

Commercial Team  
2 Staffordshire Place  
Tipping Street  
Stafford  
ST16 2DH

Name: Clare Kinvig-Jenkinson  
Email : [Clare.Kinvig-Jenkinson@staffordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Clare.Kinvig-Jenkinson@staffordshire.gov.uk)

**SUBJECT TO CONTRACT**

**Ref:** IA3441

**RESTRICTED**

**Date:** 20th October 2025

**Award Decision Notice**

**Assessment Summary**

**Light Touch Framework Agreement for the Provision of IA3441 Children's  
Community Care Framework**

**Find a Tender Service Unique Identifier ocds-h6vhtk-050f24.**

This is an assessment summary under section 50 of the Procurement Act 2023.

Thank you for your organisation's tender submission for the a forementioned procurement.

Following a comprehensive evaluation of all the tender submissions for the Light Touch Framework, I am pleased to advise you that, subject to the information set out below, your organisation has been successful, and it is the Staffordshire County Council's intention to enter into the Light Touch Framework with your organisation for the following Lots:

LOT	NORTH	SOUTH	EAST	WEST
1	N/A	YES	YES	YES
2	N/A	YES	YES	YES
3	N/A	YES	YES	YES
4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	N/A	YES	YES	YES

For the avoidance of doubt this letter is not the conclusion of the Light Touch Framework. Any expenditure incurred prior to concluding the Light Touch Framework is entirely at your organisations risk.

The Procurement Act 2023 requires Staffordshire County Council to allow a mandatory 8-working-day standstill period between notification of the award decision and the conclusion of

the Light Touch Framework. The conclusion of the Light Touch Framework will be arranged on the earliest practical date following the expiry of the standstill period which is expected to expire on 31st October 2025.

In the event there is any delay your organisation will be notified at the earliest opportunity.

The assessment summary for your organisation's submission is provided at **Annex A**. This sets out the scores, and the rationale for those scores, against each of the assessment criteria. As a reminder, the full assessment methodology can be found within the Procurement Pack, **section 51** onwards.

Where you already have the required evidence of the following, please forward it on to us. However, where you need to obtain it, it must be evidenced in full within 3 working days after the end of the standstill period. Please forward all evidence to [Commercial.Team@staffordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Commercial.Team@staffordshire.gov.uk) and clearly mark it evidence for IA3441.

Please provide evidence that your organisation holds the required levels of insurance stated in the tender/contract: -

- £5 million Employers (Compulsory) Liability Insurance is required in respect of each and every claim.
- £10 million Public Liability Insurance is required in respect of each and every claim.
- £2 million Professional Indemnity Insurance is required in respect of each and every claim.
- £2 million Medical Malpractice liability cover, in respect of any one claim and in the aggregate. [Lots 2 and 4 ONLY]
- Building and Contents insurance, this insurance will cover both accidental and non-accidental damage. [Applicable to suppliers who will deliver their service at a centre/base]

A copy of this certification is required from your organisation's insurance company.

If the terms and conditions of the contract require your company to obtain appropriate Disclosure and Barring Service ('DBS') clearance for relevant members of your staff/personnel, please ensure that this is completed prior to the Framework commencement.

If your attestation details have changed since those stated in the Procurement Specific Questionnaire, please forward these details together with this signed letter.

I should be grateful if your organisation would acknowledge receipt and understanding of this letter by signing and dating the copy of this letter as below. Please forward the signed copy to [Commercial.Team@staffordshire.gov.uk](mailto:Commercial.Team@staffordshire.gov.uk) or alternatively return by post.

Yours faithfully,



Procurement Manager for and on  
behalf of Commercial Team

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENT (IA3441)**

I hereby acknowledge the receipt of this letter:

Signed .....

Print name and position in company.....

.....

Date: .....

Company name.....

## **Annex A – Assessment Summary – Most Advantageous Tender**

### **LOT1**

Criterion Title	Weighting (%)	Scoring Scale*	Score Awarded (and %)	Explanation of Score
<b><u>QUALITY</u></b>				
5.1 Staffing and Organisational Flexibility	8%	0 – 5	3/5 (4.80%)	<p>Satisfactory and acceptable response (substantial compliance with no major concerns).</p> <p>The Evaluation Panel feedback included that the response provided some information on how the Bidder would manage staffing cover periods, including possible changes and exit arrangements. Information was provided on the recruitment and selection of staff, and the challenges of this and the Bidder demonstrated a commitment to training. The Bidders' retention strategy demonstrated that they had a clear vision of workforce levels and an understanding of natural turnover and career progression and provided the right level of detail. Information on supervisions, appraisals, training and an overview of the workforce was provided. A risk assessment policy, workforce development strategy, training and supervision matrix were also submitted as requested.</p> <p>However, there was limited information on succession planning and cross-training to mitigate risk. It was noted there was the potential for over-reliance on key individuals for specialist roles and the 30-minute response time goal is ambitious, but the plan did not fully address how this standard is maintained during peak demand, severe weather, or staff shortages.</p>
5.2 Quality and Safeguarding	12%	0 – 5	3/5 (7.20%)	<p>Satisfactory and acceptable response (substantial compliance with no major concerns).</p> <p>The Evaluation Panel feedback included that the service would be tailored to meet the needs of the C/YP. The response covered that the Bidder would ensure staff cover that can provide a continuous service. Managing unplanned events was covered in sufficient detail. The support for one, two hours or more, to potentially overnight part of the question was covered. Also, how the Bidder</p>

				<p>would link universal services into the delivery of their support was provided with an example.</p> <p>However, the response provided information on the processes and systems that would be in place to assure quality and how the Bidder would resolve any issues identified was alluded to but not really covered in detail. The Bidder provided information on their experiences of working with Children's Safeguarding Teams (CST) but there was a lack of depth on the "how" they have worked with CST. There was also limited detail and depth on cultural competency, and while escalation procedures are in place, the role and independence of external advocacy was not clearly defined. The use of SMART objectives and validated tools is positive, but there was no mention of how subjective wellbeing or qualitative feedback is incorporated. While transition success rates are high, there was limited detail on how long-term follow-up or post-transition support is managed and although satisfaction surveys are conducted monthly, there was no mention of how C/YP are involved in service design or governance.</p>
5.3 Person Centred Care and a Restorative Approach to Care Planning	8%	0 – 5	2/5 (3.20%)	<p>Partially acceptable response (one or more areas of major weakness).</p> <p>The Evaluation Panel feedback included that the services are rooted in co-production, ensuring children and families are active participants in planning and decision-making. That therapeutic engagement methods, including trauma-informed care and creative therapies, would support emotional wellbeing and communication. Multidisciplinary collaboration across social care, health, and education ensures holistic and coordinated support and that every child receives care that is tailored to their unique needs, strengths, and aspirations. The response covered that the Bidder's approach empowers C/YP to thrive, promoting independence, confidence, and long-term positive outcomes.</p> <p>However, there was a lack of depth and detail in the response to this question as it was predominately statement based. The constant reference of staff and their expertise/ qualifications was also unnecessary and detracted from the answer to the question.</p>
LOT 1 Case Study 5.4	12%	0 – 5	3/5 (7.20%)	<p>Satisfactory and acceptable response (substantial compliance with no major concerns).</p>

				<p>The Evaluation Panel feedback included that In the response the Bidder expresses an intention to deliver a holistic, child-focused, and culturally responsive model of support with an emphasis on personalised care planning and outcome tracking. The approach also aims to foster independence, emotional wellbeing, and meaningful inclusion in the community.</p> <p>However, the response lacked consistency and depth in tackling all aspects of the question. The Bidder's approach leans heavily on outcome statistics and improvement percentages, which could be overly optimistic given the complexity of the C/YP involved and may overshadow the nuanced needs of the children. The response reads more like a promotional document than a grounded, child-led service plan. Also, the presentation of the response was easy to read but the graphs did not really provide much information, it was hard to understand their purpose.</p>
<b>Total Quality</b>			<b>22.40%</b>	
<b><u>PRICE</u></b>				
<b>Total Price SOUTH</b>	60%		<b>40.35%</b>	*The <b>price</b> is converted into a score relative to the lowest price bid and is then converted into a score using the appropriate weighting from the main criteria table. The other bid prices are awarded a percentage relative to the lowest price bid and converted into a score using the appropriate weighting from the main criteria table. Refer to the Procurement Pack.
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>62.75%</b>	
<b>Total Price EAST</b>	60%		<b>39.47%</b>	See*
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>61.87%</b>	
<b>Total Price WEST</b>	60%		<b>38.63%</b>	See*
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>61.03%</b>	

Criterion Title	Weighting (%)	Scoring Scale*	Score Awarded (and %)	Explanation of Score
<b><u>QUALITY</u></b>				
5.1 Staffing and Organisational Flexibility	8%	0 – 5	3/5 (4.80%)	As above
5.2 Quality and Safeguarding	12%	0 – 5	3/5 (7.20%)	As above
5.3 Person Centred Care and a Restorative Approach to Care Planning	8%	0 – 5	2/5 (3.20%)	As above
LOT 2 Case Study 5.5	12%	0 – 5	3/5 (7.20%)	<p>Satisfactory and acceptable response (substantial compliance with no major concerns).</p> <p>The Evaluation Panel feedback included that the Bidder would offer consistency and continuity of care via the use of primary and secondary carers to ensure Chloe receives support from familiar individuals who understand her needs, preferences, and routines. The Bidder would aim to provide emotional security, reduce anxiety, and build trust. The response demonstrated foresight in planning for logistical, environmental, and scheduling challenges. The care model “goes beyond task completion” to support family well-being and confidence. The Bidder offered daily communication updates and weekly family meetings and flexible scheduling during hospital discharge transitions. The Bidder would also aim for a partnership approach with families, to allow them to feel informed, supported, and empowered.</p>

				However, while the Bidder's proposal demonstrated strong operational planning and a performance-driven approach, it lacked meaningful evidence of co-production and the child's voice. The narrative was heavily focused on service delivery metrics, contingency planning, and managerial oversight, which, while important, can come across as a sales-oriented pitch rather than a child-centred care plan. There was limited reference to how Chloe's preferences, aspirations, or communication style have shaped the proposed care model. Similarly, the role of the family in co-designing the support package was not clearly articulated.
<b>Total Quality</b>			<b>22.40%</b>	
<b><u>PRICE</u></b>				
<b>Total Price SOUTH</b>	60%		<b>60.00%</b>	See*
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>82.40%</b>	
<b>Total Price EAST</b>	60%		<b>60.00%</b>	See*
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>82.40%</b>	
<b>Total Price WEST</b>	60%		<b>60.00%</b>	See*
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>82.40%</b>	

### LOT 3

Criterion Title	Weighting (%)	Scoring Scale*	Score Awarded (and %)	Explanation of Score
<b><u>QUALITY</u></b>				
5.1 Staffing and Organisational Flexibility	8%	0 – 5	3/5 (4.80%)	As above



5.2 Quality and Safeguarding	12%	0 – 5	3/5 (7.20%)	As above
5.3 Person Centred Care and a Restorative Approach to Care Planning	8%	0 – 5	2/5 (3.20%)	As above
LOT 3 Case Study 5.6	12%	0 – 5	4/5 (9.60%)	<p>Fully satisfactory / very good response (fully compliant with requirements).</p> <p>The Evaluation Panel feedback included that the Bidder would personalise support through co-designed care plans, tailored to Paul's preferences and needs. The response also covered how the Bidder would ensure that activities were non-discriminatory, accessible and safe, and would promote independence and community participation. The Bidder also explained the short and long-term plan for Paul's development and preparation for adulthood.</p> <p>The response sets out a robust solution that fully addresses and meets the requirements but does not exceed them.</p>
<b>Total Quality</b>			<b>24.80%</b>	
<b><u>PRICE</u></b>				
<b>Total Price SOUTH</b>	60%		<b>44.28%</b>	See*
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>69.08%</b>	
<b>Total Price EAST</b>	60%		<b>43.23%</b>	See*
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>68.03%</b>	
<b>Total Price WEST</b>	60%		<b>42.22%</b>	See*
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>67.02%</b>	

Criterion Title	Weighting (%)	Scoring Scale*	Score Awarded (and %)	Explanation of Score
<b><u>QUALITY</u></b>				
5.1 Staffing and Organisational Flexibility	8%	0 – 5	3/5 (4.80%)	As above
5.2 Quality and Safeguarding	12%	0 – 5	3/5 (7.20%)	As above
5.3 Person Centred Care and a Restorative Approach to Care Planning	8%	0 – 5	2/5 (3.20%)	As above
LOT 6 Case Study 5.9	12%	0 – 5	4/5 (9.60%)	<p>Fully satisfactory / very good response (fully compliant with requirements).</p> <p>The Evaluation Panel feedback included that the response demonstrated the Bidder would deliver a programme that is tailored to Kristen’s unique needs as an autistic individual. The Bidder would incorporate visual supports, sensory regulation strategies, executive function support and communication preferences. The Bidder stated that the aim is that Kristen is not forced into unfamiliar situations but is supported in a way that respects how she experiences the world. The use of graduated exposure therapy and systematic desensitisation allows Kristen to build confidence at her own pace, starting with virtual tours and home-based exercises before progressing to real-world experiences. This would reduce the risk of her being overwhelmed and would build sustainable habits. The Bidder offers long-term planning with phased support reduction and peer support network development. The Bidder would also offer emergency protocols and self-advocacy training with the aim that</p>

				<p>Kristen is not only able to attend the gym independently but is equipped with lifelong skills for broader independence.</p> <p>The response sets out a robust solution that fully addresses and meets the requirements but does not exceed them.</p>
<b>Total Quality</b>			<b>24.80%</b>	
<b><u>PRICE</u></b>				
<b>Total Price SOUTH</b>	60%		<b>35.30%</b>	See*
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>60.10%</b>	
<b>Total Price EAST</b>	60%		<b>34.58%</b>	See*
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>59.38%</b>	
<b>Total Price WEST</b>	60%		<b>33.89%</b>	See*
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>58.69%</b>	

#### Additional information

Bidders have been ranked on the framework by their grand total per Lot and Geographical Area; however, Call-Offs will be awarded in accordance with the Competed Services Award Criteria as set out in 4.3 of the Framework Agreement.