



[Department](#)
[for Culture,](#)
[Media & Sport](#)

Guidance

Better Futures Fund learning and development partner competition: Annex A – scoring criteria

Updated 22 July 2026

Contents

[Assessment criteria - assessment of technical expertise](#)

[Section 1: BFF L&D programme objectives and outcomes](#)

[Section 2: SOP and sector knowledge](#)

[Section 3: Programme management and oversight](#)

[Section 4: Finances](#)

[Section 5: Service monitoring and evaluation](#)

Assessment criteria - assessment of technical expertise

Number	Term	Description	Weighting
1	Section 1: BFF L&D Programme Objectives	Can the applicants clearly explain their design proposal and how they intend to meet the Better Futures Fund Learning and Development objectives?	25
2	Section 2: SOP & Sector Knowledge	Does the applicant demonstrate the depth of sector expertise and evidence-based knowledge required to act as a credible expert for SOPs learning and development?	25
3	Section 3: Programme Management & Oversight	Does the applicant demonstrate the operational capability, robust governance and resourcing flexibility to mobilise quickly, deliver the grant and effectively manage variable demand over the lifecycle of the programme?	20

4	Section 4: Finances	Can the applicant demonstrate robust financial management, processes and safeguards in line with the delivery of this programme that ensure value for money?	15
5	Section 5: Service Monitoring & Evaluation	Can the applicant accurately track their own performance and build a proactive feedback loop to continuously improve the learning offer in collaboration with DCMS and other delivery partners? Do they have the systems in place to securely manage information?	15

We will assess applications based on the information provided to answer the application questions and each question response will be evaluated and marked on a scale of 0 to 4 where:

- 0 - Serious concerns: e.g. does not meet requirements, and/or raises serious concerns
- 1 - Minor concerns: e.g. meets some requirements but with gaps and/or some minor concerns
- 2 - Adequate confidence: e.g. meets most/all requirements, but lacks sufficient detail or evidence in some areas
- 3 - Good confidence: e.g. meets all requirements and provides a detailed response but lacks evidence in minor areas
- 4 - Excellent confidence: e.g. meets all requirements, provides a detailed response and evidence which demonstrates a particularly strong understanding of the requirements

Section 1: BFF L&D programme objectives and outcomes

- **Assessment Question:** Applicants must clearly explain their design proposal and how they intend to meet the Better Futures Fund Learning and Development objectives
- **Weighting:** This section is worth 25% of the proposal assessment
- **We are looking for applicants to:**
 - Demonstrate a clear design proposal which outlines the provision of relevant support at each stage of the SOP lifecycle, enabling organisations and stakeholders to explore, develop and deliver projects on the BFF. This will include any evidence the applicant can provide related to previous delivery or the previous success of the proposed model
 - Demonstrate a plan that equips recipients of this service with accessible, up to

date and practical support on a range of topics relevant to SOP development and delivery. This could include reference to any tools and resources that may be developed, and how they propose to reach a diverse range of organisations and stakeholders interested in SOPs and the BFF

- Demonstrate how they will use and translate evidence and learning from the BFF and previous SOP programmes to support stakeholders to develop and deliver projects on the BFF
- Demonstrate how they will facilitate opportunities for projects involved in both rounds of the BFF to share knowledge, learning and experience with each other
- Demonstrate how they will support local, regional and national stakeholders to build understanding of and capability in outcomes-based commissioning approaches

Assessment scoring

Excellent confidence	4 The bid: - Proposes a programme backed up by a highly persuasive hypothesis as to why they will meet the objectives and outcomes of the funding, and therefore proposes a highly effective project - Sets out a highly convincingly proposal will achieve each of the objectives and outcomes of the funding - Proposes a project that provides an excellent level of detail for its activities, outputs and outcomes - Demonstrates excellent knowledge of what is needed at various points of the SOP lifecycle for a variety of stakeholders and has a range of offers available, setting out a highly convincing argument for why this proposed programme will enable organisations and stakeholders to explore, develop and deliver projects on the BFF - Sets out a very clear plan to equip recipients with accessible, up-to-date and practical support on a comprehensive range of topics to a range of participants relevant to SOP development and delivery - Has a very clear strategy to reach and provide support to a diverse range of organisations and stakeholders - Provides numerous strong, relevant examples of evidence that demonstrates previous experience and high-quality delivery specific to the proposed model - Demonstrates clearly how they will use and translate evidence and learning from the BFF and previous SOP programmes to support stakeholders - Provides a very clear, proactive approach to cross-round knowledge sharing that outlines the rationale behind the
----------------------	--

proposal's frequency of activities, explaining specifically why the proposal will drive impactful opportunities for projects to share knowledge, learning and experience with each other

- Very clearly demonstrates the support they will provide to local, regional and national stakeholders to build strong capability and a deep understanding in outcomes-based commissioning approaches

**Good
confidence**

- 3** The bid:
- Proposes a programme backed up by a persuasive hypothesis as to why they will meet the objectives and outcomes of the funding, and therefore proposes an effective project
 - Sets out convincingly how their proposal will achieve each of the objectives and outcomes of the funding
 - Proposes a project that provides a good level of detail for its activities, outputs and outcomes
 - Demonstrates solid knowledge of what is needed at various points of the SOP lifecycle for a variety of stakeholders and has a range of offers available, setting out a convincing argument for why this proposed programme will enable organisations and stakeholders to explore, develop and deliver projects on the BFF
 - Sets out a clear and achievable plan to equip recipients with accessible, up-to-date and practical support on a range of topics relevant to SOP development and delivery
 - Has a clear strategy to reach and provide support to a diverse range of organisations and stakeholders
 - Provides examples of evidence related to previous delivery, which may or may not include examples of previous success of the specific proposed model
 - Demonstrates clearly how they will use and translate evidence and learning from the BFF and previous SOP programmes to support stakeholders to develop and deliver projects on the BFF
 - Provides a clear approach to cross-round knowledge sharing that details the rationale behind the proposal's frequency of activities, explaining why the proposal will drive opportunities for projects involved in both rounds of the BFF to share knowledge, learning and experience with each other
 - Clearly demonstrates how they will support local, regional and national stakeholders to build understanding and capability in outcomes-based commissioning approaches

**Adequate
confidence**

- 2** The bid:
- Proposes a programme backed up by a satisfactory hypothesis as to why they will meet the objectives and outcomes of the funding, and therefore proposes a limited project

- Adequately demonstrates a design proposal outlining support across the SOP lifecycle, demonstrating some understanding of the type of support that is needed to enable organisations to explore, develop and deliver projects, but lacks sufficient detail or evidence in some areas
- Provides few examples of evidence related to previous delivery or success of the proposed model
- Sets out a satisfactory plan to equip recipients with support on topics relevant to SOP development, but details on tools, resources or reaching a diverse range of organisations are general or lack specificity. Accessibility is still considered within their work
- Adequately outlines how they will use evidence from previous programmes to support stakeholders, but without explaining the practical mechanism for how that information is translated in practice
- Adequately outlines how they will facilitate knowledge sharing opportunities between both rounds of the BFF, but without clear, proactive mechanisms
- Sufficiently explains how they will support stakeholders to build understanding of outcomes-based commissioning, but lacks a detailed model for building capability

Minor concerns

- 1** The bid: (one or more)
- Proposes a programme backed up by an unclear or unconvincing hypothesis as to why they will meet the objectives and outcomes of the funding, and therefore proposes a project that may not be effective
 - Minimally demonstrates a design proposal with notable gaps across the SOP lifecycle and raises concerns regarding its alignment with BFF objectives
 - Provides minimal or weak examples of previous delivery or model success
 - Sets out a limited plan for practical support, with vague references to tools, resources or strategies to reach a diverse range of stakeholders. Limited information on how they will ensure accessibility throughout their work
 - Inadequately or fails to explain how they will use past evidence from previous programmes, failing to show how learning will practically help stakeholders develop or deliver projects on the BFF
 - Minimally addresses cross-round learning, leaving it unclear how projects in both rounds of the BFF will connect or share experiences
 - Demonstrates a weak approach to building capability in outcomes-based commissioning, with little to no clear provision for local, regional or national stakeholders
-

Serious concerns	0 The bid: (all of) - Proposes a programme backed up by an unclear or unconvincing hypothesis as to why they will meet the objectives and outcomes of the funding, and therefore proposes a project that may not be effective - Insufficiently demonstrates a design proposal, failing to address the basic stages of the SOP lifecycle and providing no relevant examples of previous delivery or evidence of model success - Proposes an ineffective or missing plan that fails to provide practical tools, resources or any accessible strategy to reach diverse organisations. Does not outline how they will ensure accessibility throughout their work - Demonstrates an inability to translate or use past learning and evidence to support stakeholders on the BFF - Fails to include any mechanisms or opportunities for projects from both rounds of the BFF to share knowledge or learning - Fails to address capability building, showing no plan to support local, regional, or national stakeholders with outcomes-based commissioning approaches
-------------------------	---

Section 2: SOP and sector knowledge

- **Assessment question:** Does the applicant demonstrate the depth of sector expertise and evidence-based knowledge required to act as a credible expert for SOPs learning and development?
- **Weighting:** This section is worth 25% of the proposal assessment
- **We are looking for applicants to:**
 - Demonstrate your knowledge of SOPs and outcomes-based commissioning and how this will apply to the development of a learning and development programme
 - Demonstrate how you will ensure communication approaches are effectively tailored and accessible to a diverse range of audiences
 - Demonstrate an understanding of effective SOP based-delivery and how they can be applied to address structural child poverty. For example, how the applicant may sufficiently flex their work to target support to organisations and stakeholders working in places and communities experiencing higher levels of child poverty
 - Demonstrate a strong understanding of the organisations and stakeholders involved in the BFF, particularly VCSE organisations and commissioners, and the support they require to develop and deliver SOPs. This should include an

understanding of place-based approaches and what is needed to support local partners to work together effectively to design and deliver outcomes-based partnerships

- Demonstrate acting as an impartial learning provider and having no conflict of interest by participating in the market when undertaking work on this grant, or provide adequate assurances that any such work would not be perceived as conflicting. Where potential conflicts, shared leadership, or shared physical addresses/postcodes exist with other entities, provide clear assurance and explanation to confirm there is no risk of fraud or bias

Assessment scoring

Excellent confidence	4	The bid: - Provides full confidence in the depth of their technical knowledge of SOPs and outcomes-based commissioning, showing very clearly how this expertise will be embedded to create a highly effective learning and development programme - Demonstrates very clearly how communication approaches are effectively tailored and accessible to a diverse range of audiences, with specific detail on how, what and why tailoring may occur - Demonstrates an outstanding evidence-based understanding of effective SOP-based delivery and how it can be applied to directly address structural child poverty - Provides very strong examples of how they will sufficiently flex their work to target intense support to organisations and stakeholders working in places and communities experiencing the highest levels of child poverty - Sets out a highly sophisticated understanding of the distinct organisations and stakeholders who might potentially be involved in the BFF, particularly VCSE organisations and commissioners, and their specific support requirements. Demonstrates an excellent grasp on what may be needed to support local partners to work together effectively to design and deliver outcomes-based partnerships - Provides clear assurances in ability to act as an impartial learning provider with zero conflict of interest in the market, or provides flawless, legally airtight assurances and explanations regarding shared leadership, potential conflicts, or shared physical addresses/postcodes to confirm there is zero risk of fraud, bias or perceived conflict
Good confidence	3	The bid: - Provides strong confidence in the depth of their knowledge of SOPs and outcomes-based commissioning, showing clearly

how this applies to the development of the L&D programme

- Clearly demonstrates how communication approaches are effectively tailored and accessible to a diverse range of audiences
- Demonstrates a good understanding of effective SOP-based delivery and its application to address structural child poverty, including clear plans to flex their work to target support to organisations and stakeholders in communities experiencing higher levels of child poverty
- Demonstrates a strong understanding of BFF stakeholders, their support needs, place-based approaches and what is required to help local partners work together to design and deliver outcomes-based partnerships
- Provides clear and credible assurances that they will act as an impartial provider with no conflict of interest, including strong explanations regarding any potential shared leadership or shared postcodes to prevent risks of bias or fraud

Adequate confidence	2 The bid: - Provides adequate confidence in their knowledge of SOPs and outcomes-based commissioning, sufficiently explaining how it applies to the programme - Adequately demonstrates that communication approaches will be accessible, though lacking customisation for diverse audiences - Sets out basic understanding of effective SOP delivery and child poverty, but provides limited detail on how they will practically flex their work to target support to places experiencing higher levels of child poverty - Demonstrates a satisfactory understanding of BFF stakeholders, but lacks specific detail on place-based approaches or mechanisms to support cohesive local partnerships - Provides basic assurances regarding impartiality and conflicts of interest, but some minor details regarding shared entities or market participation lack full, robust explanation
----------------------------	--

Minor concerns	1 The bid: (one or more) - Provides limited confidence in the depth of their SOP and outcomes-based commissioning knowledge, showing gaps in how it applies to the development of an L&D programme - Minimally demonstrates tailored or accessible communication approaches to a range of audience - Sets out minimal understanding of structural child poverty, with weak or unconvincing plans to flex work to target support to communities experiencing high levels of poverty - Demonstrates a weak understanding of BFF stakeholder dynamics and place-based partnerships in relation to SOP delivery
-----------------------	---

- Raises minor concerns or provides vague assurances regarding impartiality, market participation, or potential risks of fraud/bias stemming from shared leadership

Serious concerns

- 0** The bid: (all of)
- Provides no confidence in their knowledge of SOPs or outcomes-based commissioning in order to deliver an L&D programme
 - Fails to outline accessible or tailored communication approaches to a range of audiences
 - Sets out an inadequate understanding of SOP-based delivery providing no methodology to flex support to communities experiencing high child poverty
 - Demonstrates an insufficient understanding of BFF stakeholders, place-based partnerships and the support they require to develop and deliver SOPs
 - Fails to provide assurances of impartiality, raising serious concerns regarding conflicts of interest, market bias or potential fraud
-

Section 3: Programme management and oversight

- **Assessment question:** Does the applicant demonstrate the operational capability, robust governance and resourcing flexibility to mobilise quickly, deliver the grant and effectively manage variable demand over the lifecycle of the programme?
- **Weighting:** This section is worth 20% of the proposal assessment
- **We are looking for applicants to:**
 - Demonstrate a realistic delivery plan to establish the service from October 2026 through to March 2031. This includes a clear approach to communication and publicity for the programme and a strategy to proactively adapt resources to manage sudden changes in user demand to enable successful delivery
 - Demonstrate they have the key staff with the required levels of experience
 - Demonstrate that they have robust existing systems and technology capable of securely managing a learning and development service of this size, including the technical capacity to capture and hold interaction data of the recipients of this service
 - Demonstrate the necessary governance arrangements to give DCMS confidence there will be effective oversight of the programme, and set out their approach to risk management

- Demonstrate your approach to building trusting and collaborative relationships with wider BFF delivery partners and stakeholders (which could include technical assistance delivery partners and DCMS) to ensure cohesive programme management and effective joint ways of working
- Outline how the proposed model will comply with all relevant legal requirements including, but not limited to, Subsidy Control. The current position is that this grant is not anticipated to be subject to the Subsidy Control regime. Should this assessment change, this requirement will be clearly communicated within the Invitation to grant terms and conditions, and the successful bidder/s will be required to demonstrate full compliance with all applicable Subsidy Control regulations
- (If applicable for your proposal) If applying as a consortium, outlining clear splits of roles and responsibilities between organisations, an outline of the background the consortium including any previous experience of working together, and a brief outline of the contractual relationship and project management approach you'll be putting in place

Assessment scoring

Excellent confidence	4	The bid: - Sets out a very clear, highly detailed and achievable delivery plan to establish and run the service from October 2026 through to March 2031, with the ability to align and flex with BFF timelines - Includes a comprehensive approach to communication and publicity alongside a highly robust, proactive strategy to adapting resources to manage sudden changes in user demand to enable successful delivery - Demonstrates that key staff possess significant skill, capability and extensive experience matched to their assigned delivery roles - Demonstrates that the organisation has excellent existing systems and technology capable of securely managing a learning and development service of this size, including the relevant technical capacity to capture, process and securely hold interaction data of service recipients - Establishes comprehensive governance arrangements that give DCMS absolute confidence in effective oversight and a highly proactive approach to risk management - Outlines a very clear and effective approach to building trusting and collaborative relationships with wider BFF delivery partners and stakeholders to ensure cohesive programme management and integrated joint ways of working - Outlines very clearly how the proposed model complies fully with all relevant legal requirements including, but not limited to,
----------------------	---	--

a mechanism for Subsidy Control

- (If applicable) Provides full confidence in consortium arrangements, mapping out very clear splits of roles, responsibilities, joint working experience and clear contractual and project management frameworks

**Good
confidence**

3 The bid:

- Sets out a clear and achievable delivery plan to establish the service from October 2026 through to March 2031 with clear milestones
- Provides a clear approach to communication and publicity and an effective, realistic strategy to adapt resources to manage sudden changes in user demand
- Demonstrates that key staff have good skill, capability and the required levels of experience for their assigned roles
- Demonstrates that they have robust existing systems and technology capable of securely managing a service of this size, including the technical capacity to capture and hold interaction data
- Sets out necessary governance arrangements to give DCMS confidence in effective oversight, backed by a solid approach to risk management
- Demonstrates a clear approach to building trusting, collaborative relationships and joint ways of working with DCMS and wider BFF delivery partners
- Outlines a clear approach to complying with legal requirements and references an understanding of the Subsidy Control requirements
- (If applicable) Provides confidence in consortium details, outlining clear splits of roles, good project management and funding relationships

**Adequate
confidence**

2 The bid:

- Sets out a relatively clear delivery plan from October 2026 to March 2031, but milestones lack granular detail or only somewhat align with BFF timelines
- Includes a basic approach to communication and publicity and mentions managing demand, but lacks a detailed strategy to handle sudden changes in user needs
- Demonstrates that key staff have sufficient skill and meet the basic experience required, though there are some resourcing gaps
- Possesses satisfactory systems and technology, with a plausible but unproven capacity to capture and hold interaction data securely
- Outlines standard governance and risk management arrangements, providing adequate oversight confidence to DCMS
- Proposes a generic approach to collaborating with DCMS and

other delivery partners

- Addresses legal and Subsidy Control compliance at a basic level
- (If applicable) Provides some confidence in consortium management, but splits of roles or contractual relationships lack clarity

Minor concerns

- 1** The bid:
- Provides a limited delivery plan with unachievable or unclear milestones that do not map well to the October 2026 - March 2031 timeline
 - Includes a poorly defined approach to communication, publicity and managing demand, lacking a detailed strategy to handle sudden changes in user needs
 - Raises concerns regarding resourcing flexibility, showing minimal capacity to adapt resources to sudden changes in user demand
 - Demonstrates that key staff have minimal skill or lack sufficient experience in managing large-scale L&D services
 - Shows existing technology and systems are limited, with weak data-capture capabilities for interaction data
 - Governance arrangements are minimal and unlikely to enable effective oversight or robust risk management
 - Demonstrates an unclear approach to collaborating with DCMS and other delivery partners
 - Legal compliance or Subsidy Control pathways are unclear, and consortium details (if applicable) are structurally weak or poorly defined

Serious concerns

- 0** The bid:
- Proposes an unsatisfactory delivery plan that completely fails to align with timelines
 - Does not offer a defined approach to communication, publicity or how to address demand management
 - Key staff do not possess the required skills or experience
 - The organisation has no adequate systems or secure technical capacity to manage the service or log interaction data
 - Governance arrangements are unsatisfactory, failing to provide risk frameworks or oversight capability
 - Fails to demonstrate any capacity for joint working or collaborative engagement with DCMS and wider BFF delivery partners, showing a complete lack of a plan for cohesive programme management
 - Fails to demonstrate legal compliance, joint working capability, or clear consortium structures
-

Section 4: Finances

- **Assessment question:** Can the applicant demonstrate robust financial management, processes and safeguards in line with the delivery of this programme that ensure value for money?
- **Weighting:** This section is worth 15% of the proposal assessment
- **We are looking for applicants to:**
 - Provide a detailed and realistic budget, as outlined in the mandatory documents
 - Demonstrate they will spend the funds in the timelines of the grant funding
 - Demonstrate how they will ensure value for money
 - Demonstrate that they have robust internal financial management and control processes to monitor and account for the funding
 - Demonstrate that they have clear safeguards to prevent fraud and financial risks to an acceptable level
 - (If applicable for your proposal) If applying as a consortium, a brief outline of the funding relationship

Assessment scoring

Excellent confidence	4	The bid: - Provides a clearly detailed and realistic budget that perfectly aligns with all mandatory document requirements - Demonstrates with absolute certainty that they have the ability and experience to accurately and effectively spend the funds entirely within the timelines of the grant funding - Demonstrates very clearly and with extensive evidence an approach to ensuring maximum value for money across all delivery components - Shows excellent, highly robust internal financial management and control processes to continuously monitor and account for the funding - Demonstrates a highly advanced understanding of and active processes for preventing fraud, establishing comprehensive safeguards that reduce financial risks to a minimum - (If applicable) Provides a perfectly transparent and clear mapping of the consortium funding relationship and financial splits
Good confidence	3	The bid: - Provides a clear and realistic budget that meets the requirements of the mandatory documents - Demonstrates confidence that the funds will be spent fully

- within the timelines of the grant funding
- Demonstrates clearly how they will ensure value for money throughout the grant
- Demonstrates that they have robust internal financial management and control processes to monitor and accurately account for the funding
- Demonstrates a good understanding of the processes for preventing fraud, showing clear safeguards to mitigate financial risks effectively
- (If applicable) Provides a logical outline of the consortium funding relationship

Adequate confidence

- 2** The bid:
- Provides a sufficiently clear budget, though it lacks granular breakdowns for some activities
 - Demonstrates adequately that funds will be spent within the defined timelines of the grant funding
 - Demonstrates sufficiently how they will ensure value for money, though relies on generic cost assumptions
 - Possesses satisfactory internal financial management and control processes to track funding, meeting baseline compliance
 - Demonstrates sufficient understanding of fraud prevention, with standard safeguards in place to manage financial risks to an acceptable level
 - (If applicable) Provides a basic level of detail of the consortium funding relationship

Minor concerns

- 1** The bid:
- Provides a limited or poorly detailed budget with some questionable or unverified assumptions
 - It is unclear or doubtful whether all funds will be successfully spent within the designated grant timelines
 - Offers a limited or weak demonstration of how they will ensure value for money
 - Internal financial management and control processes are weak, raising some concerns regarding their capacity to accurately account for the grant funding
 - Demonstrates a limited understanding of financial risk, with vague or undocumented safeguards against fraud
 - (If applicable) Provides a limited or unclear outline of the consortium relationship, raising questions about financial transparency or accountability

Serious concerns

- 0** The bid:
- Provides a completely unsatisfactory, unrealistic budget
 - Fails to demonstrate that funding will be spent in line with the grant timelines
 - Provides no demonstration of value for money

- Financial management and control processes are entirely inadequate to monitor and account for the funding
 - Demonstrates an unsatisfactory understanding of financial risk, with an alarming absence of anti-fraud safeguards
 - (If applicable) Fails to provide any information regarding the consortium funding relationship
-

Section 5: Service monitoring and evaluation

- **Assessment question:** Can the applicant accurately track their own performance and build a proactive feedback loop to continuously improve the learning offer in collaboration with DCMS and other delivery partners? Do they have the systems in place to securely manage information?
- **Weighting:** This section is worth 15% of the proposal assessment
- **We are looking for applicants to:**
 - Provide a clear approach of how they would define, track and monitor the learning outcomes of the recipients of this service and KPIs against the L&D programme objectives (measuring reach, quality, and accessibility)
 - Outline a robust process for gathering user feedback from the recipients of this service and explain how these data insights will be used to continuously improve and update the learning offer
 - Demonstrate a successful track record of managing monitoring and evaluation for projects of similar size and complexity, including a clear approach to collaborating with DCMS and external evaluators. Including:
 - How you plan to design, develop and maintain a service that is accessible, simple to use and meets the needs of its users
 - How will you approach engagement, data sharing and collaboration with DCMS and our independent evaluation partners throughout the service lifecycle
 - How you will collect and use data to iterate and improve the service
 - What roles and governance your team will have to deliver, continuously improve and sustainably maintain this service
 - How you will choose your tools and technology to ensure compliance with the [Technology Code of Practice](#) and integration with DCMS systems or external evaluation platforms
 - Demonstrate the capacity to provide regular progress reports to DCMS and proactively engage with other BFF delivery partners (e.g. attending partnership meetings, reviewing emerging capacity needs and distributing learning)

- Evidence robust internal policies for data management and compliance with legal and ethical principles (including UK GDPR/Data Protection Act 2018). Applicants must demonstrate that they and any third-party suppliers can securely collect, handle and delete data, commit to completing a Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) and detail clear procedures for reporting breaches or disruptions to DCMS and the ICO

Assessment scoring

Excellent confidence	4	The bid: - Provides an exceptionally clear approach to defining, tracking and monitoring the specific learning outcomes of recipients and KPIs, comprehensively measuring reach, quality, and accessibility against the L&D objectives - Outlines a robust process for gathering user feedback and explains clearly how these data insights will be used to continuously improve, iterate and update the learning offer - Demonstrates a highly successful track record of managing monitoring and evaluation for projects of similar size and complexity, including a cooperative and proactive approach to collaborating with DCMS and external evaluators that is embedded within their proposal - The proposal comprehensively meets all the digital standards outlined in the assessment criteria - Demonstrates very clearly how they will provide regular, high-quality progress reports to DCMS and proactively engage with other BFF delivery partners - Evidences comprehensive and robust internal policies for data management and absolute compliance with ethical and legal principles - Provides full confidence that they and all third-party suppliers can securely collect, handle and delete data, showing a commitment to data protection and detailing proactive procedures for reporting any breaches or disruptions to DCMS and the ICO
Good confidence	3	The bid: - Provides a clear approach to defining, tracking and monitoring recipient learning outcomes and KPIs across reach, quality and accessibility - Outlines a robust process for gathering user feedback and explains how these data insights will be used to continuously improve, iterate and update the learning offer - Demonstrates a successful, proven track record of managing monitoring and evaluation for projects of similar size and complexity with a clear approach to collaborating with DCMS

and external evaluators

- The proposal meets all the digital standards outlined in the assessment criteria
- Demonstrates a good capacity to provide regular progress reports to DCMS and actively engage with other BFF delivery partners
- Evidences very good, compliant internal policies for data management
- Demonstrates clearly that they and third-party suppliers can securely manage, store and delete data and outline solid procedures for reporting breaches or disruptions to DCMS and the ICO

Adequate confidence

- 2** The bid:
- Provides a satisfactory approach to defining and tracking basic learning outcomes and KPIs, but lacks deep detail on measuring all fields reach, quality, accessibility
 - Outlines a sufficient process for gathering user feedback, but lacks explicit detail on how data insights structurally drive updates to the learning offer
 - Demonstrates a satisfactory track record of handling monitoring and evaluation on similarly sized schemes, showing a baseline willingness to cooperate with DCMS and external evaluators
 - The proposal meets some of the basic digital standards outlined in the assessment criteria
 - Possesses adequate capacity to submit regular progress reports and engage with BFF delivery partners
 - Maintains sufficient internal data policies that meet basic UK standards
 - Provides a basic understanding of managing data and procedures for reporting breaches or disruptions

Minor concerns

- 1** The bid:
- Provides a weak approach to tracking KPIs and learning outcomes, showing major gaps in definitions of reach, quality or accessibility
 - Outlines a fragmented process for gathering user feedback, with little to no clear mechanism for continuous improvement
 - Demonstrates a limited or weak track record in project monitoring and evaluation, raising concerns about their capability to handle a grant of this complexity or collaborate effectively with external evaluators
 - The proposal fails to outline or show an understanding of the digital standards outlined in the assessment criteria
 - Reporting capacity is limited, or data protection policies show weak compliance regarding UK data/digital principles, or unclear ICO/DCMS breach reporting channels
-

Serious concerns

- 0 The bid:
- Provides an ineffective or missing approach to tracking learning outcomes or fund KPIs
 - Fails to outline any process for user feedback collection or continuous improvement
 - Demonstrates an inadequate track record of monitoring and evaluation and an inability to collaborate with DCMS or independent evaluators The proposal meets none of the digital standards outlined in the assessment criteria
 - Data governance policies are poor or non-existent, failing to show compliance with UK data/digital principles, nor a commitment to reporting breaches or disruptions

[↑ Back to top](#)

Help us improve GOV.UK

To help us improve GOV.UK, we'd like to know more about your visit today. [Please fill in this survey \(opens in a new tab\)](#).

Cancel



Services and information

[Benefits](#)

[Births, death, marriages and care](#)

[Business and self-employed](#)

[Childcare and parenting](#)

[Citizenship and living in the UK](#)

[Crime, justice and the law](#)

Government activity

[Departments](#)

[News](#)

[Guidance and regulation](#)

[Research and statistics](#)

[Policy papers and consultations](#)

[Transparency](#)

[Disabled people](#)

[How government works](#)

[Driving and transport](#)

[Get involved](#)

[Education and learning](#)

[Employing people](#)

[Environment and countryside](#)

[Housing and local services](#)

[Money and tax](#)

[Passports, travel and living abroad](#)

[Visas and immigration](#)

[Working, jobs and pensions](#)

[Help](#) [Privacy](#) [Cookies](#) [Accessibility statement](#) [Contact](#) [Terms and conditions](#)

[Rhestr o Wasanaethau Cymraeg](#) [Government Digital Service](#)

OGL All content is available under the [Open Government Licence v3.0](#), except where otherwise stated



© [Crown copyright](#)