

COMMUNITY ASSET TRANSFER SCHEME (CATS): EVALUATION PANEL TEMPLATE

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	ASSESSMENT	SCORING GUIDANCE	NEGATIVE IMPACT		POSITIVE IMPACT						WEIGHTED SCORE	
			Critical	Potential to mitigate	No evidence 0	Very low 1	Low 2	Mod-erate 3	Strong 4	Very Strong 5		
BENEFITS		<i>Overall best value weighting 50%</i>										
1. Vision	To what extent do the overall vision for the project and the project outcomes contribute to Scotland's National Outcomes?	<p>Very strong proposals will make a major contribution to several national outcomes, deliver transformational benefits to the community, with significant public benefit, and demonstrate clear evidence of benefits and steps it is taken to contribute to equalities outcomes.</p> <p>Very low impact proposals will make a limited contribution to national outcomes and have a small positive effect on community benefit.</p> <p>Proposals may receive a negative ranking if they are likely to impact on the communities capacity to deliver other activities, or have a negative impact on parts of the community.</p>										
2. Financial	Will the project have an overall financial benefit on public sector costs and/or enhanced provision of public benefit?											
3. Non-financial benefits	What is the impact of any non-financial benefits, including economic development, regeneration, public health, social wellbeing, environmental wellbeing, inequalities of outcome, any other benefits?											
4. Equality	What evidence has the organisation provided of how it will take into account the different needs of the community, and what contribution will the project make to equalities outcomes?											
VIABILITY		<i>Overall best value weighting 30%</i>										
5. Leadership	Is there a clear plan and leadership in place for achieving the project outcomes?	<p>Very strong proposals will have clear plan, with leadership and other roles clearly identified, clear governance in place, evidence that the level of resources and community capacity is appropriate to the scale of the project, a longer-term plan and appropriate reporting and monitoring process.</p> <p>Very low impact proposals are likely to have show little evidence of their capacity to deliver the benefits identified.</p> <p>Proposals may receive a negative ranking if there is no governance in place, with no clear responsibility for delivery or a lack of resources and sustainability which is likely to lead to project failure, particularly where this may create a liability for the community or for the National Forest Estate.</p>										
6. Governance and accountability	Are appropriate governance structures and policies in place, and what impact will they have on the viability of the project?											
7. Use of Resources	Has the group identified all the resources required, such as funding, staff and volunteer resources with the appropriate skills, and are they sufficient to deliver the project? Has the group demonstrated that the resources are sustainable over the lifetime of the project?											
8. Sustainability	Has the group set out evidence of how it the project will be funded in the longer-term, e.g. through future funding or self-finance, and what impact does this have on the long-term viability of the project?											
9. Performance Management	How does the group propose to monitor and report on the achievement of the desired outcomes, including use of resources and delivery of outcomes?											
TOTAL											10	OUT OF 10
TOTAL											6	OUT OF 6

