## **Deprived Area Fund Assessment Criterion 2014-2017**

The Deprived Area Fund will be assessed on the four criterion below. A technical assessment comprising of the Organisational governance, experience, track record and capacity to deliver the project, other sources of funding will also be undertaken.

1. Assessment of Application

| CRITERION   | WEIGHTING | Max score |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| Criterion 1: Effective targeting - proposals must respond to identified community needs (primarily within   | x 2       | 10 (2x5)  |
| the identified datazones) not including published statistics but evidenced community and client group   |           |           |
| engagement and consultation.  |           |           |
| <b>Assessment:</b> Level of specific targeting identified including <u>how</u> the project is going to target these areas. A practical approach should however, be taken to ensure project proposals do not create artificial boundaries and that neighbouring datazones, as appropriate, are included.   |           |           |
| The identified needs of communities that the project is looking to address must evidenced through engagement and consultation, not just the reproduction of published statistics.   |           |           |
| <b>Criterion 2:</b> Identified employability aims – proposals must have identified and evidenced employability outputs and outcomes.  | x 2       | 10 (2x5)  |
| <b>Assessment:</b> Applications <u>must</u> demonstrate specific employability aims – even if early engagement activity: This might include hard outcomes of people entering work or college, or softer outcomes e.g. lifeskills/social skills, numeracy & literacy, employability skills, vocational skills, financial management, job seeking skills, community involvement/volunteering, work placements, enterprise skills and career related short courses. Applications must demonstrate plans to begin to move participants towards the outcome of employment. |           |           |
| Criterion 3: Proposals must complement and add value to other related services and programmes tackling poverty and inequality.  | X1        | 5 (1x5)   |
| <b>Assessment:</b> The application should that the project will actually address the needs identified and   |           |           |

| compliments and provided an additional service rather than duplicating existing activity.              |    |         |
|--|----|---------|
| Criterion 4: Proposals must engage with local communities and build community capacity and leadership. | X1 | 5 (1x5) |
| Assessment: Application should highlight how project will engage with local communities and assist in  |    |         |
| building community capacity – i.e. use of volunteers, developing project management skills             |    |         |

## **Scoring of Application**

| 0- Unacceptable               | No information provided or justification provided shows applicant does not meet key criteria                 |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1- Poor Justification         | Limited attempt to provide key information   |
| 2-Lack of full justification  | Modest attempt at providing key information with little justification on how key criteria will be met        |
| 3- Satisfactory justification | Reasonable effort at providing key information on all points and meeting criteria                            |
| 4 – Strong Justification      | Good response which covers all points requested and comprehensively provides information on how key          |
| -                             | criteria will be met   |
| 5 – Very Strong Justification | Excellent response which provides all key information requested and gives substantial additional information |
|                               | which clearly meets criteria   |

Maximum Score is 30 points.

## 2. Technical Assessment (pass or fail)

The purpose is to make a judgement on the applicant organisation's governance, experience, track record and capacity to deliver the project. This will be assessed by Council Officers and will include the following:

- History of Organisation;
- Record of previous funding being spent appropriately;
- Track record of delivering similar projects within or out with the Highland Council area;
- Capacity of Organisation to deliver the project;
- Application costs over good value for money i.e. are judged as reasonable costs; and
- Alternative sources of funding, for example through existing or planned contracting of employability services at a local or national level.
- Appropriate governance arrangements are in place, including sound financial management.