**COMMUNITY GRANTS FUND**

**APPLICATION ASSESSMENT**

This assessment sheet has been designed for use at Community Grants Fund (CGF) panels. It is a tool to help guide decision making and is not intended to be overly prescriptive. It should allow for flexibility during meetings. Its purpose is to provide a clear structure for assessing applications and justifying the recommendations that are made.

* You can decide whether to use numerical or descriptive assessment.
* Panel members should come to the meeting prepared with their assessment sheet filled out.
* After the meeting, sheets should be submitted to the officer so that feedback can be given to applicants.
* During meetings the facilitator may choose to work through each application in turn, asking individual panel members for their views. Alternatively, they may move straight to a more open discussion. The officer and facilitator can discuss which approach will work best in advance of the meeting.
* The facilitator’s role is to enable everyone to speak up and to help the group reach a decision, whilst keeping the discussion ‘on track’. A longer meeting may need to be scheduled for panels with a lot of applications to assess.
* When achieving a consensus is difficult or there are dominant voices in the meeting, this assessment sheet can be used to help determine which applications have received the most support overall (e.g. by ranking them in numerical order or by counting the number of times they’ve been assessed as ‘great’).

The use of assessment sheets during CGF panels will be evaluated after each funding round based on feedback from officers and panel members.

**CGF ASSESSMENT SHEET**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Neighbourhood area:** |  | **Panel Meeting Date:** |
| **Funding round:** | Round 1  Round 2 | |
| **Panel member name:** |  | |

**Guide to Assessing Applications**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Level** | **Description** |
| Poor  1 | * There is little or no evidence that any priorities will be met, local needs are not addressed and/or there is no added value. * Activities are the same as - or very similar to - previous work. * Costings are unclear, inaccurate and/or seem disproportionate (poor value for money). |
| Okay  2 | * Priorities and local issues are mentioned but not as the main emphasis of the project. Added value is limited. * Activities build on previous work, but the scope is limited. * Costings could be clearer, more detailed and/or better justified. |
| Good  3 | * There is evidence that priorities have been actively considered. The link to local issues is clear. There is added value. * Activities build on previous work and demonstrate some added value. * Costings are clear and proportionate. |
| Great  4 | * The application is focused around one or more priorities and/or addressing local issues is central to the proposal. * A significant amount of added value will be derived from the project. * Activities are new and/or will significantly build on existing work and longer-term sustainability of the project. * Costings are detailed, proportionate and represent good value for money. |

**Reminder: City of Edinburgh Council’s Strategic Priorities**

1. More good places to live and work.
2. End poverty in Edinburgh.
3. A net zero city by 2030.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Application**  **Reference Code** | **Q.1 To what extent does the project address any of the Council’s strategic priorities?** | **Q2. To what extent does the project add value or address local needs and issues?** | **Q3. To what extent does the project include new or developmental activities?** | **Q.4 To what extent are the costings clear, proportionate and ‘good value for money’?** | **Would you fund this application?**  **(Yes/No)** | **Comments**  **(If recommending not to fund, please provide specific reasons)** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |