

## Appendix B - Proposal Evaluation Form

Fair Funding Review Proposal Evaluation Form	
Name of proposal	
Proposed by	
Proposal produced on	
Any useful links	
General description	
<i>To include commentary on how needs and resources are reflected.</i>	
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)	
<i>Comments</i>	
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)	
<i>Comments</i>	
Credibility and future proofing	
Data used is up-to-date (1 - strongly disagree, 5 - strongly agree)	
<i>Comments</i>	

Data used is easy to update in the future (1 - strongly disagree, 5 - strongly agree)			
<i>Comments</i>			
It is clear if and where judgement has been used and the reasons for doing so (1 - strongly disagree, 5 - strongly agree)			
<i>Comments</i>			
There is little judgement in the system(1 - strongly disagree, 5 - strongly agree)			
<i>Comments</i>			
Data is not subject to historic fluctuations (1 - strongly disagree, 5 – strongly agree)			
<i>Comments</i>			
Model considers ways to future-proof the system (1 - strongly disagree, 5 - strongly agree)			
<i>Comments</i>			
Data used in the model cannot be affected by council policy decisions (1 – strongly disagree, 5 – strongly agree)			
<i>Comments</i>			
Number of positive answers on completeness (out of 3)			
Average score			
Criteria scoring '2'			
Criteria scoring '1'			
<i>Comments on potential incentives that the model will provide (positive and perverse)</i>			
<i>Any further comments</i>			
<b>Distributional impact</b>			
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			
<b>Conclusion</b>			
<i>Final general comments</i>			
Suitable for discussion at Leadership Board and Executive? (Yes/No)			
<i>If no, comments on what could be improved</i>			
Reviewed by			