

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Evaluation of the LOCAL CLIMATE ENGAGEMENT programme

This ToR provides a framework for what is expected from applicants but we are open to suggestions and evaluation approaches that might not completely fit this framework should applicants have suggestions or concerns on the feasibility.

1. BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

The Local Climate Engagement Programme (LCE) aims to provide local authorities and their partners in England with the impetus, incentives and support they need to realise the potential of widespread, high quality, inclusive local public engagement in climate decision-making in the short- and long-term. It aims to help ensure that the UK can reach its climate target, and that it does so in a way that is fair and that empowers communities to fulfil their potential.

The programme will take a multi-pronged approach. It will deliver training, mentoring, peer learning and direct project delivery support for Local Authorities around public participation in climate decision making.

To assess the impact of the programme and capture learnings on the process, the LCE partners are looking for an independent evaluator and inviting proposals that respond to these terms of reference.

1.1 Programme governance

The project is led and delivered by a consortium formed by Involve, UK100, Democratic Society, Shared Future and Climate Outreach. The programme is funded by Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation (UK branch) and Esmée Fairbairn Foundation. Democratic Society is holding the oversight of the external evaluation process.

1.2 Programme Activities

Project group activities

The LCE programme will be delivering training, in depth project support and providing peer learning sessions for the following areas until April 2023:

- Derbyshire County Council
- Warwick District Council & Stratford District Council
- Essex County Council
- Lancaster City Council
- Sunderland City Council

We expect these activities to involve and have an impact on local authorities, residents and local stakeholders.

Coaching group activities

The Programme will also deliver training, mentoring, and provide peer learning sessions for the following 16 Local Authorities until December 2022:

- Stevenage Borough Council
- South Tyneside
- Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council
- Rochdale Borough Council
- Liverpool City Council
- West Berkshire District Council
- Brighton and Hove City Council
- Winchester City Council
- Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
- West Midlands Combined Authority
- Kensington and Chelsea
- Hebden Royd Town Council and Todmorden Town Council
- Kirklees Council
- Sheffield City Council
- East Riding of Yorkshire
- Reading

Whereas the project group activities are directed both at local authorities as well as the wider community, the coaching group activities are directed specifically at local authorities.

1.3 Programme Objectives

The following are the overall objectives and outcomes of the programme. We expect the independent evaluator to work with us to assess the extent and ways in which the outcomes have been met.

Objective 1. Increased momentum behind local public participation in climate decision-making, and the need for it to be inclusive/take account of issues around power and privilege, enabling it to scale and spread at pace; + wider engagement and outreach around it

Outcome 1.1 Increase buy-in and prioritisation of inclusive local public engagement processes within the local authority

Outcome 1.2 Local authorities capture learning on impact to build on further sustained processes of public engagement in climate decision-making.

Objective 2. Increased awareness and understanding of what high quality, inclusive local public engagement in climate decision-making looks like amongst a wide range of relevant actors at local and national level, + wider engagement and outreach around it

Outcome 2.1 Increased awareness of what high quality, inclusive local public engagement in climate decision-making looks like

Outcome 2.2 Improved understanding of what high quality, inclusive local public engagement in climate decision-making looks like, including the importance of wider engagement and outreach around it

Outcome 2.3 Improved confidence in the capacity to undertake wide engagement and outreach around inclusive local public engagement for climate decision-making

Objective 3. Increased impact of public participation on decision-making, participation is (more) inclusive / takes account of issues of power and privilege and increased outreach around public participation in decision-making.

Outcome 3.1 Increased impact/influence of inclusive local public on decision-making processes

Outcome 3.2 Increased wider communication and outreach on public participation in climate decision-making

Objective 4. Communities directly involved report feelings of empowerment in relation to engaging in climate decision-making processes

Outcome 4.1 [Agency decision-making] Members of communities involved report feeling they have a role to play in decision-making processes

Outcome 4.2 [Agency climate] Members of communities involved report feeling they have a role to play in climate action

Outcome 4.3 [Efficacy decision-making] Members of communities involved report feeling able to engage in decision-making processes

Outcome 4.4 [Efficacy climate] Members of communities involved report feeling able to engage in climate action

Outcome 4.5 [Attitudes] Members of communities involved understand the impact of climate change and the need for actions for mitigation and adaptation

Outcome 4.6 [Attitudes] Members of communities involved are willing to engage in decision-making or actions to mitigate and/or adapt to climate change

Outcome 4.7 [Behaviours] Members of communities involved report having changed their practices to mitigate and /or adapt to climate change

Supplementary

This fifth objective is contingent on additional funding but we hope to capture any learning or evidence in relation to it regardless.

Objective 5. Better networks and infrastructure to support high quality inclusive local public engagement in climate decision-making

Outcome 5.1 Improved understanding of the needs of local authorities and relevant stakeholders to build better infrastructure and networks that can support high quality inclusive public engagement.

2. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES FOR THE EVALUATION

The learning from this evaluation will inform development of wider activity in Local Authority engagement on climate change, locally and nationally and at times internationally.

The evaluation should help inform our understanding of whether the project meets its high level aims by:

- Evaluating the project's progress towards achieving the outcomes above
- Feeding back any relevant learning into the continued delivery of the project and design of future projects relating to public engagement in climate decision making

3. SUGGESTED RESEARCH APPROACH AND METHODS

The specific methodology will be left to the independent evaluator. We expect the proposal to include an approach and methods that can meet the research objectives of this evaluation as stated above.

However, as a minimum we suggest:

For the project group activities, qualitative interviews to be conducted with each lead in the participating Local Authorities and with key stakeholders (who will be identified by each local authority) in each area. The evaluator can attend some project meetings with Local Authorities and their partners. We also expect qualitative interviews or focus groups with local stakeholders and residents from the community involved in the project. We suggest some of these are carried out at the start of the evaluation and at the end, one year on, to assess change and progress in planning and commissioning public engagement in climate decision-making and to capture any additional learning. The evaluator should also gather evidence from programme partners. The evaluator might also suggest methods that can be included over the duration of the programme to understand progress and pathways to change.

For the coaching group we would expect attendance at group session(s) and qualitative interviews of some of the participants from each authority at the end of the training. The evaluator might also want to consider a quantitative questionnaire for all participants at the end of the training so that we can evaluate the training and the impact it has had on the outcomes above.

We would expect that the evaluation approach allows both an answer to whether outcomes were met and also the pathways to change and what helped in achieving the outcomes.

3.1 Consortium internal learning

The consortium has conducted a baseline survey among participants of the training delivered to both the coaching and project activities members. Findings from this baseline survey will be available for analysis.

In addition, the consortium has developed an Outcome Mapping approach and agreed on indicators, or progress markers, for each outcome. We expect to collect evidence of progress in our internal learning sessions. The independent evaluator will have access to this so that the research tools developed can also be aligned with the internal indicators where possible.

The evaluator will also be able to attend internal learning sessions if appropriate although the focus of their work will be on evaluating the external learning from the project.

4. ETHICS AND DATA PROTECTION

We expect the proposal to include an ethics approach that follows the principles of informed consent, anonymity, privacy, and data protection regulations.

We expect quotes included in the final report to be anonymised but to include the type of stakeholder that the quote comes from (ie. local authority staff, resident, community-based organisation, etc) if consent is given for this.

5. KEY RESOURCES AND PROGRAMME CONTACT

Programme Lead for Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning is Paula Black
pab10@demsoc.eu

We will ensure access to all documents relating to the programme; introductions to key stakeholders for participation in the evaluation data generation; data from a base-line survey.

We will collaborate with the external evaluators to ensure they have everything they need for their work.

6. OUTPUTS

- Short, high quality, reports capturing key discussion points and any conclusions at each milestone meeting
- A final report summarizing the work
- Slide deck for public distribution
- Learning workshop(s) with participating project group Local Authorities and partners

7. TIMETABLE

Commence contract	July 2022
Inception meeting followed by monthly project meetings	July 2022 then monthly
1 st milestone meeting	September 2022
Interim findings	December 2022
2nd milestone meeting	March 2023
Evaluation report	September 2023
Return to <i>project group</i> areas to assess progress in implementing the results of the public engagement, wider impact and any additional learning; Return to <i>coaching group</i> areas to assess progress in planning and commissioning public engagement in	September 2024

climate decision-making and to capture any additional learning.	
Produce final addendum to report	

8. PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND CAPACITY

Please include in the proposal details about the team involved in the evaluation and how it will be managed within time and budget. Please include a suggested timeline. The evaluator is invited to also attach any previous evaluation work by the same team or relevant members.

9. CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF PREFERRED TENDER

The evaluation of the tender will be based on a combined scoring method. The winning tender will be the one that achieves the highest Combined Score. The Combined Score will be determined based on the following Quality/Price Ratio:

- Quality: 70%
- Price: 30%

The following criteria will comprise the quality assessment:

- Experience of the evaluator in conducting evaluations of a similar scale
- Evidence of capacity in the project management section to deliver the evaluation within the time and budget
- Rationale behind the research approach/methodology and its suitability to assess the programme outcomes
- Evidence that the evaluation will be delivered following research ethics principles

The following criteria comprises the price criteria:

- Value for money based upon calculations below

Table 1 - Price for Staff Costs

Personnel	Grade/Job Role	Days/Hours Input	Activity	Hourly Rate £
				£
				£
				£
				£
				£
Total Price (excl. VAT)				£

Table 2 – Other Activities and Costs Related to the Delivery of Service

Activity	Day Rate	Price £ (Ex VAT)
Total Price (excl. VAT)		£

This could include but not limited to:

- travel expenses directly related to the project (including attendance at meetings)
- equipment and materials
- any reimbursement of research participants
- overheads
- any other costs

Table 3 - Total Cost

Cost	
Total Table 1	
Total Table 2	
Total Tender Cost	£

10. BUDGET

A maximum budget of up to £25,000 is available for this work. The price outlined in your tender must cover liability for all costs including staff costs, attendance at meetings, equipment, access to data, any reimbursement of participants, travel and subsistence, overheads, and participation in any dissemination of the research that is envisaged in the specification. Payments will be via quarterly invoicing, and linked to the successful completion of key stages of the research (as outlined above).

11. TENDER SUBMISSION

Please return your tender by email to:

pab10@demsoc.eu by no later than 9am Monday 13th June

Interviews will be held w/c 20th June

If you have not heard from us by then please presume your tender is not being considered at this time.

The Democratic Society AISBL , 28 Fourth Avenue HOVE BN3 2PJ, UK.

The Democratic Society are a non-profit organization working for greater participation and dialogue in democracy. Demsoc is independent, non-partisan and politically non-aligned.

www.demsoc.org/