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1 Introduction

1. In 2005-06 the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) announced a major boost to the ongoing capital programme for Further Education (FE) colleges. This programme has transformed over half the FE estate, with six hundred projects in more than three hundred colleges. Initially, the programme was slow to gather momentum but early in financial year 2008-09, the Learning and Skills Council (LSC) reported a surge in demand for capital, resulting in more applications than could be funded in this spending round. In December 2008, the LSC declared a three month moratorium on further projects while Sir Andrew Foster conducted a review. The Foster Report, which was completed in March 2009, makes the following recommendations:

   - The present demand-led approach should be replaced by a needs-based approach with explicit priorities and associated decision criteria: “How should priorities and criteria be determined, and what should they be? How should these questions be answered now to deal with immediate uncertainties, and will that approach also be robust for the longer term?” (p.26)

   - Early engagement and consultation between Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills (DIUS), the LSC and the college sector is essential, including setting up a panel of college principals to work with LSC & DIUS;

   - Accurate and detailed information about capital schemes in the pipeline and mapping of potential needs is needed;

   - Urgent clarification is needed of the position of all colleges that have incurred expenditure, but have no guarantee of final approval for their proposals;

   - Open consultation with the sector followed by a small project management group set up from across LSC and DIUS will help to restore confidence;

   - Talks with HM Treasury are needed to reinforce the importance of skills development in the context of economic recovery, together with a robust clear recovery plan;

   - A clear and competent financial strategy supporting needs-related planning is necessary; and

   - Active consideration must now be given to the future working arrangements of the Skills Funding Agency and the Young People’s Learning Agency.

2. The LSC acknowledges that, in light of the Foster report, the whole capital programme needs to be reviewed and redesigned. However, it also recognises the requirement to adopt an interim approach to address the immediate funding situation.

3. In April 2009, additional capital funding was identified by HM Treasury in the Budget to support the delivery of a number of prioritised projects.

4. The LSC commissioned PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP (PwC) to support it in defining and then implementing a process by which the LSC could allocate the additional funding identified to prioritised projects. In particular PwC has:
• Worked with the LSC and the LSC’s technical advisers, Lambert Smith Hampton (LSH), to define a three stage approach to evaluating and prioritising projects for capital funding. See the next section of this report for further detail on the approach;

• Taken five evaluation criteria identified by the LSC and expanded on them to flesh out the key considerations that should be taken into account when evaluating projects against each criterion;

• Supported the LSC in undertaking consultation with FE sector representative bodies and others on the approach and evaluation criteria;

• Applied the prioritisation criteria set by the LSC to the projects to arrive at an evaluation score for each project assessed; and

• Undertaken sensitivity analysis to identify and award bonus points to projects with particularly urgent issues and/or exceptional circumstances.

5. This report sets out the approach and process adopted to evaluate projects, sets out the base case evaluation scores and the results of sensitivity analysis undertaken to award bonus points for urgent issues or exceptional circumstances. The report is structured as follows:

• Evaluation Methodology – The approach adopted to evaluate projects in a consistent, objective and transparent manner.

• Base case evaluation results – A summary of the base case evaluation scores in rank order.

• Sensitivity analysis – A summary of the approach to, and results of, an exercise to award bonus points to projects with urgent issues or exceptional circumstances.
2 Evaluation methodology

Overarching approach

6. The diagram below illustrates, at a headline level, the approach adopted by the LSC to evaluate applications for capital funding with the aim of identifying a list of prioritised projects against which the additional capital funding announced in the Budget in April 2009 will be allocated.

Stage a – Readiness assessment

7. Given that the new funding is part of a fiscal stimulus package and will need to be spent quickly, it was agreed that readiness to start on site should act as a first gateway through which all projects will need to pass before being evaluated against the other criteria. All colleges were asked, via a self-assessment questionnaire, if they considered that their projects could commence on site within three months or so. College returns were reviewed and assessed by LSH to determine a likely start date for each project. Of the over 200 college returns, 90 were considered able to start on site within three months, i.e. beginning of September 2009, and were therefore deemed to have passed the readiness criterion and were passed to PwC for evaluation at Stage b.
Stage b – Project evaluation
8. The projects passing to stage b were then assessed against the following five criteria:

- Education and skills impact;
- Present condition of the estate;
- Value for money;
- Co-dependency with third parties; and
- Contribution to local economic and regeneration priorities.

Note – A total of 98 projects were actually assessed by PwC because the readiness and project evaluation stages took place in parallel due to the tight project timescales. Nine of the projects assessed were ultimately determined by LSH to have likely start on site dates after September 2009, two projects (London Borough of Waltham Forest Cathall Road Skills Centre and Bridgewater Energy Skills Centre) were removed from the process by LSC to be considered for funding from a separate funding pot, and one further project (Otley College) was removed from the list by LSC as it is simply a land purchase, leaving a total of 86 projects deemed to have passed the readiness assessment.

Stage c – constructing a portfolio
9. Stage c acknowledges that the project evaluation scores are only one of a number of factors that will need to be taken into consideration by the LSC, when constructing a portfolio of projects to receive funding. This is because:

- it may be undesirable to construct a portfolio of very similar projects; and
- it may be necessary to differentiate between projects with the same score if there is insufficient funding available to meet the estimated project costs of all projects at the same score.

10. Considerations such as issues of urgency or exceptional circumstances, regional spread, type of college and size of project may be factors that the LSC need to take into account to arrive at an appropriate portfolio of projects to receive funding.

11. We understand that those projects that are successful at stage c, will be given authority to proceed subject to passing the LSC approvals process.

Project evaluation methodology
Process
12. The criteria against which the applications have been evaluated are largely subjective and it has therefore been important to ensure that similar scores are representative of the same level of quality in different applications.

13. In order to maximise consistency and transparency we have adopted the following process:

- Assessor briefing session held and dry run evaluations undertaken;
- Teams of two allocated to LSC regions to meet with regional representatives, understand project context, review documentation and score the projects against the criteria;
- Scores and evidence captured in a standard template;
- Each evaluation reviewed and challenged by a small team of four reviewers;
- PwC moderation day held to maximise consistency of scoring by comparing and contrasting scores across different assessment teams on a criterion by criterion basis;
- LSC/PwC moderation day held, attended by PwC assessment teams and regional LSC representatives, to review and validate scores;

- Regional LSC representatives have reviewed PwC evaluation comments to identify any factual inaccuracies, significant omissions and misinterpretations;

- Detailed presentation of methodology to AoC Reference group; and

- LSC Capital Committee and National Council have endorsed the approach and process undertaken.

14. Project evaluations have been undertaken using existing information held by LSC regions. Colleges were not asked to submit any additional information to support the evaluation process.
### Criteria and weighting

15. The table below sets out the criteria, against which, each project passing the readiness stage has been assessed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Education and skills impact</th>
<th>Condition of estate</th>
<th>Value for money</th>
<th>Co-dependency with 3rd parties</th>
<th>Contribution to local economic and regeneration priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary</strong></td>
<td>This criterion assesses the extent to which the project addresses current and future education and skills need and supports industrial activism.</td>
<td>This criterion evaluates the condition of the existing estate and the impact on learners and the extent to which they are addressed by the project.</td>
<td>This criterion assesses the extent to which the project demonstrates that it has gone through a process to maximise value for money.</td>
<td>This criterion looks at the practical implications of not proceeding with the project and the leverage ratios involved.</td>
<td>This criterion considers the wider economic and regeneration impact of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key considerations to be taken into account when evaluating the project against each criterion</strong></td>
<td>The extent to which the project: • Provides greater specialisation so that businesses have access to a wider range of specific skills to meet current and future need; • Integrates technology enhanced learning into the curriculum, delivery methods and learning styles; • Secures 14-19 reform including extension of compulsory participation to 18; • Supports high performing providers to expand; and • Secures high quality provision for learners with learning difficulties and disabilities.</td>
<td>The condition of the estate, the impact on learners and the likelihood of further deterioration; The suitability and sufficiency of the estate to meet current and future need; and The urgency of estate based issues e.g. sale/closure of buildings, links to other phases of development.</td>
<td>The extent to which the cost estimates are comprehensive and within acceptable benchmarks; The quality of technical proposals; The capacity of the organisation to deliver the project; The key risks around readiness to deliver within three months; The willingness to re-evaluate the scale and scope of the project; The sustainability and longer term affordability of the project; The extent to which the project represents value in terms of investing capital to save revenue.</td>
<td>The integration and interdependencies with other important projects in the locality e.g. Building Schools for the Future, regeneration schemes; The urgency of projects to proceed to be able to realise the benefits of the integration; and The interdependencies with 3rd party funding.</td>
<td>The level of deprivation of the local authority area as per the Index of Multiple Deprivation; The economic impact of the project including support to inward investment; The extent to which the project advances equal opportunities &amp; social impact; and The extent to which the environmental impact of the project has been minimised.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. In early consultation with representative bodies from the FE sector and the Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) various options for weighting the criteria were discussed. However no consensus could be reached and after further discussion and consideration the LSC National Council agreed that each of the criteria should have equal weighting.

17. In developing the criteria and scoring framework, every effort has been made to distinguish between the criteria to ensure that each criterion is taking separate and different considerations into account.

**Scoring**

18. Projects have been scored from 0-5 against each criterion, with 5 being the highest score. This has been multiplied by a factor of 4 to give a total score out of 100 for each project. For each criterion, we have detailed in Appendix A the characteristics of three scores which were used in the evaluation; those for a 5, 3 and 1 score.
3 Scoring projects with exceptional characteristics

19. The project evaluation exercise produced a range of scores from 20 to 92 out of 100. As explained in the previous section of this report, these scores were reviewed and moderated with the input of LSC regional representatives at a meeting which was held on 21 May 2009.

20. The base case list of project evaluation scores prioritises the projects against the agreed criteria. As with any set of criteria which are used to determine priorities, these criteria do discriminate between projects. The criteria were chosen to identify projects which demonstrate certain characteristics. Given the breadth of consultation and the extensive moderation undertaken we are confident that the prioritised list is not only robust but also a sensible reflection of the application of the criteria.

21. However, as part of our evaluation we have identified a number of exceptional issues and circumstances which are not adequately captured and distinguished by the scoring bands of 0-5.

22. In order to support the identification of the most urgent projects and those in exceptional circumstances, we have undertaken an exercise to highlight any exceptional issues or circumstances and allocate bonus marks to reflect these.

23. Bonus marks have been allocated sparingly, in the following instances:

   • **Condition of estate** - Where there are extremely urgent estate issues e.g. significant work already underway, buildings demolished, significant and unsatisfactory temporary accommodation, critical health and safety issues;

   • **Co-dependency** - Where there is significant leverage of 3rd party funding or another important project will not proceed if this project doesn’t proceed; and

   • **Regeneration** – Where the area is both highly deprived and the project is integral to a wider regeneration scheme.

24. Each project can receive a maximum of 3 bonus points, one bonus point for each of the categories set out above. (This equates to a maximum of 12 additional points when multiplied by the factor of 4, giving a total maximum project evaluation score of 112 instead of 100 as in the base case).

25. A summary of the evaluation scores including the bonus points is included in Appendix B to this report. Please note that the cost estimates included in the scoring spreadsheet reflect the cost information in a LSH report dated 1 June 2009, which we are advised was based on information provided by colleges in their self assessment questionnaires, and may not necessarily be the latest cost estimates available. In the instances where there was no LSC grant contribution included within the college self assessment returns, we have assumed that the LSC grant contribution remains the same proportion of the total project cost as stated in previous LSC documentation provided to us when we undertook our visits to the LSC regional offices.
26. It should be noted that any project with exceptional circumstances can receive a bonus mark, even if the base case score is less than 5 out of 5. This is because there are a number of considerations that are taken into account within each criterion, and a project may have an exceptional circumstance or issue in relation to one of the considerations, but score less than 5 when all of the considerations are taken into account. An example of this is the South Thames project which initially scored 3 out of 5 for co-dependencies but receives a bonus point. This is because, although there are no other projects dependent on this project and the project does not lever in any third party funding, the college is leveraging in substantial funds (£25m) from the sale of land at a price agreed in preferable market conditions. If the project does not proceed, the college would lose this contributory funding, which would leave the college in severe financial difficulty.
4 Constructing a portfolio of projects

27. The prioritised list of evaluation scores provides an objective and consistent assessment of the projects against the factors that the LSC and key stakeholders have identified as being important.

28. The PwC report and the scoring approach is one of the contributions to the decision-making process in constructing a portfolio of projects to receive funding. The LSC will need to consider other issues before identifying the portfolio to proceed to funding with.

29. It is possible to use this list to simply and straightforwardly prioritise those projects which can proceed to the next stage of the approvals process. However, we believe that it is also possible to take account of wider strategic considerations in deciding how best to use the project evaluation scores to support the identification of a portfolio of projects to receive funding. The former has the benefit of a simpler and more transparent process, the latter the benefit of ensuring that the available funds are spread more evenly by geography or by other factors which may be important to the LSC, such as provider type.

30. The LSC has decided to opt for the first approach on this occasion and has used the scores to construct the portfolio. In fact, the 13 highest scoring projects have been taken forward for further consideration.

31. The LSC has advised us that it believes that in many cases there may be potential to reduce the LSC grant required to support projects, for example by:

- Increasing the proportion of the total project cost that the college is allowed to borrow against from 40% to 50%; and
- Reducing the project cost estimates as a result of recent construction deflation and/or re-scoping the project e.g. refurbishment rather than newbuild.

32. We understand that there is work ongoing by the LSC to explore and address the issues above prior to any commitment to allocate funding.

33. In addition, the LSC is also exploring other options, including private finance, to identify possible sources of investment funding outside CSR allocations.
## Appendix A – Scoring characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description/ characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>Education and skills impact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project is essential to the successful delivery of important local/regional or national strategies or project meets an urgent local educational need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Failure of the project to proceed would result in important gaps in essential local provision that could not be met elsewhere in the vicinity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project provides one or more of the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Delivery of new full time equivalent places for 14-19 year olds and/or adults, specifying numbers and explaining area of expansion (e.g. new Diplomas, Apprenticeships, new provision for Foundation Learning Tier, Level 2 and 3 qualifications and units) in response to the regional skills strategy;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– More flexible and responsive provision for 14-19 year olds and adults (e.g. new learner support, specialist facilities) in response to the regional skills strategy and aiming to impact retention and success rates;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– New facilities providing specialist infrastructure that responds to a particular sector/employer demand, and which have been designed in collaboration with relevant employers;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– New and enhanced specialist provision for learners with learning difficulties and/or disabilities (LLDD) reflecting specific demand and regional skills strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Project will significantly contribute to reducing young people Not in Employment, Education or Training (NEETs) in response to the regional skills strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Revenue funding is confirmed for any growth in places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is evidence of meaningful consultation with the key users groups in developing the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Performance data shows excellent or continuously improving performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There is evidence that technology enhanced learning forms an important part of the project and has been integrated into the design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Description/ characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3     | • Project contributes to the delivery of local/regional or national strategies.  
       • Project provides one or more of the following:  
       - Delivery of new full time equivalent places for 14-19 year olds and/or adults, specifying numbers and explaining area of expansion (e.g. new Diplomas, Apprenticeships, new provision for Foundation Learning Tier, Level 2 and 3 qualifications and units) in response to the regional skills strategy;  
       - More flexible and responsive provision for 14-19 year olds and adults (e.g. new learner support, specialist facilities) in response to the regional skills strategy and aiming to impact retention and success rates;  
       - New facilities providing specialist infrastructure that responds to a particular sector/employer demand, and which have been designed in collaboration with relevant employers;  
       - New and enhanced specialist LLDD provision reflecting specific demand and regional skills strategy.  
       • Project will contribute to reducing NEETs in response to the regional skills strategy.  
       • Revenue funding is confirmed for any growth in places.  
       • Some consultation with key user groups undertaken.  
       • Performance data shows acceptable performance.  
       • There is evidence that technology enhanced learning forms part of the project and has been integrated into the design. |
| 1     | • Minimal evidence that the project contributes to the delivery of local/regional or national strategies or project is aligned with relevant strategies but contribution to meeting key needs is minimal.  
       • If the project failed to proceed, other local or regional providers could potentially meet demand but this would not be ideal and there would be issues to resolve.  
       • Project states that it will contribute to reducing NEETs but the plans are not specific.  
       • Revenue funding is not confirmed for any growth in places.  
       • Minimal evidence of consultation with key user groups undertaken.  
       • Ongoing performance issues or previous performance issues not fully resolved.  
       • Minimal evidence that needs of LLDD students have been understood, considered and addressed.  
       • Minimal evidence that technology enhanced learning forms part of the project and has been integrated into the design. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition of the estate</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>The project meets one or more of the following:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Urgent Health and Safety issues which could render the building unusable/condemned and needs urgent rectification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sale/closure of buildings within approximately 1 year and/or evidence of advance works undertaken in preparation e.g. decant or demolition and urgent requirement for further investment to complete the works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Significant numbers in temporary accommodation that is unsuitable even in the short term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Project delivered in interdependent phases and success of project being dependant on all phases being completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interdependency where phases of capital development are already underway or nearing completion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The project meets one or more of the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Some health and safety concerns that need to be addressed within 5 years but not immediately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sale/closure of buildings within 3 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Some temporary accommodation in use which is adequate for the short to medium term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Success of project may be linked to completion of phases but there are no significant interdependencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Existing buildings do undermine delivery of the existing or future curriculum e.g. Inspection bodies have noted that facilities are preventing effective delivery of teaching, students are required to go offsite for important elements of courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The project meets one or more of the following:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Minor health and safety issues which can be addressed through standard maintenance work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Existing buildings are unsatisfactory in relation to meeting current or future needs. Some rationalisation of estate or minor improvements to layout of existing estate required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No interdependent phases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Building largely DDA compliant or as far as possible and project will not significantly improve access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Minimal improvements in space efficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value for money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **5**           | Evidence of factors demonstrating that the project has sought ways to maximise value for money e.g. re-scoping to significantly reduce the specification or scale of the project whilst maintaining the same outcomes and/or innovative approaches to minimise costs.  
|                  | A highly robust and comprehensive assessment of the cost proposal with evidence of a good understanding of risks with contingencies costed or mitigation strategies identified.  
|                  | The costs (excluding abnormals) fall within the expected unit costs for a project of this nature.  
|                  | There is good evidence of an options appraisal process which considers options for meeting the objectives with a balanced and economic perspective of the costs of the options versus the benefits.  
|                  | The development of the proposal is grounded in high-quality consultation with relevant stakeholders and 3rd parties.  
|                  | There is evidence that the quality required of the solution has been evidenced and grounded in a design framework.  
|                  | Overall the proposal provides certainty around quality of the processes that have been employed and will be employed to provide reassurance on the quality of the delivery and outcome of the project.  
|                  | Focussed and dependable delivery organisation.  
|                  | The programme plan is credible and stands a good chance of succeeding. |
| **3**           | A comprehensive assessment of the project costs which is well-supported by evidence.  
|                  | Evidence that project specific issues have been identified but there is further work to resolve, cost or mitigate these risks and issues.  
|                  | Evidence of consultation with a broad group stakeholders to take forward and influence the design process.  
|                  | Stakeholders are committed to producing a high quality outcome although the evidence of process is not as clear as it could be.  
|                  | Proposals for project delivery in terms of project management and governance are sound but could be refined further or added to so as to provide more comfort.  
|                  | The plan looks deliverable but there may be some areas of weakness in either programme or the structure and resources put in place to deliver.  
|                  | Some additional questions around the readiness to deliver but which may be satisfactorily answered within the required timescales. Or, a small number of bigger issues with a clear route to clear them within the required timescale. |
| **1**           | Little or insufficient evidence to support the robustness of the project costs.  
|                  | The solution is not supported by an options appraisal.  
|                  | Insufficient detail around project specific issues such as site or decant issues to provide credibility that the cost is robust.  
|                  | Little or no evidence of meaningful engagement of stakeholders or other relevant groups.  
|                  | Little or no evidence that the processes in place to deliver the project are of sufficient quality given the scale and size of the project.  
|                  | Little or no evidence to support the assertion that the project can be delivered.  
|                  | Some significant uncertainty about the capacity of the organisation to deliver.  
|                  | A number of, or some significant issues associated with delivery. |
## Co dependencies with 3rd parties

### 5
- Significant other funding committed and confirmed which will be lost if the project does not go ahead; and
- Third party inter-connected developments will not be able to go ahead if this project does not go ahead; or
- Project integral to a large, strategically important, well advanced regeneration scheme/action plan.

### 3
- Some loss of other funding if the project does not go ahead.
- Interdependencies with other organisations and projects exist and will be adversely impacted, but will be able to adjust and proceed independently.

### 1
- No plans or potential for other private or public funding identified
- Minor interdependencies with other projects or organisations or
- Potential for important interdependencies but proposals are at an early stage of development.
### Regeneration and economic impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5     | - Catchment area is an area of very high socio economic deprivation.  
- Project significantly contributes to addressing an important economic or regeneration need as identified in relevant strategies that cannot be met by other institutions.  
- The project will have a significant impact on the majority of the following: Job and business creation, employability and skills of unemployed and economically inactive people, level of skill and flexibility of workforce, improving Small and Medium Enterprise (SME) access to Train to Gain and apprenticeships, encouraging business to invest in skills and training, economic regeneration of the local community.  
- Where appropriate, there is evidence of a clear strategy to work with local businesses and other organisations to improve access to college facilities to external users. There is evidence of how the project will significantly contribute to achievement of the strategy. |
| 3     | - Project contributes to addressing an important economic or regeneration need as identified in relevant strategies.  
- The project will have some impact on some of the following: Job and business creation, employability and skills of unemployed and economically inactive people, level of skill and flexibility of workforce, improving SME access to Train to Gain and apprenticeships, encouraging business to invest in skills and training, economic regeneration of the local community.  
- Where appropriate, there is evidence of a clear strategy to work with local businesses and other organisations to improve access to college facilities to external users. There is evidence of how the project will significantly contribute to achievement of the strategy. |
| 1     | - Minimal evidence that the project will have an impact on some of the following: Job and business creation, employability and skills of unemployed and economically inactive people, level of skill and flexibility of workforce, improving SME access to Train to Gain and apprenticeships, encouraging business to invest in skills and training, economic regeneration of the local community.  
- No or minimal evidence of a strategy to work with local businesses and other organisations and improve access to college facilities to external users.  
- No or limited evidence of demand or need. |
Appendix B – Project evaluation scores including bonus points

Appended separately with this report