



COST OF LIVING FUND

Evaluation and Scoring Matrix

1. Purpose of the Evaluation Matrix

This evaluation matrix is designed to support a fair, transparent, and consistent assessment of applications to the Cost of Living Fund. It should be used by panel members to score applications at **Stage One (written applications)** and to inform final decisions following **Stage Two (presentations)**.

Scores should be based on evidence provided and professional judgement, with reasons for scores recorded where appropriate.

2. Scoring Scale

Each criterion should be scored using the following scale:

Score Description

- | | |
|---|---|
| 0 | Does not meet the criterion / no information provided |
| 1 | Very weak – major concerns or gaps |
| 2 | Adequate – meets minimum requirements |
| 3 | Good – clear and convincing response |
| 4 | Very good – strong response with minor gaps |
| 5 | Excellent – outstanding, robust, and compelling |

3. Evaluation Criteria and Weighting

Criterion 1: Strategic Fit and Priority Alignment (20%)

Assessment focus:

- Alignment with the Cost of Living Fund objectives
- Clear fit with one or more priority themes

- Strong evidence of local need in Shrewsbury

Score Guidance

- 0–1 Poor alignment; unclear or weak link to priorities
- 2 Some alignment but limited evidence of need
- 3 Good alignment with clear local relevance
- 4–5 Excellent alignment with strong local evidence

Criterion 2: Impact and Outcomes (30%)

Assessment focus:

- Clear description of who will benefit
- Evidence that the project will reduce costs or increase savings
- Realistic, measurable outcomes
- Robust monitoring and evaluation approach

Score Guidance

- 0–1 Outcomes unclear or not measurable
- 2 Some outcomes identified but limited measurement
- 3 Clear outcomes with appropriate measures
- 4–5 Strong, well-evidenced outcomes with clear impact

Criterion 3: Delivery Plan and Value for Money (25%)

Assessment focus:

- Clear delivery plan and timescales
- Appropriate use of £20,000 annual funding
- Evidence of value for money
- Realistic staffing and resources

Score Guidance

- 0–1 Delivery plan unclear or unrealistic
- 2 Plan broadly feasible but some concerns
- 3 Clear and realistic delivery plan
- 4–5 Strong, efficient, and well-costed plan

Criterion 4: Partnership and Collaboration (15%)

Assessment focus:

- Evidence of existing partnership working
- Clear proposals for collaboration with other organisations
- Avoidance of duplication
- Contribution to a joined-up local response

Score Guidance

- 0–1 No evidence of partnership working
- 2 Limited or informal collaboration
- 3 Clear partnership approach
- 4–5 Strong, strategic collaboration with added value

Criterion 5: Organisational Capacity and Governance (10%)

Assessment focus:

- Relevant experience and track record
- Governance, financial controls, and policies
- Ability to manage and report on public funds

Score Guidance

- 0–1 Serious concerns about capacity or governance
- 2 Minimum requirements met
- 3 Good organisational capacity

4–5 Strong, well-governed organisation

4. Scoring Summary Table

Criterion	Weighting Score (0–5) Weighted Score
Strategic Fit	20%
Impact and Outcomes	30%
Delivery & Value for Money	25%
Partnership & Collaboration	15%
Capacity & Governance	10%
Total	100%

5. Use at Presentation Stage

Following presentations, panel members may:

- Confirm original scores
- Adjust scores where clarification strengthens or weakens confidence
- Record brief reasons for any score changes

Presentations should not introduce entirely new projects but may clarify delivery, outcomes, or partnership arrangements.

6. Moderation and Final Recommendations

- Scores will be moderated collectively by the panel
- Consideration may be given to balance across themes and target groups
- Final recommendations will be made within the available budget

This matrix supports proportionate, evidence-based decision-making and should be retained for audit and transparency purposes.