



Invitation to tender

Public Right to Justice: Evidence Reviews

Summary

Title: Public Right to Justice: Evidence reviews

Commissioner: Nuffield Foundation

Aim: In support of a forthcoming new Nuffield Foundation programme entitled *Public Right to Justice*, to review, synthesise, critically appraise and present in an accessible way research, data, and other evidence on different aspects of the justice system in England and Wales, in the form of three separate reviews covering:

1. A recent history of justice system reviews
2. The state of the justice system
3. People's experiences and views of the justice system

Timescales and key dates

Deadline for submission of clarification questions: 11am, 27 November 2024

Deadline for submissions: 11am, 18 December 2024

Appointment: 20 January 2025

Project start date and inception meeting: 27 January 2025

Delivery of first draft outputs (TBC): 1 July 2025

Project completion date (TBC): 23 September 2025

Budget

Tenders are invited up to a maximum of £65,000 (exclusive of VAT) for each of the reviews.

Please provide a statement whether or not VAT will be added to the price

Introduction and background	3
About the commissioner	4
The Public Right to Justice: evidence reviews - aims and objectives	4
Specification	5
Review methodology	5
The reviews	5
Review 1: A recent history of justice system reviews	6
Review 2: The state of the justice system	8
Review 3: People's experiences and views of the justice system	10
External contractor: roles and responsibilities	11
Indicative deliverables, milestones and outcomes	13
Legal and contracting	13
Ethics, safeguarding and data protection	15
Project management	15
Budget and indicative timetable	15
Submitting a proposal	16
Submitting clarification questions	17
Assessment criteria	17
Invoice schedule	18

Introduction and background

There is considerable concern about the state of the justice system in England and Wales, prompting growing calls for change and profound questions about the extent to which the system is effectively delivering justice. In March 2024, the Nuffield Foundation held an event entitled [“Where has my Justice gone?”](#) which highlighted the negative experiences of many users of the justice system, including long delays, difficulties navigating the system, a lack of help or advice, and a wider sense of a system that can lose sight of the needs of the individuals it serves.

We want to explore what can be done to move beyond further diagnoses of these problems and develop evidence-based approaches to solving them. This is the central goal of our new *Public Right to Justice* programme, which will be formally launched in 2025. However, to establish firm foundations for this programme of work, we first need to review and consolidate the current state of existing knowledge on key areas. In doing so, we believe that the problems identified in the justice system are not solely due to a lack of evidence – in many areas, there is already a good deal of research, past and present. Rather, there is a need to use that evidence in a more coordinated and effective way to find solutions, and to create an informed and persuasive case for change.

While we have a strong interest in the kind of legal needs and problems that people experience, our primary focus here is on the role and efficacy of the processes and institutions formally responsible for addressing legal issues, and for administering and enforcing the law. This is what we mean by ‘the justice system’. Our particular interest is in the processes leading up to and including adjudication by courts and tribunals. The primary focus is on the justice system of England and Wales, although we are interested in comparisons with other jurisdictions where appropriate. While we are interested in the system as a whole, our particular priorities are the administrative, civil, family, and youth justice systems.

We are now seeking contractors to deliver three separate evidence reviews. The contractors will be responsible for developing a review protocol, searching for, reviewing and synthesising relevant evidence and data, and presenting this in an accessible and engaging way.

We are commissioning three reviews, that we anticipate will be delivered by different contractors under discrete contracts. We are aware that there may be some overlaps in content between the three reviews, but do not expect this to be problematic and would not expect contractors to account for this overlap (though we would expect all successful contractors to maintain an awareness and interest in each other’s work). The three areas we wish to commission the reviews on are:

1. A recent history of justice system reviews
2. The state of the justice system
3. People’s experiences and views of the justice system

Interested tenderers will be asked to select only **ONE** of these reviews to bid for. **Please ensure that you select the relevant review on the application form.**

About the commissioner

The Nuffield Foundation is an independent charitable trust with a mission to advance social well-being through supporting research that improves lives. We do this by funding research that influences policy and practice, primarily in Education, Welfare and Justice. Our work on [Justice](#) illustrates our belief that a fair and effective justice system is essential for everyday social and economic life. The Nuffield Foundation is also the founder and co-funder of three centres: the [Nuffield Council on Bioethics](#), the [Ada Lovelace Institute](#) and the [Nuffield Family Justice Observatory](#) (NFJO). In particular, the NFJO, with their expertise in influencing policy and practice, are a core partner of the new programme.

Public Right to Justice: evidence reviews - aims and objectives

These reviews are part of the first phase of our new *Public Right to Justice* programme which will be focused on developing reform proposals for the justice system of England and Wales, with particular attention to the needs and experiences of those encountering the system. The reviews will draw together and synthesise the existing evidence base on different aspects of the justice system, and provide a critical assessment of that knowledge base.

Aims for the reviews are two-fold:

1. Each review will provide a stand-alone robust synthesis of a thematic area of interest, comprehensively drawing together the available research and evidence on a topic.
2. The reviews will critically appraise and identify gaps in the evidence base and be used to identify priority areas for further research in subsequent stages of the *Public Right to Justice* programme.

Specification

We anticipate commissioning three separate contractors, with each taking responsibility for delivering one of the three reviews.

Each of the three reviews will be rigorously conducted, with an objective and transparent approach to searching and analysing the evidence base. They should provide an authoritative synthesis of the evidence on their respective topic, and be able to stand up to external scrutiny and challenge. The reviews should include an interpretation of the evidence base providing commentary around the strengths and weaknesses of the research and evidence currently available. Where appropriate, we also require a critical review of how the evidence base has been used (or not) to shape justice system policy and practice.

To fit with the time frame of the overarching programme of work, we expect first drafts to be delivered by July 2025, and for the reviews to be completed by early September 2025.

Review methodology

Given the different foci and outputs of each of the reviews (see below for the specifics of each review), the three reviews may each adopt a different methodological approach. Tenderers are free to suggest whichever approach they feel is most appropriate to the task. Irrespective of the chosen approach, the search, extraction and synthesis of the data and research evidence should be systematically conducted.

The choice of an appropriate review methodology should be explained in the tender response. The reviews should all be underpinned by a *a priori* review protocol which should be shared and signed off by the Nuffield Foundation's *Public Right to Justice* team, and included as an annex to the main review and synthesis output.

The reviews

Tenderers are invited to submit bids to conduct one of the three reviews described below. While we have set out the purpose and key research questions for each review, interested tenderers are, with appropriate reasoning and explanation, invited to suggest refinements in scope or approach for the reviews. The three reviews are:

Review 1: A recent history of justice system reviews

Purpose

To examine previous reviews of various aspects of the operation and structure of the justice system over the past circa 40 years, examining what they recommended, and where and why they did, and did not, result in successful change. This recent history of reform and conditions for change will inform our future work by providing an account and critique of previous reviews and proposals for reform.

Primary research question

What have been the principal recommendations for change made by different reviews of aspects of the justice system (including independent commissions) since the mid-1980s (we suggest) and which have been adopted successfully?

Secondary research question

What factors appear to underpin whether recommendations have been adopted and whether they have been successful?

Scope

We expect this review will include the leading reviews of different aspects of the justice system and legal advice since the mid-1980s (we suggest a starting point of the 1988 Civil Justice Review), focusing on improving the accessibility, performance and effectiveness of the justice system. To include official/government or judiciary-commissioned reviews, as well as those commissioned externally or independently of government or the judiciary. The principal focus should be on our priority areas of administrative, civil, family, and youth justice.

It will be for the successful contractor to define the scope of which reviews to include, but we suggest it might include all or some of the following. At this stage, bidders should indicate how they would scope inclusion/exclusion criteria for which reviews to cover:

- Civil Justice Review (Hodgson review)
- Woolf Reforms of Civil Procedures
- Jackson Review of Civil Litigation Costs
- Norgrove Family Justice Review
- Low Commission on Future of Legal Advice and Support
- Bach Commission on the Right to Justice (access to legal aid)
- Briggs Civil Courts Structure Review
- Bellamy Review of Criminal Legal Aid
- Review of Civil Legal Aid [ongoing]
- Reforms of Criminal procedure (Auld review)
- Youth Justice (Taylor review)

- Independent Review of Administrative Law

The review should:

- (i) Describe the background, purpose, structure, approach and methods of each review covered.
- (ii) Summarise and synthesise both the reviews' main recommendations and the response to them. Note that we do not expect a detailed assessment of the content of each review's topic area.
- (iii) Chart which reviews and recommendations resulted in actions, and whether these actions followed the recommendations.
- (iv) Synthesise any evidence or accounts of the success (actual or perceived) of any recommendations resulting in action, looking for commonalities in factors associated with success (or not) across different reviews.
- (v) Provide a critical assessment of the factors that appeared to have facilitated or prevented recommendations being implemented successfully, taking account of the prevailing political, economic and social context at the time.

Review 1 outputs

We anticipate three outputs for this review, all of which will be delivered to a high-quality, publishable standard and be suitable for digital dissemination. All outputs will be provided to the Nuffield Foundation for its own use:

- 1. Main report (including Executive Summary) with a guide length of no more than 50 pages:** an extensive review of the existing published articles, reports and research, and analysis of readily available data that can provide insight about the context and traction of individual and collective justice system reviews. It should describe the key reviews conducted over the past circa 40 years and assess their influence (if any) on the justice system. The review should include a **critical assessment** of why proposals for reform may or may not have been adopted, with a view to understanding the conditions in which such proposals are likely to be most effective. The critical assessment should be expert-led, and though we expect it to take a critical and potentially challenging position, should be evidentially defensible and cognisant of the social, economic and political pressures and tensions within which the justice system functions.
- 2. A 2-3 page policy brief:** summarising and presenting key findings, implications and recommendations for policymakers, practitioners, and others with an informed interest in the legal system. The brief should be an accessible and engaging quick-read providing this essential audience with an understanding of the system conditions that precipitate change in the justice system. The brief should be accessible to an informed but not necessarily expert audience and, be written in plain English.
- 3. A presentation slide deck:** the successful tenderer will be expected to present at *Public Right to Justice* Expert Panel and at other Nuffield Foundation organised events as required, using a full set of presentation slides (in PowerPoint or equivalent package).

Review 2: The state of the justice system

Purpose

To provide a high-level overview of the performance and effectiveness of the justice system over recent decades based on key evidence, contained within a single, accessible source. The review should both map available evidence and provide insightful commentary on the state of the justice system (as defined above), establishing a baseline for our programme.

Primary research question

What does the existing evidence say about the recent and current state of the justice system in terms of its operation and performance, and what might be causing or contributing to those circumstances?

Secondary research question

What is the quality and coverage of that evidence in terms of what it tells us about the performance of the justice system?

Scope

We expect this review will provide a high-level overview of the justice system in its entirety but including disaggregation across jurisdictional areas as far as data and evidence is readily available. In particular, there should be a deeper analysis and focus on the Nuffield Foundation's priority areas of interest – family justice, civil and administrative justice, and youth justice. In line with our stated priority areas, criminal justice should be included at the high-level, but not be an area of specific focus beyond youth justice. We are especially interested in understanding the state of the justice system in terms of how it affects people's experiences and outcomes.

The review should:

- (i) Describe the recent (we suggest since 1997, although bidders can suggest, with supporting justification, other time frames) and current state of the justice system against key assessment criteria/questions. Bidders are welcome to propose criteria they might wish to use to examine the performance and effectiveness of the system, but expected measures could include:
 - levels of funding and investment in the justice system
 - efficient running of the courts and tribunal system (e.g. levels of demand/case volumes)
 - timeliness of cases and other access to justice indicators (e.g. access to legal advice and representation, case durations, delays, backlogs)
 - effectiveness of decision-making (e.g. whether decisions are enforced)
- (ii) Examine the evidence on what is known about the causes or drivers of the current position.
- (iii) Describe and assess any evidence on measures that have or might address the problems facing the justice system – for example, examining which of these are supported by empirical evidence.
- (iv) Take overall account of the quality and coverage of the available evidence.

- (v) Summarise commonalities and differences across system jurisdictions and the key evidence gaps.

It will be for the successful contractor to define the terms of the evidence to be included and reviewed, but we would expect it principally to include data and statistics. We would also expect the review to draw upon other related work in the field, including [Dr Natalie Byrom's March 2024 report](#) for us and National Audit Office reports. We will consult further with the successful contractor about these.

Review 2 outputs

We anticipate four outputs for this review (although bidders are invited to propose integrating output 1 (the data digest) and 2 (the critical appraisal) into a single output), all of which will be delivered to a high-quality, publishable standard and suitable for digital dissemination. We welcome bidders to describe what format and structure the outputs will be delivered in, to make the presentation and interpretation of data as accessible and engaging as possible:

- 1. A data digest and synthesis of evidence:** a data digest presenting the available data around the justice system, with commentary to interpret the data presented and explain trends. The output will be highly visual in its presentation making use of charts, tabulations and diagrams, alongside concise narrative explanations. The data digest should provide both a temporal overview of data where possible, and the most up-to-date snapshot in time.
- 2. Critical appraisal of data and evidence:** an expert-led critical assessment of the available data, providing insights on its nature, comprehensiveness and gaps. The critical appraisal should provide some commentary on the broader state of the justice system including how its performance might be better benchmarked and measured. This critical assessment should be informed by a deep expertise and familiarity with the justice system.
- 3. A presentation slide deck:** the successful tenderer will be expected to present at the *Public Right to Justice* Expert Panel and at other Nuffield Foundation organised events as required, using a full set of presentation slides (in PowerPoint or equivalent package). We anticipate this slide deck will be a more concise version of the full data digest, summarising the review.
- 4. A summary overview:** a short form (500 word) summary overview of the project and the learning from it written in an accessible style, using plain English. The summary will be used to provide a concise description of the project, update the *Public Right to Justice* web pages and used for communication and dissemination purposes.

Review 3: People's experiences views of the justice system

Purpose

To synthesise what is already known about user views and experiences of their contact with the justice system, and the consequences of these interactions. By 'user' here we mean members of the public encountering the justice system (or seeking to), in whatever capacity, and not practitioners or other professionals working within the system. It should also include a review of wider public views and expectations of the justice system, especially on issues of trust and confidence. The goal is to inform the framing of our new programme around user experience, and to determine if any new work might be needed to better understand it.

Primary research question

What is known about the experiences, expectations and views of the justice system of (a) people in contact with the justice system, and (b) the wider public, and in each case the causes or drivers of those?

Secondary research question

What is known about measures to address or improve these experiences and views, including their effectiveness?

Scope

We expect this review to draw on UK-based research published since 1995 (we suggest that date to include Professor Hazel Genn's 'Paths to Justice' research) to understand people's experiences and expectations of the justice system and the outcomes they achieve. Additionally, the review should examine evidence on wider public views of aspects of the justice system (for example, surveys of trust or confidence). The review should examine the justice system in its entirety, insofar as the evidence allows, but there should be a deeper analysis and focus on the Nuffield Foundation's priority areas of interest – family justice, civil and administrative justice, and youth justice. Evidence specifically on policing does not need to be included.

The review should:

- (i) Review and synthesise existing evidence (qualitative and quantitative) on people's views and experiences of contact with any part of the justice system (excluding policing) with a particular focus on:
 - a. our principal areas of interest – family justice, civil and administrative justice, and youth justice
 - b. more vulnerable and socially disadvantaged populations
- (ii) Review and synthesise evidence about the causes and drivers of those experiences, with particular focus on external factors (system or procedural).
- (iii) Review and synthesise evidence on what is known about improving user views, experiences, and outcomes, including its effectiveness.
- (iv) Critically interpret the above evidence, including its coverage and quality.

Review 3 outputs

We anticipate three outputs for this review, all of which will be delivered to a high-quality, publishable standard and suitable for digital dissemination. All outputs will be provided to the Nuffield Foundation for its own use:

- 1. Main report (including Executive Summary), with a guide length of no more than 50 pages, providing a review and synthesis of research findings and evidence:** an extensive review of the existing published research, including academic and grey literature, and analysis of readily available data. The review should also incorporate an expert-led critical appraisal of evidence and policy, though this should be clearly separated/distinct from the main review and synthesis itself (e.g. as a standalone chapter or sectioned off chapter summaries). The critical assessment should provide insights on the nature of the research and evidence, its comprehensiveness and its (mis)use in policy and service development. The critical appraisal should also include commentary on the extent to which the needs of the justice system's users are embedded within policy, service design, and points of reform.
- 2. A 2-3 page policy and practitioner brief:** summarising and presenting key findings, implications and recommendations for policymakers and practitioners. The brief should be designed to be an accessible and engaging quick read, providing this audience with key information about the review, and prompting consideration as to how they might respond to it. The brief should be geared towards an informed but non-expert audience and be written in plain English.
- 3. A presentation slide deck:** the successful tenderer will be expected to present before the *Public Right to Justice* Expert Panel and at other Nuffield Foundation organised events as required, using a full set of presentation slides (in PowerPoint or equivalent package).

External contractor: roles and responsibilities

We wish to commission three UK-based organisations to deliver the following activities in partnership with the *Public Right to Justice* project team at the Nuffield Foundation:

- Develop an approach to collate, synthesise and present the research and evidence base on one of the three focus areas, detailed above.
- Bring skills and experience of conducting evidence reviews using an appropriate review methodology, as well as deep expertise and insight about the operation and structure of the justice system of England and Wales.
- Have the necessary permissions and resources to access a comprehensive range of research outputs and data, including those behind paywalls (i.e. academic and professional journals).

- Provide regular updates to the Nuffield Foundation, including the delivery of a search protocol, and interim report.
- Draft a range of high-quality outputs (see *Outputs* section, above) to time and to standard.
- Present at key *Public Right to Justice* events including the Expert Panel meetings, and other events organised by the Nuffield Foundation associated with the programme.

We welcome tenders from both single organisations or consortia.

Expectations around accessibility of outputs

In the interest of accessibility and as part of our commitment to equality, diversity and inclusion, we encourage authors to follow the below guidelines:

- Write in [short, clear](#) sentences and paragraphs.
- Avoid using unnecessarily complex words and phrases.
- Make content unambiguous.
- Expand acronyms on first use. For example, the Ministry of Justice (MoJ).
- Consider providing a glossary for terms readers may not know.
- Use list formatting as appropriate.
- Use short blocks of text.
- Consider using images, illustrations, video, audio, and symbols to help clarify meaning.
- Complex diagrams will require [a text description](#) that can be used as an alt text tag on images for screen readers.
- Use inclusive language.

It may be helpful to refer to the gov.uk [guidance](#) on content design for further information.

Indicative deliverables, milestones and outcomes

Deliverables, milestones and outcomes	Date
Inception meeting and finalisation of project initiation document	30 January 2025
Deliver search protocol, and proposed structures and format of final output	18 February 2025
Interim report: post-search phase	8 April 2025
Delivery of first drafts of final outputs	8 July 2025 (TBC)
Early insights presentation (including slide deck) to Expert Panel	w/c 25 August 2025 (TBC)
Delivery of second drafts of final outputs	26 August 2025 (TBC)
Sign-off of final outputs	23 September 2025 (TBC)
Publication and post-publication dissemination activity	TBC

Legal and contracting

Confidential information

You agree to keep confidential at all times, whether during or after the selection procedure, any confidential information, whether it's marked "Confidential" or deemed to be Confidential, and to take all necessary steps to preserve the confidentiality of such Confidential Information including, without limitation, by disclosing relevant material to your employees or agents only on a strictly 'need to know' basis, and only for the purpose of this selection procedure and on the basis that they maintain the confidentiality of the Confidential Information. You must not distribute externally or publish any Confidential Information provided by the Nuffield Foundation in connection with this ITT (save where required by law).

You are not entitled to make any announcement relating directly or indirectly to this ITT, without the written consent of the Nuffield Foundation.

Warranty

You warrant, represent and undertake to the Nuffield Foundation that all information provided, and representations made to us during the selection procedure (including, without limitation, all information and representations contained in your proposal) are true, accurate and not misleading. If, after submitting your proposal, there is any change in your circumstances which may substantively affect such information or representations made in your proposal to us, you shall promptly notify us in writing setting out the relevant details in full. The Nuffield Foundation shall be entitled to withdraw from any further co-operation with you without any requirement to give notice, and without any liability to you.

Intellectual property

You acknowledge that all intellectual property rights of the Nuffield Foundation remain our sole and exclusive property. Furthermore, any materials provided by the Nuffield Foundation to you shall belong and/or accrue exclusively to the Nuffield Foundation. You acknowledge that final outputs or foreground intellectual property generated during the performance of the project shall belong to the Nuffield Foundation.

If needed, the Nuffield Foundation is willing to grant a non-exclusive license to use the outputs for research and non-commercial purposes.

Publications

The Nuffield Foundation must be acknowledged in all outputs resulting from the project and any communications announcements must be agreed with the Foundation in advance. The acknowledgment of the Foundation must use our standardised acknowledgement / disclaimer text which will be provided by the Nuffield Foundation along with our logo and guidance on its formatting and presentation.

The Nuffield Foundation is committed to publishing, promoting and sharing outputs from this research, but reserve the right to request changes, edit and / or delay publication if an output is considered not to be of publishable standard. Outputs may also be subject to external peer review prior to publication being agreed.

Contracting

Nothing contained in this ITT, nor any other communication made by or on behalf of the Nuffield Foundation or its representatives, shall constitute an offer capable of becoming a contract between you and the Nuffield Foundation. If your proposal is selected, you will enter into a Services Agreement with the Nuffield Foundation which will include the above stated.

Ethics, safeguarding and data protection

We anticipate these reviews pose minimal ethical challenges or data protection issues, but we would welcome applicants to set out:

- The ethical and safeguarding considerations for this work and how they will be addressed (especially if any primary research or consultation is likely to occur).
- *If necessary*, a data protection impact assessment showing how any personal data collected in the course of the work will be processed in accordance with the UK GDPR.

Project management

Please set out your approach to project management to ensure the timely delivery of the project, including staffing, timetable, risk management and production/delivery of outputs. We would like to know how you propose to work with the *Public Right to Justice* programme team at the Nuffield Foundation, as well as other relevant justice system stakeholders. We would be especially keen to know how you will quality assure your work to ensure that deliverables and project outputs are able to meet our requirements and overall project aims.

Budget and indicative timetable

Proposals should be **within** a budget of £65,000, exclusive of VAT. Please provide a statement whether or not VAT will be added to the price. Please note, as detailed in the assessment criteria (below) there is a price competitive element to our assessment of tenders, so it is important that the budget being applied for is clearly explained.

Commissioning activity	Date
Issue tender	15 November 2024
Submission of clarification questions	11am, 27 November 2024
Publish response to clarification questions	4 December 2024

Deadline for submission	11am, 18 December 2024
Shortlisting	10 January 2025
Appoint contractors	20 January 2025
Project start and inception meeting	27 January 2025
Project end	September 2025 (exact date TBC)

Submitting a proposal

We welcome bids from individual organisations or consortia.

To submit a tender, you must first **obtain an application form by completing this [Expression of Interest form](#)**.

Upon receiving your Expression of Interest, the Nuffield Foundation will email an application form – please allow up to two working days to receive the application form. **Please note, tenders must be submitted using the emailed application form** – any tenders that are submitted not using the form will not be considered.

The Nuffield Foundation will also forward a guide budget and resource template. We would urge the use of the template to show how the budget and staff resources will be distributed across the project. Tenderers are invited to use an alternative budget template if they so prefer. However, it is advisable to review the Nuffield Foundation budget and resource template before preparing any costings to ensure that right the level of detail is provided to assess a tender.

Upon receiving the application form, bidders should note and be mindful of word count limits. Tenders should clearly set out:

- An understanding of our requirements and awareness of the importance and relevance of this work.
- A proposed approach and methodology for conducting the evidence review.
- A project plan with timescales for key activities, milestones and deliverables.
- Risk management.
- Ethics, safeguarding and data protection.
- Staffing, project roles and responsibilities, and time directed towards the project.

- Relevant expertise and experience, including references to examples of relevant projects and outputs. Please provide short-form (one page) CVs for each of the project team.
- Budget breakdown. Please refer to the budget and resource template that will be provided alongside the application form upon submission of an Expression of Interest. Please also provide a statement whether or not VAT will be added to the price.

To be considered, tenders must be received by **11am on 18 December 2024**, via email sent to contactjustice@nuffieldfoundation.org.

Submitting clarification questions

We welcome clarification questions to be submitted in one of two ways.

1. There will be an opportunity to submit clarification questions when completing an Expression of Interest form
2. Clarification questions may also be submitted by email sent to contactjustice@nuffieldfoundation.org

In both cases all clarification questions about the process or specification must be submitted by **11am on 27 November 2024**.

Responses to clarification questions will be published on or by 4 December 2024. All questions and responses will be anonymised and made available to all potential tenderers. An email notice announcing the publication of clarification question responses will be sent to anyone who has completed an Expression of Interest form.

Assessment criteria

The assessment panel will comprise staff from the Nuffield Foundation.

Tender applications will be assessed using the criteria laid out in the table below. We will apply a minimum threshold score to all of the key criteria except the budget. A tender which fails to meet ANY of the minimum thresholds will be excluded from further consideration.

Criteria	Max. score	Min. score	Weighting	What we are looking for
Understanding of the requirement	100	50	10%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An understanding of what is being commissioned, and recognition of its relevance to policy and practice development in the justice system Existing knowledge and familiarity with the topic being reviewed
Methodological approach	100	50	30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The application of an appropriate review methodology Clear delivery plans and project timetable
Experience and expertise	100	50	30%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proven track record of delivering evidence reviews and high-quality, accessible research outputs Expert knowledge of the justice system and the specific issues under review
Team capacity	100	50	20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall capacity to deliver Appropriate distribution of tasks and activities across the project team
Budget	100	-	10%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost, value for money, and feasibility

Invoice schedule

- 10% on signing of contract
- 45% at delivery of interim report
- 45% on publication of final outputs