

## Application scoring guide and aspects to consider in allocating scores

<b>Applicant organisation</b>	
<b>Applicant project</b>	
<b>Application reference</b>	
<b>Date received</b>	
<b>Meeting date &amp; location</b>	
<b>Present</b>	

### **SECTION ONE:** Assessment of proposal – impact on the Council’s delivery of priority outcome(s)

<b>Please show in the table below how far the proposal meets each of the Council’s priority outcomes. Please enter a score of between 0 and 3, using the guidance below.</b>	
Strongly	<b>3</b>
Moderately	<b>2</b>
Weakly	<b>1</b>
Doesn’t meet at all	<b>0</b>

<b>Norwich City Council priority outcomes</b>	
Making Norwich a safe and clean city	
Making Norwich a city of character and culture	
Making Norwich a prosperous city	
Providing Norwich with decent housing for all	
Ensuring the Council provides value for money services	
<b>The scores afforded above are for office use only and will not form part of the application total score</b>	

<b>Please detail below any specific benefits the project offers for Norwich</b>	
<b>How many residents of Norwich will benefit?</b>	
<b>The application is requesting funding appropriate to the percentage of Norwich residents that will benefit from the project / service (i.e. if 50% of the project beneficiaries are Norwich residents, it would not be appropriate to apply for more than 50% of the project costs from Norwich City Council)</b>	<b>✓ or x</b>

<b>Capacity for success [Please circle relevant score allocated]</b>	
Proven track record of successful delivery	<b>5</b>
Proven track record of partially successful delivery	<b>4</b>
Development of partially successful model	<b>4</b>
Pilot project to proven model	<b>4</b>
No previous record of delivery, but success with other related projects	<b>4 or 3</b>
Development of previously unsuccessful project	<b>4 or 3</b>
Pilot project / new innovation	<b>3</b>
New organisation	<b>3</b>
Track record of limited or minor success in delivery of this and / or other projects	<b>2 or 1</b>
Track record of no success in delivery	<b>0</b>

## Application scoring guide and aspects to consider in allocating scores

<b>Monitoring and evaluation processes</b>	✓ or x
The application sets out relevant, robust monitoring and evaluation processes	
The proposed monitoring and evaluation processes are not sufficient and require further discussion and development with the applicant.	

<b>Does the proposal provide Value for money [Please circle relevant score allocated ]</b>	
High monetary cost, high alignment to outcomes	<b>3</b>
High monetary cost, moderate alignment to outcomes	<b>2</b>
High monetary cost, low alignment to outcomes	<b>0</b>
Moderate monetary cost, high alignment to outcomes	<b>4</b>
Moderate monetary cost, moderate alignment to outcomes	<b>3</b>
Moderate monetary cost, low alignment to outcomes	<b>1</b>
Low monetary cost, high alignment to outcomes	<b>5</b>
Low monetary cost, moderate alignment to outcomes	<b>4</b>
Low monetary cost, low alignment to outcomes	<b>2</b>

<b>Project sustainability</b>	✓ or x
The project has an appropriate exit strategy or plan to ensure long term sustainability	
The project requires no long term funding or exit strategy - it exists as a stand alone project	

### SECTION TWO: Assessment of organisation

<b>Organisational sustainability [Score out of 5 - please circle score allocated]</b>	
Organisation holds in its reserves sufficient funds to operate for approximately six months and no less than three months	<b>5</b>
Organisation has applied for funds to secure operation for next six months (from alternative funder)	<b>4</b>
Organisation is relying on success of this application to secure remaining funds to operate for next six months	<b>3</b>
Organisation does not have funding to secure operation for next six months but holds an evidenced plan for obtaining required funding	<b>2</b>
Organisation is relying on success of this application to secure total funds required to operate for next six months	<b>1</b>
Organisation does not have funding to secure operation for next six months and no evidenced plan for obtaining required funding	<b>0</b>

<b>Matched funding [Please circle relevant score allocated]</b>	
Success with this application will lever in matched funding in excess of funding requested from Norwich City Council	<b>3</b>
Success with this application will lever in matched funding equal to funding requested from Norwich City Council	<b>2</b>
Success with this application will lever in matched funding of lesser value than funding requested from Norwich City Council	<b>1</b>
Success with this application will lever in no additional funding	<b>0</b>

## Application scoring guide and aspects to consider in allocating scores

Additional considerations	✓ or x
Does the responsibility to fund this project lie with another organisation?	
Has that organisation been approached for part or full funding?	
Has this application been rejected by another funder?	

### **SECTION THREE: Assessment of risk**

**Please outline below any key risks to delivery of outcome(s) and any steps you feel the organisation should take to mitigate them if a grant is awarded**

--

**Please outline below any key risks to Norwich city council or the applicant organisation should the application be refused - financial, reputational and / or social**

--

**Comments / conditions / requests**

Please use this box to outline any conditions of award, any monitoring conditions, monitoring frequency, how the assessment group felt about the quality of the application, any supplementary evidence required, requests for further information, general comments and feedback for applicants

--

**Where possible an appropriate grant in kind should be offered for any aspect of the application where monetary costs could be alleviated**

<b>Decision</b> (please circle - add comments above if any decision other than 'fully fund' taken)				
Fully fund	Part fund	Conditionally fund	Grant in kind offered	Reject