



Aide-Memoire: Computers in Homes Tender

To:	Hon Chris Hipkins, Minister of Education
From:	Gillian Dudgeon, Deputy Chief Executive, Delivery
Date:	29 January 2019
Reference:	AM/19/00064

Purpose

1. This aide-memoire provides you with details on funding allocations for the Adult and Community Education (ACE) in Communities 'Digital Literacy – Computers in Homes' contestable round for 2019.
2. The TEC will proactively release this aide-memoire when final funding decisions have been communicated to applicants. Individual applicants' scores and unsuccessful applicants' names in Appendix B will be withheld. We will notify you once all final letters have been sent to applicants.

Background on the process leading to decisions

3. The TEC provided you with an overview of the 'Digital Literacy – Computers in Homes' contestable process in November 2018¹.
4. On 6 November 2018, TEC published information about the ACE in Communities 'Digital Literacy – Computers in Homes' contestable funding on the TEC website. This included application guidelines and an application form.
5. The application deadline was 5 pm on Monday 3 December 2018.

TEC assessed 19 applications

6. Up to \$1.0 million of funding was available for 'Digital Literacy – Computers in Homes' programmes. We received 19 applications, requesting a total of \$4.7 million.
7. In accordance with the published criteria, each application was assessed against four assessment criteria, each scored out of five, and weighted equally. Criteria scores were combined to produce an overall quality score out of 20. Assessment scores were moderated by all the assessors involved in the process to ensure fairness and consistency. The assessment framework is outlined in Appendix A.

¹ B/18/00798, 'Digital Literacy – Computers in Homes' contestable funding for 2019 delivery, 12 November 2018.

8. To ensure a focus on quality, and bearing in mind the limited funding available, the TEC review panel only considered applications achieving a quality score of 14 or better out of 20 for funding. Applications were then considered against other factors such as geographic distribution, value for money, and external evaluation and review (EER) rating.

Six applicants were successful, 12 had an opportunity to respond to our proposed decisions

9. Of the 19 applications received, five applicants were recommended for funding in full, and one applicant was recommended for funding in part.
10. Of the five recommended for funding in full, two of these were new providers (Literacy Taupō Inc. and Porirua City Community IT Educational Trust). Funding for these providers will be subject to them meeting TEC's financial viability requirements.
11. Proposed funding letters were sent to applicants on 24 December 2018.
12. Applicants that were unsuccessful or funded in part were given an opportunity to respond to our proposed decision in accordance with section 159YA(3) of the Education Act (1989). If they wished to provide a response, they had to do so in writing by 11 January 2019.
13. The one applicant approved in part (2020 Communications Trust) accepted its in part allocation.
14. Of the 11 unsuccessful applicants, four applicants² responded to their proposed decline decision. Assessors reviewed these responses and provided further recommendations to the review panel.

Final funding decisions will be communicated with applicants shortly

15. After meeting again in mid-January the TEC review panel considered this advice and recommended no changes to the proposed funding decisions. The full \$1.0 million has now been allocated.³
16. The TEC's final funding decisions and the rationale for these decisions is detailed in Appendix B. Final funding letters will be sent the week commencing 28 January 2019.
17. Once final decisions have been communicated to applicants we will publish a list of successful organisations on the TEC website.



Gillian Dudgeon
Deputy Chief Executive, Delivery
Tertiary Education Commission

___ / ___ / ___

Hon Chris Hipkins
Minister of Education

___ / ___ / ___

² s9(2)(b)(ii) [Redacted]

³ Final funding approval for Literacy Taupō Inc. and Porirua City Community IT Educational Trust is subject to meeting TEC's financial viability requirements.

Appendix A: 'Digital Literacy - Computers in Homes' Assessment Framework

Assessment Criteria	Source	Maximum score
A. Experience in targeting learners whose previous learning was not successful, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • people in low socio-economic groups, and • people who do not have digital technology access in their home. This can also include priority groups, such as Māori and Pasifika.	Application Form	5
B. Experience in raising foundation skills through delivery of digital literacy programme/s.	Application Form	5
C. Demonstrates that learners who have participated in digital literacy programmes are better able to participate in society and life. Participating learners and families have continued access to digital technology after programme completion.	Application Form	5
D. Experience in supporting foundation learners. Support to achieve these outcomes includes learner access to digital technology: access to digital literacy training, access to a device (PC or laptop) in the learner's home, access to subsidised internet, and access to free technical support for up to six months.	Application Form	5
Quality assessment score		20
Value for money – training and services proposed are an acceptable price.	Application Form proposed price	N/A
The cost is appropriate for what is being delivered.	Comparison to other applications	

Rating	Definition	Score
EXCEEDS CRITERION: significantly exceeds the criterion.	Exceeds the criterion. Exceptional demonstration by the Applicant of the relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to meet the criterion. Proposal identifies factors that will offer potential added value, with supporting evidence.	5
MEETS CRITERION: meets the criterion in full, but at a minimal level.	Satisfies the criterion. Demonstration by the Applicant of the relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource, and quality measures required to meet the criterion, with supporting evidence.	3
PARTIALLY MEETS CRITERION: partially meets the criterion, with minor reservations.	Partially meets the criterion with minor reservations. Some minor reservations of the Applicant's relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to meet the criterion, with little or no supporting evidence.	1
DOES NOT MEET CRITERION: significant issues not capable of being resolved.	Does not meet the criterion. Does not comply and/or insufficient information provided to demonstrate that the Applicant has the ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to meet the criterion, with little or no supporting evidence.	0

Appendix B: Funding decisions

Note: The table below is ordered from 'approve in full', 'approve in part', and 'decline'. 70% equals a quality score of 14 out of 20.

Quality score out of 20	Applicant	TEC approved funding (GST excl.)	Rationale for decision
■	Horowhenua Learning Centre Community Trust	\$30,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall quality score exceeded 70% threshold. No learner fees, small internet cost.
■	Literacy Taupō Inc.	\$40,000 ⁴	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall quality score exceeded 70% threshold. No learner fees.
■	Porirua City Community IT Educational Trust	\$100,000 ⁵	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall quality score exceeded 70% threshold. Good value for money for TEC.
■	Target Training Centre Limited	\$134,400	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall quality score met 70% threshold. No learner fees.
■	Capital Training Ltd	\$199,800	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall quality score met 70% threshold. Good value for money for TEC.
■	2020 Communications Trust	\$495,800 (in part)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall quality score exceeded 70% threshold.
■	s9(2)(b)(ii)	\$0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the quality score met the 70% threshold learner's only receive a device post study, which does not align to the fund purpose of providing access to subsidised internet in the learner's home for at least the duration of the programme.
■	s9(2)(b)(ii)	\$0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall quality score did not meet 70% threshold.
■	s9(2)(b)(ii)	\$0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall quality score did not meet 70% threshold. The proposed delivery arrangement (subcontracting) does not meet the conditions of the fund. This condition was communicated clearly during the procurement process.
■	s9(2)(b)(ii)	\$0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall quality score did not meet 70% threshold.
■	s9(2)(b)(ii)	\$0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall quality score did not meet 70% threshold.
■	s9(2)(b)(ii)	\$0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application #1 – Beginners Overall quality score did not meet 70% threshold.
■	s9(2)(b)(ii)	\$0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application #2 – Other Devices Overall quality score did not meet 70% threshold.
■	s9(2)(b)(ii)	\$0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application #3 – Intermediate Overall quality score did not meet 70% threshold.
■	s9(2)(b)(ii)	\$0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall quality score did not meet 70% threshold.
■	s9(2)(b)(ii)	\$0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall quality score did not meet 70% threshold.
■	s9(2)(b)(ii)	\$0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although the quality score met the 70% threshold, the application did not offer good value for money in comparison to other successful applications. Geographic distribution and EER ratings were considered.
■	s9(2)(b)(ii)	\$0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall quality score did not meet 70% threshold.
■	s9(2)(b)(ii)	\$0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall quality score did not meet 70% threshold.

⁴ Subject to meeting TEC financial viability requirements.

⁵ Subject to meeting TEC financial viability requirements.