

AREA COMMITTEE GRANTS SCORING FRAMEWORK 2018/19

Area	
Name	
Applicant	
Ref	

		Score
Evidence of Match Funding: 0 – 30	30 – Excellent (Evidence of funds sourced from national awarding bodies/local fundraising/ applications for grants/use of own funds. Request to DGC is for up to 10% of costs)	
	25 – Very Good (Evidence of funds sourced from national awarding bodies/local fundraising/ applications for grants/use of own funds. Request to DGC is between 11 and 20% of costs)	
	20 – Good (Evidence of funds sourced from national awarding bodies/local fundraising/ applications for grants/use of own funds. Request to DGC is for 21 - 35% of costs)	
	15 – Satisfactory (Evidence of funds sourced from national awarding bodies/local fundraising/ applications for grants/use of own funds. Request to DGC is for 36 - 50% of costs)	
	-10 – Weak (Evidence of funds sourced from national awarding bodies/local fundraising/ applications for grants/use of own funds. Request to DGC is for 51 - 75% of costs)	
	-20 – Poor (Evidence of funds sourced from national awarding bodies/local fundraising/ applications for grants/use of own funds. Request to DGC is for 76 – 99% of costs)	
	-30 – Unsatisfactory (Evidence of funds sourced from national awarding bodies/local fundraising/ applications for grants/use of own funds. Request to DGC is 100% of costs)	

AREA COMMITTEE GRANTS SCORING FRAMEWORK 2018/19

		Score
<p>Application fits with Dumfries & Galloway Council Priorities 0 – 5 www.dumgal.gov.uk/article/15608/Council-priorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build the local economy • Provide the best start in life for all our children • Protect our most vulnerable people • Be an inclusive council 	<p>10 – Excellent (Clearly demonstrates that the activity directly delivers on Council Priorities). High priority application.</p>	
	<p>8 - 9 – Very Good (Demonstrates that the activity has a significant positive impact on Council Priorities)</p>	
	<p>5 - 7 – Good (Demonstrates that activity meets Council Priorities but that some improvements can be identified). Medium priority application.</p>	
	<p>2 - 4 – Adequate (Demonstrates that there is tentative evidence that it meets with Council Priorities)</p>	
	<p>1 – Weak (Indicates that there is little evidence that it delivers on Council Priorities). Low priority application.</p>	
	<p>0 – Unsatisfactory (No evidence provided and no fit with Priorities – recommend nil award)</p>	
<p>Application fit to Local Area Criteria/ Priorities 0 – 10</p>	<p>10 – Excellent (demonstrates that the activity directly delivers local area Priorities)</p>	
	<p>8 – 9 Very Good (demonstrates that the activity has a significant positive impact on local area Priorities)</p>	
	<p>5 – 7 Good (demonstrates that activity meets local area Priorities but that some improvements can be identified)</p>	
	<p>2 – 4 Adequate (demonstrates that there is tentative evidence that it delivers on local area Priorities)</p>	
	<p>1 – Weak (indicates that there is little evidence that it delivers on local area Priorities)</p>	
	<p>0 – Unsatisfactory (no evidence provided within the application – recommend nil award)</p>	

AREA COMMITTEE GRANTS SCORING FRAMEWORK 2018/19

	Score	
<p>Evidence of impact: 0 – 5</p>	<p>5 – Excellent (Substantial evidence that the outcomes of the stated activities will result in a positive difference).</p>	
	<p>4 – Very Good (Positive evidence or indication that the outcomes of the stated activities will result in a positive difference)</p>	
	<p>3 – Good (Some evidence or indication that the outcomes of the stated activities will result in a difference)</p>	
	<p>2 – Adequate (Limited evidence or indication that outcomes of the stated activities will make a difference)</p>	
	<p>1 – Weak (Indicates that the evidence of impact is not clearly provided within the application)</p>	
	<p>0 – Unsatisfactory (No clear evidence – recommend nil award)</p>	
<p>Evidence of need: 0 – 10 NB This is about the need/ demand for the product/ service/ outcome of the funding, not about financial need.</p>	<p>10 – Excellent (Clear evidence of demand. Substantial evidence that need has been considered when developing the project/activity for the community and that it will make a positive difference)</p>	
	<p>8 – 9 Very good (Evidence that need has been considered when developing the project/activity for the community and that it will make a positive difference)</p>	
	<p>5 – 7 Good (Some indication of demand. Some evidence that need has been considered when developing the project/activity for the community and that it will make a difference)</p>	
	<p>2 – 4 Adequate (Limited evidence or indication that need has been identified within the application or the stated activities will make a difference)</p>	
	<p>1 – Weak (indicates that the evidence provided is limited and it is not clearly stated)</p>	
<p>0 – Unsatisfactory (No clear evidence or indication of demand. No evidence of need stated – recommend nil award)</p>		

AREA COMMITTEE GRANTS SCORING FRAMEWORK 2018/19

		Score
<p>Evidence of partnership working: 0 – 30</p>	<p>30 – Excellent (Clearly demonstrates that real partnership working is in place and is evidenced in the application. Can show formal links with public, private and voluntary bodies)</p>	
	<p>20 – Very Good (Demonstrates that the activity has some partnership working in the application)</p>	
	<p>15 – Good (Demonstrates that activity has limited partnership working in the application. Can demonstrate some links with local community groups.)</p>	
	<p>10 – Adequate (Demonstrates that there are tentative evidence that there is partnership working)</p>	
	<p>1 – 5 Weak (Indicates that it is not clear that partnership working is evidenced within the application)</p>	
	<p>0 – Unsatisfactory (No evidence provided within the application of partnership working – recommend nil award)</p>	
<p>Evidence of sustainability 0 – 5</p>	<p>5 – Excellent (Clear evidence of sustainability including exit strategy with evidence that no future requirement for funding for the purpose of the application will be required. Clear business and financial plan available)</p>	
	<p>4 – Very Good (Clear evidence of sustainability including exit strategy)</p>	
	<p>3 – Good (Some evidence of sustainability including exit strategy. Some business planning evident)</p>	
	<p>2 – Satisfactory (Limited evidence of sustainability including exit strategy)</p>	
	<p>1 – Weak (No evidence of sustainability including exit strategy. No clear business or financial planning)</p>	
	<p>0 – Unsatisfactory (No evidence of how organisation’s activities would be sustained)</p>	

AREA COMMITTEE GRANTS SCORING FRAMEWORK 2018/19

Financial Status (Not a score, just a comment on the status) NB Three months' operating costs held in reserve is deemed best practice and not considered 'free reserves'.	Total amount of free reserves is no more than 3 months' running costs, whether or not a reserves policy is in place.		
	Reserves policy in place. More than one year's operating costs held as free reserves. The reasons for holding earmarked reserves are valid, e.g. redundancy, running costs, development fund, specified projects etc.		
	No reserves policy. No reserves; or more than one year's operating costs held as free reserves.		
TOTAL SCORE:		75 – 100	100%
		50 – 74	75%
		25 – 49	50%
		<24	0%
COMMENTS:			
COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:			