

# CONTRACT AWARD REPORT

Weekend and Holiday Support for Disabled Children PEO/21049



## 1. BACKGROUND

Plymouth City Council has commissioned a specialist Weekend and Holiday Group Activities for disabled children for 11 years. The activities provide the opportunity for the children and young people to participate in activities that they might not otherwise be able to enjoy. This in turn supports their development of independence skills and their self-confidence.

The current contract expires on 31st March 2022. A tender for a new service was carried out during 2021. The tender for the service was divided into 4 Lots:-

Lot 1: Outdoor Activities

Lot 2: After School Centre Based Activities

Lot 3: Centre Based Day Activities

Lot 4: Brokerage Service

Detailed specifications were included in the Tender documentation to ensure that all providers understood the requirements for the various parts of the service.

The total anticipated budget for the service is £205,000 for a period of 3 years.

Three providers submitted tender bids: Routeways, the incumbent, Endorphins and Plymouth Argyle. Routeways submitted bids for all 4 Lots, Endorphins submitted bids for Lots 2 and 3 and Plymouth Argyle submitted bids for Lots 1, 2 and 3.

## 2. PROCUREMENT PROCESS

The tender was carried out as a one stage process with providers submitting a Selection Questionnaire, Method Statements and a price breakdown for each of the Lots they were bidding for.

The tender was launched on 5<sup>th</sup> November 2021 and the closing date for all submissions was 13<sup>th</sup> December 2021.

The scoring for the tender was as follows:-

- 70% Method Statements
- 30% Commercial Response

The pass mark for providers for the supplier questionnaire was 70%. As a one stage process only the supplier questionnaire for the successful bidder was scored. The following scoring was applied to the supplier questionnaire.

| Section | Title                           | Type of Question | Weighting(%)   |
|---------|---------------------------------|------------------|--|
| 1       | Supplier information            | Information only | Not evaluated and scored   |
| 2       | Grounds for Mandatory Exclusion | Pass/fail        | In the event of a supplier being awarded a 'fail', the remainder of their submission will not be evaluated and they will be eliminated from the process. |

|     |                                     |  |   |
|-----|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| 3   | Grounds for Discretionary Exclusion | Pass/fail                                | In the event of a supplier being awarded a 'fail', the remainder of their submission will not be evaluated and they will be eliminated from the process.        |
| 4   | Economic and Financial Standing     | Pass/Fail                                | In the event of a supplier being awarded a 'fail', the remainder of their submission will not be evaluated and they will be eliminated from the process.        |
| 6   | Technical & Professional Ability    | Scored                                   | 30%   |
| 7   | Modern Slavery Act Requirements     | Pass/Fail                                | In the event of a supplier being awarded a 'fail', the remainder of their submission will not be evaluated and they will be eliminated from the process.        |
| 8   | Additional Questions                |  |   |
| 8.1 | Insurances                          | Pass/Fail                                | In the event of a supplier being awarded a 'fail', the remainder of their submission will not be evaluated and they will be eliminated from the process.        |
| 8.2 | Health & Safety                     | Scored 8.2.2 and Pass/Fail 8.2.1 & 8.2.3 | 5%<br>In the event of a supplier being awarded a 'fail', the remainder of their submission will not be evaluated and they will be eliminated from the process.  |
| 8.3 | Equality and Diversity              | Scored 8.3.2 & 8.3.3 And Pass/Fail 8.3.1 | 10%<br>In the event of a supplier being awarded a 'fail', the remainder of their submission will not be evaluated and they will be eliminated from the process. |
| 8.5 | Quality Management                  | Scored (5%)                              | 5%  |
| 8.6 | Business Capability                 | Scored and Pass/Fail                     | 38%   |
| 8.7 | Social Values                       | Scored and Pass/Fail                     | 12%   |
| 8.8 | Safeguarding                        | Pass/Fail                                | In the event of a supplier being awarded a 'fail', the remainder of their submission will not be evaluated and they will be eliminated from the process.        |
| 8.9 | Data Protection                     | Pass/Fail                                | In the event of a supplier being awarded a 'fail', the remainder of their submission will not be evaluated and they will be eliminated from the process.        |

The evaluation panel comprised of the Short Breaks Manager and the Short Breaks Broker and the Commissioning Officer for SEND services.

The panel each evaluated the method statements scoring individually and a moderation meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2021 met to agree a final moderated score.

### 3. TENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA

Tenders were evaluated using the following scoring framework:

| Weighting %                | Evaluation Criteria   | Breakdown of criteria   |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| <b>COMMERCIAL RESPONSE</b> |   |   |
| 30%                        | Price   | Was scored using the RPI formula.   |
| <b>METHOD STATEMENTS</b>   |   |   |
| MS1                        | Collaboration, Partnerships and Sub-Contracting   | Pass/Fail   |
| MS2                        | Model of service delivery   | 50%   |
| MS2.1                      | Please describe the model of service delivery that your organisation will use for the services you are bidding for.<br>25%  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ethos of the service</li> <li>• How the service is staffed and managed</li> <li>• How staff and managers are recruited, trained and supported</li> <li>• How the performance of the service is monitored</li> <li>• How service delivery contributes to strategic and individual outcomes in a tangible and aspirational way</li> </ul>  |
| MS2.2                      | Describe how you will ensure that your model of service delivery is informed by the views of young people and parents/carers<br>10%   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regular opportunities for young people and parents/carers to share their views</li> <li>• Varied opportunities for young people and parents/carers to share their views, to encourage engagement</li> <li>• How young people's and parent/carers' views will be fed back into service delivery in a practical way</li> <li>• Engagement with wider forms of advocacy and participation for young people and parent/carers</li> </ul> |
| MS2.3                      | There is a broad range of needs of the children and young people who are allocated a place on the sessions. Describe how the service will meet the needs of individual children and young people who attend the group sessions. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The matching process for matching children and young people into the right group</li> <li>• How your service supports inclusion and reduce barriers to access.</li> <li>• The environment that is in place for the group activities</li> </ul>   |
| MS3                        | Partnership Working   | 20%   |

|       |  |  |
|-------|--|--|
| MS3.1 | Please provide detail on how your organisation works with partners to ensure an holistic approach for all children and young people who might access the service | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of partnership working links with other agencies( statutory and non-statutory in the city</li> </ul>   |
| MS4   | <b>Brokerage</b>   | 30%  |
| MS4.1 | Please provide detail on how your organisation will deliver the brokerage role.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of experience in the delivery of a brokerage service for disabled children and their families</li> <li>Evidence of the knowledge of the services available across the city in mainstream and specialist services</li> <li>Description of the model of the brokerage service that will be implemented.</li> </ul> |

#### 4. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION

##### Commercial Response

The prices were submitted with a variety of options for the length of the activities so it was necessary to break them down to an hourly rate per child/young person.

|                        | <b>Lot 1<br/>Score</b> | <b>Lot 2<br/>Score</b> | <b>Lot 3<br/>Score</b> |
|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| <b>Plymouth Argyle</b> | 25.16%                 | 19.99%                 | 10%                    |
| <b>Endorphins</b>      | -----                  | 19.99%                 | 13.64%                 |
| <b>Routeways</b>       | 30%                    | 30%                    | 30%                    |

Routeways submitted the most economically advantageous price and received 30%. For Lot 4 they submitted a price within the allocated budget for the brokerage service. None of the other providers submitted a bid for Lot 4.

##### Method Statements

The method statement scores for each provider are as follows:-

| <b>Provider</b> | <b>MS2.1</b> | <b>MS2.2</b> | <b>MS2.3</b> | <b>MS3.1</b> | <b>MS4</b> |
|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| Endorphins      | 10%          | 6.6%         | 13.2%        | 6.6%         | ---        |
| Plymouth Argyle | 20%          | 6.6%         | 6.6%         | 6.6%         | ---        |
| Routeways       | 30%          | 10%          | 20%          | 20%          | 20%        |

The submissions varied considerably between providers. The evaluation panel felt that two of the providers did not demonstrate a clear understanding of the needs of the children who would be accessing the service. The references and information provided by the two providers centred around more targeted support levels where the children might have needs that are less complex than the needs of the cohort.

**5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The prices quoted by the winning bid are within the agreed budget for the service.

**6. RECOMMENDATIONS**

It is recommended that the contract for the Weekend and Holiday Support for Disabled Children is awarded to Routeways Centre Ltd whose bid was of an excellent quality and clearly showed the organisation's commitment and understanding of the needs of the cohort of children.

It is recommended that all 4 lots are awarded in the contract to Routeways Centre Ltd.

**7. APPROVAL**

**AUTHOR:**

Signature: Penny Whitell.....

Date: 20.12 2021

**AUTHORISED SIGNATORY:**



Print Name: Ming Zhang

Position: Service Director, Education Participation and Skills

Date: 23 December 2021