**Appendix B - Proposal Evaluation Form**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fair Funding Review Proposal Evaluation Form** | | | | |
| Name of proposal |  | | | |
| Proposed by |  | | | |
| Proposal produced on |  | | | |
| Any useful links |  | | | |
| General description | | | | |
| *To include commentary on how needs and resources are reflected.* | | | | |
| Key strengths | | | | |
|  | | | | |
| Key weaknesses | | | | |
|  | | | | |
| Simplicity and transparency | | | | |
| Number of formulae | | | |  |
| Services covered by the formulae | | | |  |
| Number of cost drivers used in total | | | |  |
| Does the model calculate final allocations transparently? (1 – strongly disagree, 5 – strongly agree) | | | |  |
| Is the proposed model easy to explain to a member of the public? (1 – strongly disagree, 5 – strongly agree) | | | |  |
| *Comments* | | | | |
| Completeness | | | | |
| Does the needs assessment account for all relevant types of authority? (y/n) | | | |  |
| Is there a resources adjustment calculation for each authority or a deliberate exclusion of a resources adjustment? (y/n/ not applicable) | | | |  |
| Are there exemplifications available for all local authorities covered by the Fair Funding Review? (y/n) | | | |  |
| *Comments* | | | | |
| Credibility and future proofing | | | | |
| Data used is up-to-date (1 - strongly disagree, 5 - strongly agree) | | | |  |
| *Comments* | | | | |
| Data used is easy to update in the future (1 - strongly disagree, 5 - strongly agree) | | | |  |
| *Comments* | | | | |
| It is clear if and where judgement has been used and the reasons for doing so (1 - strongly disagree, 5 - strongly agree) | | | |  |
| *Comments* | | | | |
| There is little judgement in the system(1 - strongly disagree, 5 - strongly agree) | | | |  |
| *Comments* | | | | |
| Data is not subject to historic fluctuations (1 - strongly disagree, 5 – strongly agree) | | | |  |
| *Comments* | | | | |
| Model considers ways to future-proof the system (1 - strongly disagree, 5 - strongly agree) | | | |  |
| *Comments* | | | | |
| Data used in the model cannot be affected by council policy decisions (1 – strongly disagree, 5 – strongly agree) | | | |  |
| *Comments* | | | | |
| Number of positive answers on completeness (out of 3) | | | |  |
| Average score | | | |  |
| Criteria scoring '2' | | | |  |
| Criteria scoring '1' | | | |  |
| *Comments on potential incentives that the model will provide (positive and perverse)* | | | | |
| *Any further comments* | | | | |
| Distributional impact | | | | |
| Maximum percentage reduction for any one authority | | | |  |
| Maximum percentage increase for any one authority | | | |  |
| Authority type | | Highest percentage change | Lowest percentage change | Average percentage change |
| Shire counties  Shire districts  English unitaries  Metropolitan districts  London boroughs  Fire and rescue authorities  Greater London Authority  Combined authorities | |  |  |  |
| Authority region | | Highest percentage change | Lowest percentage change | Average percentage change |
| London  South East  South West  North East  North West  East Midlands  West Midlands  Yorkshire and Humberside  East of England | |  |  |  |
| Conclusion | | | | |
| *Final general comments* | | | | |
| Suitable for discussion at Leadership Board and Executive? (Yes/No) | | | |  |
| *If no, comments on what could be improved* | | | | |
| Reviewed by | | | |  |