structure that already exists in schools and other settings? Thereby providing value add for young people whose enrichment activities would be recognised and for schools, helping to support a financially sustainable model beyond the lifetime of the project?

- Yes - we would consider this.

Q: Are we expected to contract with different organisations in each of the 15-20 areas? Or could we contract with some larger organisations who cover multiple areas?

- The delivery partner can make this decision. We would consider applications where the delivery partner contracts with different organisations in each of the 15-20 areas, or with some larger organisations who cover multiple areas.
- However, we are expecting there to be circa 10 schools per local organisation, so you would need to ensure no overlap with schools.
- We would expect organisations receiving grants to be able to demonstrate their understanding of and ability to work effectively in the local area they are bidding for.

Q: In highly populated areas, could we have more than one enrichment coordinator? For example, 5 coordinators, covering 50 schools? Could we place all coordinators in one region? Or do we have to cover 15-20 separate Education Impact Areas?

OFFICIAL

- We would consider having more than 10 schools per Education Impact Area, and don't necessarily require the pilot to cover 15 - 20 separate EIAs; however, we would want the fund to cover a reasonable spread of EIAs
- We would not consider putting all the grants in one region - we are looking for a geographical spread to test the project in different locations
- We will expect areas/schools to be selected in line with criteria that we will develop with the delivery partner.

Q: Do you anticipate the onward grants to cover the cost of delivering/subsidising pilot enrichment activity for young people?

- No - the enrichment funding will come from schools themselves. You might look to facilitate partnerships or support accessing funding available.
- We anticipate the onward grants would fund a small number of staff in local organisations to provide bespoke support to secondary schools in their respective local areas.

Q: To what extent can we draw on the DfE for existing information, comms and engagement support with schools? Is there a targeted list or a mandated list of schools that we are expected to engage with for the pilot?

- At this stage delivery partner won't need a relationship with specific schools who will be impacted by the pilot (that's more for those bidding further down the line). What we are looking for at this stage is more about the understanding of the education system and being able to add value to the coordinating bodies.
- There is no targeted or mandated list of schools we are expecting to be engaged in this pilot. It is for the delivery partner to identify local organisations in 15 - 20 localities, working with clusters of c.10 secondary schools in each.

Q: Are there any current standards that are used to assess the quality of enrichment in/around schools? Or will the monitoring of quality of provision sit with the delivery partner?

- Extracurricular provision is not a statutory requirement for schools, but forms a part of the overall educational offer. To understand more about expectations and good practice in this area, DfE suggests looking at Ofsted material on Personal Development (such as in the [Education Inspection Framework](#) and [School Inspection Handbook](#)) which relates in part to enrichment activities, and DfE's guidance on [keeping children safe in out of school settings](#) which covers extracurricular activities.

Funding

Q: When you refer to the majority of the contract being onward granted, is there a minimum % you have in mind; and same for % of management costs max too?

- We envision that the majority of the fund will go to onward grants, but we are open to bids in terms of how much the delivery partner costs should be and we will use that as part of the assessment criteria. We consider the delivery partner costs to include activities such as; grant making and wrap around support. Up to 6% of the delivery partner costs can be admin costs.

OFFICIAL

- The budget weighting in the assessment is 10%. The applicant submitting the lowest price will serve as a benchmark and receive the full 10% score, with applicants receiving marks on a pro-rata basis from the lowest to the highest price.

Evaluation

Q: Is an independent evaluation going to be commissioned by DCMS, and therefore shouldn't be included into the budget?

- Yes, DCMS are in the process of commissioning an independent evaluation that will be paid for by DCMS.
- It should be noted that there will be an element of supporting the evaluation partner but it shouldn't be onerous.

Q: Is the short amount of time taken into consideration when conducting the evaluation and the level of impact that is expected to happen? Most of the organisations would say that a bit longer is required to see the results that are expected.

- Yes, it will be taken into account.
- DCMS is focusing on performing a 'process' evaluation to look at how the fund is being implemented, but the evaluation will touch on 'impact' as well, focussed on short-term outcomes.
- We are also evaluating if this is a model which will work in schools and if it actually helps schools by reducing the burden on them in terms of setting up enrichment programmes.

Q: Is there a Monitoring and Evaluation Obligation and does this involve collecting personally identifiable data?

- We would expect the delivery partner to support the evaluation partner with the evaluation of the pilot, including through collection of monitoring data and working with grant recipients. The delivery partner will be expected to provide contact details of people working at coordinating organisations for the evaluation.
- We would also expect the delivery partner to provide regular reports to DCMS on delivery progress

Q: Can you share a draft of the evaluation design, to help us understand what types of data we would need to collect, process and share?

- We are currently working on the design of the evaluation and commissioning an evaluator who will finalise the evaluation design once appointed.
- The evaluation will involve a process evaluation and an impact evaluation. A range of methods will be used including surveys, interviews and focus groups.
- Monitoring data will be key for the evaluation and a process will be needed to set up to make sure coordinating organisations and schools provide the data needed for the evaluation. We will be able to provide more details around this and the evaluation once a delivery partner is appointed.

Other

Q: Conflict of Interest Question - if we name partners in section 1.17 of the application form (Delivery Partners) would that exclude them from bidding for grant delivery if we were successful?

- At this stage, it would not necessarily automatically exclude them, but you would need to demonstrate at the onward grant competition stage how you would manage the conflict of interest and ensure no unfair advantage given to the organisation.
- You would need to carefully consider for this competition whether you could put robust enough procedures in place.
- As the delivery partner will be responsible for onward grant making, we would suggest you seek advice from your legal teams.

Q: Where do you see the subsidy control sitting?

- DCMS has conducted a subsidy control assessment and this grant does not meet the threshold for a subsidy. Costs for enrichment activities will be covered from school budgets, and are therefore not considered to be economic activities for the purposes of the Subsidy Control Act 2022.

Q: Brand question - how will this programme be branded? As a delivery partner programme, funded by DCMS/DfE or in partnership with...?

- We would expect the programme to be branded as 'Funded by UK Government'.