

BARNSLEY METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL

**North Area Council:
Monday 19th September 2016**

Agenda Item: 8

**Report of the
North Area Council Manager**

NAC Opportunities for Young People – Project Development Update

1.0 Purpose of Report

To update the North Area Council on the progress that has been made by the working group to develop a project to meet the priority – *Opportunities for Young People*.

2.0 Recommendation

2.1 That the North Area Council note the procurement strategy attached, appendix 1

2.2 That the North Area Council will plan to sign off the procurement strategy to enable the procurement advert to be placed in October 2016.

3.0 Background

3.1 Following the Area Council Meeting on Monday 4th April it was agreed that although the Area Council have been very pleased with the Summer Internship project and can see that it has produced good outputs and exciting outcomes, the Area Council would like to explore a more targeted piece of work.

3.2 On the 25th April Cllrs Burgess, Cherryholme, Grundy, Platts, Tattersall and Rosie Adams met with representatives from the Young People's Skills and Enterprise Service and Targeted Intervention Advice and Guidance (TIAG) including David Benbow, Jeff Townend, Chris Sorby and Angela Lomax for a workshop. The BMBC Core offer, existing gaps in provision and projects that have been observed to work well were discussed. At the end of which North Area council representatives had identified that they would like to develop a project that is specifically aimed at re-engaging young people who have triggered the Risk of NEET (Not in Education, Employment or Training) Indicator (RONI). It is hope this would enable preventative action to be taken and help improve life chances for the young people who meet the criteria.

3.3 A project proposal was developed to meet the needs identified in 3.2, please refer to appendix 1.

3.4 On the 18th May the Councillor working group reconvened and were again supported by specialist officers. The project proposal was tabled by Chris Sorby and a very productive discussion took place. The working group were supportive of the proposal and agreed for it to be placed on the

agenda for the Area Council on the 6th June. It was acknowledged that to procure a provider who can evidence success in this field and who can ensure quality, skills and commitment over 18 months -2years the anticipated value of the contract would require further consideration.

- 3.5 At the Area Council Meeting on the 6th June members indicated that they were happy with the project proposal and agreed to the project being developed in more detail prior to a decision to procure the service.
- 3.6 The Area Manager and Chris Sorby planned a meeting with schools for 7th July and had a further meeting Jane Allen (Senior Education Welfare Officer) on the 13th July.
- 3.7 The Area Manager has discussed with project with Family Intervention Service, Youth Offending Team and the Stronger Families lead to raise awareness and prevent duplication.
- 3.8 The Area Manager and Glyn Stephenson have been developing the tender pack.

4.0 Project Proposal

Please find the outline service specification attached, appendix 1.

5.0 Coproduction and Contract Management

- 5.1 It has been acknowledged that to ensure this project is successful ongoing knowledge, support and advice will be needed from the Skills, Enterprise and Employment Service.
- 5.2 It is therefore recommended that development, procurement and contract management is conducted jointly for the duration of the project to maximise the likelihood of success.

6.0 Area Council Input

- 6.1 Contract Value: approximately £55,000 - £60,000 per annum (Accommodating: two part time staff, plus contract management, activities and overheads.)
- 6.2 Contract Length: 18 months working with a cohort of 20 young people. With the option to extend by a further two years (+1+1). A 6 month break clause is incorporated in the contract.
- 6.3 Price : Quality Split for procurement: 20:80

7.0 Procurement Timeline

- 7.1 The Procurement Officer aligned to the Area Councils has been notified of the project proposal and will need to be included in the development for the specification and tender documents.
- 7.2 Intention is that the opportunity should be advertised in mid October 2016.
- 7.3 Anticipating that the contract will be let in early 2017
- 7.4 Contract will commence in May 2017.

8.0 Risks

- 8.1 Level of school engagement. To reduce this risk it has been suggested that a steering group be introduced that will meet at regular intervals to share operational information and keep the stakeholders engaged. This would involve specific cases being discussed so would be an officer meeting.

- 8.2 Overlap with other core services: Education Welfare, Stronger Families. It is proposed that other stakeholders are involved in the identification of suitable programme participants. The Early Intervention and Prevention Strategy Lead has offered support to help prevent duplication.
- 8.3 Schools may object to the withdrawing of the Summer Internship 2014, 2015, 2016 provision, which has been very well received.
- 8.4 The identified cohort will be challenging and this may have implications on engagement and retention for a provider. However engagement and retention are key part of the performance monitoring criteria.
- 8.5 The service outline dictates that the provider will work with Darton College, Holy Trinity, Carlton Community College and Horizon Community College. Working with 20 young people from up to four schools in the first year of delivery will be extremely challenging for any provider. This will need to be discussed with the schools to identify a practical solution.

9.0 Next Steps

- 9.1 It has been agreed that the Members who have been involved in the process remain as a project steering group, ensuring connectivity with the Area Council. The practicalities have yet to be defined.
- 9.2 A further meeting is planned with school representatives for mid-September to bring them up to speed on developments that have occurred over the summer break and ensure that they are supportive of the project prior to procurement.

Officer Contact:
Rosie Adams

Tel. No:
01226 773583

Date:
1st September 2016

Appendix 1:

**ON BEHALF OF BARNSLEY
METROPOLITAN
BOROUGH COUNCIL**



NORTH AREA COUNCIL

PROCUREMENT STRATEGY

September 2016

**POSITIVE PROGRESSIONS –
STRONGER FUTURES PROJECT**

**Contact :
Rosie Adams
North Area Council Manager**

North Area Council

Darton East, Darton West, Old Town, St Helens

PROCUREMENT STRATEGY

NORTH AREA COUNCIL

Positive Progressions – Stronger Futures Pilot Project

INTRODUCTION

Our Future Council Priorities are:

- Thriving and vibrant economy
- Citizens achieving their potential
- Strong and resilient communities

The aims of area governance are to:-

- Ensure people of all ages have a much greater involvement in designing services and actively participating in improving their lives
- Support the many benefits of volunteering and foster the many and diverse opportunities for residents to gain new skills and experiences through volunteering
- Ensure customer services and the citizen experience of access is improved
- Engage local communities in helping to shape the decisions and services in their neighbourhood
- Ensure the Council operates fairly and demonstrates total commitment to equalities in policy and practice
- Establish new models of delivering services guided by local choice and need

A key purpose of area councils is to grow community capacity by commissioning local services and volunteering.

Positive Progressions – Stronger Futures

The North Area Council is looking for a provider to work with twenty Y10 pupils during the summer break and then into the following Y11 academic year. The group will be made up of young people disengaged from learning and at risk of becoming NEET. The young people will be identified in conjunction with participating schools and the local authority using the Risk of NEET Indicator (RONI). Participants will reside in or attend schools within the North Area Council Area. This includes the Wards of Darton East, Darton West, Old Town and St. Helens. The programme will engage with difficult to reach young people and help ensure they make the most of their remaining time in secondary education and make a positive progression into an appropriate Post 16 learning opportunity and then beyond.

SPECIFIC AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT, INCLUDING SOCIAL VALUE

AIM

This is a programme aimed at Yr10 and then into Yr11 students who are dis-engaged from learning and are at risk of becoming NEET.

It is focussed on supporting young people to improve their school attendance, gain qualifications and progress into and remain in further learning Post-16.

OBJECTIVES

Individuals

- Improve attendance by an agreed % from the end of Year 10 until the end of Year 11
- Ensure GCSE target grades are achieved and in some cases exceeded
- Ensure progression into Post-16 learning
- Stay in Post-16 learning for at least 12 months

Organisation

- Contribute to the achievement of the councils 2020 NEET target of 3.8%
- Participating schools improve their NEET/Not Known/In Learning performance
- 100% of participants in learning as of November 2018
- 95% of participants retained in learning as of April 2019
- 90% of participants retained in learning as of October 2019

Social Value Indicators

- Increased number of economically active young people
- Enable young people to take personal responsibility for their own career development and future employability
- Contribution to the development of strong local networks
- Stronger, more cohesive communities
- Sustainable development of communities to promote their independence (self-help), ability to thrive and resilience
- Local spend
- The provider will ensure that all persons employed to deliver the contract are as a minimum paid the national 'living wage'.

The Expected Service Outcomes are:-

- Improved personal aspirations
- Improved behaviour in school
- Increased confidence
- Increased self esteem
- Improved emotional intelligence

- Increased positive communication
- The Expected Service Outputs are:-
- Personal developments plans for each student
- Improved school attendance
- Exam result targets achieved (improved attainment compared with predicted grades)
- Individuals make a positive progression into post 16 learning

CONTRACT START DATE/ CONTRACT PERIOD

The contract start date is the April /May 2017

It is anticipated that the contract will be for 18 months. The initial period will be a pilot, with an option to extend by 12 months and then a further 12 months (18 months +1year +1 year).

The contract would commence in April/May 2017 and expire in November 2020. If all potential extensions are taken up by the North Area Council.

However, a 6 month break point exists when performance and achievement of outcomes will be reviewed and, on the basis of findings, decisions will be taken to either continue to full term or cease the contract. Decisions will be based upon demand for the service, performance and budget availability.

Extensions to the contract will be granted on condition of all three indicators below being met:

- Continued availability of Area Council funding after 31st March 2017 for each financial year
- Satisfactory performance by the appointed provider meeting all required outcomes
- The service continuing to be an identified local priority as decided by the North Area Council

Budget

The budget for the service is estimated to be in the region of £55,000 over an 18 month delivery period.

The Total contract value should all options to extend the contract be taken by the North Area Council would be approximately £165,000.

PROJECT TEAM

- Project Sponsors – North Area Council Opportunities for Young People’s Priority Working Group

Project Team

- Glyn Stephenson -Commissioning and Procurement Lead
- Rosie Adams -North Area Manager & Contract Manager
- Angela Lomax -Raising Participation Service Manager
- Chris Sorby -TIAG Service Manager

Client for Project

- North Area Council

Tender Evaluation Panel

The Tender Evaluation panel will comprise of the following people

- Rosie Adams North Area Manager and Lead Commissioner
- Glyn Stephenson Commissioning and Procurement Lead
- Angela Lomax Raising Participation Service Manager
- Chris Sorby TIAG Service Manager
- TBC School Representation

The evaluation panel members have been selected for their cross section knowledge and specialisms in the services to be provided and their knowledge of the local area and community.

The presentation stage of the evaluation will involve whole project team and user group’s whose opinions and views will be recorded and considered in the evaluation by the evaluation panel.

PROCUREMENT CONSIDERATIONS

After initial research it was concluded that the best approach to engage the market was an open tender process as the most appropriate for this project.

As there is uncertainty as to the provider capacity in the market, an open tender would lead to a less bureaucratic with a one stage event so not discouraging suppliers from forwarding bids. The purpose of the bid is to receive as many different proposals as possible from that meet a minimum quality threshold for suitability to deliver the service

The open tender has the following advantages for this particular project

- It is a single stage process so one evaluation process and one feedback stage. Therefore no Pre- Qualification Questionnaire (PQQ) stage saving time in tender documentation preparation.
- An advertisement is placed for all those interested to register, all those registered can see the tender documentation immediately and assess if they are interested.
- Allows all tenderers that return a tender proposal to be considered this will enable the council to fully test the market.
- Certain qualifying criteria can still be included in the evaluation to exclude totally unsuitable organisations.
- Price / quality evaluation criteria can still be included but must be stated up front

The process still allows for a clarification / presentation stage but these must be stated including how they will be evaluated and the processes for performing them within the tender documentation

PROCUREMENT OUTCOMES

The expected outcomes from the procurement evaluation process the Tender Evaluation Panel will seek to obtain the most economically advantageous tender following a Price Quality Evaluation.

PROCUREMENT STRATEGY/ METHOD

The method of procurement for the project is the open procurement process through the OJEU process.

The activities to this method of procurement comprise of the following:

- Open Competitive Tender
 - Preparation of the Specification/ Tender Document (ITT)
 - Drafting of the Contract Terms and Conditions
 - Price & Quality Evaluation Methodology in order to award to the most economically advantageous tender
 - ITT Approval to proceed to tender
 - Dispatch of Contracts Finders notice through YORtender
 - Placing tender and advertisement on YORtender for the expression of Interest from suitable contractors
 - Tender Return
 - Tender Presentations
 - Tender Evaluation
 - Tender Report and Approval to Award
 - Tender Award
 - Contract Lead-in period for new contract

Project Plan /Timescales

The project timescales are

Area Council date for Specification Agreement.	19 th September 2016
Finalise Tender Pack	30 th September 2016
Contracts Finder Tender Advertisement	Mid October 2016
Tender Live on Yortender	Mid October 2016
Deadline for Tender Queries	
Tender Return	End November 2016
Tender Evaluation	December – January 2017
Tender Presentations ???	w/c 16 th January 2017
Tender Report and Approval to Award	January 2017
Issue of Letter Intent and Contract	31 st January 2017
Contract Lead in Period	February – April 2017
Contract Start Date/ Commencement of locally commissioned services	1 st May 2017

TENDER EVALUATION PROCESS

The evaluation process will seek to obtain the most economically advantageous tender following a Price/ Quality Evaluation.

Adverts will be placed on YORtender (BMBC's electronic tendering system) inviting expressions of interest from suppliers wishing to tender for the service

The Tender Evaluation teams will evaluate and score submissions at all stages of the procurement process, and will co-ordinate the distribution of specialist areas of the submissions, for scoring and input by the relevant experts.

Each element of the submissions will be evaluated by the same scorers/evaluators, although the scorers/evaluators may differ between elements.

The evaluation processes will be subject to approval by the main project sponsors at key decision points, at final contractor recommendation stage. The reviews will provide assurance that the project can progress successfully to the next stage, and that the business aims and compliance issues are being achieved/addressed.

All participants will be briefed on the commercial sensitivities associated with the assessment, and reminded of their obligations with regards to the management and protection of tender information.

The Process:

Records will be maintained throughout the process that provide justification for actions/decisions taken and are fully auditable. Scoring sheets will be utilised for all stages.

Outline criteria to be established to determine the ability and capacity of applicants to successfully undertake the service (see later for details), and these criteria will be scored using a pass/fail criteria as part of the overall evaluation of the open tender. Questions can include specific qualifications, organisational membership's technical references, where relevant to ensure a minimum standard required technically and legally to provide the service.

The tender evaluation process is designed to identify the successful contractor/provider and award the contract. Any Organisations can register interest and submit a tender response to the tender advert. For the tender quality evaluation, outline criteria and detailed sub-criteria have been established to determine final contractor selection (see later for details). The weightings for the outline criteria have been set to reflect their respective levels of importance. Weightings for the detailed sub-criteria will be developed and published in the Invitation to Tender.

The tender shall set out how this will be performed so the tenderer can understand how its bid will be evaluated.

A consensus scoring meeting will take place for the final tender quality evaluation where the final evaluation scores will be arrived by consensus of the whole evaluation panel. The final consensus scores will signed and dated by all evaluation panel member's to demonstrate the evaluation is agreed by all.

Unsuccessful applicants/ tenderers will be de-briefed through feedback on the written response

Price: Quality Split

A Price Quality Evaluation will be utilised for the tender evaluation, to conclude final provider selection and award the contract. To arrive at the most appropriate ratio of Price Quality, the aims and objectives, and the contract management/monitoring requirements have been consolidated and categorised according to the main drivers underpinning their achievement i.e. Price, Quality, or a combination of Price and Quality, as follows:-

Categorisation of Key Objectives and Contract Management/Monitoring Requirements		
<u>Price</u>	<u>Quality</u>	<u>Price and Quality</u>
No Disputes	Effective team working	Delivery of Value for Money
	Safe and Healthy Environment for All	Highly Satisfied User/Client
Delivery of project within the available budget	Equality & Diversity	Management and Mitigation of Risk
	Sound contract management	Open, Accurate and Timely Communication
Highly satisfied client	Effective Resident Engagement	
	No Complaints	Effective financial reporting
	Improved personal aspirations	
	Improved behaviour in school	
	Increased confidence	
	Increased self esteem	
	Improved emotional intelligence	
	Increased positive communication	
	Personal developments plans for each student	
	Improved school attendance	
	Exam result targets achieved (improved attainment compared with predicted grades)	
	Individuals make a positive progression into post 16 learning	

Of the xx consolidated aims and objectives, and the contract management/monitoring requirements for the service, 3nr. are derived from price, 16nr. are purely from quality considerations and 4nr. are derived from a combination of both. On the basis of this categorisation, it is proposed that a Price Quality ratio of 20:80 is adopted, in favour of quality.

Evaluation of Tenders

The tender will be divided into three sections

Section One – Technical Capability which will be assessed on a Pass/ Fail

Section Two – Tender Bid – Price Quality

Section Three – Presentation

Those who pass all the questions in Section One will then have their bid evaluated under the Price / Quality Evaluation Criteria detailed in Section Two and the Presentation / Interview stage

The successful bidder will be the highest scoring bid from Price / Quality / Presentation who achieved pass to all questions in Section One

The Evaluation Criteria:

For the tender quality evaluation, criteria have been established to determine final provider selection (see below). The criteria have been cross-referenced against the key aims and objectives of the service. The weightings for the criteria have been set to reflect their respective levels of importance, and a series of questions will be set within the body of the tender documentation to test provider quality credentials in these specific areas.

Some of these criteria are for information only and some are PASS/FAIL criteria. The remaining criteria will be individually awarded a score according to the standard of information provided by the applicant.

For those criteria that constitute PASS/FAIL elements, failure will result in elimination from the process.

The various criteria are listed below, along with the proposed weightings and the presence of PASS/FAIL elements, where applicable.

The criteria are:-

<u>Tender Quality Evaluation Criteria</u>	<u>Weighting</u> <u>%</u>
1. Organisational Information	Information

	Only
3. Financial Information	PASS/FAIL
4. Health & Safety	PASS/FAIL
5. Safeguarding	PASS/FAIL
6. Experience	PASS/FAIL
7. Premier Supplier Scheme	PASS/FAIL
5. Technical Capacity:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed methodology for delivering the service - CV's of persons delivering the service - Outcomes – Proposed Evaluation Methodology - Targets and Supporting Evidence for Outputs - Quality Assurance/Accreditations - Customer Care 	60%
6. Contract Management:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Financial, Budget and Change Management/Reporting 	
7. Social Value:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased number of economically active young people - Enable young people to take personal responsibility for their own career development and future employability - Contribution to the development of strong local networks - Stronger, more cohesive communities - Sustainable development of communities to promote their independence (self-help), ability to thrive and resilience - Local spend - The provider will ensure that all persons employed to deliver the contract are as a minimum paid the national 'living wage'. 	
8. Interview	40%
	100%

Part One – Technical Capability

Part One of the Quality submission details a number of questions which are designed to test the capability of the tenderer to provide the service a minimum standard and each question will be a pass/fail.

A tenderer who scores a fail for any question in part one will be eliminated from the tender process

Part Two –Tender Bid - Quality/Price

Quality Evaluation

The tenderer responses to questions will be individually awarded a score according to the standard of information provided by the applicant. The proposed scoring matrix will be bespoke to each question set and will be in accordance with the tender evaluation and scoring methodology.

Individual questions will be scored on a scale of zero to five and each question is accompanied with a scoring matrix to indicate the level of information required in order to gain a maximum score.

Individual question are weighted as to their importance within the overall marks available to the quality evaluation in the tender.

This highlights to the tenderer the questions which carry the most importance in the selection process

The highest quality score gets 80 points and the others are allocated marks pro rata to the highest scorer.

Therefore in an the example where

Tenderer A scored 75 out of the possible 80 maximum marks

Tenderer A scores 80 marks

Tenderer B scores $45/75 \times 80$ marks = 48

The consensus scores of the tender evaluation panel will be transferred to Price/Quality Evaluation Summary sheets, see example document shown at Appendix A.

Price Evaluation

Tenders which exceed the budget envelope will be rejected; the tender documentation will state the budget envelope which should not be exceeded.

The tender priced submissions will be separately evaluated as part of the tender evaluation. Individual priced components will be summarised into tender figures/bids for the whole of the work/service and for the duration of the contracts.

Unacceptably low or high bids may be discarded. A tender will be assumed to be unacceptably (abnormally) low if of all tenders submitted, it seems to be abnormally low by not providing a margin for a normal level of profit, and the tenderer cannot explain the price on the basis of economy or efficient service delivery method, .

Arithmetically incorrect tenders after checking will be corrected to the arithmetically correct figure

All returned tender submissions will be scored out of 100 points and 20 will be allocated to both price/ and 80 points to quality (20/80 Price/Quality)

Price Evaluation Methodology

The lowest priced tender will receive 20 marks.

The methodology for the calculation for points for other tender is:-

100 points will divided by the lowest tender, multiplied by the difference between the lowest and the tender being compared.

This figure is then deducted from the maximum price points of 100 to determine the price points to be awarded to the tender being compared.

Eg

Lowest acceptable tender = £1,000,000.00 = 100 points

Fourth lowest acceptable tender = £1,250,000.00

Difference between lowest and fourth lowest = £250,000.00

$\frac{100}{£1,000,000} \times 250,000 = 25$ (100 – 25 = 0.75)

£1,000,000

Price points allocated to the fourth bid is 20 X 0.75 = 15 points

The top two total aggregated scores of both price and quality will shortlisted for the presentation. All other tenderers will be eliminated at this stage.

Part Three- Interview / Presentation Stage of the Evaluation

The interview stage will incorporate initial tenderer presentations and the posing of formal interview questions.

The subject of the presentation and the scoring methodology will be detailed in the an invite to the tenderers shortlisted for the presentation stage

Interview questions will be determined to further interrogate the detailed tender evaluation sub-criteria, and address any perceived gaps/issues in the tender documentation and specification identified during the tender submission evaluation stage.

The presentation and response to interview questions will be allocated 40% of the 80% of percentage marks out of the overall evaluation criteria according to the content/standard of responses/experience demonstrated/information provided against the scoring methodology pre determined prior to the presentations.

The tenderer giving the best presentation / interview will attract the maximum score available for the presentation stage (eg 10 marks), with other tenderer (if invited) being scored out, in relation to the highest presentation score.

The interview / presentation will be presented by the tenderers to a wider audience than the tender evaluation panel:-

The selected audience will include the tender evaluation panel and selected users of the service, It is proposed that the users will be forward opinions and view s on the presentations which will be recorded but the scoring of the presentation will be performed by the evaluation panel taking account of users view and opinions

Tender Quality Evaluation Summary

For each quality appraisal stage (stages 2 and 3) the scores of evaluators for each evaluation criteria and the presentation will be discussed for each tenderer, and a consensus score will be agreed by all members of the evaluation panel.

Notes and reasons for the groups consensus scores will be recorded and signed by all evaluation panel members

Prior to incorporating price scores, the evaluation team will undertake a holistic review of the whole quality appraisal, considering all information obtained during Part 2 (tender responses) and), and scoring against pre-determined critical success factors (Yet to be detailed), but shall be concluded and included within the Tender Document . This is a reality check to confirm, or otherwise, the consensus quality scores concluded at Part 2.

APPENDIX A

PRICE/QUALITY/PRESENTATION EVALUATION SUMMARY

TENDERER	PRICE POINTS	PRICE SCORE X 20% (A)	TENDER QUESTIONNAIRE POINTS	INTERVIEW POINTS	TOTAL QUALITY POINTS	QUALITY SCORE X 80% (B)	TOTAL SCORE 100% (A) + (B)	RANKING
Tenderer A								
Tenderer B								
Tenderer C								
Tenderer D								
Tenderer E								
Tenderer F								