Community Fund

Scoring Criteria and Descriptors

Scoring will be according to the following criteria, with scoring from 1 to 3, weighted for each category. In the case of a tie and limited budget available to fund all, those projects who align best with the Town vision & strategy, or a theme clearly communicated at the start of the round, will be given preference.

Community Impact (60%)

Score	Descriptor
1 – Poor	Minimal or unclear community benefit. The project's impact is short-lived, limited in reach, or poorly aligned with local needs. Little or no evidence of inclusion, equity, or meaningful change for participants.
2 – Fair	Clear and positive benefits to a defined community group. The project addresses a recognised need and considers inclusion, though its reach or depth is limited. Benefits may be short-term but could still be worthwhile and relevant.
3 – Strong	Significant or transformational, well-evidenced impact, either broad and accessible to many, or deeply beneficial for a smaller or underrepresented group. Demonstrates strong understanding of community needs, promotes inclusion and equity, and creates meaningful, lasting value (even if not permanent).

Innovation and Creativity (20%)

Score	Descriptor
1 – Poor	No innovation or limited originality. The project repeats existing work, potentially with small new elements, but largely conventional or duplicative.
2 – Fair	Some innovative aspects; brings modest improvement on existing practice.
3 – Strong	Clearly innovative and creative. Significantly different from past efforts. Introduces new approaches, partnerships, or creative solutions to local issues. Can have strong potential to inspire or transform how things are done.

Delivery (20%)

Score	Descriptor
1 – Poor	Unclear, unrealistic or basic plan with significant gaps in costs, budgeting, timescales, or delivery capacity.
2 – Fair	Reasonably clear plan; timelines and costs broadly realistic, but some uncertainties about delivery capability.
3 – Strong	Well-developed plan with clear timelines, realistic and transparent costs, and strong evidence of delivery capability.

The Clerk or a deputy Officer will screen all applications for basic organisational eligibility. All Councillors on the Resources Committee will submit their scores independently to the Clerk for all eligible applications in a given round. Conflicts of interest need to be declared to the Clerk and the Chair of the Resources Committee prior to scoring. Where members have a conflict of interest in an application, they will be excluded from scoring that application and potentially from the final decision (at Clerk's and Chair of Resources Committee's discretion).

The final score for each application will be the average across all committee members for each criterion, summed together according to the weighting of each criterion. Applications scoring more than 50% (i.e. a score above 2) will then be ranked according to their score. The available budget will be allocated based on the ranking. However in order to maximise community benefit, lower ranked proposals that require less funding, may be given preference over equal ranked or higher ranked proposals that require more funding, where this would exceed the grant budget available in that round.

Unsuccessful applicants will receive feedback from a standard list of reasons why applications are typically unsuccessful, including their scoring against the criteria. The same application for the same project can only be submitted twice.