

COMMUNITY RENEWAL FUND - SCORING RATIONALE

MUST BE USED WHEN EVALUATING QUESTIONS

GUIDANCE NOTES:

1. Each question is scored out of 5 points as per the rationale below.
2. Assessors of CRF applications are required to use this scoring system and refer to the classification for each score when evaluating questions. Check that your comments do not contradict the classification for the score you have given.
3. Assessors must evaluate each application in isolation against the question content, specification and scoring rationale. Individual applicants must not be compared with one another. An answer cannot be penalised for something the question does not ask for.
4. It is advisable that Assessors begin each evaluation at 5 points/'perfect'. This may help with identifying and justifying any score lower than 5 and assist with the Assessors supporting comments.
5. Assessors are required to provide comments to explain and justify their score. The more detailed the comments the better. It is advisable that comments are constructive in nature, drawing attention to areas that are good and importantly, any areas that would have increased the score rather than criticising the answer without offering advice for improvement.

SCORE	CLASSIFICATION
5	Perfect response All issues addressed comprehensively stating a position clearly and unequivocally in line with or exceeding the requirement of the overall question. No omissions in the response. Inspires total confidence of ability to that aspect of the work / project. No reservation about the organisations / applicants capability, capacity and willingness.
4	Excellent response All requirements addresses thoroughly and convincingly, providing significant evidence of applicants understanding and experience. The response is credible and positive and demonstrates a position completely in accordance with the actual question. Inspires great confidence of applicant's ability to develop successful, beneficial solutions. No significant reservations about the applicant's capability, capacity and willingness.
3	Good response Provides a credible, comprehensive and convincing response to all/majority of the question asked. Demonstrates sound understanding/experience/credibility against the actual question. Overall inspires confidence that the applicant has the capability and capacity to deliver the contract objectives.
2	Poor response Only addresses the question to a limited degree. Fails to demonstrate substantive understanding/experience/credibility against the set questions. Fails to convince that the applicant would be able to make a significant positive contribution against what is set out in the CRF Prospectus. Gives significant cause for concern about the ability to develop an acceptable, meaningful and beneficial project.
1	Very poor response – unacceptable Either completely fails to address the criteria, fails to demonstrate any understanding/experience/credibility against the actual question. No confidence that the applicant would be able to develop a successful project. An unanswered response or a response that is totally unacceptable and does not fulfill the requirement in any way.