



8 March 2023

Tēnā koe

On 7 February 2023, you emailed the Ministry of Social Development (the Ministry) requesting, under the Official Information Act 1982 (the Act), the following information:

- 1. A list of all successful MSD Employment in Schools proposals submitted since January 1st, 2020.*
- 2. A copy of each successful proposal.*
- 3. Details of the evaluation process used by MSD to determine the success of these proposals, including any criteria used to assess the proposals and the process for making funding decisions*
- 4. Information on any reports or evaluations conducted by MSD on the outcomes of the employment in schools proposals, including data on the impact of the proposals on employment rates and student outcomes.*

I will respond to your requests in turn.

- 1 A list of all successful MSD Employment in Schools proposals submitted since January 1st, 2020.*

The Ministry invited Registrations of Interest through a closed tender process between 17 August 2020 and 4 September 2020. The following table displays the successful providers:

Pilot location	Provider name
Auckland	Austism New Zealand Incorporated
	Pasifika Consulting Limited
	Transitioning Out Aotearoa (TOA) Trust
	APM Workcare Limited
Waikato	Pai Ake Toru Limited (Enrich+)
	Career Moves Trust
Wellington	Horowhenua Learning Centre Trust Board
	APM Workcare Limited
	Habit Rehabilitation Limited
Canterbury	Choices New Zealand Limited
	The Catapult Employment Services Trust Board
	SPAN Charitable Trust (Skillwise)*
	CCS Disability Action Incorporated*
Otago/Southland	Choices New Zealand Limited
	APM Workcare Limited
	CCS Disability Action Incorporated

**Initially recommended as a preferred supplier on completion of the tender evaluation, however this was subject to final allocation of participant numbers in each region by the Ministry of Education.*

2 A copy of each successful proposal.

Your request is refused under section 9(2)(b)(ii) of the Act as, if released, it would be likely to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied or who is the subject of the information. There is also a public interest in information of this nature remaining confidential to maintain a good level of private and community sector participation in government tender processes.

3 Details of the evaluation process used by MSD to determine the success of these proposals, including any criteria used to assess the proposals and the process for making funding decisions

Applicants were asked to provide details of their child protection policy, a description of their staff vetting process, names of potential employees and any police vetting issues. They were also rated on their description of how they would apply the service to a provided case study scenario and explain how they would operate this service differently to their current Employment Service with the Ministry.

Using the attached Evaluation Criteria, applications were individually evaluated by a Tender Evaluation Team made up of Ministry of Education National office employees, Ministry of Social Development Principal Advisors and members of the community.

The evaluation also included reviewing the performance of the Employment Service to ensure that selected providers displayed the capabilities and capacity to deliver similar services.

- 4 *Information on any reports or evaluations conducted by MSD on the outcomes of the employment in schools proposals, including data on the impact of the proposals on employment rates and student outcomes.*

We have taken it that your question was regarding the performance of the service rather than just the proposals. The Ministry has commissioned an external evaluation report on current delivery of the Employment Service in Schools pilot and the report is expected to be published in March/April 2023.

The principles and purposes of the Official Information Act 1982 under which you made your request are:

- to create greater openness and transparency about the plans, work and activities of the Government,
- to increase the ability of the public to participate in the making and administration of our laws and policies and
- to lead to greater accountability in the conduct of public affairs.

This Ministry fully supports those principles and purposes. The Ministry therefore intends to make the information contained in this letter and any attached documents available to the wider public. The Ministry will do this by publishing this letter and attachments on the Ministry's website. Your personal details will be deleted, and the Ministry will not publish any information that would identify you as the person who requested the information.

If you wish to discuss this response with us, please feel free to contact OIA_Requests@msd.govt.nz.

If you are not satisfied with this response about Employment Service in Schools, you have the right to seek an investigation and review by the Ombudsman. Information about how to make a complaint is available at www.ombudsman.parliament.nz or 0800 802 602.

Ngā mihi nui



Rebecca Brew-Harper
General Manager
Service and Contracts Management

Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation criteria were developed using the standard approach.

Table 1 below summarises the Evaluation Criteria and Weightings for the RFP.

Table 1.

Criteria/Category	Weighting	Number of Sub-criteria
Staff Vetting	5%	0
Staff Screening	5%	0
Child Protection Policy	5%	0
Case Study Scenario	75%	4
Different to the Employment Service	10%	0

The scoring process was documented in an evaluation spread-sheet as follows:

- Policies and Procedures (15%)
- Case Study Scenario (75%)
- Student Centric (10%)
- Each question's weighting was provided directly to the left of the question
- Each criteria weighting was provided directly beneath the last question
- Comments were provided by each evaluator for the majority of questions to justify why that score was given
- During panel discussions, the comments were noted, additional comments were recorded and a consensus score was reached by the panel and recorded to form the overall score for each criteria and sub criteria

Evaluation Questions Scored

The categories and questions the respondents were required to answer were:

1. Staff vetting	Weighting 5%
Provide the details of the people from your organisation who will be working in the Employment Service in Schools (add extra rows as required)	
2. Staff Screening	Weighting 5%
Describe your organisation's process for ensuring that all new staff are police checked. Include the action you take if any issues arise from the police vetting	
3. Child Protection Policy	Weighting 5%
Provide a copy of your organisation's child protection policy. This policy must meet the requirements of section 19 of the Vulnerable Children Act 2014.	
4. Describe how your organization would work with the young person described in this scenario	Weighting 75%
Please ensure your response:	
Is Culturally responsive	30%
Is Client centred	40%
Demonstrates how you'd include the client's current networks and supports	20%
Includes any other necessary information	10%
5. Explain how you would work differently with students for this service than you do with your current Employment Service contract	Weighting 10%

Scoring Metric

The weighted service Evaluation Criteria scores were allocated using an eleven point scale (from 0 to 10), with an allowance for clarification as shown in the table below.

Guide		Score
EXCELLENT significantly exceeds the criterion -	Exceeds the criterion. Exceptional demonstration by the Respondent of the relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to meet the criterion. Proposal identifies factors that will offer potential added value, with support evidence.	10
		9
GOOD exceeds the criterion in some aspects	Satisfies the criterion with minor additional benefits. Above average demonstration by the Respondent of the relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to meet the criterion. Proposal identifies factors that will offer potential added value, with supporting evidence.	8
		7
ACCEPTABLE meets the criterion in full but at a minimal level	Satisfies the criterion. Demonstration by the Respondent of the relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource, and quality measures required to meet the criterion, with supporting evidence.	6
		5
MINOR RESERVATIONS marginally deficient	- Satisfies the criterion with minor reservations. Some minor reservations of the Respondent's relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to meet the criterion, with little or no supporting evidence.	4
		3
SERIOUS RESERVATIONS significant issues that need to be addressed	Satisfies the criterion with major reservations. Considerable reservations of the respondent's relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to meet the criterion, with little or no supporting evidence.	2
		1
UNACCEPTABLE significant issues not capable of being resolved	Does not meet the criterion. Does not comply and/or insufficient information provided to demonstrate that the Respondent has the ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to meet the criterion, with little or no supporting evidence.	0
Clarification sought	C	C