

Annex D: Scoring criteria for proposals

The following criteria will be used to score any bids to the Fund that are in scope. More detail on this process can be found in the Prospectus.

Criteria	Factors taken into account	Weighting (%)	Minimum threshold (out of 5)
Evidence of migration in the last 10 years	5 = Strong evidence (with sources) that local authority has a strong evidence and understanding of recent migration into the area covered by the proposal. 4 = Good description of recent migration in the geographical areas covered by the proposal with relevant supporting evidence. 3 = Satisfactory description of recent migration in the geographical areas covered by the proposal. Includes some relevant supporting evidence. 2 = Satisfactory description of recent migration but lacks relevant supporting evidence. 1 = The proposal is unclear on details of recent migration.	10	2
What are the issues for public services caused by recent migration? (The strategic case or rationale for intervention)	5 = Strong evidence (with sources) that local authority has a clear understanding of the problem it is seeking to address and the impacts on the wider resident population of doing nothing 4 = Good explanation of the problem the local authority is seeking to address, underpinned by strong relevant evidence. 3 = Satisfactory explanation of the problem underpinned by some relevant supporting evidence. 2 = Satisfactory explanation of the problem but little relevant supporting evidence. 1 = Problem not clearly defined. No supporting evidence.	15	2
How are you proposing to tackle the problem, and why is this your preferred approach? (Appropriateness and deliverability of the proposed solutions)	5 = This proposal provides a detailed set of practical, costed proposals with clearly defined milestones that will deliver on outcomes which are clearly measurable and has been agreed with key stakeholders. The option has been selected from a range of options for the local area. Key stakeholders have been consulted in deciding this is the preferred option and the proposal demonstrates how the LA will deliver outcomes on time and within resources provided. 4 = The proposal provides a detailed set of practical, costed proposals, which have been agreed with relevant stakeholders and demonstrates how it will be delivered on time and within the resources provided. 3 = The proposal is a sound idea for addressing the problem which has been considered and agreed with relevant stakeholders. The bid provides a clear, but general, broad plan for delivery and makes a reasonable attempt at identifying milestones, though some of this may	20	2

	<p>not be presented in detail.</p> <p>2 = The proposal is a sound idea for addressing the problem but has not been agreed with relevant stakeholders and lacks a clear plan for delivery.</p> <p>1 = The proposal is unclear/vague on detail about how the problem will be addressed. Does not include an outline logic model.</p>		
Clear benefits realisation (for the wider local community)	<p>5 = A strong proposal on how funding will make a difference to the lives of the wider community, compared to a 'do nothing' scenario. Clear measurable benefits/outcomes for the wider community are specified in the bid. Proposals which give consideration to the impacts on local services and or the local economy. Where benefits are suitable they provide a cost-benefit ratio.</p> <p>4 = A strong proposal on how funding will make a difference to the lives of the wider community, compared to a 'do nothing' scenario. Clear measurable benefits/outcomes for the wider community are specified in the bid.</p> <p>3 = A good proposal that recognises the benefits to the wider community with some examples. The benefits may not be quantified but should be clearly set out and detailed.</p> <p>2 = A bid that considers the benefits/impacts to the wider community but provides no details of these.</p> <p>1 = No or little consideration of benefits/ impacts of proposals to the wider community.</p>	25	2
Value for Money (including efficiency, proportionality and credibility of funding required)	<p>5 = The funding requested is proportionate to the challenge/problem being addressed (given the scale of the local issue). A detailed breakdown by activity they are seeking funding for, an accurate forecast of all costs by activity, staff resource or theme. The proposal clearly shows that the outcomes will be delivered on time and within the budget envelope. There has been some consideration of risk. Proposal includes significant resources from other sources.</p> <p>4 = The funding requested is proportionate. A detailed breakdown by activity they are seeking funding for, an accurate forecast of all costs by activity, staff resource or theme. The proposal clearly shows that the outcomes will be delivered on time and within the budget envelope. Proposal includes some resources from other sources.</p> <p>3 = The funding requested is proportionate – includes detailed and evidenced breakdown of the funding sought against specific activities/strands/resources.</p> <p>2 = The funding requested is proportionate – though limited detail is provided for the amount of funding sought against specific activities/strands/resources that will be required.</p> <p>1 = Unrealistic funding request that is not proportionate to the size of the overall fund. Lack of credible information and does not represent</p>	15	2

	value for money. Not clear what Government is 'buying'.		
Outputs, Outcomes and Evaluation (Demonstrating the effectiveness of the intervention)	<p>5 = The project has very clear, SMART success criteria with clear milestones. There is a detailed plan in place to monitor and evaluate the project activities and steps are in place to help local partners learn from this intervention, improve and share best practice going forward. The project has plans to commission people with the right expertise to evaluate its impact.</p> <p>4 = Strong understanding of what success looks like; good proposals on how project will capture the evidence and monitor and where appropriate evaluate the intervention. Includes some consideration on design and delivery of evaluation.</p> <p>3 = A good understanding of what success looks like; satisfactory proposals on how project will capture the evidence and monitor and where appropriate evaluate the intervention. Specific details around design and delivery of evaluation to be worked up further.</p> <p>2 = Some consideration of outputs but no clarity on how these link to the issues the proposal is addressing.</p> <p>1 = No definition of success, little consideration for engaging or measuring impact and no evaluation</p>	15	2