

Criteria for projects in England and Wales

Community Grants Programme

A grant scheme funding community and faith/beliefs organisations to positively engage Black, Asian, mixed race and minority ethnic communities in donation. Funded projects will address misinformation and barriers, share information, and increase support for donation. All applications must demonstrate how they meet the criteria below.

Priority activity focus

Deceased organ donation: reach, conversations and registration

Living kidney donation: reach, conversations

Blood: registration (*all activity must target Black African and Caribbean communities*)

Criteria

Criteria 1: Project impact and depth.

It is essential that the activity has a positive impact, and applicants clearly define how activity will address misinformation and barriers around donation and encourage registration.

Proposals must demonstrate understanding of evaluation techniques and the ability to evaluate community work.

Proposals must also demonstrate a clear and methodical approach to building on activity proposed in year one for year two.

Aspects to consider:

- Does the proposal set out how it will engage local communities, help address misinformation and barriers and increase support for donation among the target community?
- How broad is the project's reach?
- Does the proposal consider specific local needs, or propose generalised approaches?
- Does the project provide SMART objectives? Is it clear what the projects seeks to achieve, and how it will reach its goals?
- Does the project present unique activity that is scalable?
- If the project includes digital activity, do they show they have the knowledge and expertise to deliver the activity effectively?
- Are the timescales and milestones proposed realistic?
- Does the project sufficiently build upon, deepen and/or scale activity in year two?
- Does the project build on or complement any activity the organisation already does in the community or any previous activity carried out by others?
- Does the proposal demonstrate an understanding of the barriers and motivations to donation in the target community?
- Does the proposal show a clear journey with their project activity?
- What evaluation methods are the project proposing? Are they sufficient to demonstrate progress and impact? Are they reasonable, given the scope?

- Does the project sufficiently focus on registration?
 - Are the proposed objectives stretching?
 - Has the applicant included three evaluation measures as specified in the application form?
 - Does the application show an understanding of specific digital evaluation metrics e.g. reach, engagement, impressions, video views, click through etc.
 - Does the applicant have the capability/experience to evaluate and provide reports?
 - Does the applicant show an understanding of why evaluation and ROI is important?
-

Criteria 2: Understanding of the audience and issues, and experience of previous community activation work for health inequalities.

It is essential that the organisation or people leading the activity have a deep understanding of the audience and local community within which they will be carrying out the activity.

It is essential that the organisation can demonstrate experience of delivering similar activity in the targeted geographical area and with the specified community/communities.

Organisations applying for funding at the highest band (£10,001-£20,000) must have previous funded experience of working with either a [governmental department \(ministerial or non-ministerial\)](#) or a [public body](#).

Aspects to consider:

- What audience(s) and demographic area(s) will be targeted?
 - What experience do they have working alongside these communities?
 - Do they show evidence of pre-existing relationships within the local community relating to key aspects of the project? E.g. existing relationship with local faith leaders who are supportive of donation?
 - Have they demonstrated knowledge of existing attitudes/challenges in the area/target audience and put forward ideas of how they would address these?
 - What understanding can they demonstrate of the motivations and barriers around donation in their target community/communities?
 - Has the proposal set out clear plans for how they will work with donor families, transplant recipients, those waiting for a transplant, or others with lived experience to address questions and build confidence and trust in donation?
 - Why are they best placed to carry out this activity?
 - How do they propose to engage the community? Do they show history of engagement or good rationale behind creating links?
 - Have they demonstrated experience of working on organ and/or blood donation campaigns, or other health inequalities within similar communities?
 - What activities have they carried out in this area in the past? How would this project build on or complement those activities?
 - Evidence of experience working with staff at local hospitals and/or blood donor centres?
 - Existing relationships with local organ and/or blood donation teams?
 - Clear understanding of support they require from NHS Blood and Transplant
-

Criteria 3 - Whether the project delivers value for money.

Projects will need to demonstrate value for money, and we will be looking at how organisations would make the most of the grant. Preference will be given to projects that can demonstrate innovative thinking and business acumen.

Aspects to consider:

- Is the cost breakdown detailed?
- Does the proposal outline ways to ensure costs are kept to a minimum, and resources can be maximised?
- Does the project demonstrate awareness of the current market (e.g. cost of technology, etc)?
- Does the budget align clearly with the activity they have proposed for two years?
- Does the funding request demonstrate a methodical approach to their budget, considering the potential differences in activity for year one and year two?
- Are costs proposed for each aspect of the project reasonable, proportionate, and fair?
- Is the project adequately resourced?
- Have they considered all potential costs? Does it look like there could be hidden additional costs?
- Does the project include costs which could be reduced or avoided given strong community relationships and a collaborative approach, such as venue costs?
- Does the project sufficiently utilise volunteer activity where appropriate?
- Is the budget total accurate?
- Where projects are using budgets for asset creation, is this cost reasonable? Could this be reduced or avoided?

Assessment

All completed entries will be evaluated by a Panel against the criteria. The evidence put forward by each organisation in response to each criterion will be assessed against a five-point scale:

- 0 - absence of evidence / criterion not met
- 1 - meets some of the requirements of the criterion
- 2 - meets most of the requirements of the criterion
- 3 - meets all of the requirements of the criterion
- 4 - meets all of the requirements of the criterion and proposes an innovative approach that would deliver tangible results and would have a positive impact on the community

Scoring Guide

Score	Rating	Description
0	absence of evidence / criterion not met	<p>A proposal at this rating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Builds very little or no confidence that the bidder can deliver the requirements due to insufficient evidence of relevant ability, understanding, skills, resources and quality measures; • Builds very little or no confidence that the bidder's approach/solution will deliver the requirements due to insufficient evidence or an inappropriate approach/solution.
1	meets some of the requirements of the criterion	<p>A proposal at this rating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raises reservations that the bidder can deliver the requirements due to insufficient evidence of relevant ability, understanding, skills, resources and quality measures; • Raises reservations that the bidder's approach/solution will deliver the requirements due to insufficient evidence or an inappropriate approach/solution.
2	meets most of the requirements of the criterion	<p>A proposal at this rating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests that the bidder can deliver the requirements through evidence of relevant ability, understanding, skills, resources and quality measures; • Provides an acceptable approach/solution to delivering the requirements utilising standard strategies, plans, tools, methods or technologies.
3	meets all of the requirements of the criterion	<p>A proposal at this rating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Builds confidence that the bidder can deliver the requirements through evidence of relevant ability, understanding, skills, resources and quality measures; • Provides a good approach/solution to delivering the requirements utilising appropriately tailored strategies, plans, tools, methods or technologies.
4	meets all of the requirements of the criterion and proposes an innovative approach to delivering results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Builds a high level of confidence that the bidder can deliver requirements through evidence of relevant ability, understanding, skills, resources and quality measures; • Provides an exceptional approach/solution to delivering the requirements utilising appropriately tailored and at times innovative strategies, plans, tools, methods or technologies. <p><u>Note:</u> A proposal at this rating will have demonstrated an innovative approach applicable to impact, financial viability and sustainability.</p>

Judging process

Process for applications between £1 and £2,499

All applications up to the value of £2,499 will be fully assessed by colleagues at NHS Blood and Transplant. They will assess the applications based on the scoring criteria and put forward recommendations for funding to the judging panel based on the score that is required to be eligible for funding. The judging panel will either ratify or reject these recommendations.

Process for applications between £2,500 and £20,000

Sifting:

Applications for these funding bands will be pre-sifted by colleagues at NHS Blood and Transplant. They will sift the applications based on Criteria 1 and 3. Applications must score a total of 4 on the above criteria to be considered for full judging.

Full judging:

Applications will be judged by a panel of two judges who will assess the application against all criteria. Applicants must score a minimum of 12 out of 24 to be *considered* for funding. Those applicants that score a minimum of 12 will then be ranked according to their score and funding allocated accordingly in order of scores. Each judge must score the applicant a minimum of 2 across each criteria to be considered.

Clarification questions

For any applications where the judging panel feel that further clarification from the applicant is needed before they can make a final decision, clarification questions will be asked.

For any applications with multiple existing NHSBT funding, the judging team may request further reassurance of project delivery capacity.

Funding decisions

If the number of projects that achieve the required minimum score means that more than the allocated budget would need investing, final decisions on additional funding will be made by either NHS Blood and Transplant, the Department of Health and Social Care and the Welsh Government.

If there are a number of projects with the same score that have scored a high enough number of points to be eligible for funding, decisions may be made based on clinical need.