



Ferry Farm Community Grant Fund

Panel Constitution and Notes to Applicants

Constitution

The composition of the grant panel will be agreed annually by the Selsey Community Forum Funding Think Tank and Management Committee. Members may make nominations as well as agree the final membership.

The administration of the grant fund will be undertaken by independent members of the Selsey Community Forum.

The Panel will normally consist of five members. Two shall represent Selsey, two Sidlesham and one independent member who will generally be from the CDC/WSCC Communities Team.

It is envisaged that panel members will usually serve for a minimum of two years and a maximum of four years. To aid consistency of panel membership, and knowledge of and application of the funding scheme, if possible an overlap of panel members will be preferred.

The Chair will be elected annually by the grant panel.

All panel members will declare a conflict of interest in regard to a particular application.

They will take no part in that decision making and the minutes will record this.

In the event of a conflict of interest for the Chair concerning a particular application, the independent panel member will assume the Chair and a decision made by the remaining members on a majority basis.

Outcomes of panel meetings should clearly indicate the reasons for decisions and the category under which a grant was awarded. Such reasons will be expressed by reference to criteria not met, location inadmissible, project impractical and funding sources inadequate. These will be represented by the letters CM,LI,PI,PB,FS, PA.

In those minutes a voting record should be kept and individual panel members given the option of their comment/opinion being recorded.

Outcomes of the meeting will be made available in the public domain 14 days after the panel meeting.

In the event of decisions needing to be made on the grounds of limited funding weighting will be given to those having environmental or energy efficient credentials.

All applications must tick one or more category boxes at the top of the application form and show how their project fits that criteria within the different sections of the application.

Notes to Applicants

- Your application must accord with the eligibility criteria.
- Your application must have a clear focus in relation to one of the following , Environment, Health, Education, Youth.
- Please make your application as clear and concise as possible.
- Answer all the questions on the application form.
- Normally we expect you to find at least 10% of your budget from other sources. This can include your own organisation.
- Question 16 indicates you can include 'match funding'. Match funding is the funding you have received for 'this project' from other sources, to include for example other funding bodies, crowd funding, or your own organisation.
- A strong application will refer to a specific project rather than just general funding for your organisation.
- Do not send in any additional material unless you are asked to do so.
- Outcomes of the grant awarding panel meeting will be made available in the public domain 14 days after the panel meeting.
- There are five panel members who will make a judgement on your application, and you will receive an email letter indicating the result of your application within a week after the meeting of the grant panel. The reasons for decisions will be clearly expressed with the letter system detailed below.

Criteria not met : CM

Unclear application, with the ideas, aims and objectives not clearly expressed.
Poorly written application, with incorrect information, statistics and detail.
Insufficient detail of how the project fits the criteria in relation to one of the following: Environment, Health, Education, Youth.
The quality of the experience of the people taking part in the project is insubstantial.

Location inadmissible : LI

The project does not benefit the communities of Selsey and Sidelsham explicitly enough.

The project is impractical and constitutes a major risk: PI

Insufficient management experience and track record for successful delivery of the project.
There are unrealistic expectations.
The scale and ambition of the project is not realistic in terms of time scale and funding.
The project is badly conceived.
There are inaccurate cost estimations.
There is little evidence of a secure project methodology.

Public Benefit/ Engagement: PB

Insufficient evidence of public engagement in relation to the cost of the project
The project is too focused on a small group of people.
Lack of understanding shown regarding how your contributors will engage with the project.
Marketing and Communication strategy in relation to the target group is weak.

Other Funding sources: FS

No or little evidence of application to other funding bodies.
Cash reserves seem adequate to deliver the project.
No evidence of fund raising activity.
Budget does not seem appropriate for the activity.

Preferred Application: PA

In relation to the number of applications received and the quality of those applications in relation to the criteria, other applications were preferred.