

Applicant	Trustee score 1	Trustee score 2	Trustee score 3
Shortlisted			
OMG Training & Development CIC)	DL (3): Key issues, Tower Hamlets very deprived, formed in 2019, specifies target numbers to be helped, emphasis on music and BAME community.	AH (4): Looks like this is quite an established programme and our funding would add extra fuel to the tank. Once again reserves are super low.	JA (4): Good stats; well elaborated and detailed; locally important
Merseyside Expanding Horizons	DL (4): Key issues, Social Enterprise, liked the Re-Write program, creative and ongoing, female, and specifies target number to be helped.	AH (4): Prioritised this because of young women focus. More holistic than our guidance encourages but still think 20 women x 2 years will get into work .	DF (2): Worth another look. I doubted they could deliver the volume of outputs but they then go on to tell us what they have achieved over the past 16 months. It would be good to know more about how it will become "ensconed" in their activities/supported beyond our funding. What does that look like?
Open Lens Media CIC	JM (2)	JA (4)	DF (4): BUT big concern about viability of organisation. Have not looked at other documents but annual income and expenditure very low - maybe explained elsewhere. Good points are: specificity of target group, focus on a locality, addressing barriers and way forward in a clear way
St. Columb's Park House	KD (4): On the money in terms of spec, although a slight concern I have is the low success rate (25%). Would be happy to support this given the turmoil N Ireland is in politically. Project looks very solid although	AH (2): Dissapointing, would have prioritised this due to NI location but doesn't focus enough on employment outcomes.	SC (4): Important to support work in NI as under-served by funders. Great use of sport and strong relationship with prison and other services and NGOs. Like the fact that start their work in prison.

	their strategic plan is not very strategic.		
Women Acting In Todays Society (WAITS)	AH (2): Gave this a low score because was more early stage intervention than getting women into and staying in jobs.	JA (4): Established charity with relevant experience with vulnerable target group	DF (4): (Note one of my best friends is on the board and one of my sisters is a Friend of Waits but neither have discussed this application with me - I don't even think they know that I am a Trustee - and I suspect they will not have been involved in the development of the application) Having made that declaration it is a strong application. They demonstrate clear understanding of the need and the type of intervention required.
To be discussed			
Braveheart Industries	DL (3): Key issues, Glasgow, pilot scheme, direct staff cost and specifies target number to be supported.	KD (4): Good links with CJS and other agencies; tried and tested techniques in gang rehabilitation and re-entry. Need to know what's happening with the CEO (currently interim). Salary seems low.	AH (2): Found this difficult to score because it was difficult to understand who Braveheart Industries was, other than a spin off from the Violence Reduction Unit particularly because website link didn't work. No shop window for young people to be found.
Konnect Communities CIC	JM (3)	KD (3): All seems in order, but 'long term' here means 12 months of support over 21 months - doesn't seem long term to me. Needs support from Cranford I think - issues with cash flow and data seems a problem. They run their reserves very close to the bone.	AH (3): £17k reserves doesn't sound plausible given their size. Have left that aside as it must be wrong or will have folded by the time we get to our meeting! Rural location was a reason to prioritise.
Sussex Pathways	AH (4): Gave this a high score because it was clearly focused on	JA (4): Good established charity with relevant expertise	1 (DF): Because it is not a good application though it is an important area of work. I don't understand the

	getting women into and staying in jobs.		proposal. What is ETE and how do these opportunities empower clients? Don't understand how they plan to appoint a co-ordinator on quite a low wage to carry a "caseload" and "manage" volunteer mentors who will be carrying quite a bit of responsibility. Have they designed the project to fit the grant limit or what is required to deliver properly? Concern is that with this approach they won't gather sufficient evidence of success to secure future funding. They appear to employ quite a lot of people on a very small turnover £205k? Would like to know how many women they intend to work with. What their track record of success looks like - more evidence of their proven track record.
Trail-Blazers Mentoring Ltd	DL (3): Key issues, over 60% BAME, building relationships with 5/6 prisons and supporting a target of 150 mentees.	JM (3)	SC (3): This was OK, didn't stand out as particularly innovative approach. Use of mentors good but can this scale? Ambitious target to get to 4 more open prisons... not sure about this
Rochdale AFC Football In The Community Trust	DL (2): Key issues, recruiting Learning mentor, focus on sport but no detail on numbers supported. Rochdale an area which merits support.	JA (2): Much needed support in deprived area but inadequately focussed and limited expertise	SC (4): Holistic approach, c-designed, excellent and innovative link to local businesses to raise funds and meet CSR, linking to micro business. Really liked this one.
Three13 Training and Enterprise Ltd	JM (3)	KD (2): They seem to be a training company, partnering with others to reach the rehabilitation sector. Not sure.	DF (3)

<p>Accrington Stanley Football In The Community</p>	<p>JM (2)</p>	<p>KD (2): Key focus for this organisation is on physical activity and while that is positioned as a support to rehabilitation, I'm not particularly convinced. The website shows a distressing lack of diversity in the organisation's beneficiaries. Considerable similarity between this and the Rochdale application. Salary seems low.</p>	<p>JA (3): Few figures/stats; inadequately focused project but good local links</p>
<p>CDA Herts</p>	<p>KD (2): Seems entirely the right kind of project but I'm concerned we're duplicating funding already provided by the OPCC (renewed July 2022). A strange and disjointed application.</p>	<p>DF (2): No clear plan for sustaining beyond funding. Not sure why they did not wait to submit after developing a clear strategic plan. That it supports local strategies does not mean that they will secure future funding. I am not clear how the range of support will be delivered and by whom. It does not sound very cohesive. The key worker will be managing caseload - what does that mean. Is recommendation by professionals the fairest way to get onto the programme? It presumes that "professionals" don't have their own biases/preferences as to who to support. What if a young person wants to apply but has not formed a bond with the professionals?</p>	<p>SC (3): Liked the fact that programme starts while in prison, good understanding of nature of problems faced, good on lived experience leadership.</p>
<p>Sport 4 Life UK</p>	<p>DL (3): Key issues, West Midlands, supporting 30 people per year and well connected in the community, full time NEET, Grant not supporting named managers.</p>	<p>JM (2)</p>	<p>SC (2): This was not particularly clear how it links to sport and was less impressive than some of the other applications. Not sure about use of generic workshops with this group.</p>

To be discussed			
Pallion Action Group	<p>DL (1): Key issues, deprived area but application not very inspiring, (Charity established for nearly 30 years)... maybe needs a refresh? Also Management fee of 20% should ideally have been explained.</p>	<p>JA (2): Too generic; limited CJS experience</p>	<p>SC (2): A v socially deprived area but felt the application lacked the depth of others in terms of underlying reasons and was quite surface level intervention</p>