



ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING (ELT) CONTRACT

708502450

REQUIREMENTS OF RESPONSE (RoR)

&

TENDER EVALUATION SCORING METHODOLOGY

Contents	Pages
A. Technical / Quality Evaluation Criteria	2-6
B. Social Evaluation Criteria	7-10
C. Price Evaluation Criteria	11-12
D. Tender Evaluation Scoring Methodology	13-25

A. Technical / Quality Evaluation Criteria

(RoR Questions A1 to A4; Weighting: 50% of Overall Evaluation Score)

Question	Category / Description of Requirement	Weighting %
A1	<p>Organisational Capability and Capacity to manage the ELT service</p>	15%
	<p>Evidence Required:</p> <p>Please detail how you plan to resource and ensure appropriate capability and capacity to manage the ELT contract throughout the term of the contract, including mobilisation.</p> <p>A strong bid will provide:</p> <p>Evidence to demonstrate the depth and breadth of expertise offered by the Provider’s team. While there should be a clear focus on individuals within the bidding organisation, the credibility and reputation of the bidding organisation within the field of language training is also important.</p> <p>Evidence of working collaboratively and in partnership with clients on 2 contracts of a similar scale.</p> <p>Evidence of processes in place to ensure resilience and mitigate risks relating to business continuity, particularly in relation to the absence of key Provider personnel.</p> <p>Provider’s solution should include the identification of key risks associated with this element of the solution and appropriate risk mitigations. They should also include a list of any key assumptions relevant to this element of the solution.</p> <p>Minimum mark required: This criterion requires the Provider to secure a minimum mark of 7 (Good confidence) to be deemed acceptable to the Authority. A mark of 3 (Minor Concerns) or a zero (Critical Concerns) means that the Tender would not be acceptable to the Authority and shall not pass the Technical/Quality Evaluation. The Tender shall therefore be rejected.</p>	
<p>SoR Reference KSR 3 SR 3.1 SR 3.2</p>		
<p><u>N.B.</u> Question A1 represents 15% of the Overall Technical / Quality Evaluation Score, which comprises 50% of the Overall Evaluation Score. Response: Providers are advised that a word count limit of 1500 words apply to Question A1. If the word count exceeds this limit, only the first 1500 words will be counted. Word count does not include diagrams, flowcharts, tables etc.</p>		

Question	Category / Description of Requirement	Weighting
A2	<p>Assured Supply Chain of tutors with a quality-focused approach to Tutor recruitment, selection, development and retention</p> <p>Evidence Required:</p> <p>Please detail how you will provide assured access to a network of English language tutors and how you will prioritise quality of service delivery throughout the term of the contract</p> <p>A strong bid will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A capability statement which details the Provider's experience within the field of ELT Evidence of Providers existing in-house tutor capability and capacity Strategy for securing a supply chain through which quality tutors can be sourced, including how you will leverage established national, regional and local networks Proposed approach for sourcing tutors with experience in course and assessment design & delivery Evidence of effective strategies for recruiting, selecting and retaining high-quality tutors during the term of the contract Proposed plan to prepare tutors for delivering quality ELT within a Defence environment Evidence of a clear strategy to promote teaching excellence and continuous improvement. To include (but not be limited to) your approach to Continuous Professional Development (CPD) for tutors Provider's solutions should include the identification of key risks associated with this element of the solution and appropriate risk mitigations. They should also include a list of any key assumptions relevant to this element of the solution. 	50%
<p>Minimum mark required: This criterion requires the Provider to secure a minimum mark of 7 (Good Confidence) to be deemed acceptable to the Authority. A mark of 3 (Minor Concerns) or a zero (Critical Concerns) means that the Tender would not be acceptable to the Authority and shall not pass the Technical/Quality Evaluation. The Tender shall therefore be rejected.</p>		
<p>SOR Reference: KSR 1, SR 1.1, SR 1.7, SR 1.8; KSR 2, SR 2.2, SR 2.3</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OFFICIAL SENSITIVE - COMMERCIAL</p>		

N.B. Question A2 represents 50% of the Overall Technical / Quality Evaluation Score, which comprises 50% of the Overall Evaluation Score.

Response: Providers are advised that a word count limit of 3500 words apply to Question A2. If the word count exceeds this limit, only the first 3500 words will be counted. Word count does not include diagrams, flowcharts, tables etc.

Question	Category / Description of Requirement	Weighting %
A3	<p>Mobilisation Readiness</p>	15%
	<p>Evidence Required:</p> <p>Please detail how you will ensure readiness to mobilise for ELT delivery by 1st April 2024.</p> <p>A strong bid will provide:</p> <p>Evidence of a mobilisation plan to include key activities, outputs, delivery milestones and identification of decision gateways.</p> <p>Proposed arrangements for working with the Authority to make optimal use of the Authority team’s skills, knowledge, and time.</p> <p>Proposed plan for engaging with the extant provider to ensure the smooth transition of the ELT Service.</p> <p>Provider’s solution should include the identification of key risks associated with this element of the solution and appropriate risk mitigations. They should also include a list of any key assumptions relevant to this element of the solution.</p>	
	<p>Minimum mark required: This criterion requires the Provider to secure a minimum mark of 7 (Good Confidence) to be deemed acceptable to the Authority. A mark of 3 (Minor Concerns) or a zero (Critical Concerns) means that the Tender would not be acceptable to the Authority and shall not pass the Technical/Quality Evaluation. The Tender shall therefore be rejected.</p>	

SoR Reference

KSR 8
 SR 8.1
 SR 8.2

N.B. Question A3 represents 15% of the Overall Technical / Quality Evaluation Score, which comprises 50% of the Overall Evaluation Score.

Response: Providers are advised that a word count limit of 1000 words apply to Question A3. If the word count exceeds this limit, only the first 1000 words will be counted. Word count does not include diagrams, flowcharts, tables etc.

Question	Category / Description of Requirement	Weighting %
A4	<p>Governance, Reporting and Continuous Service Improvement</p>	20%
	<p>Evidence Required:</p> <p>Please detail how you plan to meet Authority requirements relating to ELT Contract Governance, Reporting and Continuous Service Improvement (CSI).</p> <p>A strong bid will include:</p> <p>Proposed approach to underpinning ELT provision with comprehensive governance and performance management and procedures that are aligned with the Authority requirements set out in the SOR.</p> <p>Proposed approach to performance monitoring and MI reporting for this contract, including how a data-driven approach will be used to monitor performance against agreed KPIs.</p> <p>Evidence of a strategy for identifying and reporting potential CSI initiatives to ensure ELT represents good Value for Money.</p> <p>Providers solution should include the identification of key risks associated with this element of the solution and appropriate risk mitigations. They should also include a list of any key assumptions relevant to this element of the solution.</p>	
<p>Minimum mark required: This criterion requires the Provider to secure a minimum mark of 7 (Good Confidence) to be deemed acceptable to the Authority. A mark of 3 (Minor Concerns) or a zero (Critical Concerns) means that the Tender would not be acceptable to the Authority and shall not pass the Technical/Quality Evaluation. The Tender shall therefore be rejected.</p>		
<p>SoR Reference SR 3.3 SR 3.4</p>		
<p><u>N.B.</u> Question A4 represents 20% of the Overall Technical / Quality Evaluation Score, which comprises 50% of the Overall Evaluation Score.</p> <p>Response: Providers are advised that a word count limit of 1500 words apply to Question A4. If the word count exceeds this limit, only the first 1500 words will be counted. Word count does not include diagrams, flowcharts, tables etc.</p>		

B. Social Value Evaluation Criteria

(RoR Questions B1 to B2; Weighting: 10% of Overall Evaluation Score)

Question	Theme 2: Tackling Economic Inequality	Weighting %
B1	<p>Model Award Criteria (MAC) - 2.3 (Education and Training)</p> <p>Authority Aim The Authority seeks a solution that supports educational attainment relevant to the contract, including training schemes that address skills gaps and result in recognised qualifications.</p> <hr/> <p>Evidence Required Using a maximum of 750 words describe the commitment your organisation will make to ensure that opportunities under the contract deliver the Policy Outcome and Award Criteria. A strong bid will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provider’s ‘Method Statement’, stating how you will achieve this and how your commitment meets the Award Criteria. A timed project plan and process, including how you will implement your commitment and by when. Also, how you will monitor, measure and report on your commitments/the impact of your proposals. Providers responses should include but not be limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timed action plan • Use of metrics • Tools/processes used to gather data • Reporting • Feedback and improvement and; • Transparency How you will influence staff, suppliers, customers, and communities through the delivery of the contract to support the Policy Outcome, e.g., engagement, co-design/creation, training and education, partnering/collaborating, volunteering. Additionally, the Provider solution should include identification of the key risks associated with this element of the solution and provide a risks and mitigation plan. 	50%

N.B. Question B1 represents 50% of the Overall Social Value Score. Social Value comprises of 10% of the Overall Evaluation Score.

Response: Providers are advised that a word count limit of 750 words apply to Question B1. If the word count exceeds this limit, only the first 750 words will be counted. Word count does not include diagrams, flowcharts, tables etc.

Question	Theme 2: Tackling Economic Inequality	Weighting %
B2	<p>Model Award Criteria (MAC) - 3.1 (Diverse Supply Chains)</p> <p>Authority Aim The Authority seeks a solution creates a diverse supply chain to deliver the contract including new businesses and entrepreneurs, start-ups, SMEs, VCSEs and mutuals.</p> <p>Evidence Required Using a maximum of 750 words describe the commitment your organisation will make to ensure that opportunities under the contract deliver the Policy Outcome and Award Criteria. A strong bid will include:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Provider’s ‘Method Statement’, stating how you will achieve this and how your commitment meets the Award Criteria.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">A timed project plan and process, including how you will implement your commitment and by when. Also, how you will monitor, measure and report on your commitments/the impact of your proposals. Providers responses should include but not be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timed action plan • Use of metrics • Tools/processes used to gather data • Reporting • Feedback and improvement and; • Transparency <p style="padding-left: 40px;">How you will influence staff, suppliers, customers and communities through the delivery of the contract to support the Policy Outcome, e.g., engagement, co-design/creation, training and education, partnering/collaborating, volunteering.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Additionally, the Provider solution should include identification of the key risks associated with this element of the solution and provide a risks and mitigation plan.</p>	50%

N.B. Question B2 represents 50% of the Social Value Score. Social Value comprises of 10% of the Overall Evaluation Score.

Response: Providers are advised that a word count limit of 750 words apply to Question B2. If the word count exceeds this limit, only the first 750 words will be counted. Word count does not include diagrams, flowcharts, tables etc.

C. Price Evaluation Criteria

(RoR Questions C1 to C4; Weighting: 40% of Overall Evaluation Score)

Pricing Instructions:

For the avoidance of doubt Providers must detail their financial assumptions underpinning the pricing submission as part of their Tender. Any assumptions and allowances should be made purely at the financial risk of the Provider. The Authority accepts no liability should the Provider be unable to support the service requirements in future.

The extent of the Service to be priced is defined within the Statement of Requirements (SoR). Providers are required to fully complete the Appendix C - Pricing Schedule in response to C1, C2, C3 & C4 below.

Providers should note that in accordance with the Commercial Evaluation Criteria a failure to complete Appendix C - Pricing Schedule in line with the below instructions shall be deemed as a Fail and the Provider will not pass the Commercial Evaluation and will therefore be rejected.

Question	Category / Description of Requirement	Price Weighting %
C1	Mobilisation	15%
	<p>Providers are requested to provide a Total Firm Price for any associated Mobilisation Costs for the period up to commencement of the services (1st April 2024) in GBP (£), within the relevant table within Appendix C - Pricing Schedule (Mobilisation).</p> <p>Providers should ensure the price is provided in accordance with the instructions within this table and those within Appendix C - Pricing Schedule (Mobilisation).</p>	
C2	Face-to-Face Delivery	60%
	<p>Providers are requested to provide hourly rates (where applicable), half day rates and full day rates within the relevant table within Appendix C - Pricing Schedule (Face-to-Face delivery).</p> <p>Providers should note that half-day is based on 4 hours and a full day is based on 8 hours. Providers are requested to provide rates in GBP (£) and rates should be Total Firm Priced for the delivery of all services and requirements, as detailed within the Statement of Requirements (SoR) for Contract years 1-3 (if year 3 is exercised). The rates submitted within Appendix C - Pricing Schedule (Face-to-Face delivery) will be fixed for year 4 (if year 4 is exercised) of the Contract based on the indexation formula detailed within the SoR.</p> <p>Providers should include rates inclusive of Travel and Subsistence (T&S) and excluding T&S for Face-to-Face.</p>	

	The Authority will evaluate a total price for all rates but will award the Contract based on affordability (for Face-to-Face) and which option presents the most value for money (VFM) for the Authority as detailed in the SoR.	
C3	Delivery Online	10%
	Providers are requested to provide hourly rates (where applicable), half day rates and full day rates, within the relevant table within Appendix C – Pricing Schedule. Providers are requested to provide rates in GBP (£) and rates should be Total Firm Priced for the delivery of all services and requirements, as detailed within the Statement of Requirements (SoR) for Contract years 1-3 (if year 3 is exercised). The rates submitted within Appendix C – Pricing Schedule will be fixed for year 4 (if year 4 is exercised) of the Contract based on the indexation formula detailed within the SoR.	
C4	Design, Development & Assessment	15%
	Providers are requested to provide hourly rates (where applicable), half day rates and full day rates, within the relevant table within Appendix C - Pricing Schedule (Design, Development & Assessment). Providers are requested to provide rates in GBP (£) and rates should be Total Firm Priced for the delivery of all services and requirements, as detailed within the Statement of Requirements (SoR) for Contract years 1-3 (if year 3 is exercised). The rates submitted within the relevant table within Appendix C - Pricing Schedule (Design, Development & Assessment) will be fixed for year 4 (if year 4 is exercised) of the Contract based on the indexation formula detailed within the SoR. Providers should include rates inclusive of Travel & Subsistence (T&S) and excluding T&S for Course Material Design and Development, Assessment Design and Development and Assessment Delivery. The Authority will evaluate on a total price for all rates but will award the Contract based on affordability (for Course Material Design and Development, Assessment Design and Development and Assessment Delivery) and which option presents the most value for money (VFM) as detailed in the SoR.	

N.B. Questions C1 – C4 represents the total Price Evaluation Score, which comprises 40% of the Overall Evaluation Score.

D. Tender Evaluation Scoring Methodology

1. Overview of Evaluation Process

Evaluation is the process by which the Providers bid is assessed and then marked by the Authority in accordance with the criteria outlined in this document.

The overall evaluation criteria is based on a four-stage process as follows: -

- Commercial Evaluation (Pass/Fail)
- Technical/ Quality Evaluation (50% of overall score)
- Social Value Evaluation (10% of overall score)
- Price Evaluation (40% of overall score)

Each bid submitted will be evaluated, assessed, and marked by each member of the Evaluation Panel in accordance with the evaluation process detailed within this document.

Minimum Participation Criteria

The minimum condition of participation relating to this tender is the completion of the entire tender return, as per instructions included within the DEFFORM 47, ITT and this SoR. Providers who do not meet these minimum criteria will be excluded from the tender process.

Minimum Pass Mark

Technical/Quality Criteria A1 to A4 (inclusive) have minimum pass marks assigned to them as detailed in the note below each criterion. Providers who do not meet the minimum pass mark on any of the applicable Technical/Quality Criteria shall be deemed to have failed and will not pass the Technical/Quality Evaluation.

Criteria Weightings

Each Evaluation Criteria has been assigned a weighting according to its significance to the project. With the exception being the Pass/Fail Criteria.

Evaluation Methodology

The Evaluation Methodology for each stage of the Evaluation Process can be found in Sections 2-6 (inclusive) below.

Providers responses to each of the Technical/Quality and Social Value Criteria will be awarded marks between 0 and 10, with the maximum 10 marks being available for each question.

The following list provides the general scoring rationale for each score:

- 10 Marks - High Confidence – receives 100% of the Max Available Score for the Question
- 7 Marks - Good Confidence – receives 66% of the Max Available Score for the Question
- 3 Marks - Minor Concerns – receives 33% of the Max Available Score for the Question
- 0 Marks- Critical Concerns – receives 0% of the Max Available Score for the Question

10 Marks - High Confidence – receives 100% of the Max Available Score for the Question

The Provider has provided a solution:

- The Provider has provided a solution that:
- Provides the Authority with a high level of confidence
- Meets the Authority's stated aim
- Provides evidence which exceeds that required to demonstrate confidence in delivery of the solution
- Provides the Authority with a high level of confidence that the solution is robust, as a result of:
 - Identification of all key risks together with the provision of comprehensive mitigation plans
 - Identification of all key assumptions.

7 Marks - Good Confidence – receives 66% of the Max Available Score for the Question

The Provider has provided a solution that meets each of the following:

- Provides the Authority with a good level of confidence
- Meets the Authority's stated aim
- Provides evidence which meets that required to demonstrate confidence in delivery of the solution
- Provides the Authority with a good level of confidence that the solution is robust, as a result of:
 - Identification of key risks together with the provision of comprehensive mitigation plans
 - Identification of key assumptions.

3 Marks - Minor Concerns – receives 33% of the Max Available Score for the Question

The Provider has provided a solution that:

- Provides the Authority with minor concerns
- Does not sufficiently meet the Authority's stated aim
- Provides evidence that is insufficient to fully demonstrate delivery of the solution
- Provides the Authority with minor concerns that the solution is robust, as a result of:
 - Insufficient identification of risks together with the provision of comprehensive mitigation plans
 - Insufficient identification of assumptions.

0 Marks- Critical Concerns – receives 0% of the Max Available Score for the Question

The Provider has provided a solution that:

- Provides the Authority with critical concerns
- Does not meet the Authority's stated aim
- Provides evidence presented which does not meet that required to demonstrate delivery of the solution
- Provides the Authority with critical concerns that the solution is robust, as a result of;
 - A failure to identify risks together with the provision of comprehensive mitigation plans
 - A failure to identify assumptions.

Final Evaluation Results

The Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT) process is being used to evaluate the tenders. The Authority shall calculate an Overall Evaluation Score in accordance with Section 5 of this document and the Provider with the highest Overall Evaluation Score shall be deemed the winner and the Authority’s preferred English Language Training (ELT) Provider.

Should two or more Providers be awarded the same Overall Evaluation Score the Authority will follow the Tied Score Process Section 6 to identify a winning Provider.

2. Commercial Evaluation Methodology

Each Provider shall firstly be assessed against the Commercial Evaluation criteria detailed in the table below. Should Providers fail to provide unqualified acceptance to this criteria and not provide declaration of unqualified acceptance, or should the Provider state anything in their Assumptions that undermines compliance with the criteria, this will be deemed as a Fail and the Provider will not pass the Commercial Evaluation and will therefore be rejected.

Should Providers fail to complete the required Schedules as part of their Tender response this will be deemed as a Fail and the Provider will not pass the Commercial Evaluation and will therefore be rejected. Only Providers deemed Commercially compliant will be assessed against the remaining Evaluation Criteria.

Once the Authority’s Commercial team has confirmed that the Provider has passed the Commercial criteria the unpriced tender documents will be passed to the Technical team for the Technical/Quality Evaluation to take place.

The Commercial Assessment will be carried out independently by the Authority’s Commercial Team and will not include any of the Technical/Quality Assessors.

Criteria	Category / Description of Requirement	Weighting %
Commercial Criteria 1	<u>Commercial compliance</u> Provider has confirmed unconditional acceptance within the Defence Sourcing Portal (DSP) mandatory criteria & DEFFORM 47	Pass / Fail
Commercial Criteria 2	<u>Completion of Pricing Schedule</u> Provider has completed Appendix C (Pricing Schedule), and associated Appendices in accordance with the instructions detailed within Appendix C (Pricing Schedule)	Pass / Fail

3. Technical and Quality Evaluation Scoring Methodology

Each Provider that has passed the Commercial Evaluation shall then proceed to the Technical/Quality Evaluation stage. Each Provider shall be evaluated against Technical/Quality Evaluation Criteria A1 – A4 (inclusive) and scored in accordance with the Scoring Methodology detailed within Section 5 of this document.

In order to pass the Technical/Quality Evaluation the Provider is required to score at least the specified Minimum Pass Mark in all Technical/Quality Evaluation Criteria. Providers who do not meet

the specified Minimum Pass Mark on any of the applicable Technical/Quality Criteria shall be deemed to have failed and will not pass the Technical/Quality Evaluation and will therefore be rejected.

Overall Technical/Quality Score

Once the Providers have been allocated a Technical/Quality mark against each of the Technical/Quality Evaluation Criteria the Authority will calculate an overall Technical/Quality Weighted Score.

To calculate the Technical/Quality Weighted Score for each evaluation criteria the Authority will undertake the following calculation:

Technical/Quality Weighted Score = (Maximum Available Score for Section x Percentage of Max Available Score Achieved) x Overall Technical/Quality Weighting

Examples of this calculation can be found below:

Example 1

A technical/ quality mark of 7 for Question A1 = 50% of the maximum available score

The Technical/ Quality weighted score = (15 x 66%) x 50%

Technical/ Quality weighted score = 4.95

Example 2

A technical/ quality mark of 7 for Question A2 = 50% of the maximum available score

The Technical/ Quality weighted score = (50 x 66%) x 50%

Technical/ Quality weighted score = 16.5

The Weighted Score against each Technical/Quality question shall then be combined to give the Provider an Overall Technical/Quality score.

Each Provider Overall Technical/Quality Score will be rounded to one decimal place.

The table below details the Maximum Technical/Quality score, the Criteria Weighting, Available Marks and Total Weighted Marks Available against each of the 4 Technical/Quality questions.

Question	Question Description	Max Technical/Quality Marks	Criteria Weighting %	Max Available Score for Section	Max Total Technical/Quality Weighted Score Available
A1	Organisational Capability & Capacity to manage the ELT service	10	15%	15	7.5
A2	Assured Supply Chain of quality tutors with a quality focused approach to tutor recruitment, selection,	10	50%	50	25

	development and retention				
A3	Mobilisation Readiness	10	15%	15	7.5
A4	Governance, Reporting and Continuous Service Improvement	10	20%	20	10
Total Available Marks			100%	100	50.0

4. Social Value Evaluation Methodology.

Each Provider that has passed the Commercial and Technical/Quality Evaluation shall then proceed to the Social Value Evaluation. Each Provider shall be evaluated against the Social Value Evaluation Criteria (B1 and B2) and marked in accordance with the Scoring Methodology both detailed within Section B of this document.

Once the Providers have been allocated a Social Value mark against the Evaluation Criteria the Authority will calculate an Overall Social Value Weighted Score.

Overall Social Value Score

To calculate the Overall Social Value, Score the Authority will undertake the following calculation:

Overall Social Value Score = Maximum Social Value Score x Percentage of Maximum Available Score Achieved x Criteria Weighting

An example of this calculation can be found below:

Example 1

A Social Value mark of 7 for Question B1 = 10% of the maximum available score
 The Social Value weighted score = (50 x 66%) x 10%
 Social Value weighted score = 3.3

Example 2

A Social Value mark of 10 for Question B2 = 10% of the maximum available score
 The Social Value weighted score = (50 x 100%) x 10%
 Social Value weighted score = 5

The Weighted Score against each Social Value questions shall then be combined to give the Provider an Overall Social Value score.

Each Provider Overall Social Value Score will be rounded to one decimal place.

The table below details the specific Score Weighting and Available Marks for the question to be evaluated.

Question	Question Description	Max Social Value Marks	Criteria Weighting %	Max Available Score for Section	Max Total Social Value Weighted Score Available
B1	Tackling Economic Inequality – Education and Training	10	50	50	5
B2	Tackling Economic Inequality – Diverse Supply Chains	10	50	50	5
Total Available Marks			100%	100	10

5. Price Evaluation Methodology

Each Provider that has passed the Commercial and Technical/Quality Evaluation and has been evaluated against the Social Value criteria shall then proceed to the Price Evaluation. Pricing responses against evaluation criteria (C1, C2, C3 and C4) will be awarded a mark based on a comparison against the responses from competing Providers. The Authority will then calculate Weighted Criteria Price Score.

The Weighted Criteria Price score shall then be used to calculate an Overall Price Score.

The table below details the Maximum Price score, the Criteria Weighting, Available Marks and Total Weighted Marks Available against each of the 4 Price questions.

Question	Question Description	Max Price Marks	Criteria Weighting %	Max Available Score for Section	Max Total Technical/Quality Weighted Score Available
C1	Mobilisation	100	15%	15	6
C2	Delivery Face to Face	100	60%	60	24
C3	Delivery Online	100	10%	10	4
C4	Design & Development & Assessment	100	15%	15	6
Total Available Marks			100%	100	40

C1: Total Value of Mobilisation

In accordance with Appendix C – Pricing Schedule, Providers shall provide an overall Total Cost of Mobilisation (exclusive of VAT) for all required SOR deliverables as shown in the table below. The C1 total value will be inclusive of all total costs for Mobilisation of the ELT Contract and is worth 15% of the overall Price Evaluation.

The example below illustrates how this methodology will work in principle and is not meant to be representative of the specific requirement:

Mobilisation	
Total Value (£)	Detailed breakdown of what this cost includes
£120,000.00	

To calculate the Providers mark for this Price Criteria the Authority will divide the lowest Total Value of Mobilisation by the Providers Total Value of Mobilisation. An example of this calculation can be found below:

Providers Total Value of Mobilisation: £120,000

Lowest Total Value of Mobilisation: £100,000

Total Value of Mobilisation Mark = £100,000 / £120,000

Total Value Criteria Mark = 0.83

The Price Evaluation Criteria mark which will then be converted to a Price Criteria Weighted Score.

To calculate the Price Criteria Weighted Score for this Price Criteria the Authority will undertake the following calculation:

Price Criteria Weighted Score = Total Value Criteria Mark x (Price Criteria Weighting) /100 x (Overall Price Weighting)

An example of this calculation can be found below:

Price Criteria Mark: 0.83

Price Criteria Weighted Score = 0.83 x 15% / 100 x 40

Price Criteria Weighted Score = 5

The example below illustrates how this methodology will work in principle:

Provider	Providers Total Mobilisation Value	Lowest Mobilisation Value / Providers Mobilisation Value	Mobilisation Criteria Weighted Score /100 x 40	C1 Price Criteria Weighted Score
Provider 1	£100,000.00	= £100,000.00 / £100,000.00	15	6

Provider 2	£120,000.00	= £100,000.00 / £120,000.00	15	5
Provider 3	£140,000.00	= £100,000.00 / £140,000.00	15	4.3
Provider 4	£150,000.00	= £100,000.00 / £150,000.00	15	4
Provider 5	£200,000.00	= £200,000.00 / £100,000.00	15	3

C2. Face-to-Face Delivery Rates

In accordance with Appendix C – Pricing Schedule, Providers are requested to provide hourly rates (where applicable), half day rates and full day rates and complete the highlighted cells in yellow as part of their response to this tender for Face-to-Face Delivery Rates.

To calculate the Providers mark for the Face-to-Face Delivery Rates the Authority will combine the Total Rate for Face-to-Face and divide this total by the number of rates (i.e., 6 for Face-to-Face) for each mode of delivery to give a Total Rate for Evaluation Weighting. For Face-to-Face Delivery Rates the overall weighting is 60%.

The Total Rate for Evaluation Weighting rate will be divided the Providers lowest Total Rate for Evaluation Weighting to give a Face-to-Face Delivery Rates mark. An example of this calculation can be found below:

Providers Total Rate for Evaluation Weighting: £300,000.00

Lowest Providers lowest Total Rate for Evaluation Weighting £200,000.00

Total Value of Contract Mark = £200,000 / £300,000

Total Value Criteria Mark = 0.66

The Price Evaluation Criteria mark which will then be converted to a Price Criteria Weighted Score.

To calculate the Price Criteria Weighted Score for this Price Criteria the Authority will undertake the following calculation:

Price Criteria Weighted Score = Total Value Criteria Mark x (Price Criteria Weighting) /100 x (Overall Price Weighting)

An example of this calculation can be found below:

Price Criteria Mark: 0.66

Price Criteria Weighted Score = 0.66 x 60% / 100 x 40

Price Criteria Weighted Score = 16

The example below illustrates how this methodology will work in principle:

Provider	Providers Total Face-to-Face Delivery Rates Value	Lowest Face-to-Face Delivery Value / Providers Face-to-Face Delivery Value	Face-to-Face Delivery Criteria Weighted Score /100 x 40	C2 Price Criteria Weighted Score
Provider 1	£200,000.00	= £200,000.00 / £200,000.00	60	24
Provider 2	£300,000.00	= £200,000.00 / £300,000.00	60	16
Provider 3	£400,000.00	= £200,000.00 / £400,000.00	60	12
Provider 4	£500,000.00	= £200,000.00 / £500,000.00	60	9.6
Provider 5	£600,000.00	= £200,000.00 / £600,000.00	60	8

C3. Online Delivery Rates

In accordance with Appendix C – Pricing Schedule, Providers are requested to provide hourly rates (where applicable), half day rates and full day rates and complete the highlighted cells in yellow as part of their response to this tender for Online Delivery Rates.

To calculate the Providers mark for the Online Delivery Rates the Authority will combine the Total Rate for Online Delivery and divide this total by the number of rates (i.e. 3 for online) for each mode of delivery to give a Total Rate for Evaluation Weighting. For Online Delivery the overall weighting is 10%. The Total Rate for Evaluation Weighting rate will be divided the Providers lowest Total Rate for Evaluation Weighting to give an Online Delivery mark. An example of this calculation can be found below:

Providers Total Rate for Evaluation Weighting: £300,000.00

Lowest Providers lowest Total Rate for Evaluation Weighting £200,000.00

Total Value of Contract Mark = £200,000 / £300,000

Total Value Criteria Mark = 0.66

The Price Evaluation Criteria mark which will then be converted to a Price Criteria Weighted Score.

To calculate the Price Criteria Weighted Score for this Price Criteria the Authority will undertake the following calculation:

Price Criteria Weighted Score = Total Value Criteria Mark x (Price Criteria Weighting) /100 x (Overall Price Weighting)

An example of this calculation can be found below:

Price Criteria Mark: 0.66

Price Criteria Weighted Score = 0.66 x 10% / 100 x 40

Price Criteria Weighted Score = 2.7

The example below illustrates how this methodology will work in principle:

Provider	Providers Total Online Delivery Value	Lowest Online Delivery Value / Providers Online Delivery Value	Online Delivery Criteria Weighted Score /100 x 40	C3 Price Criteria Weighted Score
Provider 1	£200,000.00	= £200,000.00 / £200,000.00	10	4
Provider 2	£300,000.00	= £200,000.00 / £300,000.00	10	2.7
Provider 3	£400,000.00	= £200,000.00 / £400,000.00	10	2
Provider 4	£500,000.00	= £200,000.00 / £500,000.00	10	1.6
Provider 5	£600,000.00	= £200,000.00 / £600,000.00	10	1.3

C4. Design, Development & Assessment Rates

In accordance with Appendix C – Pricing Schedule, Providers are requested to provide hourly rates (where applicable), half day rates and full day rates and complete the highlighted cells in yellow as part of their response to this tender for Design, Development & Assessment Rates.

To calculate the Providers mark for the Design, Development & Assessment Rates the Authority will combine the Total Rate Design, Development & Assessment and divide this total by the number of rates (i.e., 6 for Course Material Design and Development, 6 for Assessment Design and Development and 6 for Assessment Delivery) to give a Total Rate for Evaluation Weighting. For Design & Development Rates the overall weighting is 15%.

The Total Rate for Evaluation Weighting rate will be divided the Providers lowest Total Rate for Evaluation Weighting to give a Design, Development & Assessment mark. An example of this calculation can be found below:

Providers Total Rate for Evaluation Weighting: £300,000.00

Lowest Providers lowest Total Rate for Evaluation Weighting £200,000.00

Total Value of Contract Mark = £200,000 / £300,000

Total Value Criteria Mark = 0.66

The Price Evaluation Criteria mark which will then be converted to a Price Criteria Weighted Score.

To calculate the Price Criteria Weighted Score for this Price Criteria the Authority will undertake the following calculation:

Price Criteria Weighted Score = Total Value Criteria Mark x (Price Criteria Weighting) /100 x (Overall Price Weighting)

An example of this calculation can be found below:

Price Criteria Mark: 0.66

Price Criteria Weighted Score = 0.66 x 15% /100 x 40

Price Criteria Weighted Score = 4

The example below illustrates how this methodology will work in principle:

Provider	Providers Total Design, Development & Assessment Value	Lowest Design, Development & Assessment Value / Providers Design, Development & Assessment Value	Design, Development & Assessment Criteria Weighted Score /100 x 40	C4 Price Criteria Weighted Score
Provider 1	£200,000.00	= £200,000.00 / £200,000.00	15	6
Provider 2	£300,000.00	= £200,000.00 / £300,000.00	15	4
Provider 3	£400,000.00	= £200,000.00 / £400,000.00	15	3
Provider 4	£500,000.00	= £200,000.00 / £500,000.00	15	2.4
Provider 5	£600,000.00	= £200,000.00 / £600,000.00	15	2

Overall Price Score

To calculate Providers Overall Price score the Authority will combine the Providers Price Criteria Weighted Scores from all the Price Criteria (C1, C2, C3 and C4) to calculate a Combined Price Criteria Weighted Score.

Overall Evaluation Score Methodology

The Overall Criteria Score assessed for each evaluation criterion, as detailed in section D2 to D5 above (i.e., the Commercial Evaluation, Technical/Quality Evaluation, Social Value Evaluation and Price Evaluation) will be combined to produce an Overall Evaluation Score out of 100.

Overall Evaluation Score (out of 100 points) comprising:

- Commercial Evaluation (Pass/Fail)
- Technical/ Quality Evaluation (50 available points / 50% overall weighting)
- Social Value Evaluation (10 available points / 10% overall weighting)

- Price Evaluation (40 available points / 40% overall weighting)

The Provider with the highest Overall Evaluation Score will be deemed the Most Economically Advantageous Tender (MEAT). Each Providers Overall Evaluation Score will be rounded to one decimal place.

Providers should refer to the notional example in the Overall Evaluation Score table below where Provider 1 achieves maximum score and hence is the winning Provider.

Evaluation Criteria	Provider 1	Provider 2	Provider 3	Provider 4	Provider 5
Commercial Evaluation	Pass	Pass	Pass	Fail	Pass
Overall Technical/Quality Score	44.90	Fail	35.80	N/A	41.50
Overall Social Value Score	10	N/A	10	N/A	0
Overall Price Score	40	N/A	21.30	N/A	14.30
Overall Evaluation Score	94.90	N/A	57.10	N/A	55.80

6. Tied Score Process

Should there be a tie in the ranking, between two or more Providers with the highest Overall Response Score, after the MEAT calculation, the following process shall be followed to rank the Providers and identify a winning Provider:

- The Provider with the highest Technical/Quality Response Score (evaluated score) shall be awarded the Contract.
- Should a tie still occur then the Provider with the highest score against the highest weighted Technical/Quality Response question A2 – Assured Supply Chain of tutors with a quality-focused approach to Tutor recruitment, selection, development and retention, shall be awarded the Contract.
- Should a tie still occur the Provider with the highest score against the second highest weighted Technical/Quality Response question A4 – Governance, Reporting and Continuous Service Improvement, shall be awarded the Contract.
- Should a tie still occur the Provider with the highest score combined score against the third highest weighted Technical/Quality Response questions A1 – Organisational Capability and Capacity to manage the ELT service, shall be awarded the Contract.
- Should a tie still occur the Provider with the highest overall Commercial/Price Response Score shall be awarded the Contract.

- g) Should a tie still occur the Provider with the highest score against the highest weighted Price Response Question C2 – Face-to-Face Rates Total, shall be awarded the Contract.
- h) Should a tie still occur the Provider with the highest score against the highest weighted Price Response Question C1 – Mobilisation Cost Total, shall be awarded the Contract.
- i) Should a tie still occur the Provider with the highest score against the highest weighted Price Response Question C3 – Online Delivery Rates, shall be awarded the Contract.