

# FY23APPLICATIONSCORINGSYSTEM

December 2021

CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	POINTS	SCORING BREAKDOWN	FOCUS	METRICS FOR EVALUATION
<b>Community Participation</b>	Does the Sponsor have active Big Sky Community participation?	5	No evidence (0) Some evidence (3) Strong evidence (5)	Collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Volunteers</li> <li>• Members</li> <li>• Sponsorships</li> <li>• Donors</li> </ul>
<b>Program Expense Ratio</b>	What percentage of expenses are “Programming” related?	5	Below 50% (0) 51-69.9% (3) Above 70% (5)	Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sponsor Expenses (administration, fundraising, programming)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Current year budgeted</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Revenue Reliance</b>	How financially reliant is the Sponsor on Resort Tax?	5	67-100% of Sponsor revenue from RT (0) 33-66% of Sponsor revenue from RT (3) 0-32% of Sponsor revenue from RT (5)	Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sponsor Revenues                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Current year budgeted</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Resort Tax Track Record</b>	Does the Sponsor follow through with funding terms?	10	FY22 project(s) on track (1) Public funding recognition (1) Accurate payment requests (1) FY21 Impact Report completed accurately (2) FY21 project(s) completed as outlined (5)	Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FY21 Awards</li> <li>• FY22 Awards</li> <li>• Payment requests</li> <li>• Project applications</li> <li>• Impact Reports</li> </ul>
<b>Forecasting Accuracy</b>	How accurate was the Sponsor forecasted request last year?	5	+/- 30% or more variance (0) +/- 16-29% variance (3) +/- 0-15% variance (5)	Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forecasted requests                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ FY22 Applications</li> </ul> </li> <li>• FY23 request</li> </ul>

CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	POINTS	SCORING BREAKDOWN	FOCUS	METRICS FOR EVALUATION
<b>Matching Funds</b>	What portion of the project is funded by matching funds?	10	Less than 20% <b>(0)</b> 20-39% <b>(4)</b> 40-59% <b>(6)</b> 60-79% <b>(8)</b> 80% or greater <b>(10)</b>	<b>Collaboration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project revenues</li> </ul>
<b>"Our Big Sky" Alignment</b>	Is the project addressing strategies demonstrating need and urgency?	10	Meets no strategies <b>(0)</b> Meets strategy with a green status <b>(5)</b> Meets strategy with a yellow status <b>(7)</b> Meets strategy with a red status <b>(10)</b>	<b>Collaboration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Our Big Sky" report card</li> </ul>
<b>Partnerships</b>	Does the project demonstrate collaboration?	5	0 partners <b>(0)</b> 1-3 partners <b>(3)</b> 4+ partners <b>(5)</b>	<b>Collaboration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partner support statements</li> </ul>
<b>Direct Expense Ratio</b>	What portion of the request is for Direct expenses?	5	19% <b>(0)</b> 20-39% <b>(2)</b> 40-59% <b>(3)</b> 60-79% <b>(4)</b> 80-100% <b>(5)</b>	<b>Efficiency</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project expenses</li> </ul>
<b>SMART Accountability</b>	Does the project demonstrate and articulate SMART metrics?	10	<b>SPECIFIC</b> deliverables <b>(2)</b> <b>MEASURABLE</b> goals <b>(2)</b> <b>ACHIEVABLE</b> goals <b>(2)</b> <b>RELEVANT</b> deliverables <b>(2)</b> <b>TIME BOUND</b> milestones <b>(2)</b>	<b>Efficiency</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deliverables</li> <li>Goals</li> <li>Milestones</li> </ul>

CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	POINTS	SCORING BREAKDOWN	FOCUS	METRICS FOR EVALUATION
<b>Financial Sustainability</b>	Will the project result in operating costs requiring Resort Tax funding?	5	Yes (0) No (5)	Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project budget forecast</li> </ul>
<b>Longevity of Deliverable(s)</b>	What is the life of project deliverable(s)?	5	Life of 1 year or less (2) Life of 1-10 years (3) Life of 10+ years (5)	Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deliverable(s)</li> </ul>
<b>Quality of Proposal</b>	Was the funding application complete, thorough, and thoughtful?	15	All questions answered directly (3) Complete and accurate budget that matches application details (3) Articulate project summary (3) Application outlined project specifics, not org. level detail (3) Sponsor attended training session or consultation (3)	Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application responses</li> <li>Budgets</li> <li>Attendance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Training session or consultation</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Resort Tax Annuity</b>	For how many years will this project need administration funds from Resort Tax?	5	3+ years (0) 1-3 years (3) 0-1 year (5)	Planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Application responses</li> <li>Forecasted requests</li> </ul>

### SCORE BREAKDOWN

SPONSOR VS PROJECT	
SPONSOR	30
PROJECT	70

SCORE FOCUS	
COLLABORATION	30
EFFICIENCY	35
PLANNING	35