

This is valid from March 2007

Reaching Communities 2 Assessment Criteria

Criterion one: The proposed project outcomes meet an identified need and help to achieve the programme outcomes

Judgement point 1a: There is a need for the project and this has been clearly identified

In assessing whether this has been achieved the following questions are considered.

- Whether there is a clearly defined need or needs that the project will address
- Whether the applicant has carried out or referenced open and inclusive research and consultation that is recent and relevant to the project and demonstrates a clear need
- Whether the consultation has been extensive and detailed and included potential beneficiaries and all relevant stakeholders
- Whether the consultation clearly shows that the project will fill identified gaps or add value to existing provision
- Has the applicant demonstrated a clear understanding of existing local, regional or national strategies and how the project will complement these.

Judgement point 1b: The intended project outcomes will address the need of the target beneficiaries

In assessing whether this has been achieved the following questions are considered.

- Are the project outcomes SMART
- Are the project outcomes clear, well researched and ambitious
- Is the project delivery method the most appropriate way to address the beneficiaries' needs
- Is the project delivery method realistic and achievable and responds to a clearly identified need
- Is there a clearly defined group of target beneficiaries that is relevant to the project and programme
- Do the project outcomes directly and effectively address the need of the target beneficiaries.

Judgement point 1c: The identified need or needs are relevant to the programme aims and the intended project outcomes will help achieve the intended programme outcomes

Outcomes describe the proposed changes that happen as a result of the project. The project outcomes should address the identified needs of the beneficiaries as well as helping to meet the intended programme outcomes. The Reaching Communities programme's intended outcomes are:

- People having better chances in life, with better access to training and development to improve their life skills

- Stronger communities, with more active citizens working together to tackle their problems
- Improved rural and urban environments, which communities are better able to access and enjoy
- Healthier and more active people and communities.

In assessing whether this has been achieved the following questions are considered.

- Is there a clearly identified need
- Is it clear how the identified need, which the project seeks to address, meets the programme aim
- Is it clear how the identified need, which the project seeks to address, meets the programme outcomes
- Will the intended project outcomes clearly and directly address the programme outcomes
- Is there strong evidence that the project will have a long-term impact.

Criterion two: The organisation can deliver the project well and achieve the intended project outcomes.

Judgement point 2a: The project is likely to achieve the intended outcomes

In assessing whether this has been achieved the following questions are considered.

- Is the organisation financially healthy
- Has the applicant clearly shown why the project is the best way to meet the identified need and achieve the project outcomes
- Have all the project costs and overheads been identified, accurately worked out and included in the budget
- Are there clear milestones and the applicant has extensive plans to monitor progress in achieving the proposed project outcomes
- Are there comprehensive resource plans in place and appropriate levels of support to staff
- Are there comprehensive procedures in place to manage external relationships and partnerships and the organisation has a good record of working with other organisations.

Judgement point 2b: The project is likely to be delivered well

In assessing whether this has been achieved the following questions are considered.

- Does the applicant demonstrate a high level of commitment to equalities and provided details on how the project will be made accessible to all potential beneficiaries
- Are there appropriate plans to fully engage the target beneficiaries in the monitoring, planning and delivery of the project

- Has the applicant identified the main risks involved in delivering the project and will put in place effective responses.
- Has the organisation realistic and detailed plans for continuing or closing down the project when the grant ends
- Are there comprehensive, appropriate and inclusive plans in place for measuring and evaluating the success of the project (and for existing projects, the applicant has demonstrated the successes and achievements to date)
- Is the organisation reflective of the beneficiaries that the project will target.

A rating is given against each of the eight grading points within the criteria, and an overall rating is given for each of the two criteria. These ratings are: **excellent; good; satisfactory; weak** or **unsatisfactory**.

If either criterion is graded unsatisfactory, or both as weak, then the application need not go to the committee, it can be rejected through delegation as a **grading reject**.

All others go to the committee. Following the consideration, the committee decides whether to award, offer or reject each application.

Early rejects occur if any of the following apply:

- Missing information is not returned within the time stated.
- The project has changed and no longer fits with our funding policy.
- The status of the applicant organisation has changed and they are no longer eligible to apply to our funding.
- The organisation is unsuitable for funding, for example, because of poor financial health.
- There has been a failure to meet outline proposal requirements or guidance.

An assessment report is completed, and the early reject is agreed at Programme Manager level.