



**Te Tāhuhu o
te Mātauranga**
Ministry of Education

Ministry of Education Procurement Recommendation Report

Curriculum and Assessment Change Programme Phase 5 Subject Advisors EOI

Document Control	
Prepared by:	Catherine Law and Smita Bhula
Title:	Phase 5 Programme Lead and Programme Manager
Business unit:	Curriculum and Assessment Change Programme
Document version:	1.0
Date of last revision:	23 January 2026
Status:	FINAL

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
Approvals.....	3
Recommendation Endorsement.....	3
Approval of the Evaluation Panel Recommendation	3
Summary	4
The Procurement.....	5
Recommendation of the Evaluation Panel	6
Negotiation Recommendations	8
Applications Received	8
Evaluation Process	9
Conflicts of Interest.....	9
Appendix 1: Compliance and Due Diligence	10
Appendix 2: Procurement Plan.....	10
Appendix 3: Shortlist of Applicants and Cost.....	11
Appendix 4: Scoring and Evaluation Plan	17
Appendix 5: Evidence of Briefing and Evaluation Sessions	19
Appendix 6: Non-compliant Application Exclusions	20
Appendix 7: Applications Not Shortlisted	20
Appendix 8: Evaluation and Moderation Workbook	23
Appendix 9: Evaluation Adjustments	24

Approvals


Recommendation Endorsement

The scoring member(s) of the Evaluation Panel (EP)			
Approval that all applications were evaluated as planned. Endorse the EP recommendation(s).			
Name	Title	Signature	Date
Catherine Law	Programme Lead Phase 5	Approved by e-mail	16 January 2026
s9(2)(a)	General Manager, New Zealand Curriculum and Te Whāriki	Approved by e-mail	14 January 2026
Kiritina Johnstone	General Manager, Te Uepū Reo Māori	Approved by e-mail	14 January 2026
Rob Mill	General Manager, Qualifications and Pathways	Approved by e-mail	12 January 2026
Wiki Upward	Manager, Perspectives	Approved by e-mail	15 January 2026

Approval of the Evaluation Panel Recommendation

Chair of the Evaluation Panel			
Approval:	The evaluation of applications has been carried out as planned and the rankings of applicants accurately reflects the Evaluation Panels conclusions.		
Name & title	Alister McLeod		
Signature	Approved by e-mail	Date	14 January 2026

Acceptance of the Recommendation and Authority to Proceed

Project Sponsor / Business Owner			
Approval to:	Accept the Evaluation Panel's recommendation(s) and proceed to contract.		
Name & Title	s9(2)(a) Programme Manager CACP		
Signature:	Approved by e-mail	Date:	16 January 2026
Procurement			
Procurement Manager Signature:	Pru Popple, Manager Procurement Services 	Date:	21/01/2026
Chief Procurement Officer Signature:	Chris Richards, Acting CPO 	Date:	30.01.2026

Summary

Procurement Title	Curriculum and Assessment Change Programme Phase 5 Subject Advisors EOI
Procurement Process	<p>Best characterised as a light-touch, two step procurement process which is deemed appropriate for the proposed contract values and risk profile.</p> <p>Step 1: Release of a closed Expression of Interest (EOI) to the relevant associations/organisations inviting applications.</p> <p>Step 2: Applications evaluated by the Evaluation Panel using the information / CV provided to enable an assessment against the requirements/criteria to identify suitable candidates to contract with.</p>
Contract Type	<p>Depending on the applicants selected, one of the following forms of contract will be offered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government Model Contract (GMC); • Statement of Work (SoW) (or prescribed contract form if contracting via a supply panel or Ministry Master Agreement); or • Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) (with a school or kura).
Project Code	50376-4122-2517 Departmental
Report Purpose	The purpose of this Procurement Recommendation Report is to document the procurement process and recommend a shortlist of applicants to offer contracts to.
Background	<p>The redesign of the New Zealand Curriculum (NZC) and Te Marautanga o Aotearoa (TMoA) aims to ensure that the national curriculum is knowledge-rich, internationally comparable, and clear about what students need to understand, know, and do from Years 0 to 13, along with the evidence-based teaching practices to use.</p> <p>The phase 5 National Curriculum content is being developed and released with the objective of delivering the full National Curriculum for schools and kura to use in Year 11 by the start of 2028 and for Year 12 in 2029 and Year 13 in 2030.</p> <p>Phase 5 will focus on the joint development of subject content and assessment frameworks for both NZC and TMoA. This work aims to ensure coherence, clarity, and equity across curriculum pathways. This phase will include development of approximately 48 Year 11 Subjects, 72 Year 12 Subjects and 74 Year 13 Subjects. Key areas of development include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and practices for each subject • Detailed content and contexts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachability and pathways <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Diversity and inclusion • Assessment <p>To implement the changes, Subject Advisors (SAs) are being engaged to contribute to the content and assessment development of subjects that the Ministry will review and refine as per the design criteria and principles. The SAs will be a mix of university, subject association and school based disciplinary experts.</p> <p>The approved Procurement Plan can be found in Appendix 2.</p>
Preferred Applicant(s)	<p>At the time of EOI closing on Friday 12 December 2025, 342 applications had been received.</p> <p>Due to the large number of subjects and shortlisted applicants per subject please refer to the table in Appendix 3 for details of the 182 shortlisted applicants.</p>

Whole-of-life Costs (WOLC)	The table below provides a summary of the estimated WOLC cost per contract for the shortlisted applicants listed in Appendix 3 . The summary outlines the role type, whether work is scheduled during the school term or school holidays, the expected effort (in days) and the associated cost based on the subjects allocated to each Subject Advisor and Subject Advisor Reviewer.												
	Role	Work Period	Rate per day	Effort (Days)				Cost based on Subjects Allocated					
	Subject Advisor - Teacher	School Term	s9(2)(j)	1 Subject	2 Subjects	3 Subjects	4 Subjects	8 Subjects	1 Subject	2 Subjects	3 Subjects	4 Subjects	8 Subjects
	Subject Advisor - Teacher	School Holidays											
	Subject Advisor - Teacher	Expenses											
	Total Subject Advisor - Teacher												
	Subject Advisor - Non Teacher	Term											
	Subject Advisor - Non Teacher	Holiday											
	Subject Advisor - Non Teacher	Expenses											
	Total Subject Advisor - Non Teacher												
	Subject Advisor Reviewer - Teacher	School Term											
	Subject Advisor Reviewer - Teacher	School Holidays											
	Subject Advisor Reviewer - Teacher	Expenses											
	Total Subject Advisor Reviewer - Teacher												
	Subject Advisor Reviewer - Non Teacher	Term											
Subject Advisor Reviewer - Non Teacher	Holiday												
Subject Advisor Reviewer - Non Teacher	Expenses												
Total Subject Advisor Reviewer - Non Teacher													
The estimated WOLC for all contracts excluding GST is s9(2)(j)													
Budget	It is confirmed that the funding to cover the costs is available within the Curriculum and Assessment Change Programme (CACP) budget.												
Benchmark Costs	The estimated cost for contracting the shortlisted applicants listed in Appendix 3 is s9(2)(j). This cost is below the estimate of up to s9(2)(j) outlined in the Procurement Plan.												

The Procurement

Ministerial Priority(ies)	<p>The Ministerial Priority Outcomes that this procurement will seek to achieve are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clearer Curriculum <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Better Approach to Literacy and Numeracy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Smarter Assessment and Reporting <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Improved Teaching Training <input type="checkbox"/> Stronger Learning Support <input type="checkbox"/> Greater use of Data <input type="checkbox"/> [other] [specify the details] 																	
EOI Dates	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>EOI publish date</td> <td>Date</td> <td>28/11/2025</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EOI submission deadline</td> <td>Date</td> <td>12/12/2025</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Evaluation panel briefing date</td> <td>Date</td> <td>17/12/2025</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Evaluation panel moderation</td> <td>Date</td> <td>17/12/2025</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Final evaluation meeting date</td> <td>Date</td> <td>19/12/2025</td> </tr> </table> <p>The timeline outlined in the Procurement Plan was not met.</p> <p>The initial Subject Matter Advisor contracts were scheduled to be in place by the end of November 2025. This was delayed primarily due to the plan to release the Subject Descriptors before the Expressions of Interest. Finalising the Subject Descriptors took longer than expected, and the approach was amended to release the Subject Descriptors and the Expressions of Interest together in one communication to the sector.</p> <p>However, due to the additional feedback and approval required by the Minister on the Subject Descriptors, the communications had to be decoupled, resulting in the Expressions of Interest being released separately on 28 November 2025, with a closing date of 12 December 2025.</p> <p>Despite this delay, the majority of Subject Matter Advisor contracts are expected to be in place by the end of March 2026, as per the Procurement Plan.</p> <p>Evidence of the evaluation briefing can be found in Appendix 5.</p>			EOI publish date	Date	28/11/2025	EOI submission deadline	Date	12/12/2025	Evaluation panel briefing date	Date	17/12/2025	Evaluation panel moderation	Date	17/12/2025	Final evaluation meeting date	Date	19/12/2025
EOI publish date	Date	28/11/2025																
EOI submission deadline	Date	12/12/2025																
Evaluation panel briefing date	Date	17/12/2025																
Evaluation panel moderation	Date	17/12/2025																
Final evaluation meeting date	Date	19/12/2025																

Contract Information	Contract Type	Either GMC, MOU, Service Agreement or SOW as is appropriate to each applicant.	
	Contract start date – As soon as approved	Date	26 January 2026
	Contract end date	Date	18 December 2026
	Initial term of the contracts	11 months	
	Right of Renewal	None	
	Ministry Contract Manager	Catherine Law, Programme Lead Phase 5	

Recommendation of the Evaluation Panel

Preferred Applicant(s)	<p>The Evaluation Panel recommends the 182 shortlisted applicants, as per Appendix 3, as representing the best overall expertise.</p> <p>It is recommended that the Ministry enters into appropriate contracts with the preferred applicants.</p> <p>Please refer to the list of 182 selected applicants in Appendix 3.</p> <p>The decision for the recommendation is based on the evaluation of candidates' CVs, experience in curriculum design and/or other curriculum systems, understanding of and commitment to designing a knowledge rich curriculum, assessment specification experience.</p>
Engagement Risks	<p>The risks identified during the procurement planning process have been reviewed and the CACP Risk Register has been updated.</p> <p>New risks that have been identified will be monitored throughout the contracting and/or post-award stages.</p> <p>These risks include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited Availability of Subject Advisors <p>If selected subject advisors are not available for the required timeframes, then the design and development of the subjects may not be completed as scheduled, resulting in delays to programme milestones and pressure on the delivery timeline.</p> <p>Mitigation / Treatment Strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Confirm availability and capacity during contracting ○ Prioritise applicants who have demonstrated the ability to meet delivery expectations ○ Include clear timelines and delivery clauses in contracts • Logistics, Information Access and Travel Coordination <p>If required information, approvals or travel arrangements cannot be secured at short notice to support Subject Advisor participation, then Subject Advisors may be unable to attend key workshops or sessions, resulting in reduced attendance, disruptions to planned activities and potential delays to deliverables</p> <p>Mitigations / Treatment Strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Plan session dates as early as possible and communicate to Subject Advisors

- Establish internal escalation pathways to expedite travel approvals when required (travel is outside of the contracted costs, but part of the Programme budget).
- Provide Subject Advisors with clear expectations about availability and potential travel needs during contracting
- Maintain flexibility in session planning e.g. hybrid attendance options where appropriate

- **Meeting Delivery timeframes and milestones**

If Subject Advisors do not meet required deliverable timelines, then critical milestones may be delayed or compressed, resulting in overall programme timeline risk and increased pressure on internal and sector contributors

Mitigation / Treatment Strategies:

- Include expectations in contracts
- Ongoing delivery monitoring and progress updating

- **Privacy, Security and Confidentiality of Materials**

If Subject Advisors do not handle draft materials or sensitive information appropriately, then private or confidential information may be inadvertently disclosed, resulting in potential privacy breaches, reputational risk and legal consequence for the Ministry

Mitigation / Treatment Strategies:

- Require all Subject Advisors to sign a Non-Disclosure Agreement at contracting
- Provide clear written guidance on secure information handling and approved channels
- Restrict access to information based on role and need-to-know

- **Subject Advisors do not meet expected criteria after contracting**

If contracted Subject Advisors do not demonstrate the expected capability or quality once work commences, then the outputs may not meet required standards and additional oversight may be needed, resulting in rework, delays, or the need to replace Subject Advisors partway through delivery

Mitigation / Treatment Strategies:

- Include quality expectations and performance criteria within contracts
- Undertake early quality checks and provide structured feedback
- Offer support or remediation where possible and appropriate
- Invoke contract clauses that allow for termination where performance does not improve

Whilst there won't be a contract management plan in place for these contracts as they are low value, there will be a handshake document created and the CACP Risk register will cover all of the above risks.

Preferred Applicants Contract Price

The preferred Applicants will be offered a fixed rate based on the Cabinet Fees Guidance. This will be either a daily rate of:

- 9(2)(j) plus expenses (excluding GST) in school holidays or if an external party; or
- 9(2)(j) plus expenses (excluding GST) to the applicant's school during term time should they be teaching currently.

The estimated contract costs for each of the shortlisted applicants are available in [Appendix 3](#).

Expenses are limited to a maximum of \$9(2)(j) per contract.

	All travel will be booked and paid for by the Ministry directly. No right of renewal will be offered for these contracts.	
Whole-of-life Costs	The WOL costs are estimated as follows:	
	Estimated Contract Costs (including Expenses)	s9(2)(j)
	Contingency (20%)	
	Estimated Total WOLC excluding GST	

Negotiation Recommendations

Negotiation	There are no negotiation recommendations as the rates and contract terms are set by the Ministry based on previous decisions and Cabinet Fees guidance.
Next Steps	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Due diligence checks 2. Emails to advise successful and unsuccessful applicants. 3. Emails to advise school principals of successful applicants 4. Contracts, COI and NDA signed

Applications Received

Applications	<p>A two-step procurement process was conducted as per the procurement plan, and applications were submitted by 342 applicants.</p> <p>10 applications were from Ministry staff and international applicants. These were deemed non-compliant and were not evaluated.</p> <p>Panel members evaluated the remaining 310 applications against the set criteria using the scores as per the procurement plan. Once individual evaluations were completed the panel met over 3 days. Applicants were ranked through the scoring in each learning area and then in subjects. Applicants with a wide differential of scores were discussed and panel members were asked to discuss and moderate the scores. Final lists were checked to ensure compliance to ranking.</p> <p>Compliance and Due Diligence document can be found in Appendix 1.</p>						
Applicants not short-listed	<p>There were 342 applicants and 182 have been shortlisted. The calibre of the candidates was exceptional and it took significant time to ensure a final selection where the applicants rankings were close.</p> <p>The following Tenders have not been shortlisted:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name of Tenderer</th> <th>Reason for not shortlisting</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Ministry employees and international applicants who were unaware this was an external process (10)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Those who ranked lower than the top 4-5 in their subject (135).</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Refer to Appendix 6 and Appendix 7 for details.</p>	Name of Tenderer	Reason for not shortlisting	1. Ministry employees and international applicants who were unaware this was an external process (10)		2. Those who ranked lower than the top 4-5 in their subject (135).	
Name of Tenderer	Reason for not shortlisting						
1. Ministry employees and international applicants who were unaware this was an external process (10)							
2. Those who ranked lower than the top 4-5 in their subject (135).							

Evaluation Process

Conflict of Interest	<p>There were 2 opportunities for conflict of interest to be declared:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prior to the process. s9(2)(a) declared, and COI management plans were developed 2. At the start of the panel meetings when names of all applicants were available. There were no extra declarations. <p>The evaluation process was undertaken in line with the COI management plans.</p> <p>It is confirmed that the outcome of the evaluation was not influenced by any conflicts of interest.</p>
Evaluation Methodology	<p>The evaluation model that was used was in accordance with the Evaluation Plan detailed in the Procurement Plan and against system of scoring against criteria.</p> <p>The Evaluation Plan can be found in Appendix 4.</p> <p>Further information regarding evaluation adjustments can be found in Appendix 9.</p>
Pre-conditions and Alternative Solutions	<p>No pre-conditions applied to this procurement.</p> <p>No alternate solutions were received.</p>
Strengths and Weaknesses of shortlisted Applicant(s)	<p>There were 342 applications to the EOI, an outstanding pool and with excellent strengths. The scores against criteria are evident in the scoring sheet.</p> <p>Non-shortlisted applicants were not weak, they were just less strong when assessed against higher ranked candidates.</p>
Due Diligence	<p>Due diligence for the short-listed Applicants will include company checks, where the successful applicant is a company that has not been contracted by the Ministry previously, and Social Media checks.</p>
Additional Process(es)	<p>The following additional step was undertaken during the evaluation process.</p> <p>Due to the large number of applicants, the panel started evaluating candidates against the criteria earlier than planned and did the individual evaluation in two tranches – the first halfway through and the second after the closing date.</p> <p>As the evaluation was against criteria, this streamlined the work with no adverse effect on outcome.</p>
Additional Considerations	<p>N/A</p>


Conflicts of Interest

COI	<p>By submitting, endorsing, or approving this Recommendation Report, Procurement Reviewer(s), Procurement Manager, Procurement Owner, and Business Lead or Sponsor confirm that they have no conflicts of interest to declare.</p> <p>Should any conflicts exist, they have submitted an updated Conflict of Interest declaration outlining any potential conflicts.</p>
COI Declarations	<p>None</p>

Appendix 1: Compliance and Due Diligence

Compliance	<p>The applications were initially assessed for compliance with the terms and conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applications deemed compliant are listed in Appendix 2. • The following 10 applications received from Ministry employees (9) and overseas applicants (1) were deemed non-compliant and, as a result, were excluded from progressing to the evaluation and moderation process for this procurement: See Appendix 6: Non-compliant Applications for details. 											
Due Diligence of Applications Received	<p>Due diligence was confirmed using the verification matrix as part of the compliance and evaluation process. The table below outlines the specific criteria elements to be verified:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="483 613 1361 965"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Evaluation & Due Diligence options</th> <th colspan="2">Criteria</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Fit for purpose</th> <th>Ability to deliver</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Social Media checks</td> <td style="text-align: center;">✓</td> <td style="text-align: center;">✓</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Companies' office check (where applicant is a company who have not been contracted by the Ministry previously)</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">✓</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Evaluation & Due Diligence options	Criteria		Fit for purpose	Ability to deliver	Social Media checks	✓	✓	Companies' office check (where applicant is a company who have not been contracted by the Ministry previously)		✓
Evaluation & Due Diligence options	Criteria											
	Fit for purpose	Ability to deliver										
Social Media checks	✓	✓										
Companies' office check (where applicant is a company who have not been contracted by the Ministry previously)		✓										

Appendix 2: Procurement Plan

Approved Procurement Plan	<p>Below is the original approved Procurement Plan. No amendments have been raised to date.</p> <div style="text-align: center;">  <p>CACP Phase 5 Curriculum Developm</p> </div> <p>As per the approval procurement plan, the available budget is 9(2)(j)</p>
----------------------------------	---

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Appendix 4: Scoring and Evaluation Plan

Scoring and Evaluation Plan

The following Scoring and Evaluation Plan outlines the approach used to assess EOIs for Subject Advisor roles across the learning areas and wāhanga ako. This plan ensured a consistent and transparent process that supported fair assessment and robust decision-making.

1. Evaluation Framework

A master evaluation template was established to provide a single source of truth for all applications received across the learning areas. The master template included:

- The full list of EOIs received for each learning area
- The approved scoring criteria and scoring scale
- Detailed instructions to guide evaluators
- Fields for capturing scores and comments

From this master document, individual evaluation spreadsheets were created for each panel member, ensuring that each evaluator could independently assess the application.

2. Two-Tranche Evaluation Approach

Due to the high number of EOIs received, evaluations were carried out in two tranches to manage workload and maintain quality:

- Tranche 1: Applications received up to 4 December were included in the first evaluation set and distributed to the panel members on 05 December 2025.
- Tranche 2: Applications received from 5–12 December (EOI close) were compiled and distributed on 15 December 2025.

Each tranche contained the same scoring criteria, instructions, and structure to ensure consistency across all assessments.

3. Independent Evaluation Process

Panel members completed their scoring independently, using their individual evaluation spreadsheets. This independent assessment phase ensured:

- A balanced range of professional judgments
- Unbiased scoring prior to group discussion
- Structured documentation of both quantitative scores and qualitative comments

These individual evaluations formed the foundation for subsequent moderation.

4. Moderation Process (17–19 December)

Moderation meetings were held from **17–19 December** to consolidate assessments and confirm the final selection recommendations. At the start of each moderation session, the panel confirmed the moderation approach, which included:

- Reviewing the list of subjects relevant to the panel's learning area(s)
- Filtering applications by highest total scores to prioritise discussion
- Identifying and reviewing scoring outliers
- Examining discrepancies between evaluators' assessments
- Discussing rationales for score variations, including differences relating to representation (e.g., school type, region) or experience

During moderation, all individual scores were collated into a summary evaluation spreadsheet to enable comparison across evaluators and support transparent, evidence-based decision-making.

Through structured discussion, the panel reached consensus on whether each applicant should be recommended for contracting, considering both the scoring outcomes and the demonstrated capability and experience of each applicant.

5. Final Output

The results of the moderated evaluation process form the basis for the recommendations presented in this EOI Recommendation Report, including the identification of applicants proposed for contracting.

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Appendix 5: Evidence of Briefing and Evaluation Sessions

Evidence and Artefacts

Master Evaluation Template

Artefact confirming an evaluation spreadsheet was created for each panel member from the evaluation template



Master Evaluation
Template artefact.pdf

Evaluation Briefing – Tranche 1

The below email was sent to each panel member for tranche 1



Evaluation briefing -
Tranche 1.msg

Evaluation Briefing – Tranche 2

The below email was sent to each panel member for tranche 2



Evaluation briefing -
Tranche 2.msg

Moderation sessions

Artefact confirming the moderation sessions scheduled



Moderation
sessions.pdf

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

Released under the Official Information Act 1982

s9(2)(a)



Appendix 8: Evaluation and Moderation Workbook

Evaluation and Moderation workbook

Below is the evaluation and moderation workbook which includes the Evaluation Instructions and Evaluation Scoring Scale



Summary Evaluation Sheet for EOI respons

Appendix 9: Evaluation Adjustments

Due to the complexity of:

- Subject expertise and specialism needed from within learning areas
- the need for advisors to be able to cross over subjects to check boundaries of knowledge
- representation from a varied mix of school contexts (especially for deliverability checks)

qualitative adjustments have been made in order to address these needs. This involved detailed evaluation of CVs and answers in the application.

These adjustments were as follows:

1. specialty in specific technologies, arts by aspects of the subject
2. specific pathway knowledge through to Year 13
3. expertise across 2 subjects that were close in content e.g Ag/Hort and Business, Philosophy and Sociology
4. Specialised expertise e.g. Photography, Media Studies, Music technology
5. Ensuring that a range of expertise of context e.g Area school as well as a large urban school

This resulted in an applicant being successful where there may have been a number of applicants on the same overall score or a person being successful above someone with a slightly higher score.

This resulted in people not being picked for all subjects they had ticked and in some people being asked to contribute to a number of subjects.

The impact of these adjustments affected 2-3 people.

An unintended consequence of the spreadsheets and complex formulas was as follows was that a score for a candidate given in English would remain with that person and appear as the same score in another learning area if they applied for more than one.

This meant that in one area the candidate had a low score but would look higher in another area but not have the specialty needed for that subject. This resulted in an anomaly in the scoring.