

RELEVANCE

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA: The extent to which the proposal meets the criteria of the strategic component.

When assessing the RELEVANCE criteria, assessors will consider how well the proposal addresses each of the following questions:

- Does the proposal outline and are the selection(s) relevant for:
 - one or more of the NRSPs, or
 - categories of PDMF funding
- Does the proposal have a coherent story from identifying an issue, stating the approach to be taken, through to anticipated results? i.e. does the proposed approach link logically to addressing the issue?
- Does the issue outlined require additional funding to be addressed?
- Does the proposal benefit learners?

1

Insufficient

Does not meet criteria

The proposal outlines:
- one or more NRSPs, or
- categories of PDMF funding, but the proposal shows limited relevance to these.

The proposal design is not fit for purpose, does not have a logical flow, there is little or no link between the approach and proposed results/outcomes.

The proposed approach shows no evidence of why additional funding is required for this purpose.

The proposal does not provide any obvious benefits for learners.

2

Acceptable

Meets criteria

The proposal outlines:
- one or more NRSPs, or
- categories of PDMF funding, and the proposal shows good relevance to these.

The proposal design is suitable and makes logical sense from issue through to results/outcomes.

The approach outlined is suitable, and there is acceptable evidence of why additional funding is required for this purpose.

The proposal presents good evidence of benefits for learners.

3

Strong

Excellent proposal

The proposal outlines:
- one or more NRSPs, or
- categories of PDMF funding, and the proposal shows definite, clear relevance to these.

The proposal design is exemplary and shows excellent logic from issue through to results/outcomes.

The approach outlined is excellent and includes clear rationale for additional funding in order to achieve its aims.

The proposal presents desirable and excellent benefits for learners.

ALIGNMENT

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA: The extent to which the proposal aligns with the PTE’s wider operations, including delivery and learner components.

When assessing the ALIGNMENT criteria, assessors will consider how well the proposal addresses each of the following questions:

- Does the proposal fit with current provision and planned future operations?
- Does the proposal align with existing delivery and learner needs?
- If applicable (proposing to develop a new programme), does the proposal outline any considerations for new geographical or subject areas?
- Does the proposal show clear alignment with advice from WDCs, RSLGs, and show links to the TES?

<p>1</p> <p>Insufficient</p> <p><i>Does not meet criteria</i></p>	<p>2</p> <p>Acceptable</p> <p><i>Meets criteria</i></p>	<p>3</p> <p>Strong</p> <p><i>Excellent proposal</i></p>
<p>The proposal does not include evidence of alignment to existing and future operations.</p>	<p>The proposal clearly considers and provides good evidence of alignment to existing and future operations.</p>	<p>There is excellent evidence that the proposal considers and provides comprehensive alignment with existing and future operations.</p>
<p>The proposal does not provide any evidence of relationships to existing delivery and learner needs.</p>	<p>The proposal provides clear and acceptable evidence of relationships to existing delivery and learner needs.</p>	<p>The proposal provides excellent evidence of relationships to existing delivery and learner needs.</p>
<p>If applicable (proposing to develop a new programme), does not consider current geographical or subject delivery.</p>	<p>If applicable (proposing to develop a new programme), clearly considers and explains links with current geographical or subject delivery, and identifies some risks.</p>	<p>If applicable (proposing to develop a new programme), evidently considers and explains links with current geographical or subject delivery, and identifies any risks and possible mitigations for these.</p>
<p>The proposal outlines little or no alignment with advice from WDCs, RLSGs, and links to the TES.</p>	<p>The proposal details multiple areas of alignment with advice from WDCs, RLSGs, and links to the TES, and these are explained.</p>	<p>The proposal has multiple, strong links and areas of alignment with advice from WDCs, RLSGs, and links to the TES, and these are explained clearly.</p>

NEED

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA: the extent to which the proposal will address identified need, including how key partners and stakeholders (e.g. WDCs, industry, Māori and iwi) have and will be involved, and the extent to which it will complement and enable the network of provision.

When assessing the NEED criteria, assessors will consider how well the proposal addresses each of the following questions:

- Does the proposal outline an evidence base of need?
- For NRSP: Does the proposal explain relevance to regional/national area(s) of delivery, and to regional and national needs?
- For PDMF: Does the proposal support the development and review of programmes that reflect industry and community need?
- Does the proposal have support from relevant stakeholders, including industry, community, businesses and employers?
- Does the proposal include sufficient input from Māori and/or iwi?
- If applicable, does the proposal outline how any collaborations, partnerships or joint application will benefit the approach?

<p>1 Insufficient <i>Does not meet criteria</i></p>	<p>2 Acceptable <i>Meets criteria</i></p>	<p>3 Strong <i>Excellent proposal</i></p>
<p>The proposal includes no evidence of need.</p>	<p>The proposal clearly considers and explains an evidence base of need.</p>	<p>The proposal includes an extensive evidence base of need.</p>
<p>For NRSP: the proposal does not show any relevance to regional/national delivery or needs.</p>	<p>For NRSP: the proposal shows clear links to need at a regional/national delivery level.</p>	<p>For NRSP: the proposal shows excellent and strong links to need at a regional/national delivery level.</p>
<p>For PDMF: the proposal does not explain any links to industry or community need for the programme(s).</p>	<p>For PDMF: the proposal explains some links to industry or community need for the programme(s).</p>	<p>For PDMF: the proposal has strong and clearly developed links to industry or community need for the programme(s).</p>
<p>The proposal shows no evidence of input from stakeholders at any stage.</p>	<p>The proposal includes adequate input and evidence of support from one or more stakeholders.</p>	<p>The proposal shows strong relationships with a range of stakeholders, and clearly evidences support from relevant industry, businesses or employers.</p>
<p>The proposal does not include appropriate input from Māori.</p>	<p>The proposal has adequate input from Māori at the appropriate stage(s) for the approach.</p>	<p>The proposal includes outstanding engagement with Māori at the appropriate stage(s) for the approach.</p>
<p>If applicable, the proposal does not outline how collaborations, partnerships or joint application will be of benefit.</p>	<p>If applicable, the proposal clearly outlines how collaborations, partnerships or joint application will be of benefit.</p>	<p>If applicable, the proposal gives an excellent explanation of how collaborations, partnerships or joint application will be of benefit.</p>

CAPABILITY AND VALUE

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA: whether the PTE is able to deliver the proposal and its intended outcomes, including the extent to which the proposed funding demonstrates value for money comparable to similar proposals.

When assessing the CAPABILITY AND VALUE criteria, assessors will consider how well the proposal addresses each of the following questions:

- Does the proposal demonstrate relevant capability and previous delivery history and relationships to give confidence the PTE can successfully implement it?
- Does the proposal outline how the PTE plans to measure outcomes/benefits?
- Are at least three milestones, key deliverables, and payments outlined?
- Is there a high-level breakdown of proposed costs, including the total funding requested?
- Do the activities and amounts show effective prioritisation and use of resources?

<p>1</p> <p>Low quality</p> <p><i>Does not meet criteria</i></p>	<p>2</p> <p>Acceptable</p> <p><i>Meets criteria</i></p>	<p>3</p> <p>Strong</p> <p><i>Excellent proposal</i></p>
<p>The proposal does not demonstrate relevant capability to deliver and implement.</p>	<p>The proposal clearly demonstrates relevant capability to deliver and implement.</p>	<p>The proposal shows exemplary demonstration of relevant capability to deliver and implement.</p>
<p>The proposal does not outline how the PTE plans to measure outcomes/benefits?</p>	<p>The proposal clearly outlines how the PTE plans to measure outcomes/benefits?</p>	<p>There is excellent evidence that shows how the PTE plans to measure outcomes/benefits?</p>
<p>The proposal does not include milestones, deliverables or payments.</p>	<p>The proposal includes adequate milestones, with deliverables and payments.</p>	<p>The proposal clearly outlines a number of milestones appropriate to the size of the proposal, with deliverables and payments.</p>
<p>The proposal does not include a high-level breakdown of costs.</p>	<p>The proposal clearly outlines high-level costs, and total funding requested.</p>	<p>The proposal provides an excellent outline of high-level costs, and total funding requested.</p>
<p>The activities and amounts listed (if any) do not show effective prioritisation and use of resources.</p>	<p>The activities and amounts are reasonable, and show effective prioritisation and use of resources.</p>	<p>The activities and amounts are desirable, and show excellent prioritisation and use of resources.</p>