**Appendix 1 – The Evaluation Framework**

The plan submitted in all application forms will be evaluated by ILF Scotland and follow the process as identified below:

On receipt of an application to the ILF Transition Fund, the application will initially be logged, confirming date of receipt.

ILF Scotland will then verify the identity of the applicant, and confirm that all eligibility criteria are met. This will be done using: National Insurance numbers; a letter of confirmation of impairment from a professional support worker; social worker; teacher or careers advisor; input from clinical staff who may be working with the individual; and/or through evidence of receipt of DLA or PIP.

Once the verification process is complete, we will proceed to pre-check the application. At this stage, we will confirm that the application form has been fully completed, and that we have all of the information we need to allow us to evaluate the application. If necessary we may make contact with applicants at this stage to seek clarification or additional information that we feel is necessary ( e.g. to allow us to fully understand the plan as detailed in the application).

There are 3 outcomes of the verification and pre-check stages:

1. The applicant is not eligible to apply and is informed of this;
2. An application is able to proceed to full evaluation;
3. Further information is required from the applicant to confirm eligibility, identity and/or to seek information/clarification.

If further information or clarification is required, this will instigate communication with the applicant, either by telephone call, email or, if deemed necessary by ILF Scotland, a visit. The aim of this support is to collate any missing information required to develop a clear understanding of what the individual is trying to achieve. Note that we will not offer support to write an application form for an individual, but will facilitate the process of the person articulating their own goals and developing their own plan to achieve them. In evaluating the applicant’s involvement in the development of their plan, ILF Scotland will have full regard to the support that a person might need from a where the applicant lacks capacity, as in line with the policy intention of TF06.

Once we are satisfied that we have the necessary information, applications will be evaluated using a ‘**success rating model**’. The ‘success rating model’ asks eight questions in total, with each rated from 1-5 (with 5 being the highest rating). Each of the eight questions will be rated on the strength of evidence provided in the application form (see table below).

Questions 1 - 4 relate to the probable impact the plan will have on the applicant’s life, and are used to generate an **impact score**.

Questions 5 – 8 relate to the likely effectiveness of the plan at delivering this impact, and generate an **effectiveness score**.

Please note that, in order for ILF Scotland to prioritise plans which are led by the individual and enable them to achieve community presence, additional weighting is applied to questions one and two.

The impact score and effectiveness score are then multiplied together to get an ‘overall success rating’:

 **Impact Score (1-5) x Effectiveness Score (1-5) = Overall Success Rating (1-25)**

Applications will be ranked in order of overall success rating and will be prioritised for funding on this basis. Funding will be offered to the highest scoring applications within the resources available to ILF Scotland. There will be a processing window during which ILF Scotland will determine the total amount requested across all received applications to decide on the number of offers which can be made (using the highest scoring first approach). Until all applications are processed, an individual will experience a time delay before it is possible to notify them of the outcome

Throughout the application evaluation process, ILF Scotland staff will consider the following:

1. Does the application meet all the criteria detailed in the evaluation framework (below)?
2. How strong is the evidence provided in relation to each of the eight criteria?
3. Criteria 1-4 will be used to evaluate the likely impact or benefit that the plan could make.
4. Criteria 5-8 will consider the planning and the likelihood that the plan can be put into action to bring about the benefit.
5. An overall weighting will be given to each application.
6. Those applications which evidence a high benefit and a strong plan will be prioritised for funding.
7. Some applicants may be contacted by an ILF Caseworker or Assessor for further information or clarity.
8. Unsuccessful applicants will be notified of the reason why their application was unsuccessful.
9. In the evaluation framework below an example is provided under each criterion of the kind of evidence that will be sought in the evaluation of applications by ILF Scotland.
10. There is an option to score any criteria as a zero (0) which in effect will stop the evaluation process and potentially decline the application. Some of the likely scenarios for this are that: the plan is not led by the individual; there is no impact or difference identified; the identified support should be provided by another service or organisation; the costs are not representative of what is being requested; or there are risks identified without thought to how those risks will be managed.

The fund available from which grants can be paid is fixed. Once all applications are processed and the successful ones identified, the overall financial demand on the available fund will be known. At this point the Senior Management Team at ILF Scotland will be able to understand if all successful applications can be funded or if a further sift is required. If required, this sift will involve allocating funding with priority given to those applicants who have scored highest in the evaluation process.

**Evaluation Framework**

Those applicants/recipients who lack capacity, or who need additional support, are able to apply to the ILF Transition Fund on an equal basis with others. ILF Scotland would offer support to any person lacking capcity and those requiring support, who have no other identified source of support, to complete an application..A support visit will be instigated, if on first evaluation it is apparent that the person lacks capacity and has had limited support to make the application.

**Impact Questions**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1.** **An outcome or goal must be identified in the plan, and must be fully centred on, or determined by, the young person** | Strong Evidence (5-4)Plan clearly demonstrates significant involvement of the young person and/or is fully centred on the young person. e.g. is part of any future planning or person centred planning undertaken with the young person.   | Less strong (3)The plan shows some indication that this represents the applicants preferences ambitions/hopes but some indication of how the identified goal emerged . | Weak (2-1)Plan shows a small amount of evidence of involvement of the applicant or their supporting adultOr Plan is service-led. | Zero (0)The plan appears to be written on behalf of the applicant. It is not clear that the person has been involved at any point in the development of their plan (Further information is required)  |
|  | Where the young person lacks capacity the plan must reflect the principles of the Adults with Incapacity (Scotland) Act 2000 and clearly demonstrate significant involvement of young person, by the person completing the application. | Where the young person lacks capacity this may trigger a visit | Where the young person lacks capacity this would likely trigger a visit |  |
| **Other possible Indicators**  | The plan is written in first person by the person and is strengths based.The plan is written by someone else but using only words of young person Guardian cleary states that that past behaviour or experiences in the activity or goal has been successful/enjopyable .Explicit statement that the plan supports the applicants aspirations.Efforts have been made to support the communication of the Young Person. | The degree to which best practice is absent ie some evidence is present | The degree to which best practice is absent Ie a small amount of best practice is evident | Poor practice that excludes the applicant  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Insert your score and reason on this line.** |  |  |  |  |
| **2. The outcome or goal must be clearly and directly linked to promoting the young person’s participation or presence or inclusion in a community setting.**  | Strong Evidence (5-4)The plan will clearly alleviate isolation in the community and promote inclusion.  | Less strong (3)Some links between the goal and the outcome of inclusion. Or the link is tenuous  | Weak (2-1)The plan provides little information on how it would support the applicant to be active in a community setting. It has to be inferred from the goal how the grant will be spent , and on whether the individual will be active and participating in their community.  | Zero (0)It cannot be inferred from plan what the outcome is or how it might enable the applicant to be active and included in a community setting. Further information is required.  |
| **Other possible Indicators**  | Plan clearly identifies what the applicant would like to do in a community setting and the type support necessary to achieve this. The terms ‘active’ and ‘community setting’ are referred to in its broadest sense and refers to any recreational, leisure or daily living activity out with a residential or hospital setting. Enables applicant to overcome any barriers to participation in an activity or be visable and present in their community of choice. Community can be geographical or of interest.  | It may be a step removed from Immediate inclusion or participation but lead to or assist in future inclusion-  | May be very tenous or not related to overcoming the barriers presented by applicants impairment.  | Plan is entirely related to critical needs at home. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Insert your score and reason on this line.** |  |  |  |  |
| **3. The benefit the young person anticipates the grant will make must be clearly outlined.**  | Strong evidence (5-4)Plan, in whatever form it may be presented, is SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Timely- Timely may not be required if the grant is to fund initial steps). | Less strong (3)The goal and benefit is identified but other smart principles are missing  | Weak (2-1)Plan is lacking both in terms of specifics as to what the goal and the intended time frames.It is difficult to establish a clear link between the plan and the intended outcome. | Zero (0)There is no evidence that the grant would provide a step change in the applicant’s ability to live more independently and achieve outcomes linked to being more active and participating in their community.  |
| **Other possible Indicators**  | End result is decribed .Or plan clearly shows how current barriers to inclusion will be overcome and be of lasting benefit.  |  | Perhaps an item for purchasing has been identified but no clear link made to any outcome or goal that will be achieved  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Insert your score and reason on this line.** |  |  |  |  |
| **4. Applicants must be in receipt of little or no formal support from Social Work Services (SWS) under options 1-4 of the Social Care (Self-directed Support) (Scotland) Act 2013.** | Strong Evidence (5-4)There is evidence that no SWS support is in place following a SW assessment. | Less strong (3)Applicant has some SDS supports or is likely to be eligible for some. NB The average SDS budget is 7.5hrs support per week. Supports between 7-14 hrs which provide personal care can be considered “some” support | Weak (2-1)Applicant has high levels of SDS support which is largely comprised of critical personal care. Or no SW support has been requested although the applicant may be eligible for high levels of support.  | Zero (0)Applicant has high levels of SWS support providing a comprehensive support package that includes a high degree of support to be active and included in their community. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Other possible Indicators**  | .The impairment has a significant impact on ability to participate and be included and no SWS is in place.   | Although sw input has been requested, no sw support been offered | Signifcant levels of support offered. Is there sufficient support, perhaps with a reconfiguration of current hours, to meet the identified goal? The declared impairment has minimal impact or dos not create barriers to participation and inclusion  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Insert your score and reason on this line.**  |  |  |  |  |

**Effectiveness Questions**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5. The plan has clear costs identified to deliver it, and evidences value for money.** | Strong evidence (5-4)The plan is clearly costed and/or includes quotations for the purchase of any goods or services. The initial cost of implementing the plan is outweighed by the long-term benefits for the applicant .  | Less strong (3)Only some costs are provided or the costs are generic without evidence of person centred costing. The costs are disproportionate when bench marked | Weak (2-1)Cost is disproportionate to any benefit likely to be achieved for the applicant. | Zero (0)No indication of costing is provided. The presented costs bear no relation to the intended purchases. The costs could be seen as a means to obtain public funds by another route . .  |
| **indicators** | May reduce the need for future statutory supports by promoting resilience and independence |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Insert your score and reason on this line.** |  |  |  |  |
| **6. The plan has considered how the benefit from the grant will be maintained at the end of the grant period.** | Strong evidence (5-4)The award applied for forms part of a larger transitional plan for the applicant with identifiable ‘next steps’.The plan is time limited with a clearly identifiable outcomes and next steps outlined where required | Less strong (3)Plan is time limited and partly shows how the applicant will proceed once award period has ended. | Weak (2-1)There is a little consideration of on-going development or maintenance of the positive impact of the grant. The plan is speculative where it should be specific.NB Trials and hopeful outcomes are encouraged but thought to the exit process is needed | Zero (0)There is no consideration of how the proposed positive impacts will be sustained , and the grant might be considered as a ‘stop-gap’ for other services..  |
| **Indicators**  |  |  |  |  |
| **Insert your score and reason on this line.** |  |  |  |  |
| **7. The plan does not create any circumstances which may cause physical emotional material harm or abuse.**  | Strong evidence (5-4)The plan is consistent with safeguarding the interests of the applicant from harm or abuse.  | Less strong (3)There are potentially significant risks of harm however other agencies are accepting and managing these risks. | Weak (2-1) There are concerns that the plan may create some circumstances which could give rise to harm, abuse or be otherwise detrimental to the applicant and no other agencies are managing these risks. | Zero (0)It is evident in the evaluation process that there are significant unidentified risks associated with the proposed plan. Or there are identified risks which are not managed. set in the context of what the individual is trying to achieve. .  |
| **Indicators**  |  | There are people in the applicants life who will be able to contribute to safeguarding the applicant | The intervention makes the individual vulnerable in their community with no person or plan to keep the person safe. . |  |
| **Insert your score and reason on this line.** |  |  |  |  |
| **8. There is evidence that no other agencies or sources of funding will support this request.**  | Strong evidence (5-4)Applicant does not meet eligibility criteria for funding from the relevant statutory body or other well known funder.There is no body to apply to for the funding applied for.  | Less strong (3) There is a little or some potential eligbility but the timeframe or local eligbility criteria mean an application would take too long or be unlikely to succeed.NB Pending or suspending is available | Weak (2-1) There is signficant potential eligbility for other funding but the timeframe or local eligbility criteria mean an application would take too long or be unlikely to succeed.NB Pending or suspending is available | Zero (0)Plan is designed to meet critical or substantial social care need that is likely available from social work. Or other sources of funding have been offered. Another statutory service or support organisation which would normally provide this type of support has not been approached. Consider signposting.  |
| **Indicators**  |  |  |  | See policy and practice papers on * Assistive technology for communication
* Motability and drving lessons
* Assitance for studying
 |
| **Insert your score and reason on this line.** |  |  |  |  |