



Tackling Race Inequalities Fund **Assessment Strategy**



Tackling Race Inequalities Fund
Assessment Strategy

Communities and Local Government
Eland House
Bressenden Place
London
SW1E 5DU
Telephone: 020 7944 4400
Website: www.communities.gov.uk

© Crown Copyright, 2009

Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.

This publication, excluding logos, may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium for research, private study or for internal circulation within an organisation. This is subject to it being reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the title of the publication specified.

Any other use of the contents of this publication would require a copyright licence. Please apply for a Click-Use Licence for core material at www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/system/online/pLogin.asp, or by writing to the Office of Public Sector Information, Information Policy Team, Kew, Richmond, Surrey TW9 4DU

e-mail: licensing@opsi.gov.uk

If you require this publication in an alternative format please email alternativeformats@communities.gsi.gov.uk

Communities and Local Government Publications
PO Box 236
Wetherby
West Yorkshire
LS23 7NB
Tel: 0300 123 1124
Fax: 0300 123 1125
Email: communities@capita.co.uk
Online via the Communities and Local Government website: www.communities.gov.uk

April 2009

Product Code: xx xxx xxxxx

ISBN: xxx-x-xxxx-xxxx-x

Introduction

The Department for Communities and Local Government (The Department) is keen that the Tackling Race Inequalities Fund (TRIF) application process should be as open and fair as possible. The Community Development Foundation (CDF) will carry out the assessment of the applications in consultation with the Race Equality and Diversity Division in the Department.

Stages 0 and 1 will identify which applications are eligible for the fund. Stage 2 will assess the relative merit of all eligible applications based on the assessment criteria set out in this document.

An advisory board, consisting of representatives from the CDF, Race Equality and Diversity Division and at least one independent person with experience of the sector will determine the final list of organisations to recommend to the Secretary of State for funding. The final assessment of the board will be based on

- The scores received by each applicant.
- The need to have wide coverage of regions, themes and communities covered by the funded organisations.

The Secretary of State will then make the final decision on which organisations to fund and the amount of funding based on the information in the applications, the published assessment criteria and the advisory board's recommendations.

Assessment criteria – stage by stage

Stage 0

Stage 0 will simply ensure that applications are complete, signed and include all requested documentation.

Are all the questions answered?

Yes – continue

No – return to applicant asking for a complete response within 48 hours

Is the Application Signed?

Yes – continue

No – send signatory form to applicant asking for a signed response within 48 hours

Have the following documents been submitted?

Equality statement/policy	Yes	No
Audited accounts for the last 2 years – 2008 – 2009 and 2007 – 2008	Yes	No
Governing document/constitution	Yes	No
Charity registration number or an explanation of why the institution falls within section 70 of the Charities Act 2006.	Yes	No
Annual report for last year	Yes	No

If no to any of the above, request documents within 48 hours. If the applicant does not have audited accounts yet for the most recent financial year, the last two completed and audited accounts are acceptable. If the applicant is less than two years old, a letter from their accountant summarising their financial position is acceptable.

Stage 1

Stage 1 will assess whether the applicants are eligible for the fund – in other words that they meet the criteria in sections 2.9 and 2.10 of the prospectus.

Are the organisation and any partners in the case of a partnership bid either a registered charity or another charitable, benevolent or philanthropic organisation as defined in section 70 of the Charities Act 2006?

Pass – Is a charitable, benevolent or philanthropic organisation – move to next question

Fail – organisation does not fall within the scope of section 70 so ineligible for funding.

Are the organisation and any partners legal entities as set out in their constitution, governing or other documents?

Pass – Proof that all organisations in the application are legally constituted entities (eg a charity, trust, friendly society, legally recognised partnership)

Fail – Not a legally constituted entity.

Will receipt of funding raise concerns about possibility of financial dependency on CLG? (We will not normally provide funding (in the form of any grants or other funding) amounting to a total of more than 50% of an organisation's income for the most recent year that accounts are available.

Pass – Funding requested from CLG in any year amounts to no more than 50% of the organisation's income over the most recent year for which accounts are available (i.e. before taking the grant into account).

Fail – Funding requested in any year amounts to more than 50% of the organisation's income over the most recent year for which accounts are available.

Would funding for this organisation (or in the case of a partnership, any of the partners) support economic activity in a way that distorts competition and therefore amount to State Aid as set out in Article 87(1) of the EC Treaty? See guidance produced by the Department for Business and Regulatory Reform at: www.berr.gov.uk/whatwedo/businesslaw/state-aid/rules/index.html

Pass – Funding does not constitute State Aid

Fail – Risk that funding would constitute State Aid.

Is tackling race inequalities or promoting race equality a clear aim of the mission or purpose of the organisation, as set out in the organisation’s governing document, purposes or constitution?

Pass – organisation clearly exists to promote racial equality or tackle race inequalities or this is a key aim of its objects.

Fail – promoting race equality is not one of the organisation’s main aims.

Does the organisation operate across England or across one or more of the nine English Regions?

Pass – Organisation has a clear national remit.

Pass – Organisation is not national but operates across one or more of the English Regions (Government Office Regions – East, East Midlands, London, North East, North West, South East, South West, West Midlands or Yorkshire and the Humber)

Fail – Organisation operates at a local or sub regional level.

Fail – Organisation operates at international level and (or) undertakes activities largely for beneficiaries outside England.

The Race Equality and Diversity Division will consider and approve the list of organisations to progress to stage 2 of the assessment process.

Stage 2

The purpose of this stage is to assess the degree to which the application supports the Government’s aim to tackle inequalities for Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic Groups. CDF will assess against the criteria below.

Applicants can indicate one or more themes that they believe their work contributes to. Their application will be assessed against these themes but the total available points for each criterion remain the same. Only one grant will be awarded and an application which is meets one of the themes very well will score as well as one that meets two or three well.

Assessment criteria

Applications will be given a score for each of the assessment criteria below. The criteria are divided into four broad headings – Focus on the themes of the fund, additional impact of the proposed work, value for money and focus on groups experiencing multiple disadvantage. The assessors will also award points for two questions concerning their assessment of the bid overall and the degree to which it will support the aims of the fund.

Focus on themes of the fund

1. To what extent does the organisation focus on the themes of the fund (set out in section 3 of the prospectus) that they have identified as being relevant to their proposal?
2. To what extent does the organisation have a track record of delivering against these themes?
3. To what extent are the proposals reasonable, innovative and achievable?

Additional impact of proposed work

4. In the opinion of the assessor, what difference will funding make to the organisation's capacity to deliver against the relevant themes?
5. Is the applicant developing innovative approaches to addressing the needs they have identified?
6. Is there good evidence of the need for the additional work planned by the project?
7. Can the applicant achieve what they plan to do by March 2011?

Value for money

8. Does the application represent good value for money?
9. Are the deliverables identified reasonable for the cost?
10. Is the budget realistic – are the activities achievable in the funding period?
11. If work is being scaled up does the unit price go down?
12. To what extent would the new work simply displace existing support?
13. To what extent is the organisation capable of scaling up its activities in a short timescale in order to ensure that value for money is achieved during the funding period?

Focus on groups experiencing multiple disadvantage

14. Does the organisation's work particularly benefit people with multiple disadvantages (for instance Bangladeshi women, young black men)?
15. To what extent will the organisation be able to reach particularly disadvantaged communities?

Assessment process

Assessors from CDF will score the applications against each of the criteria above from 1 – does not meet criteria to 7 – outstanding against each of these criteria. The score for each criterion will dictate the percentage of the total points available for that criterion that the applicant receives.

Score	Assessment
1 =	Does not meet criteria at all. The project is poorly thought out, and the benefits are unclear or non-existent. (Does not meet expectations).
2–3 =	Less than average. It just about meets the criteria, but the match with the priority is sketchy at best. There may be concerns over whether they can deliver what they say, or whether they are clear on what they actually want to do.
4 =	Average. Not innovative, but not deficient. Fits within the aims of the fund.
5–6 =	Very good. Well thought out project. Solid fit with criteria. Clear benefits.
7 =	Outstanding. This project would make an excellent case study. It is innovative, well thought out and well planned, and the benefits to the wider community are evident and exceptional. (Exceeds expectations).

The assessors will award scores for each criterion and calculate the overall points total for each application. This score will be presented to the advisory board.

The advisory board will agree a list of applications to be recommended for funding and indicative funding allocations based on the budget supplied by the applicants, the overall budget of the fund, allocations related to thematic and regional spread and considerations related to the assessment of value for money. The Department will then present a short list to the Secretary of State to consider. The Secretary of State will make her decision with due regard to the available information and the advisory board's recommendations. The final list of successful applicants will be announced by July 2009. The decision of the Secretary of State is final and there is no appeal process.

Each unsuccessful applicant will receive a decision letter setting out the reasons for the decision made.

