Item No: 10

Meeting Date: **Wednesday 24th January 2024**

Glasgow City
Integration Joint Board

Report By: **Sharon Wearing, Chief Officer, Finance and Resources**

Contact: **Margaret Hogg, Assistant Chief Officer**

Phone: **0141 287 8838**

Glasgow City IJB Grants Policy

Purpose of Report:	The purpose of this report is to seek approval for an IJB Grants Policy. This policy will apply to all grant funding which is awarded by functions delegated to Glasgow City Integration Joint Board (IJB) and delivered by the Health and Social Care Partnership. It will apply to both Council and Health Board functions which fall within this definition.

Background/Engagement:	The purpose of this policy is to recognise that grant funding is one tool available to the IJB in the delivery of its Strategic Plan with delivery supported through the grant giving powers of both Partner Bodies. This policy will define when it would be appropriate to use grants as a funding route.

Governance Route:	The matters contained within this paper have been previously considered by the following group(s) as part of its development. HSCP Senior Management Team ☒ Council Corporate Management Team ☐ Health Board Corporate Management Team ☐ Council Committee ☐ Update requested by IJB ☐ Other ☒ Core Leadership Teams Glasgow City Council Internal Audit Service Greater Glasgow and Clyde Health Board Financial Governance Service

Recommendations:	The Integration Joint Board is asked to: a) Approve the IJB Grants Policy; b) Note the guidance which has been developed to support delivery of the policy; and c) Note that a request will be made to Glasgow City Council to change the Glasgow City Council Scheme of Delegation to reflect the role of the IJB as approver of grants programmes for Council's Social Work Services and remove the need for Council committee approval.

Relevance to Integration Joint Board Strategic Plan:

The IJB aims to deliver a sustainable health and social care service for the City which will focus on prevention and early intervention approaches and will enable individuals and communities to support each other. This requires a range of tools to be in place to support the delivery of this ambition. This grants policy is one tool.

Implications for Health and Social Care Partnership:

Reference to National Health & Wellbeing Outcome(s):	This policy will support delivery of these outcomes.

Personnel:	Not applicable at this time.

Carers:	Not applicable at this time.

Provider Organisations:	Not applicable at this time.

Equalities:	This policy has been subject to an EQIA assessment and has been published at the link below: https://glasgowcity.hscp.scot/publication/eqia-policy-issuing-grant-funding-external-organisations

Fairer Scotland Compliance:	This policy will support delivery of Fairer Scotland principles.

Financial:	None. Funding will be identified for individual grants programmes prior to them being approved.

Legal:	Not applicable at this time.

Economic Impact:	Not applicable at this time.

Sustainability:	Not applicable at this time.

Sustainable Procurement and Article 19:	Not applicable at this time.

Risk Implications:	Not applicable at this time.

Implications for Glasgow City Council:	This policy will apply to all grant funding which is awarded by functions delegated to Glasgow City Integration Joint Board (IJB) and delivered by the Health and Social Care Partnership. It will apply to both Council and Health Board functions which fall within this definition.

Implications for NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde:	This policy will apply to all grant funding which is awarded by functions delegated to Glasgow City Integration Joint Board (IJB) and delivered by the Health and Social Care Partnership. It will apply to both Council and Health Board functions which fall within this definition.

Direction Required to Council, Health Board or Both	
Direction to:	
1. No Direction Required	☒
2. Glasgow City Council	☐
3. NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde	☐
4. Glasgow City Council and NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde	☐

1. Purpose

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek approval for an IJB Grants Policy. This policy will apply to all grant funding which is awarded by functions delegated to Glasgow City Integration Joint Board (IJB) and delivered by the Health and Social Care Partnership. It will apply to both Council and Health Board functions which fall within this definition.

2. Background

2.1. Fundamentally the IJB seeks to deliver transformational change in the way health and social care services are planned, delivered and accessed in the city for better outcomes for our diverse population. The IJB aims to deliver a sustainable health and social care service for the City which will focus on prevention and early intervention approaches and will enable individuals and communities to support each other. This requires a range of tools to be in place to support the delivery of this ambition.

2.2. The purpose of this policy is to recognise that grant funding is one tool available to the IJB in the delivery of its Strategic Plan with delivery supported through the grant giving powers of both Partner Bodies. This policy will define when it would be appropriate to use grants as a funding route for services delegated to the IJB.

3.   **Grant Policy**

3.1   Public sector funding of external organisations is an important part of ensuring delivery of a wide range of services, in conjunction with a range of partners, to provide a 'seamless' service which offers greater choice for service users and patients whilst delivering quality services which secure best value.

3.2   Grant funding is not intended to be a replacement for the procurement of services and its use requires to be governed to ensure compliance with the relevant rules and regulations.

3.3   The functions delegated to the IJB are wide ranging and as a result this policy cannot define all aspects of what a grant funding programme should look like in support of delivering the IJB's ambitions. This will require individual grant funding programmes to be developed by functions and submitted for approval ahead of grant funding being considered as an option.

3.4   This policy can define what overarching principles must be followed when developing grant funding programmes for functions delegated to the IJB and the guidance which must be followed when developing and implementing grant funding programmes. This will include the approval routes to ensure compliance with IJB and Partner Body rules and regulations.

3.5   Glasgow City Council Scheme of Delegation requires all new grants to be considered by a Glasgow City Council committee. The Councils Scheme of Delegation has one exception which is where grants are provided under the statutory provision in (a) the Social Work (Scotland) Act 1968, the Children's Act 1975, or the Children (Scotland) Act 1995; and (b) Sections 29 and 30 of the Children (Scotland) Act 1995, Section 73 of the Regulation of Care (Scotland) Act 2001 and Section 6 of the Children (Leaving Care) Act 2000. As a result, any grants programme approved by the IJB for Council services where the exception does not apply would also require to go to a Glasgow City Council committee prior to a grant programme commencing and awards of grants being made. This report recommends that a request is made to Glasgow City Council to change the Glasgow City Council Scheme of Delegation to reflect the role of the IJB as approver of grants programmes for Council's Social Work Services and remove the need for Council committee approval. This will be done at the next annual review of the Council's Scheme of Delegation. There is no corresponding requirement for Health Board approval prior to commencing a grants programme.

3.6   Grant funding programmes for functions delegated to the IJB must follow the overarching principles that recognises that communities are best placed to identify and deliver solutions that meet their needs. The contribution that community led organisations can make to delivery are vital to creating, empowering, and sustaining resilient communities and this should be reflected in grant funding programmes developed. Programmes should be further underpinned by a focus on the IJB's strategic priorities.

3.7   Grant programmes must be focused on local communities of place and interest and as a result applicants will be restricted to the following types of organisations:

- Company Ltd by Guarantee
- Scottish Charitable Incorporated Organisation (SCIO)
- Community Interest Company (CIC)
- Social Enterprise
- Housing Associations
- Colleges

3.8   Grant funding will not be considered for:

- Individuals or Sole Traders
- Organisations that generate profit for private distribution
- Statutory/Public Bodies such as Glasgow City Council and its Arm's Length External Organisations, Community Councils, NHS, Police Scotland etc, except for charitable arms of these organisations which are registered formally as charities
- Unincorporated Organisations unless it is for small value grants.

3.9   The full grants policy is included in Appendix 1 for consideration and approval.

4.   Guidance on Issuing of Grant Funding to External Organisations

4.1   Guidance has been written to support delivery of this policy and to ensure strong financial governance is in place which meets the rules and regulations which govern the IJB and our Partner Bodies. All grant funding programmes must follow this guidance when developing, gaining approval, and implementing funding programmes.

4.2   It is important to ensure clear public accountability for public funds at the same time as supporting initiatives to secure quality local authority and NHS services in the most effective, efficient, and economic manner.

4.3   The principles of openness, integrity and accountability apply to the IJB in their decisions on spending public money which are subject to public record and external audit. These principles should also apply to funds or other resources which are transferred by IJB's to external organisations such as companies, trusts and voluntary bodies.

4.4   This guidance is intended to build on the arrangements which are already in place to ensure that we continue to secure accountability for such funds and that the principles of regularity and probity are not circumvented.

4.5   The IJB also has a responsibility to the organisations which apply for funding. This guidance also aims to ensure that grant processes are open and transparent for organisations which seek funding. It also tries to take a

risk-based approach striking a balance between the IJBs need for accountability and the benefits which come from supporting organisations to support the people of Glasgow.

4.6   These procedures have been developed to ensure adherence to the Code of Guidance on Funding External Bodies and Following the Public Pound which was jointly published in 1996 by the Accounts Commission and the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities, Glasgow City Council's Scheme of Delegated Functions and NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde Standing Financial Instructions.

4.7   The full guidance is included in Appendix 2 for information.

5.   Recommendations

5.1.   The Integration Joint Board is asked to:

a)   Approve the IJB Grants Policy;
b)   Note the guidance which has been developed to support delivery of the policy; and
c)   Note that a request will be made to Glasgow City Council to change the Glasgow City Council Scheme of Delegation to reflect the role of the IJB as approver of grants programmes for Council's Social Work Services and remove the need for Council committee approval.

Glasgow City Integration Joint Board
Policy on Issuing of Grant Funding to External Organisations

Introduction

Glasgow City Integration Joint Board (IJB) is a joint venture between NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde and Glasgow City Council. The purpose of the IJB is to improve the wellbeing of the population we serve and those people who use health and social care services, particularly those whose needs are complex and involve support from health and social care at the same time.

Fundamentally the IJB seeks to deliver transformational change in the way health and social care services are planned, delivered, and accessed in the city for better outcomes for our diverse population. The IJB aims to deliver a sustainable health and social care service for the City which will focus on prevention and early intervention approaches and will enable individuals and communities to support each other. This requires a range of tools to be in place to support the delivery of this ambition.

Purpose of the Policy

Public sector funding of external organisations is an important part of ensuring delivery of a wide range of services, in conjunction with a range of partners, to provide a 'seamless' service which offers greater choice for service users and patients whilst delivering quality services which secure best value.

Grant funding is not intended to be a replacement for the procurement of services and its use requires to be governed to ensure compliance with the relevant rules and regulations.

However, it can be a useful vehicle in supporting a range of organisations to offer support and services which can contribute to the delivery of the IJB's aims, whilst engaging with service users and patients in a way that traditional procured services cannot achieve. Importantly grants enable community organisations to address specific health and social care needs at a local community level and empowers community groups to take an active role in improving the well-being of their population and the people who access their resources. Examples are the ability of voluntary organisations to engage with socially excluded groups such as drug users and the homeless who may be reluctant to contact statutory agencies to access services. In addition, these services can offer wider benefits to local communities by, for example, helping people to develop skills and encouraging community involvement.

The purpose of this policy is to recognise that grant funding is one tool available to the IJB in the delivery of its Strategic Plan with delivery supported through the grant giving powers of both Partner Bodies. This policy will define when it would be appropriate to use grants as a funding route.

Scope of the Policy

This policy will apply to all grant funding which is awarded by functions delegated to Glasgow City Integrated Joint Board (IJB) and delivered by the Health and Social Care Partnership. It will apply to both Council and Health Board functions which fall within this definition.

This policy should apply to any new funding relationship entered into by the functions delegated to the IJB and to existing funding relationships at the earliest possible review date.

Policy for the Use of Grant Funding

The functions delegated to the IJB are wide ranging and as a result this policy cannot define all aspects of what a grant funding programme should look like in support of delivering the IJB's ambitions. This will require individual grant funding programmes to be developed by functions and submitted for approval ahead of grant funding being considered as an option.

This policy can define what overarching principles must be followed when developing grant funding programmes for functions delegated to the IJB and the guidance which must be followed when developing and implementing grant funding programmes. This will include the approval routes to ensure compliance with IJB and Partner Body rules and regulations.

Grant funding programmes for functions delegated to the IJB must follow the overarching principles that recognises that communities are best placed to identify and deliver solutions that meet their needs. The contribution that community led organisations can make to delivery are vital to creating, empowering, and sustaining resilient communities and this should be reflected in grant funding programmes developed.

Programmes should be further underpinned by a focus on the IJB's Strategic Priorities

1. Prevention, early intervention and well-being

2. Supporting greater self-determination and informed choice

3. Supporting people in their communities

4. Strengthening communities to reduce harm

5. A healthy, valued and supported workforce

6. Building a sustainable future

Grant programmes must be focused on local communities of place and interest and as a result applicants will be restricted to the following types of organisations:

- Company Ltd by Guarantee
- Scottish Charitable Incorporated Organisation (SCIO)
- Community Interest Company (CIC)
- Social Enterprise
- Housing Associations
- Colleges

Grant funding will not be considered for:

- Individuals or Sole Traders
- Organisations that generate profit for private distribution
- Statutory/Public Bodies such as Glasgow City Council and its Arm's Length External Organisations, Community Councils, NHS, Police Scotland etc, except for charitable arms of these organisations which are registered formally as charities
- Unincorporated Organisations unless it is for small value grants

Guidance for the Provision of Grant Funding

Guidance has been written to support delivery of this policy and to ensure strong financial governance is in place which meets the rules and regulations which govern the IJB and our Partner Bodies. All grant funding programmes must follow this guidance when developing, gaining approval, and implementing funding programmes.

24 January 2024

Guidance on Issuing of Grant Funding to External Organisations
24 January 2024

Objectives of the Guidance

It is important to ensure clear public accountability for public funds at the same time as supporting initiatives to secure quality local authority and NHS services in the most effective, efficient, and economic manner.

The principles of openness, integrity and accountability apply to the IJB in their decisions on spending public money which are subject to public record and external audit. These principles should also apply to funds or other resources which are transferred by IJB's to external organisations such as companies, trusts and voluntary bodies.

This guidance is intended to build on the arrangements which are already in place to ensure that we continue to secure accountability for such funds and that the principles of regularity and probity are not circumvented.

The IJB also has a responsibility to the organisations which apply for funding. This guidance also aims to ensure that grant processes are open and transparent for organisations which seek funding. It also tries to take a risk-based approach striking a balance between the IJBs need for accountability and the benefits which come from supporting organisations to support the people of Glasgow.

These procedures have been developed to ensure adherence to the Code of Guidance on Funding External Bodies and Following the Public Pound which was jointly published in 1996 by the Accounts Commission and the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities, Glasgow City Council's Scheme of Delegated Functions and NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde Standing Financial Instructions.

Scope of the Guidance

This guidance will apply to all grant funding which is awarded by functions delegated to Glasgow City Integrated Joint Board (IJB) and delivered by the Health and Social Care Partnership. It will apply to both Council and Health Board functions which fall within this definition.

This guidance should apply to any new funding relationship entered into by the functions delegated to the IJB and to existing funding relationships at the earliest possible review date.

Definition of Grant Funding

It is important that staff are clear what is defined as grant funding and what is spend which should be procured through the traditional procurement rules. In principle the difference between a grant and a procured contract is clear

- in the case of a grant, the public body contributes to a project carried out by an external organisation, or contributes directly to that organisation, because the project or activities have been identified as in alignment with and/or directly contribute to the public body's policy aims.
- in the case of a procured contract, the public body specifies the product or service that it wants and receives that product or service in return for payment.

However, in practice it may not always be clear whether something could properly be funded by a grant or whether it should be procured under a contract.

Grants are issued, depending on eligibility and funding, where:

- the public body has a legal basis to pay the grant and the grant will further the public body's duties
- the project or organisation being funded contributes to the public body's policy aims
- the money will be used to deliver something (which can include goods, services, or works) to someone other than the public body itself.

The following questions may help establish whether a grant or a procured contract is most appropriate. These are intended to serve as guidance only but may provide a strong indication.

- If the project was not being delivered by the provider, would the public body need either to pay someone else to do it or do the project itself?
- If the project was started but not finished, would the public body need either to pay someone else to finish it or to finish the project itself?
- Once the project is finished, will the public body need either to pay someone to continue it or to continue the project itself?
- Is the public body, in effect, outsourcing a service provision, requirement or function?
- Is the project delivering one of the public body's statutory functions?

Answering "yes" to any of those questions may indicate that the public body needs this service to be provided and would therefore suggest that a procured service contract, rather than a grant, may be most appropriate. The key factor is whether the body needs the work to be completed [Clearly, if a public body is considering issuing a grant to fund a project, it wants the project to be completed, but the important distinction is whether the body needs the project to be completed].

The following questions may also be useful to consider:

- What does the public body require in return for the funding? (A requirement to produce progress reports and evidence of delivery against agreed targets or outputs may be consistent with a grant. However, a requirement to comply with detailed obligations and specific requirements set by the public body could suggest that a procured contract may be more appropriate).
- If the project was not completed as agreed, what remedy would the public body want to have? (Restricting or reclaiming the funding would be consistent with a grant. However, legal action to force completion would suggest that procurement may be more appropriate).

If you are an unsure or need further guidance, a discussion with your commissioning link officer is recommended.

Things to Think About

If the proposed programme meets the definition of grants, then before you proceed there are a few further areas which merit consideration before you progress.

- Do you have the resources to support delivery of the programme both in terms of setting criteria, assessment of applications and monitoring of outcomes for the grant offered? If not is there an option to procure grant management services and if so, is there provision for this within the programme funding?
- Is your function the correct delivery vehicle for this programme or could this be delivered by a Partner Body who already has existing grant programmes or mechanisms to support this funding programme? Will this come at a cost and if so, is there provision for this within the programme funding?
- Why is grant support required in this particular function? Are there other funding streams offered by other bodies? Is there a gap to be filled? Would there be synergies in working jointly with other funding programmes?
- If this programme is about supporting developments in services where there are gaps, can the grants process deliver on this given the limited control which can be exerted over the outcome?
- How do you develop a programme which upholds equity/equality across different funds/localities and organisations in the sector

Even if you decide that an alternative delivery vehicle is an option, approval to offer these grants to support delivery of IJB objectives still requires to be sought.

Approval Routes

All proposed grants programmes will require a business meeting report to be presented to the Chief Officer and Chief Finance Officer which will outline the proposed grant fund and should consider all the points identified in the 'Developing Your Grants Programme' below. This report needs to be clear whether this grants programme is being offered as part of a function delegated by the Council/NHS or both.

Glasgow City Council Scheme of Delegation requires all new grants to be considered by a Glasgow City Council committee. The Councils Scheme of Delegation has one exception which is where grants are provided under the statutory provision in (a) the Social Work (Scotland) Act 1968, the Children's Act 1975, or the Children (Scotland) Act 1995; and (b) Sections 29 and 30 of the Children (Scotland) Act 1995, Section 73 of the Regulation of Care (Scotland) Act 2001 and Section 6 of the Children (Leaving Care) Act 2000.

As a result, if a grants programme is proposed for Council functions and the exception above does not apply, irrespective of value, there needs to be a report to the IJB approving the programme, as well as a report to the relevant Glasgow City Council committee referencing the IJB approval and direction which also seeks Glasgow City Council approval. This also requires to be done BEFORE any grant awards are made unless delegated authority can be secured.

In the future, it may be possible to seek a revision to the Glasgow City Council's Scheme of Delegation to seek approval limits which can be delegated to the Chief Officer. This will be considered as proposals are brought forward for approval.

For Health services, following business meeting approval, the Chief Officer, and Chief Finance Officer, will consider if IJB approval is required. There is no need for Health Board approval prior to commencing a grants programme. An extension to an existing contract or a waiver for tender must be signed by the Chief Officer before grants are awarded. Signature by the NHS Head of Procurement is also required for a waiver to tender. The NHS Head of Procurement is responsible for the issue of condition of grant letters.

Developing Your Grants Programme

All grants' programmes developed to support delivery of the IJB Strategic Plan must have a high-level grants programme which defines the following:

- **Aims of the Fund**
  What is the fund trying to achieve? Why can this not be secured via an available commissioning route – why is grant funding recommended? How will this contribute to the delivery of the IJB's Strategic Priorities

- **Outcomes Anticipated**
  These should follow the SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timely) principles and should be described in a way which will support monitoring of outcomes at the end of the process when grants have been awarded and projects delivered. This should include the proposed evaluation methodology relevant to the value of the overall programme and minimum and maximum values of the grant available. Higher value awards are likely to require a greater level of evidence gathering to support impact and outcomes achieved compared to values that are lower in value.

- **Priorities of the Fund**
  These should be clearly defined as these will form part of the assessment process.

- **Eligibility - Who Can Apply?**
  The IJB has been clear that grant programmes must be focused on local communities and as a result applicants will be restricted to the following types of organisation:

  - Company Ltd by Guarantee
  - Scottish Charitable Incorporated Organisation (SCIO)
  - Community Interest Company (CIC)
  - Social Enterprise
  - Housing Associations
  - Colleges

  Grant funding will not be considered for:

  - Individuals or Sole Traders
  - Organisations that generate profit for private distribution

- o Statutory/Public Bodies such as Glasgow City Council and its Arm's Length External Organisations, Community Councils, NHS, Police Scotland etc, except for charitable arms of these organisations which are registered formally as charities
- o Unincorporated Organisations unless it is for small value grants

- **Eligibility Criteria - What Can and Cannot be Supported?**

  It is expected that funding will be spent in Glasgow for the benefits of Glasgow citizens. Eligibility criteria will need to be developed for each specific grant programme. However, as a guide the areas which could be considered for funding are:

  - o Employee costs including staff salaries and training
  - o Activity and programme costs
  - o Running costs including premises, utilities, equipment
  - o Event costs
  - o Development of enhanced community asset activities
  - o Professional fees including audit costs
  - o Accessibility costs e.g., interpreting
  - o Full Cost Recovery

  Areas that are unlikely to be supported for funding could include:

  - o Capital costs
  - o Religious or political activities
  - o Costs already funded by someone else
  - o Costs incurred before the activity starts or approval is granted
  - o Expenditure on alcohol, tobacco, drugs and other harmful substances/circumstances
  - o Initiatives noncompliant with the Equality Act (Scotland) 2010 and forthcoming Equalities and Human Rights legislation
  - o Recoverable VAT
  - o Loans or interest
  - o Mortgages
  - o Activities out with Glasgow and/or not for the benefit of Glasgow citizens or Greater Glasgow and Clyde for hosted services

  It is essential that once determined for a programme these are not changed and are consistently applied and communicated for each programmme.

- **Overall Funding Available**

  The proposal should include details of the total funding available, the minimum and maximum funding that organisations can apply for and when you expect projects to be able to start and complete.

- **Timetable**

  An anticipated programme should be included which shows the following key dates:

- o When fund will open
- o Deadline for submission of applications – would recommend at least 8 weeks
- o When assessment will be complete – this will take a minimum of 6 weeks depending on resources
- o When award recommendations will be made to business meeting
- o For council functions, anticipated reporting dates for IJB and CAC
- o When award letters will be issued
- o Date monitoring will commence
- o When programmes need to be delivered including spend – need to ensure that adequate time is provided to support delivery by applicant organisations, especially when recruitment is required.

- **Practical Tips and Things to Think About**

  - o Who should be involved in the development of the programme? You should consider co-production with the local community/community equality groups/service users/patients and their families.
  - o What level of grant is being offered and if a maximum cap is applied how do you ensure that this is reasonable for groups with disabilities to ensure accessibility costs and programme delivery can be managed within the cap
  - o Are there any groups which are currently underrepresented in terms of services and if so, would you want to prioritise them or highlight them within the programme design/eligibility criteria?
  - o Consider having an official launch to raise the profile of the programme.
  - o Awareness/Help sessions for potential applicants can also be useful. This should include engagement with community equality groups.
  - o A mailbox is required for submission of applications and enquiries re the fund
  - o An automated message is helpful to acknowledge receipt of application forms etc
  - o Mailing list for applicants should be developed to support broad communications to all potential applicants and support communications with applicants during the process
  - o Ensure application forms and guidance being issued meets accessibility standards BEFORE you publish
  - o Would the assessment process benefit from having service users/patients involved?
  - o Ensure closing dates for applications are well communicated including through social media channels
  - o When planning programmes consider what other grants programmes are running at the same time either within Partner Bodies or through the third and independent sector to avoid conflicts and maximise opportunities for applications to be made.
  - o Resourcing of the programme can be impacted by annual leave or unexpected leave; cover arrangements should be planned to avoid disruption to the programme.
  - o For new staff involved in programmes full training should be put in place ahead of the programme starting.
  - o Allow time at the end of the application process to provide feedback to unsuccessful bidders

- **How Will Applications Be Assessed and Who Will Undertake the Assessment?**

  The proposals should include details of how assessments will be undertaken and who will undertake them. This should include:

  - Details of basic eligibility checks to ensure they meet the criteria before detail assessments are completed.
  - Steps to be taken to ensure applications are assessed independently and that no conflicts of interest arise.
  - Who will be the assessing officers and who will the officer responsible for chairing the funding panel and adjudication of applications where dispute arise either during the assessment process or after awards have been made?
  - Do you have finance teams involved to support assessment of finance evaluations?
  - Will the assessment process allow clarification from applicants to support applications? If yes, this needs to be specified at the start of the process to provide a level playing field.
  - The assessment and scoring template to be used. For grants £20,000 and above the template below is recommended. It is recognised that for short time projects scoring of sustainability may not be appropriate and scoring can be revised to reflect this where appropriate.

Criteria	Weighting
Organisation/Governance	5
Project Development	18
Project Delivery	28
Project Impact – Impact and Outcome of the Fund	34
Project Finance	10
Sustainability	5
Total Points Available	100

  - The assessment and scoring template to be used. For grants under £20,000 the template below is recommended. It is recognised that for short time projects scoring of sustainability may not be appropriate and scoring can be revised to reflect this where appropriate.

Criteria	Weighting
Who is Applying - Organisation/Governance	5
Involving Local People – Project Development	8
How Will You Do It? - Project Delivery	28
Why Do You Want to Do This? - Project Development and Impact	44
Costs - Project Finance	10
Sustainability	5
Total Points Available	100

o For all grants each criteria should then be assessed using the Score Key Assessment Tool below. This should range from 0 (lowest) – 100 (highest). This will be used to provide a weighted score for each applicant. The application template has been designed to ensure that all components of the guidance can be recorded to support the assessment process.

Scoring Guidance	Key Assessment	Score
No response is provided to allow the criteria to be assessed	No Response	0
Response provided but not acceptable, not relevant or contains minimal information or, where relevant to the nature of criteria to be assessed, unacceptable or minimal experience/skills/resources	Unacceptable	20
Response fails to satisfactorily provide information to enable the entire criteria to be assessed or, where relevant to the assessment provides limited relevant information or limited experience/skills/resources	Serious Reservations	40
Response enables the criteria to be assessed and contains satisfactory information or, where relevant to the assessment satisfactory experience/skills/resources but could be enhanced in multiple aspects	Minor Reservations	60
Response enables the criteria to be assessed and contains good information or, where relevant to the assessment good experience/skills/resources but could be enhanced in one aspect	Good	80
Fully detailed response enables the criteria to be assessed and contains excellent information or, where relevant to the assessment excellent experience/skills/resources answering the entire remit of the question	Excellent	100

Guidance for Assessing Grants £20,000 and Above

1.   Introduction

1.1   An assessing staff member, is anyone who participates in assessing a grant application as part of an IJB Grant Funding Programme. These guidance notes have been devised to aid Assessing staff to complete the assessment and scoring of eligible applications to the IJB Grant Funding Programme and should be read prior to assessing applications.

2.   Background

2.1   Prior to commencing the assessment each Assessing staff should review the specific Grants Programme documentation for the Grant Programme being assessed which defines a range of areas relevant to each individual programme including aims, outcomes, impacts, eligibility criteria, grant awards and scoring. This will provide the context for the assessment process.

3.   Pre-Assessment

a.   Eligibility Check

3.1   Prior to the Assessment and Scoring Stage, an initial analysis will be conducted by the Assessing staff to identify ineligible applications. Ineligible applications include:

- Did not meet the deadline for applications
- Non-submission of required documentation. All applications that have been received should be logged on the IJB Grant Fund - Application Log. This spreadsheet records whether all required documentation has been submitted. For example, the application form is the only part that has been submitted with no budget form or minutes of meetings; and
- Funding request is out with the threshold specified by the fund.

3.2   Only eligible applications will be put forward for assessment. Any applications that are deemed ineligible will be put forward to the Adjudication Manager for adjudication. The Adjudication Manager should be someone who is not involved in the assessment process. Ideally this should be someone who is more senior than the staff undertaking the role of Assessing staff or someone from a partner body where a joint assessment process is being undertaken.

b.   Assessment Documents

3.3   Prior to commencing and throughout the assessment of eligible applications, Assessing staff should refer to the following documentation outlined below.

(i)   Fund Guidance

3.4   Assessing staff should familiarise themselves with the relevant fund application pack which will have been issued to applicants wishing to apply to the fund.

3.5   In particular they should familiarise themselves with aims, principles, outcomes, and priorities of the fund being assessed. This information can be found in the Grants Programme approved when the fund was established.

(ii)   Application Forms, Budget Forms and Supporting Documentation

3.6   A Project Workspace folder should be created on EDRMS for Council Services and the network drive for NHS Services to save Application Forms, Budget Forms and Supporting Documentation. Access should be restricted to Assessing staff and information that is saved in it should be treated confidentially. The Project Workspace should contain the following folders:

- Application and Budget Forms (Holding Folder) Application and Budget Forms can be accessed in this folder. They have been saved using the following naming convention:

  Organisation Name – Application
  Organisation Name – Budget

- Application Supporting Docs (Holding Folder) Supporting documentation for each application can be accessed in this folder. Supporting documentation includes Accounts; Governing Document; and Bank Statement and Minutes of Meetings. They have been saved using the following naming convention:

  Organisation Name – Bank statement
  Organisation Name – Governing Doc
  Organisation Name – Minute March 2023 (for example)
  Organisation Name – Accounts March 2023 (for example)

- Assessments. This folder is for completed assessments. Assessing Officers should save all assessments in this folder and use the following naming convention:

  Organisation Name – Assessment

3.7   All information should be treated confidentially.

(iii)   Assessment and Scoring Template

3.8   An Assessment and Scoring Template has been developed to assess and score eligible applications to ensure that:

- Funding is directed towards activities that contribute to the aims, principles, outcomes, and priorities of the fund.
- Applicants are treated fairly and undergo the same process in determining whether they are funded; and
- Any 'risks' in providing funding are taken into consideration.

3.9   The Assessment and Scoring Template should be completed for each eligible application. All application forms passed for scoring will have passed the eligibility checks.

Assessment and Scoring Template

3.10   Further information how to use the Assessment and Scoring Template is provided below at Section 4 and Appendix 1.

Allocation of Applications for Assessment

3.11   Applications should be assigned to Assessing staff. It should be noted that for reasons of openness and transparency, Assessing staff should not assess applications from the geographical areas that they support as part of their current operational duties, wherever practically possible. Assessing staff should also be independent of the organisation they are assessing and have a duty to declare any interests in an organisation prior to the assessment enabling the application to be assigned to another assessing officer.

3.12   Assessing staff who are carrying out assessment and scoring for the first time should either be 'buddied' with more experienced staff or where this is a new process support can be offered from the IJBs Finance Teams. If they are unsure about some applications and information included, they should speak to either other Assessing staff of the IJBs Finance Team. Assessing staff should provide peer support for each other and use it.

4.   Assessment and Scoring Process

4.1   The Assessment and Scoring Template is based on information that has been submitted in the Application Form and Budget Template and each application will be assessed on the following criteria. It is recognised that for short time projects scoring of sustainability may not be appropriate and scoring can be revised to reflect this where appropriate.

Table 1: Assessment and Scoring Template Criterion

Criteria	Weighting
Organisation/Governance	5
Project Development	18
Project Delivery	28
Project Impact – Impact and Outcome of the Fund	34
Project Finance	10
Sustainability	5
Total Points Available	100

4.2   It should be noted that each criteria has been weighted appropriately. Applications should demonstrate in the Project Development, Project Delivery and Project Impact sections that they are addressing the overarching aim of the fund.

4.3   Assessing staff should allocate each criterion a score using the following Score Key Assessment Tool below. This should range from 0 (lowest) – 100 (highest).

Table 2: Score Key Assessment Tool

Scoring Guidance	Key Assessment	Score
No response is provided to allow the criteria to be assessed	No Response	0
Response provided but not acceptable, not relevant or contains minimal information or, where relevant to the nature of criteria to be assessed, unacceptable or minimal experience/skills/resources	Unacceptable	20
Response fails to satisfactorily provide information to enable the entire criteria to be assessed or, where relevant to the assessment provides limited relevant information or limited experience/skills/resources	Serious Reservations	40
Response enables the criteria to be assessed and contains satisfactory information or, where relevant to the assessment satisfactory experience/skills/resources but could be enhanced in multiple aspects	Minor Reservations	60
Response enables the criteria to be assessed and contains good information or, where relevant to the assessment good experience/skills/resources but could be enhanced in one aspect	Good	80
Fully detailed response enables the criteria to be assessed and contains excellent information or, where relevant to the assessment excellent experience/skills/resources	Excellent	100

answering the entire remit of the question		

4.4   A weighted score will automatically populate in the template and calculate the overall score for each application.

4.5   There is also a comments column for each criterion. Assessing staff should use this, where necessary, to provide a short narrative to highlight any strengths or reservations. For example, under Governance a comment could be made that there are some reservations with the Governance Structure. All comments should be based on the evidence provided with the application form/supporting papers.

4.6   Assessing staff should also refer to Accounts; Governing Document; Bank Statement and Minutes of Meetings.

4.7   Guidance is provided in Appendix1 on what Assessing staff should be assessing under each criterion.

4.8   Completed Assessments should be saved in the folder using the naming format highlighted at Para 3.6, bullet point 3.

4.9   A senior officer such as the Assistant Chief Finance Officer for Finance should review the completed assessment to ensure consistency of scoring ahead of a funding panel being convened.

5.   Recommendation Process

5.1   This section outlines the steps to be taken to complete the recommendation process in relation grant awards and IJB governance processes.

5.2   Once all assessments have been completed a funding panel should be convened with assessing officers in attendance to report on their individual assessments and recommendations.

5.3   The discussions at this meeting may require clarifications to be sought from applicants. These clarifications should be written by the assessor and submitted to the provider to allow the funding panel to consider their application. Clarifications should be used fairly and consistently across all applicants to ensure a fair and equitable process.

5.4   This panel will have responsibility for making the final recommendations in relation to which organisations are offered grant funding. This will include a recommendation on the minimum threshold of scores which will be used to award grants. This will be dependent on both the funding available and the minimum acceptable threshold for viable projects.

5.5   The outcome of this assessment process and the recommended grant awards requires to be reported back to the Business Meeting. This report needs to be clear whether this grants programme is being offered as part of a function delegated by the Council/NHS or both. Glasgow City Council Scheme of Delegation requires all grant awards to be considered by a Glasgow City

Council committee. As a result, irrespective of value, there needs to be a report to the relevant Glasgow City Council committee which references the IJB approval and direction for the fund and seeks Glasgow City Council approval of the awards recommended. For Health functions, once grant awards are approved at the business meeting, an existing tender can be accessed for delivery or a waiver for tender must be signed by the Chief Officer before grants are awarded.

5.6   In the future, it may be possible to seek a revision to the Glasgow City Council's Scheme of Delegation to seek approval limits which can be delegated to the Chief Officer. This will be considered as proposals are brought forward for approval.

6.   Award Letters

6.1   Following receipt of the necessary approvals outlined in section 5 an award letter can be issued to all successful applications.

6.2   For Council services this must be issued by the service and should also include a copy of the standard conditions of grants, blank information mandate and a funding acceptance form. The funding acceptance form must be signed and completed before a project can commence.

6.3   For NHS services, the NHS Head of Procurement is responsible for the issue of condition of grant letters for NHS awards. The information from the waiver to tender document or from the contract fund management will be used to populate these letters.

7.   Payment of Grants

7.1   After all necessary approvals are in place, grants can be paid to successful organisations using the payment information received during the application process.

7.2   If the assessment process resulted in a conditional approval linked to payments i.e., such as the payment of grant in 2 stages this should be reflected in the payment schedule.

7.3   All successful applicants will be required to provide information about their community organisation on the HSCP's information platform namely 'Your Support Your Way Glasgow'.

8   Monitoring Process

8.1   It is important that a monitoring process is put in place to ensure that funds have been used as outlined in the application form, but also confirmation of the outcomes delivered.

8.2   A monitoring form is available and should be issued to organisations awarded grants when projects are completed. These completed forms can also be used when reporting the outcomes delivered from the grant funding programme put in place and can assist with evaluation processes.

Guidance for Assessing Grants < £20,000

1.   Introduction

1.1   An assessing staff member, is anyone who participates in assessing a grant application as part of an IJB Grant Funding Programme. These guidance notes have been devised to aid Assessing staff to complete the assessment and scoring of eligible applications to the IJB Grant Funding Programme and should be read prior to assessing applications.

2.   Background

2.1   Prior to commencing the assessment each Assessing staff should review the specific Grants Programme documentation for the Grant Programme being assessed which defines a range of areas relevant to each individual programme including aims, outcomes, impacts, eligibility criteria, grant awards and scoring. This will provide the context for the assessment process.

3.   Pre-Assessment

a.   Eligibility Check

3.1   Prior to the Assessment and Scoring Stage, an initial analysis will be conducted by the Assessing staff to identify ineligible applications. Ineligible applications include:

- Did not meet the deadline for applications
- Non-submission of required documentation. All applications that have been received should be logged on the IJB Grant Fund - Application Log. This spreadsheet records whether all required documentation has been submitted. For example, the application form is the only part that has been submitted with no budget form or minutes of meetings; and
- Funding request is out with the threshold specified by the fund.

3.2   Only eligible applications will be put forward for assessment. Any applications that are deemed ineligible will be put forward to the Adjudication Manager for adjudication. The Adjudication Manager should be someone who is not involved in the assessment process. Ideally this should be someone who is more senior than the staff undertaking the role of Assessing staff or someone from a partner body where a joint assessment process is being undertaken.

b.   Assessment Documents

3.3   Prior to commencing and throughout the assessment of eligible applications, Assessing staff should refer to the following documentation outlined below.

(i)   Fund Guidance

3.4   Assessing staff should familiarise themselves with the relevant fund application pack which will have been issued to applicants wishing to apply to the fund.

3.5   In particular they should familiarise themselves with aims, principles, outcomes, and priorities of the fund being assessed. This information can be found in the Grants Programme approved when the fund was established.

(ii)   Application Forms and Supporting Documentation

3.6   A Project Workspace folder should be created on EDRMS for Council Services and the network drive for NHS Services to save Application Forms and Supporting Documentation. Access should be restricted to Assessing staff and information that is saved in it should be treated confidentially. The Project Workspace should contain the following folders:

- Application Forms (Holding Folder) Application Forms can be accessed in this folder. They have been saved using the following naming convention:

    Organisation Name – Application
- Assessments. This folder is for completed assessments. Assessing Officers should save all assessments in this folder and use the following naming convention:

    Organisation Name – Assessment

3.7   All information should be treated confidentially.

(iii)   Assessment and Scoring Template

3.8   An Assessment and Scoring Template has been developed to assess and score eligible applications to ensure that:

- Funding is directed towards activities that contribute to the aims, principles, outcomes and priorities of the fund.
- Applicants are treated fairly and undergo the same process in determining whether or not they are funded; and
- Any 'risks' in providing funding are taken into consideration.

3.9   The Assessment and Scoring Template should be completed for each eligible application. All application forms passed for scoring will have passed the eligibility checks.

Assessment and Scoring Template

3.10   Further information how to use the Assessment and Scoring Template is provided below at Section 4 and Appendix 2.

Allocation of Applications for Assessment

3.11   Applications should be assigned to Assessing staff. It should be noted that for reasons of openness and transparency, Assessing staff should not assess applications from the geographical areas that they support as part of their current operational duties, wherever practically possible. Assessing staff should

also be independent of the organisation they are assessing and have a duty to declare any interests in an organisation prior to the assessment enabling the application to be assigned to another assessing officer.

3.12 Assessing staff who are carrying out assessment and scoring for the first time should either be 'buddied' with more experienced staff or where this is a new process support can be offered from the IJBs Finance Teams. If they are unsure about some applications and information included, they should speak to either the Assessing staff or the IJBs Finance Team. Assessing staff should provide peer support for each other and use it.

4.   Assessment and Scoring Process

4.1   The Assessment and Scoring Template is based on information that has been submitted in the Application Form and each application will be assessed on the following criteria. It is recognised that for short time projects scoring of sustainability may not be appropriate and scoring can be revised to reflect this where appropriate.

Table 1: Assessment and Scoring Template Criterion

Criteria	Weighting
Who is Applying - Organisation/Governance	5
Involving Local People – Project Development	8
How Will You Do It? - Project Delivery	28
Why Do You Want to Do This? - Project Development and Impact	44
Costs - Project Finance	10
Sustainability	5
Total Points Available	100

4.2   It should be noted that each criteria have been weighted appropriately. Applications should demonstrate in the application that they are addressing the overarching aim of the fund.

4.3   Assessing staff should allocate each criterion a score using the following Score Key Assessment Tool below. This should range from 0 (lowest) – 100 (highest).

Table 2: Score Key Assessment Tool

Scoring Guidance	Key Assessment	Score
No response is provided to allow the criteria to be assessed	No Response	0
Response provided but not acceptable, not relevant or contains minimal information or, where relevant to the nature of criteria to be assessed,	Unacceptable	20

unacceptable or minimal experience/skills/resources		
Response fails to satisfactorily provide information to enable the entire criteria to be assessed or, where relevant to the assessment provides limited relevant information or limited experience/skills/resources	Serious Reservations	40
Response enables the criteria to be assessed and contains satisfactory information or, where relevant to the assessment satisfactory experience/skills/resources but could be enhanced in multiple aspects	Minor Reservations	60
Response enables the criteria to be assessed and contains good information or, where relevant to the assessment good experience/skills/resources but could be enhanced in one aspect	Good	80
Fully detailed response enables the criteria to be assessed and contains excellent information or, where relevant to the assessment excellent experience/skills/resources answering the entire remit of the question	Excellent	100

4.4 A weighted score will automatically populate in the template and calculate the overall score for each application.

4.5 There is also a comments column for each criterion. Assessing staff should use this, where necessary, to provide a short narrative to highlight any strengths or particular reservations. For example, under Governance a comment could be made that there are some reservations with the Governance Structure. All comments should be based on the evidence provided with the application form/supporting papers or review of relevant websites such as OSCR.

4.6 Guidance is provided in Appendix 2 on what Assessing staff should be assessing under each criterion.

4.7   Completed Assessments should be saved in the folder using the naming format highlighted at Para 3.6, bullet point 3.

4.8   A senior officer such as the Assistant Chief Finance Officer for Finance should review the completed assessment to ensure consistency of scoring ahead of a funding panel being convened.

5.   Recommendation Process

5.1   This section outlines the steps to be taken to complete the recommendation process in relation grant awards and IJB governance processes.

5.2   Once all assessments have been completed a funding panel should be convened with assessing officers in attendance to report on their individual assessments and recommendations.

5.3   The discussions at this meeting may require clarifications to be sought from applicants. These clarifications should be written by the assessor and submitted to the provider to allow the funding panel to consider their application. Clarifications should be used fairly and consistently across all applicants to ensure a fair and equitable process.

5.4   This panel will have responsibility for making the final recommendations in relation to which organisations are offered grant funding. This will include a recommendation on the minimum threshold of scores which will be used to award grants. This will be dependent on both the funding available and the minimum acceptable threshold for viable projects.

5.5   The outcome of this assessment process and the recommended grant awards requires to be reported back to the Business Meeting. This report needs to be clear whether this grants programme is being offered as part of a function delegated by the Council/NHS or both. Glasgow City Council Scheme of Delegation requires all grant awards to be considered by a Glasgow City Council committee. As a result, irrespective of value, there needs to be a report to the relevant Glasgow City Council committee which references the IJB approval and direction for the fund and seeks Glasgow City Council approval of the awards recommended. For Health functions, once grant awards are approved at the business meeting, an existing tender can be accessed for delivery or a waiver for tender must be signed by the Chief Officer before grants are awarded.

5.6   In the future, it may be possible to seek a revision to the Glasgow City Council's Scheme of Delegation to seek approval limits which can be delegated to the Chief Officer. This will be considered as proposals are brought forward for approval.

6.   Award Letters

6.1   Following receipt of the necessary approvals outlined in section 5 an award letter can be issued to all successful applications.

6.2   For Council services this must be issued by the service and should also include a copy of the standard conditions of grants, blank information mandate and a funding acceptance form. The funding acceptance form must be signed and completed before a project can commence.

6.3   For NHS services, the NHS Head of Procurement is responsible for the issue of condition of grant letters for NHS awards. The information from the waiver to tender document or from the contract fund management will be used to populate these letters.

7.   Payment of Grants

7.1   After all necessary approvals are in place, grants can be paid to successful organisations using the payment information received during the application process.

7.2   If the assessment process resulted in a conditional approval linked to payments i.e., such as the payment of grant in 2 stages this should be reflected in the payment schedule.

7.3   All successful applicants will be required to provide information about their community organisation on the HSCP's information platform namely 'Your Support Your Way Glasgow'.

8   Monitoring Process

8.1   It is important that a monitoring process is put in place to ensure that funds have been used as outlined in the application form, but also confirmation of the outcomes delivered.

8.2   A monitoring form is available and should be issued to organisations awarded grants when projects are completed. These completed forms can also be used when reporting the outcomes delivered from the grant funding programme put in place and can assist with evaluation processes.

Sole Awards of Grant Funding

1.   Introduction

1.1   There may be exceptional circumstances when a sole award of grant funding may be considered out with a defined grants programme. This is likely to be in support of specific pieces of work which support delivery of the IJB objectives but do not require the need for a wider grants funding programme.

1.2   In these cases, it is important that officers are clear that this meets the definition of grants funding and is not a good or service which requires to be commissioned. In addition, similar to governance arrangements in commissioning, there would need to be a clear justification for why support should be offered to that specific organisation at the exclusion of the opportunity of offering funding to other organisations.

2.   Assessment of Request for Grant Funding

2.1   Although it is not anticipated that there will be a formal application for grant, there should be some form of submission which outlines what the request for funding is, the planned use of the funding, what it will be used for specifically and what the intended outcome which will be delivered.

2.2   In addition supporting documentation such as Accounts; Governing Document; and Bank Statement and Minutes of Meetings should also be obtained.

2.3   Similar to the assessment undertaken in a grant funding programme, it is expected that this application is assessed across the following headings and the outcome of this assessment should be reported to the business meeting.

Organisation/Governance
Project Development
Project Delivery
Project Impact – Impact and Outcome of the Fund
Project Finance
Sustainability

3.   Approval of Grant Funding

3.1   Any recommendation for a sole award will need to be the subject of a report to the business meeting. This report should cover the main purposes of the funding, what this funding will achieve and demonstrate that grant funding is the correct route of funding. This paper should also outline the justification for a sole award to that particular organisation. This report needs to be clear whether this grants programme is being offered as part of a function delegated by the Council/NHS or both. Glasgow City Council Scheme of Delegation requires all grant awards to be considered by a Glasgow City Council committee. As a result, irrespective of value, there needs to be a report to the relevant Glasgow City Council committee which references the IJB approval and direction for the fund and seeks Glasgow City Council approval of the awards recommended. For Health functions, once grant awards are approved at the business meeting,

a waiver for tender must be signed by the Chief Officer before grants are awarded.

4. Award Letters

4.1 Following receipt of the necessary approvals outlined in section 5 an award letter can be issued to all successful applications.

4.2 For Council services this must be issued by the service and should also include a copy of the standard conditions of grants, blank information mandate and a funding acceptance form. The funding acceptance form must be signed and completed before a project can commence.

4.3 For NHS services, the NHS Head of Procurement is responsible for the issue of condition of grant letters for NHS awards. The information from the waiver to tender document or from the contract fund management will be used to populate these letters.

5. Payment of Grants

5.1 After all necessary approvals are in place, grants can be paid to successful organisations using the payment information received during the application process.

5.2 If the assessment process resulted in a conditional approval linked to payments i.e., such as the payment of grant in 2 stages this should be reflected in the payment schedule.

6. Monitoring Process

6.1 It is important that a monitoring process is put in place to ensure that funds have been used as outlined in the application form, but also confirmation of the outcomes delivered.

6.2 A monitoring form is available and should be issued to organisations awarded grants when projects are completed. These completed forms can also be used when reporting the outcomes delivered from the grant funding programme put in place and can assist with evaluation processes.

Appendix 1
Guidelines for Scoring Criterion £20,000 and above

Before beginning, Assessing Officers should note that all information provided by the applicant may not be displayed within the text box in the application form. If this is the case, a scroll bar will be displayed at the side of the box or a + sign in the bottom right-hand corner. These applications will have additional pages attached to the back of the form with this text detailed.

During assessment you may identify that the Applicant has not completed some questions, please note these in the appropriate comment section.

When assessing applications Assessing Officers should use the following prompts:

1. Organisation/Governance
Refer to Section B/C in the Application Form. In scoring this section, consideration should be given to how effective the governance arrangements are including: - Consider the risk if the organisation is unincorporated – consider the level of funding applied for   - Are there any concerns relating to Governing meetings? e.g., are meetings quorate and meeting regularly, are there any concerns relating to the Board membership? You should refer to the minutes and Governing Document.   - Has the Governing document been reviewed in the last 3 years (refer to Governing document)   - Does the organisation have the governance arrangements in place to support the delivery? You should refer to the minutes, Governing Document and Annual Accounts.   - Has the organisation clearly outlined what its purpose is (refer to A4)   - Has the application form been signed by a Board Member? In cases where it has not, please note this in your comments. For example, it may have been signed by a Senior Officer.   Some organisations may submit redacted minutes. Organisations can do this, but redactions should be restricted to commercially sensitive or personal data. Sufficient data should be made available to allow attendance and whether the meeting was quorate to be established. If required for the assessment additional Information can usually be obtained from the annual accounts and OSCR/Companies House can also be used when completing the assessment of this section. Some of organisations who have only recently been constituted may not have minutes for the length of time requested. In this case assessors should assess what is available and comment on the adequacy of what has been submitted.

2. Project Development

Refer to Section E

In scoring this section, consideration should be given to the following:

- Have they identified a gap in service provision?
- How has the evidence of need been demonstrated? Is there reference to surveys, research, or local consultations to assess demand
- Does the application refer to the Fund Outcomes?
- Have local communities been involved in the design and development of the service? This can be service users, volunteers and/or management committee members.
- Will they be involved in the delivery of the service?

3. Project Delivery

Refer to Section F

In scoring this section, consideration should be given to the following:

- Is it clear from the application what will be delivered, including where, when and who will benefit, for each year that funding has been requested?
- Has the applicant ticked the correct boxes in relation to the geographical areas covered by the activity detailed in the application form i.e., correct sector/citywide selected?
- Is the planned activity appropriate, realistic, and deliverable?
- Have details been provided for each year that funding has been requested?
- Does the application include details of how the Fund Priorities will be met?
- Is there reference to partnership working? Has the applicant demonstrated a joined-up approach with other partners and provided details of this? Is the applicant involved in local structures?

4. Project Outcomes and Impact

Refer to Section G

- Does the application identify the Outcomes that the proposal will meet? These programmes should relate to the project description at B10
- Is it clear how the outcomes can be achieved?
- Is it clear how the outcomes can be measured?
- Is it clear how communities will benefit?
- Are the results (outcomes?) realistic?
- Is it clear what difference will be made as a result of this project to service users and the wider community?

5. Organisation and Project Finance

Refer to Section H and Budget Template

This section should be assessed by a member of your Finance Team who will then return to the assessing officer for inclusion in the overall scoring.

Prior to completing the assessment, the financial viability template should be completed to assess the financial viability of the organisation. The assessment should clearly identify if the organisation passed this check or whether there were any concerns raised. The completed financial viability check should be saved in the relevant EDRMS folder.

In addition, the budget template should be reviewed to ensure that all costs are reasonable and are eligible for grant funding. Finance Teams should refer to the eligibility criteria for costs defied for the grants programme. Finance Teams may also need to refer to the application form and specifically the section which describes the project to ensure that costs of delivery are consistent with what is described on the form.

In scoring this section, consideration should be given to the following:

- Is the organisation financially sound? Did the organisation have a deficit last financial year? (refer specifically to B17 and the audited accounts/bank statements). If an organisation is newly constituted bank statements can be taken in lieu of annual accounts.
- Has the organisation provided a detailed breakdown of funding costs? Do the costs appear reasonable/realistic? Has sufficient funding been identified to cover activity costs?
- Are the funding costs eligible? Refer to the fund guidance for a list of ineligible cost
- Although match funding is not mandatory, has match funding been secured. Is evidence of this match funding available? Will this match funding enable a more coherent/competent project to be delivered?

If required for the assessment additional Information can also be obtained from OSCR/Companies House and can be used when completing the assessment of this section.

Having assessed an application that contains more than one activity (for example a project that wishes to run a community centre and deliver a youth programme), should the situation arise that the assessing officer considers one element to be stronger, a comment should be added to the comments column to highlight this to the Funding Panel.

If the application includes costs that are ineligible, a comment should be added to the comment's column within the Scoring template to highlight this to the Funding Panel.

6. Sustainability
Refer to Section G where relevant

This relates to how sustainable the activity is beyond the life of the grant.

- Does the Application Form demonstrate any plans for how the activity can be sustained in the longer term?
- Is there reference, although not mandatory, to ongoing continuity of service/activity, a Business Plan, or a Planned Exit Strategy if this is appropriate? |

7. Summary Comments
This section should be used by the Assessing Officer to provide an overall summary of the application and assessment. You should use this to highlight the strengths and weaknesses or any other information that you believe will assist in the decision-making process.

Appendix 2

Guidelines for Scoring Criterion below £20,000

Before beginning, Assessing Officers should note that all information provided by the applicant may not be displayed within the text box in the application form. If this is the case, a scroll bar will be displayed at the side of the box or a + sign in the bottom right-hand corner. These applications will have additional pages attached to the back of the form with this text detailed.

During assessment you may identify that the Applicant has not completed some questions, please note these in the appropriate comment section.

When assessing applications Assessing Officers should use the following prompts:

1. Who is Applying - Organisation/Governance
In scoring this section, consideration should be given to how effective the governance arrangements are including: • Assessing staff should use the OSCR and Companies House website to access the latest information on this organisation. • Any red flags in relation to governance/organisation should be raised with the organisation and scoring will be dependent on the response • Further consideration could include the risk if the organisation is unincorporated – consider the level of funding applied for Some of organisations who have only recently been constituted may not have detailed information recorded in OSCR. In this case further information may be required to be requested from the organisation to support assessment. This may include governing documents and committee meeting minutes.
2. Involving Local People – Project Development
In scoring this section, consideration should be given to the following: • Have local communities been involved in the design and development of the service? This can be service users, volunteers and/or management committee members.
3. How Will You Do It? - Project Delivery
In scoring this section, consideration should be given to the following: • Is it clear from the application what will be delivered, including where, when and who will be involved, for each year that funding has been requested? • Has the applicant provided information in relation to the geographical areas covered by the activity detailed in the application form i.e., correct sector/citywide selected?

- Is the planned activity appropriate, realistic, and deliverable?
- Have details been provided for each year that funding has been requested?
- Is there any reference to partnership working? Has the applicant demonstrated a joined-up approach with other partners and provided details of this? Is the applicant involved in local structures?

4. Why Do You Want to Do This - Project Development and Impact

- Does the application identify the Outcomes that the proposal will meet?
- Have they identified a gap in service provision?
- How has the evidence of need been demonstrated? Is there reference to surveys, research, or local consultations to assess demand
- Is it clear how the outcomes can be achieved?
- Is it clear how the outcomes can be measured?
- Is it clear how communities will benefit?
- Are the results (outcomes?) realistic?
- Is it clear what difference will be made as a result of this project to service users and the wider community?

5. Organisation and Project Finance

This section should be assessed by a member of your Finance Team who will then return to the assessing officer for inclusion in the overall scoring.

Prior to completing the assessment, the financial viability template should be completed to assess the financial viability of the organisation. This can be accessed from OSCR/Companies House.
The assessment should clearly identify if the organisation passed this check or whether there were any concerns raised. The completed financial viability check should be saved in the relevant EDRMS folder.

In addition, the costs should be reviewed to ensure that all costs are reasonable and are eligible for grant funding. Finance Teams should refer to the eligibility criteria for costs defied for the grants programme. Finance Teams may also need to refer to the application form and specifically the section which describes the project to ensure that costs of delivery are consistent with what is described on the form.

In scoring this section, consideration should be given to the following:

- Is the organisation financially sound? Did the organisation have a deficit last financial year? If an organisation is newly constituted bank statements can be taken in lieu of annual accounts.
- Has the organisation provided a detailed breakdown of funding costs? Do the costs appear reasonable/realistic? Has sufficient funding been identified to cover activity costs?
- Are the funding costs eligible? Refer to the fund guidance for a list of ineligible cost

- Although match funding is not mandatory, has match funding been secured. Is evidence of this match funding available? Will this match funding enable a more coherent/competent project to be delivered?

Having assessed an application that contains more than one activity (for example a project that wishes to run a community centre and deliver a youth programme), should the situation arise that the assessing officer considers one element to be stronger, a comment should be added to the comments column to highlight this to the Funding Panel.

If the application includes costs that are ineligible, a comment should be added to the comment's column within the Scoring template to highlight this to the Funding Panel.

6. Sustainability

It is recognised that for short time projects scoring of sustainability may not be appropriate and scoring can be revised to reflect this where appropriate. Only assess where relevant.

- Does the Application Form demonstrate any plans for how the activity can be sustained in the longer term?
- Is there reference, although not mandatory, to ongoing continuity of service/activity, a Business Plan, or a Planned Exit Strategy if this is appropriate?

7. Summary Comments

This section should be used by the Assessing Officer to provide an overall summary of the application and assessment. You should use this to highlight the strengths and weaknesses or any other information that you believe will assist in the decision-making process.

Appendix 3   **Diagram of Grant Process**

```
                    ┌─────────────────────────┐
                    │  Develop Grants Programme │
                    │         Proposal          │
                    └─────────────────────────┘
                                 │
                    ┌─────────────────────────┐
                    │  Report to Business Meeting│
                    │     Proposal Approved      │
                    └─────────────────────────┘
                                 │
              ┌──────────────────┴──────────────────┐
              │                                       │
```

Council Service (if SOD exception does not apply)	Health Board
IJB Report	Business Meeting to advise re IJB Report
CAC Report	

Commence Grants Programme (All Services)	Commence Grants Programme
Communication, Issue Grant Applications, Assess Grant Applications, Recommend Grant Awards	Communication, Issue Grant Applications, Assess Grant Applications, Recommend Grant Awards

Report to Business Meeting Grant Awards Approved	Report to Business Meeting Grant Awards Approved

Council Service	Health Service
IJB Report	Business Meeting to advise re IJB report/Chief Officer and HB Head of Procurement to sign Waiver to Tender
CAC Report	

Issue Grant Award Letter and Payment Instructions	HB Head of Procurement Issue Condition of Grant Letter and Payment Instructions

Monitor Delivery	Monitor Delivery

Report on Outcomes to Business Meeting	Report on Outcomes to Business Meeting