**Document 4**

**Evaluation Criteria**

This document describes the criteria against which bids will be scored, relating the specification of required services, together with the scoring mechanism and associated weightings for each section or question.

All completed tenders who complete the Supplier Selection Questionnaire, available on Jaggaer, to the satisfaction of the Department, with reference to the criteria for pass / fail for each section of the questionnaire, will be evaluated and full details of the evaluation process are provided below.

Bidders must provide a response to the method statements; each question should be answered in full and should not refer to other documents or appendices. There is a maximum word limit for each response so bidders should ensure they are concise and unequivocal in their submissions. Where information is required as an attachment this will be stated in the request. Any information provided as an attachment that is not requested will not be considered as part of the scoring. Relevant charts and graphs can be included and will not count towards any word count but should be provided sparingly and only to emphasise a response not to replace a response.

The following points will be used to determine the most economically advantageous tender:

* Meeting the specification 50 points
	+ Bidders are expected to respond to all questions within the method statements of which there are five (5) in total. Where attachments are requested, bidders should provide as evidence for evaluation.
* Social Value 10 points
	+ Bidders are expected to respond to only one (1) of the two (2) available questions within the method statements for Social Value.
* Price 40 points
	+ Bidders are requested to complete the pricing spreadsheet attached to the tender document and are required to outline as part of this element of the evaluation their methodologies for developing their pricing model.

Scoring

In general terms higher scores will be awarded when the evidence provided demonstrates good quality information in support of proposals for specific requirements and provides high confidence in reliable delivery of the required services. Lower scores will be given when the evidence provided does not demonstrate and/or provide confidence in reliable delivery of the requirement as specified.

Responses for **meeting the specification**, **social value** and **developing the price model** will be assessed on a scale of 0 to 4 points, as detailed in the table below:

| **Score** | **In the evaluating officers’ reasoned opinion** |
| --- | --- |
| 0 | **Unacceptable Response.** No response, response not relevant or question not answered. |
| 1 | **Poor.** The response is partially compliant, but with serious deficiencies in meeting service requirements (any supporting evidence provided as part of the method statement is minimal). |
| 2 | **Fair.** The response is compliant (some evidence may be provided as part of the method statement which supports compliant elements) with shortfalls in meeting service requirements or lacking clarity. Any concerns are of a minor nature.  |
| 3 | **Good.** The response is compliant and offers relevant evidence as part of the method statement to support their claims, clearly indicating that service requirements would be met. |
| 4 | **Excellent.** The response is compliant and offers relevant detailed evidence as part of the method statement to support their claims, clearly demonstrating a comprehensive understanding of the service requirements. |

Please note that **scoring zero (0)** for any **one or more** requirement questions (ie. Meeting the Specification, Social Value or developing the price model) **OR** **failure to achieve** an unweighted score for requirement questions 1-5 of twelve (**12) or more** will give grounds for **excluding** the tender from further consideration. For any tenders so excluded, that tenderer’s price shall be excluded from the ‘’Price’ evaluation.

Each score achieved for the individual requirements will then be multiplied by the weighting detailed below to calculate the final points for each requirement.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Requirement** | **Weighting** | **Max Points** |
| A | Meeting the Specification |  | 50 |
| 1 | Design, Develop and Manage Operational Delivery of Practice Leadership CPD Programme | X | 20 |
| 2 | Project Management, Reporting arrangements and Evaluation | X | 12 |
| 3 | Contractor management and governance | X | 8 |
| 4 | Communications and Engagement | X | 8 |
| 5 | Ensuring quarterly key performance and delivery plan updates |  |  |
| 6 | End of contract |  | 2 |
| B | Social Value | 2.5 | 10 |
| C | Developing the pricing model | 1.25 | 5 |

For example, for ‘Design, Develop and Manage Operational Delivery of Practice Leadership CPD Programme’ a response that receives an unweighted score of three (3) will be multiplied by five (5) to gain final points score of fifteen (15). The same unweighted score of three (3) for ‘Contractor management and governance’ would be multiplied by one point five (1.5) to gain final points score of four point five (4.5).

For the “meeting the specification” responses, all individual point scores for the five (5) questions will be added together to give a final weighted point score out of 50.

Marks for the Price template will be calculated as follows:

* 7.5 points will be allocated to the average cost per participant for the delivery of the programme for April 2022 to March 2024 (excluding set-up price) for each level of the programme. This means that the average cost per participant for Practice Supervisor, Middle Manager, Head of Service and Practice Leader will each have a maximum of 7.5 points available.
* 5 points will be allocated for the set-up price associated with the delivery of the programme

The following calculation, that attributes price scored via the deviation of bids from the lowest submitted (excluding abnormally low bids), will be used to determine the point for each element.

**For set-up price:**

**(1 - ((quoted price – lowest price ) / lowest price ))) x 5**

**For Cost per participant per level:**

**(1 - (( A – B ) / B ))) x 7.5**

**A** – bidders average quoted price, calculated as follows:

(bidders year 1 quoted price + bidders year 2 quoted price) / 2

**B** – lowest average price submitted by a single bidder, calculated as follows:

(year 1 price submitted by a bidder + year 2 price submitted by the same bidder) / 2

For example, if the lowest average price bid for Practice Supervisor was £40 (scoring 7.5), another price bid of £44 would score 6.75 as it is 10% higher and would therefore be deducted 10% of the available points.

Any tender that is found too low to be credible will be excluded from further consideration. In this instance, the Department will initially clarify with the bidder whether the pricing is correct and has been interpreted correctly. As part of the clarification, evidence will be required to demonstrate that the charges are accurate, achievable, and sustainable. If following the clarification, any charge is found to be abnormally low, that tender will be excluded in accordance with the Public Contract Regulations 2015 regardless of how many points it scores in all other aspects.

Any tender which is found to be too high to be acceptable (i.e., **exceeds the stated value of £9.9m for the 2-year delivery of this programme**) will be **excluded** from further consideration. In this instance, the Department will initially clarify with the bidder concerned whether the pricing is correct and has been interpreted correctly. If following the clarification, any charge is found to be too high to be acceptable, that tender will be **excluded** in accordance with the Public Contract Regulations 2006 regardless of how many points it scores in all other aspects.

Moderation of Scores

Evaluators have been chosen as they possess the required skills, knowledge and experience to professionally assess the robustness of submitted bids. These attributes will be used to ensure that all bids are scrutinised effectively and scored fairly in accordance with the provided scoring matrix.

Un-weighted scores for each requirement will be agreed by consensus amongst the evaluators. Where consensus cannot be reached the independent moderator will use all evidence provided by evaluators to decide on the final un-weighted score to be allocated.

**Award of Contract**

Upon conclusion of the evaluation, the points for price and non-price will be combined to give a total score out of 100 and the tenderer with the highest number of points will be awarded the contract.

The bidder to be offered the contract will be advised accordingly. Such award, offered pursuant to this invitation to tender, will be based on the most economically advantageous tender and based on the evaluation criteria described above.

For full details of the requirements to which a response is required please see:

Document 3 – Requirement Specification, AND

Document 5 – Cost Matrix