

Policy: Grant Adjudication

First approved: 21 June 2013

Last reviewed: June 2016

Next review due: June 2019

1.0 Introduction

It is important to have a simple, transparent, and fair adjudication process to ensure that each application is assessed equally and solely on its merits. The adjudication process is divided into two stages.

2.0 Stage One – Shortlisting

All applications go through the first stage of the application process which intends to sift out ineligible applications and make an assessment of the quality of those remaining.

2.1 Initial sift

The Director and Grants Assistant check applications against the published criteria, any which do not meet the criteria are instantly rejected. Those that applied less than 12 months previously are withdrawn from the application process.

2.2 Assessment of quality

Director and Grants Assistant review applications against evidence of the following:

- Track record of working with young offenders.
- Good understanding of young offender's needs.
- Solely targeting young offenders through the funding.
- Are already known to Police, Youth Offending Teams etc or have served a custodial sentence?
- Clear information about what happens to the project at the end of the funding
- Overall difference the grant will make.

The following point system is applied to all of the above criteria on each application:

| | |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Criterion is met | 1 |
| Criterion is partially met | 0.5 |
| No evidence | 0 |

After considering the scoring of applications the strongest proposals are selected for Trustees to review. Trustees have access to electronic copies of all applications and their supporting documents and can ask for any rejected application to be added to the list for review.

2.3 Trustee review

Prior to the shortlisting meeting each application selected for review is allocated to 3 Trustees to undertake a detailed review. Taking the criteria above into account Trustees score each of their allocated applications between 1 and 4 using the scale below:

| | |
|--|---|
| Excellent should definitely be shortlisted | 4 |
| Strong application that should be shortlisted if funds permit | 3 |
| Good application that could be shortlisted if funds permit but some concerns and weaknesses | 2 |
| Several issues and weaknesses identified making the application not worth considering further | 1 |

Trustees are likely to be allocated 12 to 15 applications to review.

When the scores are collated, each application will have a score between 4 and 12. The approximate implications of these scores are below, these may be adjusted slightly to ensure the number of applications discussed at the meeting is manageable.

| | |
|----------|--|
| 4 to 6 | Rejected without discussion at the meeting |
| 7 to 9 | Discussed at the meeting |
| 10 to 12 | Shortlisted for a Director visit without discussion at the meeting |

2.4 Trustee shortlisting meeting

At the meeting Trustees agree on a shortlist of applications (up to 1.5 times the total budget to be awarded) for the Director to visit and report back on at the next meeting when a final decision on which applications to fund will be made.

3.0 Stage Two – Award Decision Making

All shortlisted applications undergo a more detailed review including an organisation visit from the Director in the second stage of the application process.

3.1 Director visit

All shortlisted organisations are visited by the Director. Two hours are allowed for each visit and prior to the visit applicants are asked to submit the following:

- The organisation's current strategic plan including a 5 page summary if appropriate.
- Expected income and expenditure projection for the entire organisation, clearly showing planned income and expenditure for the next financial year and the year after. This needs to show any expenditure that is already committed to.
- An organisational structure diagram, including any new posts to be funded by the grant.

- Expected Key Achievements for year 1 of the grant.
- A Safeguarding Policy.
- An Equal Opportunities/Diversity Policy.
- A completed form for the Spark Programme.
- The latest annual report and accounts if a more recent version is available compared to that submitted with the original application.

Discussion during the visit covers the following:

- General introduction to the Triangle Trust, our aims and history.
- Overview of the organisation, including the history, governance, current and longer-term plans.
- Discussion of the particular aspect of the work that funding has been requested for.
- Consideration to the budget and whether any aspects of the application need to be changed since its submission.

A detailed report is written following each visit and with a funding recommendation.

3.2 Trustee award meeting

Trustees read the documentation supporting each shortlisted application prior to the award meeting, where a joint decision is made on which applications should be funded.