

Appendix 8

Evaluations of the Tenders

1. Method statements were evaluated by ten Tender Evaluation Panels (TEPs). Panels were made up of commissioning officers from the four participating boroughs and other professional stakeholders. The aim was to have a membership of five for each panel as this offered a balance between a sound breadth of knowledge and experience, work loads and the overall administration of the evaluation process. Two training sessions were held for TEP members. On the whole TEP members undertook evaluations remotely as submissions were anonymised and supplied on an usb memory stick. Each TEP had a Chair who was responsible for arranging meetings with other TEP members, to make sure evaluations were progressing and to come to a final consensus score. Each question was scored from 0 – 5, with half points allowed, and standard guidance including details from the service specification was provided to TEP members. Also using TEPs experience and knowledge panels also considered and took a view on what a model answer should include.
2. The project group also wanted to make sure that service users were involved in the evaluation process in a meaning full way. Brent Homeless User Group (BHUG), an organisation who was involved in the West London Framework, was commissioned to facilitate this process. A number of briefings were set up for support workers and interested service users. Between 40 and 45 applied to be part of the process and this number was reduced to 30 following interview. As part of the package training for service users was undertaken and throughout November Service user evaluators attended at Tooley Street to undertake evaluations. Travel, luncheon vouchers were provided as well as a small payment for completing the task based on £1 per evaluation plus £20 on completion. Service users evaluated 2 questions only from the specialist method statements. More detailed support was made available when required especially to support service users with Learning Disabilities undertake their evaluations. Once service users completed their evaluations they met with TEP representatives to incorporate with the TEP scores to come to an overall quality score.
3. The Project team facilitated a SU graduation event on 27 January 2010 and the participating service users expressed positive comments about the learning experience and empowerment they felt in being able to participate in such a meaningful way.
4. The councils commissioning and contract monitoring teams will continue to work with the pool of service users used in the evaluation process to help develop strategic consultation on the housing support services involving them in the operation of the Framework and SU lay/peer monitoring of SP contracts.
5. The project group considered that under each category there should be a maximum of between 10-15 providers accepted onto the framework. This would allow each borough to consider a segmentation policy to avoid a few providers dominating and to maintain a diverse market.
6. Once the TEPs had reported a moderation panel was instituted with the following remit:-
 - Review and check evaluation process for each TEP.
 - Review and check SU evaluation process.
 - Check how SU scores have been amalgamated.
 - Moderate a sample of evaluations.
 - Receive and investigate any concerns from TEP members about the process.
 - Moderate where TEPs are unable to agree.
7. The moderation panel was made up of the Head of Adult commissioning in Southwark, the SP manager from Lewisham, the framework project manager and officer. The majority of the

moderation panel had not been directly involved in the TEP evaluation but were familiar with the process and documentation.

8. The panel met several times and reviewed the process for each TEP. Panel members also independently undertook evaluations for a number of tender statements and were reassured that the TEP scores were appropriate and closely agreed with moderator panel scores.
9. Where TEPs had scored 0 the panel also reviewed these and in some instances where the question had been answered albeit poorly uplifted these by 0.5 of a point. Only where there was no answer was a 0 score given.
10. The moderator panel has approved the final TEP scores including the scores and contribution of the Service User panel. It has reviewed and approved the TEP process and methodology.