



Ministry of Housing,
Communities &
Local Government

2020/21 Faith, Race and Hate Crime Grant Scheme

Scoring Criteria

The following criteria will be used to score any bids that are within the scope and eligibility criteria set out in the Guidance for Applicants.

Assessment Criteria	Scoring Criteria	Weighting (%)	Minimum threshold (out of 5)
1) The organisation(s)' standing, aims and ability to successfully plan and deliver the proposed project	<p>5 =</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong evidence that the organisation or consortium can deliver work on the geographical scale they have set out in the proposal. • Clear and evidenced reasoning and plan for the geographical reach of the work, with the indicated networks and contacts that will be mobilised to achieve this included. • Thorough description and evidence of the underlying issues driving the need for the intervention • Strong evidence of the need for the intervention and the effectiveness of their approach • All documentation requested in the Application Guidance under this criterion (1a) is supplied. <p>4 =</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good evidence that the organisation/s can deliver work on the geographical scale they have set out in the proposal. • Plan containing some evidence and reasoning for the geographical reach, with indication of networks and contacts that will be mobilised to achieve this included. • A good description and evidence base of the underlying issues driving the need for the intervention. • Good evidence of the need for the intervention and the effectiveness of their approach. • All documentation requested in the Application Guidance under this criterion (1a) is supplied. <p>3 =</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory evidence that the organisation/s can deliver work on the geographical scale they have set out in the proposal. • Plan containing a reason for the choice of geographical reach of the project, with some of the networks and contacts that will be mobilised to achieve this indicated. • Basic understanding of the underlying issues described, and some evidence provided demonstrating the need for the intervention. • Satisfactory evidence of the need for the intervention and the effectiveness of their approach. • Evidence of the need for the intervention. • All documentation requested in the Application Guidance under this criterion (1a) is supplied. <p>2 =</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description but no evidence that the organisation or consortium can deliver work on the 	20	3

	<p>geographical scale they have set out in the proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimal plan or reasoning for the geographical reach, with a few or no indicated networks and contacts that will be mobilised to achieve this. Little mention of underlying issues in the project's topic areas with little or no supporting evidence. No or very basic evidence of the need for the intervention and the effectiveness of their approach No or very basic evidence of need for the intervention. Some documentation requested in the Application Guidance under this criterion (1a) is supplied. <p>1=</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The organisation's aims and ability to deliver the project are not outlined or are not coherent. No supporting evidence mentioned. No or poor documentation provided as requested under this criterion in the Application Guidance (1a) 		
2) Viability and expected impact of proposal	<p>5 =</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong evidence of the project's ability to have a positive impact, with clearly defined, measurable and specific target outcomes. A strong project plan where the outcomes are proportionate to the budget, the success measures are clear, and there is evidenced/proven reasoning for the methods that will be used to ensure the project achieves its outcomes. Plan sets out at least two outcomes specified in the application guidance, and a wide geographic spread of activities. There is a clear project management structure with built-in resilience and well-established roles. Clear plans for sustainability beyond the period of funding are set out. Clear plan for fulfilling data protection obligations <p>4 =</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good evidence of the project's ability to have a positive impact, with measurable and specific target outcomes. A good project plan where the outcomes are proportionate to the budget, the success measures are included, and there is reasoning for the methods that will be used to ensure the project achieves its outcomes. The plan sets out at least two outcomes specified in the application guidance and a geographical spread of activities. There is a project management structure set out, including established roles. Ideas for sustainability beyond the period of funding are set out. Clear plan for fulfilling data protection obligations <p>3 =</p>	30	3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory evidence of the project’s ability to have a positive impact, with target outcomes. • Bid includes a reasonable project plan where the assessor can follow how the budget and outcomes are related. Methods that will be used to ensure the project achieves its outcomes are explained. • Plan outlines two outcomes specified in the guidance and geographic spread that it plans to target. • There is a project management structure outlined. • Suitable plan for fulfilling data protection obligations <p>2 =</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some unsatisfactory evidence of the project’s ability to have a positive impact, with target outcome/s. • The project plan is weak or incomplete. • Unrealistic budget to outcome links. • Project management structure and partner organisation roles are weak or incomplete. • Outcomes are not reflective of the specification in the guidance. • Basic plan for fulfilling data protection obligations <p>1 =</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal is unclear, does not provide evidence of the potential impact, few or no target outcomes, and little or no alignment with the programme’s shared objectives. • No plan for fulfilling data protection obligations. 		
3) Evaluating and measuring impact	<p>5 =</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All factors set out in the Application Guidance under this criterion (3a) is supplied • There is a detailed and robust plan set out to monitor and evaluate project activities. • Outline logic model is completed and demonstrates a clear and viable path to achieving the proposed impacts. • Proposal uses appropriate indicators to measure progress, in line with Government’s methods of measuring and monitoring outcomes for integrated communities. • Where relevant, proposal includes plans for a counterfactual to measure what might have happened without the project and demonstrate successful delivery of outcomes. <p>4 =</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a plan set out to monitor and evaluate project activities. • All factors set out in the Application Guidance under this criterion (3a) is supplied • Outline logic model is completed and reasonable/viable. • Proposal uses indicators to measure progress, in line with Government’s methods of measuring and monitoring outcomes for integrated communities. 	25	3

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where relevant, proposal has included some plans for a counterfactual to measure what might have happened without the project and demonstrate successful delivery of outcomes. <p>3 =</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a plan set out to monitor and evaluate project activities. • The plan covers some of the factors set out in the Application Guidance under this criterion (3a) • Outline logic model is completed. • Proposal uses indicators to measure progress. <p>2 =</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan set out to monitor and evaluate project activities is weak or incomplete. • The plan does not cover the factors set out in the Application Guidance under this criterion (3a) • Outline logic model is weak or incomplete. • Any indicators listed to measure progress are not robust. <p>1 =</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little or no plan set out to monitor and evaluate project activities. • Outline logic model is incomplete or missing. • Indicators to measure progress are weak or missing. 		
4) Value for money	<p>Please refer to the application pack for rules on what the fund can and cannot pay for, and the ‘spend by’ date.</p> <p>5 =</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals must include all the factors listed in the ‘Assessment Criteria: Criteria 4’ section of the application guidance • Application includes a clear and detailed breakdown of requested funding, including an accurate forecast of all reasonable and proportionate costs by activity, staff resource or theme. • The funding requested is reasonable and proportionate to the scope and challenge being addressed. • All anticipated benefits are quantified. • All risks are noted, with achievable mitigation suggestions against each. • Proposal includes significant additional funding, match funding if possible, from other sources. <p>4 =</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposals must include the vast majority of factors listed in the ‘Assessment Criteria: Criteria 2’ section of the application guidance. • Application includes a breakdown of requested funding, including an accurate forecast of all 	25	3

	<p>reasonable and proportionate costs by activity, staff resource or theme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The funding requested is reasonable and proportionate to the challenge being addressed. • The majority of anticipated benefits are quantified. • A substantial list of key risks are noted, and achievable mitigation actions are noted. • Proposal includes some additional funding from other sources. <p>3 =</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application includes a breakdown of requested funding. • The funding requested is proportionate to the challenge being addressed. • Some anticipated benefits are quantified. • Main risks are noted, with appropriate mitigation suggestions. • Proposal does not include funding from other sources. <p>2 =</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • Or, the amount of money is not proportionate or reasonable, despite a detailed breakdown of predicted spend. • No anticipated benefits are quantified. • No risks are noted. • No funding from other sources are listed. <p>1 =</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An unrealistic funding request that is not proportionate to the size of the overall fund. • Lacks credible information and does not represent value for money in any of the ways indicated in the previous scoring categories. 		
--	--	--	--