

Policy Quality Framework: Paper-scoring template

Title of paper: _____

Assessor name: _____

- 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.
- Add any comments in the box beneath the elements, noting the paper's strengths and areas for potential improvement.
- Repeat this for each of the four standards – Context, Analysis, Advice, and Action.
- When you've 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	Quality level	Criteria
1	Unacceptable	Does not meet the relevant quality standards in fundamental ways <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lacks basic information and analysis• Creates serious risk of poor decision making• Should not have been signed out• Needed fundamental rework
2	Poor	Does not meet the relevant quality standards in material ways <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Explains the basic issue but seriously lacking in several important areas• Creates risk of poor decision making• Should not have been signed out• Needed substantial improvement in important areas
3	Acceptable	Meets the relevant quality standards overall, but with some shortfalls <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provides most of the analysis and information needed• Could be used for decision making• Was sufficiently fit-for-purpose for sign-out• Could have been improved in several areas
4	Good	Meets all the relevant quality standards <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Represents good practice• Provides a solid basis for decision making• Could have been signed out with confidence• Minor changes would have added polish
5	Outstanding	Meets all the relevant quality standards and adds something extra <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Represents exemplary practice• First-rate advice that provides a sound basis for confident decision making• Could have been signed out with great confidence• A polished product



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"/>
<p>Comments: What are the paper’s strengths? How could it have been improved?</p>			

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 on 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"/>
<p>Comments: What are the paper's strengths? How could it have been improved?</p>			

Actions – 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 paper's strengths and weaknesses, the panel should collectively assign an overall score between 1 and 5.

/ 5