



INVITATION TO TENDER

Contract for

LSE Students' Union Engagement & Democracy Review

March 2025

Submissions Closing Date and Time is shown in Section 1

Name of Entity completing this form:	
---	--



1. INSTRUCTIONS TO TENDERERS

LSESU invites you to tender for the above contract. The Union’s detailed requirements are set out in Section 3

1.1 Submission Closing Date And Time

Completed tender submissions must be submitted as instructed below, no later than the ‘Closing Date and Time’, **via email**, shown below:

Tenderers are required to submit their submission to su.representation@lse.ac.uk before 12 noon on **Monday 13th April 2026**

Tender Packages received after this specified date and time will not (except in exceptional circumstances) be considered.

1.2 SUBMISSION OF TENDERS

Tenderers wishing to be considered for this Contract must fully complete and submit all the following documents, known as the Tender Package:

Tender Package	Section 4	Fully completed Pricing Schedule within this document
	Section 5	Fully completed Qualitative Questionnaire within this document
	Section 6	Fully completed Form of Tender within this document

The Union is not obliged to accept the lowest or any tender.

1.3 FORM OF CONTRACT

The contract to which this tender competition relates will be let in adherence to the attached Terms and Conditions of Contract.

1.4 DURATION OF CONTRACT

One-Off Contract

1.5 ESTIMATED VALUE

The estimated value of the total services for this contract - including expenses - is in the range of £15k to £20k (excluding VAT).

1.6 FURTHER INFORMATION

For more information:

Supplementary information can be provided, including more detail of the application process and the Review Scope.

Please direct any queries to su.representation@lse.ac.uk by 2nd April 2026. Responses will be shared with all bidders to ensure transparency.



2. EVALUATION GUIDELINES

Tender submissions will be evaluated against the qualitative and price Award Criteria set out below:

Evaluation Criteria	Award Weighting
Price Submission	25%
Qualitative Submission	75%
Total	100%

Most Economically Advantageous Tender

The price/qualitative weightings above will be applied to the Tenderer’s price and qualitative scores. The weighted scores will be added together to calculate the overall score for the Tender, to identify the most economically advantageous tender. The Tenderer who is awarded the highest total score will be declared the Preferred Bidder.

2.1 PRICE SUBMISSION

Pricing Schedule

The Tenderer should enter its price submission (exclusive of VAT) in Section 4, Services Pricing Schedule.

Price Score

The Union will use a ‘Lowest Tender Price’ scoring mechanism as set out below in order to convert the Tender Price into a score:

$$\text{Tender Price Raw Score} = \frac{\text{Lowest Tendered Price submitted} \times 25 (\%)}{\text{Tender Price (being evaluated)}}$$

2.2 QUALITATIVE SUBMISSION

LSESU will assess the Tenderer’s qualitative submission on the basis of the information submitted by the Tenderer in the Qualitative Questionnaire. Each individual question will be scored out of 5 raw marks in accordance with the scoring guidance.



Please note that failure to meet any mandatory requirements included within the specification/scope of services will result in your bid being rejected from the competition.

QUALITATIVE SCORE

Each of the questions in the Qualitative response will be weighted through the following Qualitative Criteria Evaluation Matrix:

No.	Qualitative Question	Max Raw Score Available (Marks)	Award Weighting (%)
[A-01]	Relevant Experience	5	40%
[A-02]	Approach and Methodology	5	30%
[A-03]	Contract Terms & Guarantees	5	5%
TOTAL		15	75

Scored Qualitative criteria will be scored initially out of 5 on a consensus based whole number basis. Raw scores out of 5 will be awarded for each question. Responses will be allocated a score of 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 for each scored criterion as detailed in the relevant questions.

Each raw score will be divided by 5 and the sum then multiplied by the above weightings (e.g., 40% for question 1) to give a weighted score. For example, a score of 3 marks (out of an available 5 marks) allocated to a scored criterion with a weighting of 25% will be calculated as a weighted score of 15.



Questions [A-01 – A-03] Assessment

(Max raw score of 5 marks)

Score	Interpretation
5	<p>Excellent response, fully supported by excellent, comprehensive and relevant details on the key elements requested.</p> <p>Response inspires an extremely high degree of confidence to the Tender Assessment Panel.</p>
4	<p>Very good response, well supported by very good relevant details on the key elements requested.</p> <p>Response inspires a high degree of confidence in the Tenderer’s proposed methodology.</p> <p>Strengths far outweighed any weaknesses in the response.</p>
3	<p>Good response, supported by good relevant supporting details on the key elements requested.</p> <p>Response inspires a good degree of confidence to the Tender Assessment panel.</p>
2	<p>Satisfactory response supported by adequate relevant supporting details on the key elements requested.</p> <p>Response provides a satisfactory degree of confidence to the Tender Assessment panel.</p>
1	<p>Limited response containing limited relevant supporting information on the key elements requested.</p> <p>Weaknesses far out-weighed strengths in the response.</p> <p>Response provides a low degree of confidence to the Tender Assessment panel.</p>
0	<p>No response or unacceptable information provided.</p>



3. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

3.1 Introduction

LSE Students' Union (LSESU), founded in 1897, is among the UK's oldest and most politically vibrant students' unions, with a rich history of representation, activism, and community life.

Today, LSE students love participating in Union-run events, clubs, and societies. They run established media titles like The Beaver and work with the University through departmental forums. But our democratic structures sit separate from all of this. The students already engaged in clubs, societies, media, and the Athletic Union have no real link to our decision-making or how we work to help students improve their social and educational experience at LSE.

We need to review our democratic structures, align them with where students already spend their time, and use both to get better insight into what students actually need.

LSE Students' Union is evolving under new leadership. We are now seeking tender submissions for a full Student Engagement and Democracy Review to design a democracy and engagement process that helps students improve their educational and social experiences at LSE.

3.2 Principles

The review will redesign LSESU's engagement and democratic structures to create a system that is inclusive, evidence-led, and capable of delivering measurable impact. In essence, we want the review to redesign our democratic structure to be:

- Connected – join up our democratic structures, student communities (clubs, societies, media groups, Athletic Union), and educational partnerships with the University to get a clear picture of student sentiment and our impact
- Data driven - addressing the widely and deeply felt issues from all students
- Student led – built on the foundations of student community and agency, so our members and existing student communities have an impactful influence over their educational and social experience at LSE.
- Fit for the LSE context and facilitates our inclusion efforts
- Transparent, efficient, practical, simple, and easy to engage with

3.3 Why this project matters

This is a rare opportunity to redesign democracy for one of the world's leading social science institutions. LSE's departmental model, city campus, internationally diverse



student body of over 14,000 students from 140+ countries, and large post-graduate cohort present a complex and stimulating challenge that few student unions face.

We're not looking for an off-the-shelf solution. Instead, we need innovative thinking that can balance elite research culture with authentic student voice. Your work will directly impact how 14,000+ students experience democracy, belonging, and agency during their time at one of the world's most influential universities in the world.

3.4 Project Deliverables

We appreciate that there are many ways to approach a Student Engagement and Democracy Review and so have deliberately chosen not to be too prescriptive when outlining our project deliverables.

However, whilst we enter into this process with an open mind and a willingness to consider different approaches, below are some suggested deliverables which we think reasonable to expect:

- A project plan - to be agreed in advance - detailing qualitative and quantitative methods to be used alongside a timeline and plan for delivery that begins in the new academic year in 2026.
- Sessions with stakeholders to:
 - Outline a proposed research plan
 - Consult stakeholders and conduct research
 - Explain findings from that research
- A report that:
 - Addresses the questions outlined in the Scope of Review
 - Produces a suite of recommended changes for consideration
 - An impact and evaluation framework
 - Outlines a transition plan to practically enact the recommendations, including role descriptions, and draft amendments to governing documents (Articles, Byelaws) and supporting policies.

3.5 Timescale

Key Dates	Item
23 March 2026	Tender application open
13 April 2026	Tender application closes
14/15 April 2026	Shortlisting – CEO and Transformation Director
21/22 April 2026	Interviews – Panel TBC



29 April 2026	April Board of Trustees Meeting – preferred candidate approved by the Board
May - June	Feedback and consultation opportunities from stakeholders (students, staff, LSE etc)
22 June 2026	June Board of Trustees Meeting – present mid-project update (papers due 10 days prior)
June - July	Feedback and consultation opportunities from stakeholders (students, staff, LSE etc)
August 2026	August Board of Trustees Meeting – final decisions
June-September	Preparation, Policy Updates etc
1 September 2026	New Academic Year, target implementation date



4. PRICING SCHEDULE

GUIDANCE FOR COMPLETION OF PRICING SCHEDULE

This Section 4, Pricing Schedule is to be fully completed and returned in the Tender Package, failure to complete will result in Tenderer's submission being rejected.

This Price Submission is scored out of **25**

Tenderers are required to complete the Tender Pricing schedule outlined below:

	FEE
[A1] Provision of services as outlined in (3) above	[Enter price here - max 100 characters]
[A2] Other Costs if applicable	[Enter price here - max 100 characters]



5. QUALITATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

Tenderers must ensure that the response to each question is relevant and focused on addressing the question asked. Each question will be evaluated only on the information provided in the response text box provided for that particular question.

No marks will be awarded for a particular question for information given in response to any other question or elsewhere in the Tender Package (in other words, no cross-referencing is permitted).

[A-01] Relevant Experience

Award Weighting 40% (*Maximum Raw Score 5 marks*)

Tenderers are required to outline relevant experience that demonstrates their capability to understand and fully deliver the scope of services outlined in (3) above.

Two case-study examples should be given which demonstrate recent success in a similar or related area. Ideally this should include at least one student union case study.

Please enter your response in the table provided below; the response is limited to 15,000 characters.

Question A-01 Response
[Enter text here - max 15000 characters]

[A-02] Approach & Methodology

Award Weighting 30% (*Maximum Raw Score 5 marks*)

Tenderers are required to provide a detailed outline of the proposed approach and methodology that they would apply to this project.



Please include in this response a detailed proposed timeline for the review, based on the indicative timeline given in section 4 above.

Please enter your response in the table provided below; the response is limited to 10,000 characters.

Question A-02 Response

[Enter text here - max 10000 characters]

[A-03] Terms and Guarantees

Award Weighting 5% (*Maximum Raw Score 5 marks*)

Tenderers are required to indicate how payment is to be phased for the fees and expenses as outlined in (4) above. Specifically, tenderers are asked to detail any exclusions or limitations on fees included in the Tender Pricing Schedule.

Tenderers are also required to indicate any guarantees relating to the services provided. Specifically, these should include details of insurances held by tendering parties, including indemnity, public & employee liability insurances.

Please enter your response in the table provided below; the response is limited to 2,000 characters.

Question A-03 Response

[Enter text here - max 2000 characters]



1. FORM OF TENDER

[B-01] FORM OF TENDER

Tender Name: LSESU Engagement & Democracy Review

1. I/we the undersigned hereby tender for this contract in accordance with the Services Terms and Conditions of Contract and Scope of Services at the prices quoted in the Pricing Schedule.
2. I/we agree that the tender together with your written acceptance thereof shall constitute a binding contract between us and the customer.
3. I/we certify this is a bona fide tender intended to be competitive.
4. I/we understand that LSE SU does not bind itself to accept the lowest or any tender submitted in response to this enquiry and may accept the whole or part of any tender.
6. [I am exempt from VAT] [my/our VAT Registration No is: **[Enter number here]**]¹

7. **Conflict of Interest:**

I/We confirm, to the best of my/our knowledge, that:

1. There **would be no** conflict or perceived conflict of interest in relation to the personnel or type of work involved in this contract.

YES/NO [---]

Or

2. There **could be** a possible conflict or perceived conflict of interest in relation to the personnel or types of work involved in this contract.

YES/NO [---]

I/ We warrant that the level of conflict or perceived conflict of interest in relation to the personnel or type of work involved in this contract is as follows:

[Enter text here]

¹ Delete and/or complete as appropriate



If applicable please explain what the possible conflict or perceived conflict of interest may be and who it relates to and how it could have an adverse effect on this contract:

[Enter text here]

I the under named hereby confirm that I have read and accept to abide by the terms of the Invitation to Tender and that I have all requisite corporate authority to authorise this declaration on behalf of the entity named below.

Entity:	[Enter text here]
Name:	[Enter text here]
Title:	[Enter text here]
Position:	[Enter text here]
Date:	[Enter text here]

It is the Tenderer's responsibility to ensure that the Tender Package is fully completed and returned to the Students' Union as explained in Section 1 – Instructions to Tenderers.