GRANTS SCORING CRITERIA

OVERVIEW for COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

> **The following information is to be used in conjunction with the rubric on page 4 in order to identify strengths and weakness of applications and to prompt questions and dialogue about them. Reviewers should also consult SCF Grant Application Guidelines. Few projects will excel across the board, however ranking in various categories should be helpful in assisting with an overall judgment.**

General:

- Our geographical area is the Shuswap area, including the City of Salmon Arm, the District of Sicamous and inclusive of the following electoral areas within the Columbia Shuswap Regional District:

  i. Electoral Area C, including the unincorporated communities of Sorrento, Sunnybrae, Tappen, White Lake, Blind Bay, Eagle Bay and Notch Hill;
  ii. Electoral Area D, including the unincorporated communities of Falkland, Deep Creek, Ranchero, Salmon Valley, Silver Creek, and Gardom Lake;
  iii. Electoral Area E, including the unincorporated communities of Mara, Swansea Point Solsqua and Malakwa; and
  iv. Electoral Area F, including the unincorporated communities of Squilax, Lee Creek, Scotch Creek, Celista, Magna Bay, Anglemont, St. Ives and Seymour Arm.

- In order to make grant adjudication consistent and fair, the scoring system is as simple as possible while allowing sufficient room for the perspective of each member of the committee to be reflected.

- The categories we are using were selected after review of a number of different approaches taken by other community foundations.

- Category 8 allows us an opportunity to factor in a weighting for a new vs. repeat grants and may be taken into consideration.

- We are using the median as a "first" attempt at prioritizing the grants. This will be a discussion point at the committee meetings.

- A committee member will abstain from input on an application where a conflict of interest is deemed to exist.

- Only a registered charity can be awarded a grant. We encourage partnerships to build the capacity of the community. SCF under CRA regulations can provide funding through the municipal umbrella to organizations that partner with the local government on projects that have a benefit to the community.

OUR MISSION:
To inspire community giving, foster donor confidence and community trust, honour memories, support community causes and provide responsible granting

Grants Scoring Criteria

> **In order to make grant adjudication consistent and fair, the scoring system should be a simple as possible while allowing sufficient room for the perspective of each member of the team to be reflected. The following is a list of categories and the information relevant within each.**

Category 1   Organization

This is a quick evaluation of the organization applying for the grant. Is it a strong and well-established organization? Does it have good local representation? Is it sufficiently organized to be capable of carrying out this project, i.e., staff & volunteers? What is its past involvement with the community and history with grants?

Category 2   Need / Benefit to the Community

Need may be at the community or individual level or a blend of both. Need is intended to apply to all grant areas. (Social and Health, Education, Heritage and Local Culture, Sports and recreation, etc). A maximum possible score of 5 should be for projects which identify a critical need and address the problem.

Score: 5-4   Critical need
                2-3   Obvious or documented need
                0-1   Reasonably accepted need

Category 3   Impact / Ripple Effect

This is perhaps best thought of as enrichment of the community. The question for the team is "Does the project provide added value or provide enhanced capacity to the community/individual?" Does the project assist the applicant to fully develop their potential? A maximum score of 5 should be for projects which may result in significant improvement in the community or individual.

Score: 4-5   Should have a dramatic effect
                2-3   Will likely have a noticeable effect
                0-1   May have some effect

Category 4   Innovation / Duplication

Does the project demonstrate an innovative approach, encourage visioning or respond to new ideas? A maximal score of 5 should be for projects which are very creative.

Score: 4-5   Highly Innovative
                2-3   Fresh approach
                0-1   Not new

Category 5   Feasibility / Planning

Can the applicant carry out the project? Is the project feasible? Does the project show evidence of sustainability?
We are looking here for the capacity of the applicant in terms of appropriate staff, ability to manage and sufficient knowledge to carry out the project. This also intends to cover how success will be measured. A maximum score of 5 would reflect a well thought out project involving individuals with the capacity to carry it out along with evaluation criteria.

Score: 4-5   Well developed project with evaluation
                2-3   Defined project with some evaluation
                0-1   Ill-defined project objectives/evaluation

Category 6   Budget / Finances

Is it clear how the money will be spent? Are there funds from other sources for this project?
We are interested only in relevant financial disclosure, for example we do not need to see the full budget of an organization, but it is important to know exactly how the monies awarded will be spent and that we are not duplicating donations coming from other sources. Maximum score of 5 to be awarded where the budget is clear supported by reasonable estimates and outside project funds are disclosed.

Score: 4-5   Good budget definition and disclosure
                2-3   Adequate budget and disclosure
                0-1   Ill-defined budget/disclosure

Category 7   Collaboration / Partnership

The question for the team is "Does the project foster collaboration and community partnerships?". A maximal score of 5 would be awarded to a project which might have a wide effect in the community and where a number of community groups were involved.

Score: 4-5 Wide effect
                2-3 Substantial effect in a limited area or a limited effect over a substantial area
                0-1 Some effect

Category 8   Repeat Application

Two additional questions will be asked on the application to address the question of repeat applications:
    1)   Have you received funding from SCF in the past?
    2)   Have you received funding from SCF for this project in the past?
Due consideration will be given to the answers and may be considered in the decision process.

Grants Scoring Rubric

The reviewer may use ½ marks, scoring 0 through 5 in each category.

Criterion	Low (Score 0 – 1)	Medium (Score 2 - 3)	High (Score 4 – 5)
1. Organization	• Organization is not strong enough yet to carry out this project • Does not have representative local board or committee	• Well-established organization, good representative local Board • Capable staff and/or volunteers	• Strong organization • Strong Board • Good track record with grants • Strong staff and volunteers
2. Need & Benefit to Community	• Reasonably accepted need • Need not obvious • Insufficient evidence • Project not likely to enhance community life much even if well delivered	• Obvious documented need • Addresses a real need, provides evidence of need. • Interesting or useful opportunity for many • Will provide interesting public event or program	• Critical need • Addresses important, well-documented need in community • Valuable opportunity for many • Will provide exciting, enriching public event or project
3. Impact & Ripple Effect	• May have some effect • Project will be useful to very small number of people • Only mildly useful to a wider group	• Will likely have noticeable effect • Project will be worthwhile to a modest group of people • Quite valuable to a smaller group	• Should have dramatic effect • Project will provide a large benefit to a moderate-sized group and/or a significant benefit to a larger group
4. Innovation or Duplication	• Not new • Project "reinvents the wheel" without building on existing work	• Fresh approach • Idea is not new, but project is worthwhile and will not duplicate work already being done by others in the community	• Highly innovative • Interesting new idea or approach • Project could provide models or lessons for other groups
5. Feasibility & Planning	• Ill-defined project objectives/evaluation • Project plan lacks clarity and focus • Project is unlikely to meet its goals and be successfully implemented • Proposers might be advised to consider the plan more carefully and resubmit	• Defined project with some evaluation • Project goals seem appropriate and achievable • Plan of action seems likely to be successful • Project fits organizations goals and current activities	• Well-developed project with evaluation • A well-developed plan, with a clear idea of resources to be used • Staff and/or volunteers are in place to make the plan work • Project will enhance organization's strength
6. Budget & Finance	• Ill-defined budget/disclosure • Budget is unclear, unrealistic, or contains inflated numbers • Plan is unrealistic about other sources of funding and future sustainability • Organization has unnecessarily large reserve	• Adequate budget and disclosure • Budget is reasonable • Plan is likely sustainable based on proposed plan	• Good budget definition and disclosure • Budget is realistic in costs and in plans for other funding • Organization's finances are in order and it has an appropriate reserve for its staff and property obligations
7. Collaboration & Partnership	• Some effect • No evidence that organization has considered possible useful collaborations	• Substantial effect in a limited area or limited effect over a substantial area • Project involves some useful collaboration and evidence that organization is willing to collaborate where appropriate	• Wide effect • Project involves significant collaboration that could build an enhanced community resource