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**Multiply – Warwickshire Call for Projects (October 2023)**

**Scoring Criteria**

**Please note, this document should be read alongside WCC’s call for projects, the application form, and the Department for Educations Multiply Prospectus.**

|  |
| --- |
| WCC will assess each application for funding against the following programme selection criteria, please note the weighting indicated against each part.  The core selection criteria can be summarised as: |
| **Part 1: Project summary**  Not scored however, the projects can fail on the timescales and the minimum spend.  The projects must be a minimum of £20,000.  Financial Standing. All non-Local Authority bids will be assessed, and this is a pass/fail question. Applicants must “Agree” to this check and be allocated a score of “Secure” or “Sound” to pass this question. |
| **Part 2: Strategic Fit (30% of score)**  The answers in this section will be used collectively to determine the strategic fit and the need for this project.   * The proposed project contributes to the needs/ opportunities identified in the UK Government Multiply Prospectus and WCC’s call for projects. * The proposed operation represents an appropriate means of delivering the relevant specific objectives, outputs, and results of Multiply. * The proposed operation is aligned to the local growth needs. * The proposed project must add value to and not duplicate existing provision and must not conflict with national policy.   **Part 3: Cross Cutting Themes (10% of score)**  This section will be used to score the cross-cutting themes of this project. The project takes account of, and contributes to, the Cross Cutting themes, and meets the legal obligations of each:   * Gender Equality and non-discrimination * Sustainable Development |
| **Part 4: Deliverability (30% of score)**  This section alongside the detailed outputs, outcomes and financial breakdowns will be used to assess the deliverability of the project.  The applicant must demonstrate:   * Appropriate expertise, capacity, and capability to deliver the operation successfully. * The necessary management capacity, systems, and processes in place to meet the requirements of the Fund. * Capability to meet the financial requirements and liabilities that flow from the receipt of Multiply funding. Any non-public sector organisation will be subject to a full due diligence assessment of the applicant organisation. * The operation is deliverable within the requirements of Multiply taking account risks, constraints, and dependencies. * Evidence has shown that this type of operation is effective or where the operation is new or innovative, the risks have been considered and appropriate mitigations put in place. |
| **Part 5 ILRs (Individualised Learner Record) Compliance (10% of score)**  It is not necessary to be able to upload ILRs however, need to include staff costs if uploading them.  It will be necessary to commit to uploading to the Multiply Record Management system. |
| **Part 6 Evaluation (10% of score)**  Need to have an evaluation plan and how it will be disseminated. |
| **Part 7: Value For money (10% of score)**  There are no ‘Value for Money’ criteria however, we will use this section alongside the detailed financial breakdown and output and outcome profiles, to determine that the project would be of fair value in achieving the delivery.  Applications must demonstrate a clear case that the investment will deliver relevant activities, outputs and results that would not otherwise take place.  The operation must represent value for money. In assessing value for money, WCC will take account of:   * Efficiency: the rate/unit costs at which the operation converts inputs to the Fund outputs. * Economy: the extent to which the operation will ensure that inputs to the operation are at the minimum costs commensurate with the required quality. * Effectiveness: the extent to which the operation contributes to programme output targets, results and/or significant strategic impact at the local level. * Proposed activity and related expenditure are compliant with the fund specific rules. |
| **Part 8 Subsidy Control & Part 9 Branding and Publicity Compliance.**  These are pass/fail sections. The applicant must show that they have a full understanding of the compliance requirements for procurement, Subsidy Control, branding & publicity, and Multiply Fund specific rules. Where relevant they must demonstrate that:   * Any procurements already undertaken as part of the operation are compliant with the Multiply procurement requirements. * Any frameworks that they intend to use must be identified and compliant. * Timescales around any new procurement are realistic and achievable. * Subsidy Control would be lawful, and that the applicant is eligible to receive grant aid at the requested level within the Subsidy control regulations, if applicable. * Any aid granted through the project to third parties is permissible under and would be managed in accordance with Subsidy control regulations. * Publicity activities undertaken as part of the operation are compliant with the Multiply publicity requirements. * Proposed activity and related expenditure are compliant with the fund specific rules |

**Scoring system**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Number** | **Indicator** | **Reason** |
| 5 | Very Good | Provision of a high level of detail and key information which has allowed a thorough and extensive assessment; All information is specific and relevant and very well thought out; All of the issues raised by the Council have been considered or addressed to a very good degree; The responses exceed all of the Council’s requirements; High level of evidence that applicant can exceed requirements with detailed explanations/evidence in support. The Council has no concerns and has a high level of confidence in the applicant’s proposals. |
| 4 | Good | Provision of a good level of detail or key information which has allowed a thorough assessment; Responses give a detailed, specific and well thought out answer to the question; All of the issues raised by the Council have been considered and addressed to a good degree; The responses satisfy all and exceed some of the Council’s requirements Appropriate level of evidence provided to indicate that the applicant can satisfy the requirement. The Council has no concerns and has a good level of confidence in the applicant’s proposals. |
| 3 | Satisfactory | Provision of a sufficient level of detail or key information which has allowed assessment; Information is generally specific to the tender; Responses answer the questions to an acceptable degree; All of the issues raised by the Council have been considered or addressed to a satisfactory degree; The responses satisfy all of the Council’s requirements; There is evidence that the applicant can satisfy the requirement with minor reservations about ability to provide the service. The Council has some minor concerns and has confidence in the applicant’s proposals. |
| 2 | Minor  Reservations | Some information has been provided which has allowed a basic assessment; Information is generally not specific to this tender; Responses answer the questions to a limited degree; Some of the issues raised by the Council have been considered and addressed to a fair or acceptable degree; The responses satisfy some but not all of the Council’s requirements; There is some evidence that the applicant can meet some of the requirement, but limited information and/or significant weaknesses The Council has some confidence but has several concerns in the applicant’s proposals. |
| 1 | Poor | Very little information provided, or key information omitted; Responses do not properly answer the questions; Very few of the issues raised by the Council have been considered or addressed, or they have been poorly considered/addressed; The responses only satisfy a few of the Council’s requirements; There is some evidence that the applicant can meet some of the requirement, but limited information and/or significant weaknesses The Council has little confidence in the applicant’s proposals. |
| 0 | Very Weak/No Answer | No information provided and/or fundamentally unacceptable; Responses do not answer the questions; Responses do not consider/address the issues raised by the Council; The responses do not satisfy any of the Council’s requirements; non-Compliant – there is no evidence that the applicant can meet the stated requirements. The Council has no confidence in the applicant’s proposal. |