Core Project Information

Title of project		
Project Summary		
Project Priority		
Total Project Cost		
Amount of Grant Requested (£)		
Amount of Grant Requested (%)		Guidance document to state: 30% GTV applicant required to achieve 8 / 15 in economic impact section (3?); 60% GTV=11/15; 80% GTV=13/15. GTV will also impact on financial assessment scores

Project Programme and Spend

Project Costs Incurred 2014-15	£0	
Project Costs Incurred 2015-16	£0	
Project Costs Incurred 2016-17	£0	
Project Costs Incurred 2017-18	£0	

Estate Gateway

Project Deliverability		**Green:** Programme clearly indicates project will be ready for September 2017 with minimal risk evident. **Amber:** Programme indicates readiness for September 2017, but risks apparent which may delay completion up to end December 2017 **Red:** Programme clearly shows project will not be ready for start of 2017/18 academic year
Eligibility of Project (including costs)		**Green:** Project as presented appears to meet eligibility criteria **Amber:** Part of project is eligible and minimum project value threshold is still met **Red:** Project is not eligible for SCF

Estate Need

Estate Need	Score	Comments
Does the proposal provide evidence that demonstrates a case for investment based on estate need with particular reference to the following:	Assessment	Give clear but brief explanation of rationale for scoring - for example if scored '1' rather than '3' any shortcomings that prevent the case from being compelling need to be clearly explained. Avoid use of shorthand notes and abbreviations
Renewal and modernisation - improvement to condition of estate/ estate rationalisation and efficiency	-	3. Project reduces amount of accommodation in D/C by more than 1,000 m^2 or 5% of total floorspace in D/C (whichever is the lesser) and/or Project reduces amount of floorspace by a minimum of 1,000m2 or 5% of current total floorspace (the latter ensures smaller colleges are not penalised). **I WOULD LIKE TO SUGGEST THE PRINCIPLES OF ESTATE RENWAL CAN ALSO APPLY TO AGREED% INCREASE IN MODERNISATION OF EQUIPMENT** 1. Project reduces the amount of accommodation in D/C by less than (or equal to) 1,000 m^2 or 5% of total floorspace in D/C (whichever is the lesser) and/or Project reduces the amount of floorspace by i) 999m2 or less or ii) less than 5% of total current floorspace. **AGAIN TO APPLY TO EQUIPMENT MODERNISATION OF AGREED %**
The project and rationale is clearly articulated in the College Estate Strategy		3. The college provides evidence that the project is in the Estate Strategy and clearly states it as short to medium priority. For non-college providers, applicants can provide evidence through relevant organisational strategic planning documents. 1. Project is referenced in relevant strategy / strategic planning documents but identified as longer term priority of more than 5 years. 0. No reference in relevant documents
Total (out of 6)	**0**	

Financial Assessment

Financial Assessment	Score	Comments
Does the proposal provide evidence that demonstrates value for money, with particular reference to the following:	Assessment	Give clear but brief explanation of rationale for risk rating. Avoid use of shorthand notes and abbreviations. **FOR THIS SECTION APPLICANT CANNOT SCORE LESS THAN 10 IF FAIL TO ACHIEVE AGREED CUT OFF POINTS IN ECONOMIC BENEFITS SECTION**
Net Present Value	0	3: NPV for proposed project is better than base case. 1: NPV for proposed project is equal to base case NPV 0: either no NPV for proposed project/base case or proposed project NPV is worse than base case NPV
College contribution		5= LEP Contribution to project costs is 30% or less; 3= LEP Contribution to project costs is 50% or less; 1= LEP contribution to project costs is 70% or less; 0= LEP contribution to project costs is 100% **Marks for this section out of 5. CANNOT CHANGE THE CELL THOUGH!!**
Efficiency savings	0	
Risk mitigation	0	**Green: (3)** Good evidence of risk mitigation planning. Key project and finance risks identified. Likelihood and impact recorded for each risk. Mitigation measures recorded. **Amber:** (1) Limited evidence of risk mitigation planning. Key project and finance risks identified but likelihood and impact not recorded for each risk or mitigation measures not recorded. **Red: (0)** Inadequate or no evidence of risk mitigation planning.
Total (out of 14)	**0**	

Benefits to Learners and Supporting Economic Growth

Benefits to Learners and Supporting Economic Growth	Scoring guidance	Score	Comments
Does the proposal provide evidence that demonstrates the following:			Give clear but brief explanation of rationale for scoring - for example if scored '1' rather than '3' any shortcomings that prevent the case from being compelling need to be clearly explained. Avoid use of shorthand notes and abbreviations
Benefits to Learners: > Impact on unemployment and NEET > Benefits to classroom-based students > Offers pathways and opportunities that engage the educational and training needs of students and support the business and skills requirements of employers and sectors > Improving quality	Compelling evidence = 3 Adequate Evidence = 1 Nil/ inadequate evidence=0	0	3. Compelling evidence provided that demonstrates measurable benefits linked to local plans and priorities. Most of the underpinning investment criteria are met through the provision of, for example: • A succinct outline of the issue, identified where appropriate by employers, stakeholders (including the LEP) and including clear baseline data. • An explanation of how the project will address the issue, including clear and quantified targets / benefits / measures as appropriate. • How the College will work to achieve these targets / benefits, with clear references to how the project will support this. Benefits should be realistic and sense-checked based on knowledge of the College, the local area, and local plans. If these are deemed to be unrealistic (for example a large increase in learner numbers that would require a significant increase in Adult Skills Budget, or unrealistic targets for reducing NEETs, unemployment etc.) then this should be taken account of in the scoring.
Benefits to Employers eg Employer Co-investment; Employer Sponsorship; Employer Support.			3. Employer co-investment = evidence has been provided that one or more employers will coinvest in the proposal; 2 = evidence has been provided that one or more employers will sponsor equipment; 1 = evidence has been provided that one or more employers support the development; 0 = no evidence
Supporting Economic Growth: > Skills shortages / Growth industries > Responsiveness and securing added value for agreed local priorities and action plans > Demonstrates links with plans for tackling specific local issues and challenges. Demonstrates added value / cost reduction or increased impact benefits for the outcomes and priorities set out within these plans and priorities > Other growth measures: including widening participation by creating improved opportunities for learners with learning difficulties and disabilities, offering more flexible routes and opportunities to higher education		0	1. Adequate evidence provided - for example, a narrative of the project impact and benefits and measures outlined that partly meet most of the underpinning evidence. 0. Nil/inadequate evidence provided on how the criteria will be met. For example, evidence that is nil/inadequate will be a predominantly narrative response that meets none or only some of the underpinning evidence.
Supporting Apprenticeships: > Supporting the expansion of 16-18 and 19-24 Apprenticeships, supporting other work place provision, and providing clear routes to higher level training including higher level Apprenticeships			As above
Collaboration with other projects / exisitng provision: Applicants needs to demanstrate that they understand how their project complements / adds value to other provision available or other projects seeking funding through this programme			As above
Total (out of 15)		**0**	

Total (out of 44)	**0**	