

# Policy Quality Framework – paper-scoring template

Paper title: \_\_\_\_\_

Assessor name: \_\_\_\_\_

1. After reading each paper, assess its performance against each of the elements of the Policy Quality Framework, and tick yes, no, or N/A as appropriate.
2. Add any comments in the box beneath the elements, noting the paper's strengths and areas for potential improvement.
3. Repeat this for each of the four standards – Context, Analysis, Advice, and Action.
4. When you have assessed the paper against all four standards, this completed scoring template can be used in panel discussions on an overall score for the paper.

## Scale for scoring the quality of advice

Score	Meaning	Description
1	Unacceptable	<p>Does not meet the relevant quality standards in fundamental ways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lacks basic information and analysis</li> <li>• Creates serious risk of poor decision making</li> <li>• Should not have been signed out</li> <li>• Needed fundamental rework</li> </ul>
2	Poor	<p>Does not meet the relevant quality standards in material ways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explains the basic issue but seriously lacking in several important areas</li> <li>• Creates risk of poor decision making</li> <li>• Should not have been signed out</li> <li>• Needed substantial improvement in important areas</li> </ul>
3	Acceptable	<p>Meets the relevant quality standards overall, but with some shortfalls</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides most of the analysis and information needed</li> <li>• Could be used for decision making</li> <li>• Was sufficiently fit-for-purpose for sign-out</li> <li>• Could have been improved in several areas</li> </ul>
4	Good	<p>Meets all the relevant quality standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Represents good practice</li> <li>• Provides a solid basis for decision making</li> <li>• Could have been signed out with confidence</li> <li>• Minor changes would have added polish</li> </ul>
5	Outstanding	<p>Meets all the relevant quality standards and adds something extra</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Represents exemplary practice</li> <li>• First-rate advice that provides a sound basis for confident decision making</li> <li>• Could have been signed out with great confidence</li> <li>• A polished product</li> </ul>

**Context** – explains why the decision maker is getting this and where it fits

	Yes	No	N/A
The paper is clear about the:			
• purpose	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
• context	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
• priorities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
• connections across government.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The paper outlines previous advice and history of the issue.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Comments: What are the paper's strengths? How could it have been improved?			

**Analysis** – is clear, logical and informed by evidence

	Yes	No	N/A
The analysis clearly defines the:			
• problem or opportunity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
• rationale for intervention	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
• policy objectives.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The analysis uses relevant analytical frameworks and methodologies.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The analysis incorporates Treaty and te ao Māori analysis.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The analysis draws on relevant research and evidence.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The analysis assesses options to make impacts clear and reveal workable solutions.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The analysis is clear about any strengths and limitations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The analysis reveals diverse views, experiences and insights, and engagement approaches.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Comments: What are the paper's strengths? How could it have been improved?			

**Advice** – engages the decision maker and tells the full story

	Yes	No	N/A
The advice enables a clear and informed decision or next steps.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The advice is communicated in a clear, concise and compelling way.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The advice is free and frank.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The advice reflects diverse sector perspectives.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The advice outlines risks and mitigations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The advice anticipates the decision maker’s needs, next steps, and is timely.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Comments: What are the paper’s strengths? How could it have been improved?			

**Action** – identifies who is doing what next

	Yes	No	N/A
The actions enable effective implementation.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The actions explain how the policy solution will be monitored and evaluated.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Comments: What are the paper’s strengths? How could it have been improved?			

**Overall panel rating for paper**

Based on consideration of the ratings above and panel discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the paper, the panel should collectively assign an overall score between 1 and 5.

/ 5

**If this paper is an exemplar, retain it for future reference and make it available for others as an example of best practice.**