

RECOGNITION OF LOCAL ACHIEVEMENT

1. SUMMARY

At the meeting of the Oban, Lorn and the Isles Area Committee held in February 2013 Members agreed a process for recognising local achievement in the area. The detail of taking this forward for the first time now requires to be put in place to meet agreed timescales, members are asked to give consideration to proposals to facilitate this.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That the Area Committee consider and agree the details below to allow the first process of recognising local achievement to be undertaken this year.

3. DETAIL

- 3.1 At the Oban, Lorn and the Isles Area Committee meeting held in February 2013 Members agreed a number of recommendations which had been made by the Short Life Working Group put in place to consider how best the Area Committee could recognise in a corporate way local achievements in the OLI area.

3.2 The Committee agreed the recommendations from the Short Life Working Group as follows:-

1. The proposed Lorn medals are not required given the existing mechanisms to recognise achievement or voluntary service.
2. Quaichs should be issued to deserving individuals and that the following process is noted.
 - i. Proposals intimated to the Council be held pending a Chatham house discussion in September each year to consider nominations;
 - ii. That discussion will consider if an alternate route should be looked at i.e. BEM submission;
 - iii. A recipient will not normally be eligible for doing the 'day job';
 - iv. If there is public speculation around an award for an individual that may be a factor that will mitigate against an award being made;
 - v. No Member should engage in discussion or express support for any proposal publically until the award has been presented;
 - vi. Members should have regard to previous award justification in ensuring the Quaich remains highly valued by a recipient;
 - vii. The award would be made on the basis of either;
 - actions that have promoted Oban Lorn and the Isles beyond the authority area; and
 - voluntary service to the community and that service is drawing to an end.
3. Clubs and organisations who have achieved significant national or international success or have achieved a landmark in their chosen area of participation will be eligible for a Quaich or plaque, and the same process and timeline will be followed as for individual awards, unless there are exceptional circumstances.
4. The Area Committee will seek to agree such awards by consensus as worthy recipients should engender a wide degree of support. The Area Committee will consider whether the scoring mechanism used by the third sector grants assessment process might be useful.

3.4 The scoring mechanism for third sector grants, and the one used by the Health and Wellbeing partnership are attached as appendices to this report; Members may wish to consider use of such frameworks for assessing suggestions made relating to local achievement.

4. CONCLUSION

4.1 By way of progressing the decision made by the Area Committee in February 2103 Members are asked to consider a process of advertising their desire to recognise local achievement, and put in place a suggestion process such that applications can be submitted and discussed at the September Business meeting.

5. IMPLICATIONS

Policy - This is in keeping with Council commitment to work in partnership with and recognise the value of citizens, agencies and organisations.

Financial – None

Legal - None

HR - None

Equalities - None

Risk - None

Customer Service - None

Executive Director of Customer Services

19th July 2013

For further information contact: Shirley MacLeod, Area Governance Manager,
Hill Street, Dunoon. Tel 01369 707134

THIRD SECTOR GRANTS SCORING MATRIX

DRAFT SCORING MATRIX SUMMARY					
Section	Max. Score	Weighted score for section	Overall Weighting	Final score	Outcome
Social Impact	100	0.0	100%	0.0	

ORIGINAL - COPY BEFORE USING

SOCIAL IMPACT								
Ref		Level	Score	Max Score	Awarded	Measure	Weighting	Outcome
Q1	Educational	Weak	0	10	0	No clear educational targets	10%	0
		Average	5			Project has broad aims but may provide the opportunity for skills development for participants		
		Strong	10			Project aims to increase skills and knowledge of participants		
		Level	Score	Max Score	Awarded	Measure	Weighting	Outcome
Q2	Environmental Impact	Weak	0	10	0	No environmental targets	10%	0
		Average	5			Does not specifically contribute to council targets but has clear environmental aims		
		Strong	10			Contributes to council strategic targets		
		Level	Score	Max Score	Awarded	Measure	Weighting	Outcome
Q3	Cultural Impact	Weak	0	10	0	No cultural targets	10%	0
		Average	5			Does not specifically contribute to council targets but has clear cultural aims		
		Strong	10			Contributes to council strategic targets		
		Level	Score	Max Score	Awarded	Measure	Weighting	Outcome

Q4	Health and Wellbeing	Weak	0	10	0	No clear health and wellbeing targets	10%	0
		Average	5			General statement provided without targets or means to assess impact		
		Strong	10			Group can evidence clear physical or mental health and wellbeing targets and how these will be measured		
		Level	Score	Max Score	Awarded	Measure	Weighting	Outcome
Q5	Addressing Social Inclusion - targeted groups: people with disabilities, black and minority ethnic groups, young people, people on low incomes, elderly people, LGBT	Weak	0	10	0	General community benefit	10%	0
		Average	5			No specific group targeted but clear benefits for one or more targeted group		
		Strong	10			One or more groups targeted		
		Level	Score	Max Score	Awarded	Measure	Weighting	Outcome
Q6	Community Capacity Building	Weak	0	10	0	Activities may result in individuals or organisations gaining more skills or confidence, but this is not an aim of the project or measured.	10%	0
		Average	5			Skills and/or structures of the group or organisation are developed to enable it to builds its capacity to play a stronger role within its community		
		Strong	10			Community is better able to identify and help meet their needs and to participate more fully in society		
		Level	Score	Max Score	Awarded	Measure	Weighting	Outcome

Q7	Community Impact	Weak	0	10	0	Activity brings people together for personal benefit	10%	0
		Average	5			Activity brings people together from different areas for no particular developmental purpose but in a way that creates a sense of community cohesion and belonging		
		Strong	10			Activity brings people together for the purpose of improving or developing their local community (geographical or community of interest)		
		Level	Score	Max Score	Awarded	Awarded	Weighting	Outcome
Q8	Alleviation of rural isolation	Weak	0	10	0	Community is not disadvantaged in project area by its rural location	10%	0
		Average	5			Project increases access for rural communities or small towns to services that are available in urban areas		
		Strong	10			Project increases access for island and remote rural communities to services that are available in small towns or urban areas		
		Level	Score	Max Score	Awarded	Measure	Weighting	Outcome
Q9	Enhancement of quality of life for residents and visitors	Weak	0	10	0	Project does not provide or increase activities or access to community spaces	10%	0
		Average	5			Project provides or increases access to activities or spaces in the area on a short-term (less than a year) basis		
		Strong	10			Project provides or increases regular access to activities or spaces in the area on a long term basis		
		Level	Score	Max Score	Awarded	Measure	Weighting	Outcome

Q10	Partnership Working	Weak	0	10	0	Applicant evidences no partnership working or support from other organisations	10%	0
		Average	5			Project can demonstrate support from CPP partners or other third sector groups or organisations		
		Strong	10			Applicant has involved or worked in partnership with other organisations and has demonstrated this in the application		

Total Scores							100%	0.0
--------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	------	-----

Scoring System

CRITERIA		STRONG PROJECTS WILL HAVE...	WEAK PROJECTS WILL HAVE...
A	Priority	Clear links to local health improvement priorities.	No links to health improvement priorities.
B	Rationale	Evidence that the community needs this project. Clear links to policies or research stating that this project is appropriate.	Proposals based on anecdotal evidence or out of date research with no direct reference to the client group.
C	Value for money	Makes best use of resources. Identified match funding. Applying for other funding.	No references to other funding sources or existing in-kind resources; or it is a costly project.
D	How will the project be evaluated?	Clearly explained method for measuring the success of the projects.	Little evidence of an evaluation plan.
E	Is the project time limited? Can the project be sustainable in the long term?	There is a plan for how the initiative will continue without HWF funding in future.	No thought has been given to what will happen to the project when the grant funding ends.
F	Partnership working	Clear links with other partners.	No links with other partners.

SCORING SYSTEM	
1	Weak
2	More weaknesses than strengths
3	Average
4	More strengths than weaknesses
5	Strong

Criteria	Score Range	Weight	Max Weighted Score
A	1-5	4	20
B	1-5	4	20
C	1-5	2	10
D	1-5	3	15
E	1-5	3	15
F	1-5	2	10

Maximum score = 90 Minimum score = 18 Mid score = 54

Applications scoring less than 54 should be referred back to the applicant or rejected.