APPRAISAL FORM for:

This form should be used in conjunction with the CfW grant support programme appraisal desk instructions.

Step 1: Policy Delivery Branch identify ineligible applications

Proposal name	Teaching Digital with Confidence		
Lead applicant	STEM Learning UK		
Log ID Number	CFWGSP – 82	Date application received	18/07/2025
Application fully completed?	Y	Date acknowledgement sent:	18/07/2025
Funding requested:	2025-26 £400,000	2026-27 £500,000	2027-28 £500,000
Proposed start date	September 2025		
Grant priority area (incl sub-section)	Computing and digital skills		
Date sent to due diligence	28/07/25	**Any issues identified:**	No
Did the applicant ask a question at application stage?	*No*		

Step 1 check completed	**Date:21/07/2025**	**Eligible**
Comments from step 1	None	

Step 2: Policy lead individual appraisal

Policy individual appraisal

Using the grant [guidance](#) and appraisal [desk instructions](#), individually assess and score the application (remember this is an individual and not a group appraisal to remain compliant with GCoE appraisal standards)

Evidence requirements	Score 0-7	Weighting factor	Total	Rationale for scores (to be expanded as required)
Section B: focus of the **proposal** • how well is it aligned to our grant priorities and the CfW? • Is there a sufficient focus on addressing cross-cutting priorities? To what extent is the proposal focussed on producing resources, respecting Adnodd's role?	5	x 4	20	Application indicates support for each of the cross-cutting priorities, and additionally, a strong focus on computing and digital skills (DCF). Includes CPD, as well as bilingual sessions available for all across Wales – digitally, with a particular focus on progression within the DCF. 5 is perhaps a bit conservative. Potential for this to be a 6, as it does fit with priorities across curriculum.
Section C: Why are actions needed • What information and evidence provided has been drawn on? Is this sufficient? • Are the outcomes, outputs suitably detailed and appropriate? • To what extent does it address **Strategic objectives** (WFGA goals, sustainable development, VfM)? • How well are value for money considerations addressed?	6	x 3	18	*STEM Learning Impact Reports: https://www.stem.org.uk/about-us/impact-and-evaluation/impact)* *STEM Learning Evaluation, 2022)* the *Pupil Level Annual School Census* Estyn *Annual Report 2023-2024* *Rural Education Action Plan* Good evidence provided which has informed this application, clearly evidencing need for this programme. Outcomes – **ACCESSIBILITY** is strong focus in this application. Targeting Estyn's key priority groups – including ALN, children from ethnic minority backgrounds, and schools with high levels of FSM. Good value for money evidence. Strong fit with strategic objectives – identifying how it supports a prosperous Wales, resilient, healthier, and particularly the more equal Wales.

	5		10	Delivery plans are realistic, phased approach over 3 years, with identified opportunities for scaling. Online facilitated sessions to reach a broad audience, and twilight sessions to fit around school schedules.
Section D: Delivery • To what extent are delivery plans realistic and appropriate? (incl staff, accommodation, finance) • Are collaborative arrangements fit for purpose? • Are the bilingual delivery measures acceptable? • To what extent are communication plans sufficient? • To what extent does the proposal ensure appropriate equity of access?		x 2		Face to Face in high-priority areas – identified different modalities and approaches, where needed. Collaboration with Adnodd, use of Estyn's report and information to inform work, Building on long-standing collaboration with See Science and the STEM Ambassador programme – using established network with positive reputation. STEM Learning UK already delivers digital courses to teachers, such as the highly successful 'Unlocking AI Potential for Teachers' course. Contract holders for the NCEE in the DfE in Education in England. Important to note that the application is not just lifting what is done in England and applying to Wales – they have taken time and effort and full consideration of the Welsh context and the curriculum for Wales, and want to develop work which fits our framework. As above – equity of access is a strong focus in the application. With good focus also on bilingual provision. 5 could be a 6.
Section E: Organisation and collaboration • If delivered by a number of organisations, to what extent can the partnership deliver activity? • Do the collaboration arrangements seek to draw in other perspectives and sources of information? • To what extent does the organisation / partnership have a track record of delivery relating to the proposals? How strong is the evidence of this?	5	x 2	10	Building on existing strong partnership working and established networks and brand. Link with existing networks does draw in alternative perspectives – DfE, STEM Learning UK, See Science, Adnodd, LAs. Strong track record of delivery, evidence provided indicates this, and desire to build upon it for Wales.

• To what extent are wider networks being engaged to support the work of the organisation(s)?				
Section F: Financial management and planning. • Whether the level of funding requested is justified? • Is there anything to suggest other funding may be available towards the same proposal? • Are the expected social and/or economic benefits, against the level of grant funding required to produce these benefits enough?	5	x 2	10	Costs are broken down to indicate spending on different aspects of the programme, including Advisor's fees, programme management, comms and impact and marketing, management fees, VAT, and includes a small contingency budget to cover any additional costs. Potentially some funding in the wider digital or AI space, but not bespoke or specific to education outcomes nor the curriculum for Wales. That would not have a focus on schools and education practitioners – whereas this would clearly fund in a way that meets our education priorities and desired outcomes.
Final score			68	

Any comments/issues identified which are not covered above including what is going to be provided that is additional to what would be provided without any grant assistance.	

Individual assessment completed by:

==*Redacted Information S40 (Welsh Government official)*==

Do you have any conflict of interests?	No	Provide details:

Step 3: Priority panel appraisal

Panel sessions should draw from guidance and appraisal desk instructions, which need to be reviewed in advance. The following table to be used to record any revised scoring agreed by the Panel, and the rationale for that.

Evidence requirements	Score 0-7	Weighting factor	Total	Feedback and supporting Comments (to be expanded as required)
Section B: **Proposal aim**	4	x 4	16	The panel agreed there the proposal had a strong PL focus aligned with DCF. It provided a bilingual delivery with clear practitioner support. It was also agreed that whilst this was a good proposal they could have better unpacked computational elements as required for schools by the mandatory statement of what matters.
Section C: Evidence of need	5	x 3	15	The panel agreed there was clear alignment with grant objectives, good deliverables and outcomes with targeted support for underrepresented groups. The panel noted that there was limited detail on long-term impact and practitioner follow-up.
Section D: Delivery	3	x 2	6	It was agreed that the proposal contained a phased and realistic delivery plan with strong bilingual and equity focus whilst making good use of existing networks. However, this does mean lower delivery in year 1 meaning lower immediate impact for practitioners. Panel discussed a higher score but due to the limited detail on facilitator roles and local authority engagement. Also it was not particularly clear on the focus of the 20 sessions of PL and whether delivery involved one off sessions, or part of a more structured programme of PL over time.
Section E: Organisation and collaboration	5	x 2	10	This part of the proposal included strong partnerships and showed that the organisation had good national standing. However, the panel noted that there was no explicit mention of Cyber First/Tech First which would need to be included in discussions if this proposal is awarded.

Section F: Financial management and planning	4	x 2	8	The panel agreed that the financial management plan was good with reasonable cost structure and detailed figures However, it was agreed that it lacked breakdown by delivery targets with some figures overly rounded or imprecise.
Final score			55	
Panel undertaken on:	03/09/25		Panel agreed outcome: Y – as reviewed at STEP4	

Step 4: Overarching panel prioritisation/recommendations

Using the guidance, appraisal desk instructions and Step 1-3 appraisals the panel to take a balanced view on the range of support

Outcome of due diligence checks
Are there any issues identified: No issues flagged in the due diligence report.

The overarching Panel should agree:

	Supporting comments		
Is the scoring consistent when compared to other applications?	No – the panel thoroughly reviewed the scoring and agreed to adjust STEM Learning UK's Section B scoring from 5 to 4 given the lack of detail on PL focus.		
Where does this proposal rank for support under this priority?	First		
What is the panel's preferred ranking on this proposal	The panel recommends this proposal, though recognises CSE has options		
If proposal is recommended (or on hold) what funding should be put to CSE for agreement?	**2025-26** £400,000	**2026-27** £500,000	**2027-28** £500,000
Panel feedback to inform recommendations to the CSE on awards in the resulting MA.	This application scored higher and aligns more closely with the programme's professional learning focus. There are pros and cons with both proposals, which both scored in the 'medium' band under appraisal. For example, compared to the other proposal option for this priority, the organisation is less known in Wales for digital and strong communications will be needed to build awareness. The need to scale up delivery and less information on the focus of the PL was also noted. The panel agreed recommending STEM Learning UK as first on the list of proposals for this priority, with the final decision resting with the Cabinet Secretary. The Cabinet Secretary will be made aware through the MA the risks and remedial actions necessary in respect of both options for this priority. If she is minded towards this proposal, detailed discussions would need to take place with the organisation.		