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# 1. Overview of this tender

Heads On are seeking a consultant to conduct a final evaluation of the Sussex NHS Charities Stage 2 Community Partnership Grant, funded through the NHS Charities Together (NHSCT) stage 2 Community Partnerships Grant Programme.

Heads On, the charity for Sussex Partnership NHS Foundation Trust, is lead charity for the Sussex allocation, and has overall responsibility for distributing the funding.

NHSCT is the national membership body for NHS charities. Their Covid-19 emergency fundraising appeal has raised over £130 million and the Stage 2, £30million, disbursement of this money to NHS member charities opened in September 2020 in the form of Community Partnership Grants.

The Stage 2 funding for Community Partnership Grants: *"recognises the profound impact of the pandemic on all communities outside NHS settings such as hospices, community health care and social care….the NHS relies on partnerships with social care and community health organisations to provide vital patient services and care…"* Ellie Orton, Chief Executive NHSCT

£750,000 was available for Sussex, to achieve the fund's national aims:

*Supporting the wider NHS and voluntary community dealing with COVID-19, working in partnership with the voluntary, care and hospice sector so that NHS patients can leave hospital more quickly and safely, stay or remain out of hospital thereby reducing the stress on the NHS and providing the wrap around provision for patients which is vitally needed.*

It is anticipated that this evaluation will broadly examine:

a. Main activities and outputs of the work - who was involved and who benefitted (quantified where possible).

b. Outcomes of the work – the difference made for beneficiaries, other participants, NHS charities, and NHS trust.

c. Lessons learnt - what went well and what didn’t - unexpected outcomes.

d. Expenditure information.

In order to achieve this, the evaluation will look at the following key elements:

1. The Sussex NHS Charities community partnership fund – including:
2. how the fund was developed (consultation)
3. how the fund was managed (application and assessment process)
4. The successful projects (outputs, outcomes, case studies)
5. Training to address systemic racism.
6. Partnership working (6 Sussex NHS Charities, third sector organisations)

# 2. Background

### Project name

Sussex NHS Charities Stage 2 Community Partnership Grant

### Project duration

2 years

### Project budget

£750,000

### Partners

**Sussex NHS Charities:**

* University Hospitals Sussex NHS Foundation Trust
* East Sussex Healthcare NHS Trust Charitable Fund
* Heads On - dedicated charity for Sussex Partnership NHS Foundation Trust
* QVH Charity - dedicated charity for Queen Victoria Hospital NHS Foundation Trust
* South East Coast Ambulance Service NHS Foundation Trust Charitable Funds
* Sussex Community NHS Foundation Trust Charitable Funds

**Delivery Partners:**

* The Trust for Developing Communities
* The Crew Club
* Extratime
* 4Sight Vision Support
* Demelza Hospice Care for Children
* Martlets Hospice
* Albion in the Community
* Citizens Advice 1066
* Crawley Community Action
* Amaze

### Project details

NHSCT launched the Stage 2 Community Partnership Grants Programme in September 2020 in recognition of the vital work that voluntary and community groups do to support the work of the NHS. These groups, such as hospices, care homes and charities, have helped the NHS by supporting the health of communities affected by Covid-19. This funding seeks to support effective partnerships between the NHS and its community partners.

£30m was available through the Stage 2 Community Partnerships Grants Programme. Funding was allocated across geographical areas. In England, the allocation was based on the Integrated Care Systems (ICS) and Sustainability & Transformation Partnerships (STP).

Grants were made to NHS charities to support their voluntary, care and hospice sector so that NHS patients can leave hospital more quickly and safely, stay or remain out of hospital. Supporting the integrated care partnerships in this way significantly reduces stress on the NHS and provides the wrap around provision for patients which is vitally needed. NHS charities were encouraged to sustain, develop or establish these partnerships (where they have not done so already) in order to fund collaborative projects.

Overall aims of the grant:

**1. Results in a measurable improvement in health outcomes for communities adversely affected by Covid-19**

**2. Involves a partnership of NHS charities and community organisations**

**3. Leads to a direct, positive impact on the NHS whilst it responds to the Covid-19 pandemic**

Heads On is lead charity for the distribution of this funding in Sussex and is managing a grants budget of £750,000 on behalf of the 6 NHS charities operating in Sussex.

Heads On ran an open grant making round for third sector organisations to apply for funding to deliver projects in Sussex that would relieve pressure on NHS services within the following priority areas (agreed by the NHS Charities Sussex Programme Board, all 6 related Charitable Funds Committees and the Sussex Health and Care Partnership):

• Health Inequalities (only projects delivered within the 5 most deprived areas of Sussex);

• Suicide Prevention; and

• Supported Hospital Discharge.

In addition 20% of the total grants budget was restricted for projects delivered within BAME communities in recognition of the disproportionate impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on BAME communities and the exacerbation of existing health inequalities for these communities.

10 projects have been recommended for funding through the open grant round.

Final recommendations for funding include the development and delivery of training to address systemic racism across the healthcare system, developed in partnership with the Brighton & Sussex Medical School and supported by the CCG’s Covid-19 BAME Disparity Programme.

# 3. Purpose of Evaluation

The purpose of this end of project evaluation is to establish to what extent the project has successfully achieved the overall aims of the grant, in an efficient and cost-effective manner.

### Evaluation criteria

In order to generate the information needed to achieve this goal, the consultant(s) will utilise the 6 evaluation criteria, as explained below.

**RELEVANCE** – Is the intervention doing the right thing?

1. Did the intervention target the right population?

2. To what extent does the intervention address beneficiaries’ needs and priorities?

**EFFECTIVENESS** – Is the intervention achieving its objectives?

3. To what extent have the objectives and planned outputs and activities been met? What were the major factors influencing the achievement or nonachievement of the objectives?

4. Have applied activities and their delivery methods been effective? Are there aspects that could have been done differently?

**EFFICIENCY** – How well are resources being used?

5. Was the programme implemented in a timely and efficient manner according to plans and budget objectives?

**IMPACT** – What difference does the intervention make?

6. Is the project impacting positively on key groups and issues that have been identified as important in project design?

7. Were there any unintended consequences or impacts of the project?

**SUSTAINABILITY** – Will the benefits last?

8. What is the continued relevance of the project over time?

**COHERENCE/COORDINATION** – How well does the intervention fit?

9. What methods have been effective in mobilising multiple projects and partners concurrently within the programme timescale?

10. What methods have been effective at working at scale?

11. To what extent has working in partnership (NHS Charities) impacted upon the success of the project? What were the biggest successes and challenges in the partnership approach?

12. What has been the value and effectiveness of the NHS Charities partnership approach

# Skills and Expertise

### Review Team

The evaluation will be conducted by an external consultant, or evaluation team. The consultant/s or firm will have demonstrated competence in having undertaken similar work before, including experience in programme design and management, planning, monitoring and evaluation.

The lead evaluator will have as a minimum the following core competencies; experience of working in the health and social care sector, projects/programme analysis, report writing, oral presentation skills. Extensive experience in conducting medium scale evaluations.

The evaluator/evaluation team will work closely with an evaluation working group. The role of this group (or their representatives) will include validation of strategic information, issuing of relevant directives or endorsement of necessary proposals during the course of the exercise and coordination of local logistics. The working group will include the following: programme leads from Heads On and other NHS charities, third sector partners and potentially healthcare system colleagues.

# Methodology

The evaluation team should detail their approach and methodologies to be used, and indicate how they will fulfil the requirements of the ToR in their Expression of Interest application. These may include qualitative and quantitative tools as appropriate to conduct this evaluation. The evaluator/evaluation team is responsible for developing the evaluation framework and methodology that addresses the key evaluation questions.

# 6. Reference Material

* Proposal documents for NHSCT Community Partnership Grant
* Sussex NHS Charities Community Partnership Fund documents including: Fund Guidance document, EOI template, Budget Template, EOI Tracker spreadsheet, Assessment Templates
* Expressions of Interest documents for each third sector partner including: Expression of Interest, response to Additional Information, completed budgets.

# 7. Timeframes

The evaluation team will be expected to demonstrate through their expression of interest indicative timeframes for undertaking the key activities.

The evaluation will follow the key phases:

Phase I - Desk study: Review of documentation and elaboration of data collection

The evaluator/s will review relevant documentation from section 6 above (Reference material). Based on this review, they will produce an inception report which will include an elaborated plan, methodology and sampling strategy of the data collection for this study. The evaluation will only proceed to the next stage upon approval of this inception report.

Phase II: Data Collection

This phase of the evaluation will seek to collect data on the key evaluation questions explained under evaluation criteria. The evaluator/s will use the agreed plan, methodology and sampling strategy from phase 1 to conduct the work.

Phase III – Data analysis and production of evaluation report

The team will draw out key issues in relation to evaluation questions and produce a comprehensive report.

# 8. Outputs / Deliverables

The minimum expected outputs are –

**1. An Inception Report** - The inception report should be available to Heads On within six working days of project commencement. Feedback will be provided within seven working days following acknowledged receipt of inception report. Data collection should not commence until an agreement on the report has been made.

**2. A draft Evaluation Report -** A draft report (using an agreed reporting format and not more than 40 pages including executive summary and excluding annexes) should be submitted to the evaluation working group, who will liaise with the project partners for feedback. Heads On will provide feedback on the draft version to the evaluation team within 3 weeks after receiving the draft report.

**3. A final Evaluation Report -** The final report should be submitted to the agreed Heads On contact point within 5 working days after receiving the feedback from Heads On on the draft report. The appropriate reporting format will be agreed at the commencement of this contract

**4. Data sets (Excel or Word files)** – The evaluation team will be expected to submit complete data sets (in Access/Excel/Word) of all the quantitative data gathered during the exercise. These data sets should be provided at the time of submission of the final report.

**5. PowerPoint presentation summary** - On submission of the final report, the team is expected to submit a PowerPoint presentation (maximum 12 slides), summarising the methodology, challenges faced, key findings under each of the evaluation criteria and main recommendations.

# 9. Administrative support

### Budget

The consultant should submit to Heads On an Expression of Interest indicating their daily rates for the assignment. Heads On will assess Expression of Interests submitted according to standardised quality assessment criteria, as well as on the basis of their competitiveness and value for money in line with the budget available for this evaluation.

A maximum budget of £25,000 is available for this work.

### Schedule of Payment

* On signing the contract: 20%
* On acceptance and approval of inception report: 20%
* On submission of draft final report: 30%
* On acceptance and approval of final report: 30%

### Mode of payment

As agreed by Heads On and the consultant

# 10. Shortlisting and award procedure

Interested organisations/individuals should submit an Expression of Interest to Heads On.

Completed Expressions of Interest should be sent to [SussexNHSCharities@sussexpartnership.nhs.uk](mailto:SussexNHSCharities@sussexpartnership.nhs.uk) by **5pm 10th January 2022**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Excellent | There is strong evidence that the project ***fully meets all or almost meets all aspects*** of the evaluation criterion under consideration. The findings indicate **excellent and exemplary** achievement/progress/attainment. |
|  | Satisfactory | There is strong evidence that the project ***mostly meets*** the aspects of the evaluation criterion under consideration. The situation is considered **satisfactory, but there is** **room for some improvements.** |
|  | Attention | There is strong evidence that the project ***only partially meets*** the aspects of the evaluation criterion under consideration. There are **issues which need to be addressed and improvements are necessary** under this criterion. |
|  | Caution | There is strong evidence that the project ***does not meet the main*** aspects of the evaluation criterion under review. There are **significant issues which need to be addressed** under this criterion. |
|  | Problematic | There is strong evidence that the project ***does not meet*** the evaluation criterion under consideration and is performing very poorly. There are **serious deficiencies** in the project under this criterion. |
|  | Not Sufficient Evidence | There is ***not sufficient evidence*** to rate the project against the criterion under consideration. |

# Evaluation Criteria Rating Guidance