Clarification questions and answers

1. **Can we clarify if this ITT is just to design the evaluation methodology, or will the appointed supplier also be conducting the evaluation?**

We can confirm that this tender process is only for the design of the evaluation methodology and the successful tenderer will not be conducting the future evaluation. However, we would expect the successful tenderer to give us an initial assessment of us trying to improve access to the profession with ARB's existing data.

2. **If this ITT is just for methodology design, are you planning to commission an external partner to carry out the evaluation or will this likely be conducted in-house?**

We have not yet determined whether ARB will conduct the evaluation or if it is more appropriate to get a third party to do this. However, as stated in supporting tender document, we expect the successful tenderer to "recommend next steps for ARB to conduct the evaluation, such as the frequency of the data collection and analysis, noting the timelines for implementing the education reforms, with options for ARB to manage the data and methodology in-house on an ongoing basis, or the need to commission a third party."

3. **Do you expect the L7 apprenticeships to be covered too? My reading of the requirements suggests not, as the effects are largely about re-shaping the master's and professional practice elements in higher education and the workplace, but I could be wrong.**

We want to know what barriers exist for those who wish to enter the profession. This includes determining how our education systems (including L7 apprenticeships) may contribute to potential barriers to enter the profession.

We refer to this in our supporting tender document when we say: "it will be important that the methodology / evaluation logic model can isolate and track the improvements ARB's education reforms make to access to the profession. This means the research will need to take account of factors that ARB cannot directly influence – such as structural issues in society, and how these interact with other factors, including the funding for the higher education sector. The research will also need to take account of existing trends and structural shifts. We know from our own data analysis that the makeup of the architects profession is already becoming more diverse year on year."

4. **The ITT (p. 2) mentions that *"a successful proposal will achieve the following research objectives: … use ARB's existing data to offer an initial assessment of ARB's progress in improving access to the profession, and potential barriers to progress…"*. Would you**

please be able to expand a bit more on what data (in terms of, for example, focus and type) is available and could be shared with the selected contractor?

The data ARB has collected can be found on our website as mentioned within our supporting tender document. This includes our 2022 report, Architects Today, which had similar results to our 2023 Year in Review work.

ARB has collected this data from Architects in the following ways:

Architects must give us some basic information about themselves to be able to join the Register. This includes their date of birth, binary gender and the location where they are based.

Architects can also complete our optional EDI survey in which they can give us information about their ethnicity, gender (including non-binary options), sexuality, religion, disability and their socio-economic background. Each question includes a 'prefer not to say' option so architects can choose what information to share.

The percentage of those who have voluntarily completed this survey has increased since 2016 and now over 70% of architects do so.

Once the researcher is appointed and the project starts, we will also be able to privately share data collected through our accreditation role and the new standards, but as these are still being implemented, we can't yet predict how comprehensive that data will be at the start.

5. **I would be grateful to know if you have already used a logic model or Theory of Change process as part of the existing impact monitoring?**

The aim of this work is to start monitoring the impact of reforms we have announced, and are in the process of implementing. Following ARB's major education reforms, we want a new methodology/ logic model to be designed and developed during this tender process so it can be used to evaluate the effectiveness of our reforms.

6. **The ITT states: "We would be looking for a summary of the methodology / evaluation logic model, followed by a breakdown of the most appropriate methods to apply to the research along with any other considerations or criteria relevant to the above research objectives." Just for clarity, is this statement referring to the outputs from the project or the tender response? We assume the former, thus it would be "most appropriate methods" to be taken forward post this research to implement the impact evaluation at a future stage? Also, we note the word "summary" which suggests you might be looking for a "light" or abridged version of the full logic model being supplied as part of the project, is that correct please?**

We would assess all tender applications on the basis of their ability to demonstrate summarising their plan for the methodology/ evaluation logic model. Therefore, an abridged

version of the methodology/ evaluation logic model is accepted for the tender process while we expect a full summary of it from the successful tenderer during the project.

We can also confirm that this tender process is only for the design of the evaluation methodology and the successful tenderer will not be conducting the future evaluation. However, we would expect the successful tenderer to give us an initial assessment of us trying to improve access to the profession with ARB's existing data.

7. **The ITT mentions that you would like the supplier to use ARB's existing data to offer "an initial assessment of ARB's progress in improving access to the profession, and potential barriers to progress." Do you require this initial assessment by any particular point in the project timetable?**

We do not currently have any set deadline for the initial assessment but once the tender has been awarded, we would likely set expectations for the successful tenderer on when this would be practical.

8. **Can you provide any further details please of key internal/external stakeholders you would want to be sure the research involves and whether ARB is in a position to broker access to these groups or if this would be down to the contractor?**

Key internal stakeholders would include members of our Accreditation team and Policy and Communications team. While external stakeholders would include professional membership bodies, and key learning providers from across the country. We would be able to share key contacts, where available, with the successful tenderer and to help facilitate first meetings if necessary.

9. **Can the proposed timetable be provided in a separate MS Excel document or would you require this within the main Word proposal response?**

You may attach a proposed timetable as a supporting document, but this will need to be counted towards the 15-page limit.

10. **Some of the hyperlinks on p.3 do not work for external readers– would you be able to re-send a version of the ITT with repaired hyperlinks?**

Thank you for bringing this to our attention, we apologise for the inconvenience this may have caused you. The correct links to both documents are below.

[Architects Today: Analysis of the architect's profession 2022](#)

[Workplace Culture (2024)](#)

We will work to update the supporting document for the tender as soon as possible.

11. What data do ARB collect from learning providers (format, sample, frequency)? What are learning providers required to submit to ARB?

Accredited learning providers are required to submit annual monitoring data. To learn more about what data we collect from learning providers, you can read about it here Annual Monitoring - Architects Registration Board.

This is the template we require learning providers to fill out AM-2025-Student-Data-2024-10.xlsx

12. May we append CVs for project team members separately to our proposal (beyond the page limit)?

You may attach CVs for project team members as supporting documents, but this would have to be included within the 15-page limit. You may wish to summarise CVs of project team members in order to reduce the word count.

13. Do you anticipate any face-to-face engagement (e.g. meetings, workshops, etc) would be required as part of the study?

We would be happy to discuss engagement methods further with the appointed research body and have no strong views at this stage.

14. Can you clarify any further your expectations regarding isolating the effect of your reforms?

We expect this to form part of the proposed methodology / evaluation logic model, e.g. the research body will set out how their proposed approach can achieve this. Some of the factors that will impact the effect of our reforms are already set out in the associated tender document.