

Woodlands In and Around Towns and Forestry for People Challenge Fund

Scoring Sheet Guidance Note - How to complete the form

Section 1 – Background Information

1. The **Woodland Officer** should fill in the application / woodland name along with details of the nearest town and the local authority area and the applicant details.
2. The **Woodland Officer** should tick the relevant section to indicate if this is a WIAT, F4P or both.
3. In the **summary box** the **Woodland Officer** should provide a ‘pen picture’ of the application that clearly sets out the background of the applicant, a summary of the application and the rationale that underpins it. The Woodland Officer should also use this section to map out the history of the application and the degree to which the applicant responded to input and advice provided by the Conservancy. The amount of information that is provided in this section should be proportionate to the complexity of the proposals and the degree to which the application required modification following submission.
4. Where the application involves Educational or Health aspects, for instance FEI projects or projects linked with the NHS the woodland officer should involve one of the policy team leading on that subject. As an example, Where the application is related to Forest Schools the application should be copied to Bonnie Maggio or Sally York for review and feedback which should be copied into the specialists advisors section.
5. The **Woodland Officer** should then write against the scoring criteria as objectively as possible. The completion of these sections is critical to the judging process and Woodland Officers should ensure that their responses are sufficiently detailed to aid the judges understanding of the application. The responses should provide an accurate and concise analysis of the application in relation to each of the scoring criteria.
6. The **Woodland Officer** should then complete the finance details in the ‘Ranking of Proposals’ section, as follows: (this can be directly copied and pasted from the Excel Application summary sheet)

<i>(To be completed by Woodland Officer)</i>	
Total cost of project (£)	£

Total grant applied for	£
Total eligible match funding from parties other than FCS	£
% FCS contribution to the project	%

7. The Woodland Officer must sign and date the scoring sheet.
8. The **Judges** should read the Proposal, the Woodland Officer's assessments, and they should then score the proposal against each question giving it a value. A proposal would score 0 against a given question where the Woodland Officer's comments and the proposal documents demonstrated that the theme of the question had **not** been addressed. A proposal would score highly, i.e. 8 to 10, where the Woodland Officer's comments and the proposal document demonstrated that the theme of the question had been **fully addressed**. Please read section 2 for examples of statements that would relate to low and high scoring proposals. Preference should be given to schemes where the value for money is well demonstrated and arguments are logically and rationally presented in the proposal document.
9. **Judges** should then total the scores in the 'Ranking of Proposals' section and return scores to Panel Secretary (Craig Dinwoodie, Operations Manager, Central Scotland Conservancy.)

Management Plans - Special Note:

Applications for WIAT Challenge Fund assistance for the preparation of Urban Woodland Management Plans should be judged using the same scoring form and the procedure outlined above. In these cases Woodland Officers' assessments will be especially important in guiding the Judges' scoring. Woodland Officers should assess the proposals against each scoring criteria by making a judgement as to the potential for the management plan to recommend actions that will address the theme of each question. Urban Woodland Management Plans should be produced in accordance with the published WIAT Woodland Management Plan guidance (link?)

Section 2 – Scoring Criteria

Woodlands in and around Towns (WIAT)

1. Has a holistic approach to the management of the woodland under ownership been demonstrated?

Lower scoring (e.g. 0 to 2)

High scoring (e.g. 8 to 10)

No adequate survey of all the woodland under the ownership has been completed. Extent of the ownership is uncertain and poorly mapped. A piecemeal approach is apparent.	The woodland has been well surveyed with an agreed methodology. A comprehensive management plan is planned or exists. The application appears rational in the context of the ownership and a piecemeal approach is not apparent.
--	--

2. Do threats to the woodland exist and have they been identified and mitigated against?

Lower scoring (e.g. 0 to 2)

High scoring (e.g. 8 to 10)

The woodland is already well managed and provides the maximum benefit to the local community. WIAT CF input would simply replace an existing, apparently sustainable, commitment. There are very few notable threats.	The woodland is under-managed and the proposed inputs would enhance economic, environmental and social outputs. Its current poor condition impacts negatively on the urban environment (e.g. harbours fly-tipping, rubbish etc.) The proposed operations represent part the beginning of a sustainable process as identified in the management plan.
---	--

3. To what extent does the proposal fit with the outcomes and objectives of the Scottish Forestry Strategy?

Lower scoring (e.g. 0 to 2)

High scoring (e.g. 8 to 10)

The proposal does not fit with the Scottish Forestry Strategy or meet with any of the key themes within it.	The proposal addresses a number of the key themes within the Scottish Forestry Strategy and it is clear that a logical thought process has gone into the proposal.
---	--

4. To what extent is the woodland integrated within an urban area?

Lower scoring (e.g. 0 to 2)

High scoring (e.g. 8 to 10)

The woodland is within the 1km buffer zone but is poorly accessed by the local population due to irreconcilable factors (e.g. it is 'landlocked' by a motorway / river?).	The woodland is/could be easily accessed by the local population. It is accessible from large residential areas and forms the missing link between communities.
---	---

5. To what extent does the proposal protect and improve the biodiversity of the woodland?

Lower scoring (e.g. 0 to 2)

High scoring (e.g. 8 to 10)

The proposal does little to enhance the biodiversity of the woodland. It is questionable whether the proposal may be in conflict with this objective, for example by encouraging excessive access into sensitive areas. The proposal does not include works to maintain or enhance sensitive or designated areas (SSSIs etc), and it does not contribute to National HAPs, SAPs or Local Biodiversity Action Plans.	The woodland is a designated environment (SSSI, cSAC etc). The proposals, linked to the management plan, enhance and protect the sensitive areas, create opportunities for expansion of key habitats (linked to the National HAPs, SAPs or the LBAP) and the potential for conflict between the proposal's aims has been identified and mitigated against. There is also evidence that the proposal will contribute to the deliverance of a Forest Habitat Network.
---	---

6. What evidence of stakeholder support do the proposals demonstrate?

Lower scoring (e.g. 0 to 2)

High scoring (e.g. 8 to 10)

No evidence of stakeholder or community support.	The proposal contains information regarding the types of stakeholders, their involvement and support. It provides evidence of sustained support for the proposal through a continued involvement and/or commitment to delivery. There is clear evidence of a partnership approach being adopted for the delivery of the proposal. The community has had a significant involvement in drawing together the proposal and will be involved in the implementation stage.
--	--

Forestry for People

7. To what extent does the proposal fit with the outcomes and objectives of the Scottish Forestry Strategy?

Lower scoring (e.g. 0 to 2)

High scoring (e.g. 8 to 10)

The proposal does not fit with the Scottish Forestry Strategy or meet with any of the key themes within it.	The proposal addresses a number of the key themes within the Scottish Forestry Strategy and it is clear that a logical thought process has gone into the proposal.
---	--

8. To what extent does the proposal provide opportunities for people to get involved in learning activities in the woodland?

Lower scoring (e.g. 0 to 2)

High scoring (e.g. 8 to 10)

There are no apparent opportunities for learning outcomes contained within the application. The proposal is not likely to contribute to delivery of the Forestry Commission 'Woods for Learning' strategy	There are significant opportunities for learning likely to arise from this application. The proposals clearly indicate how learning/education will take place. The proposal is likely to deliver successfully against a number of of the outcomes of the Forestry Commission 'Woods for Learning' strategy.
---	---

9. Do the proposals involve people living locally and/or local community groups?

Lower scoring (e.g. 0 to 2)

High scoring (e.g. 8 to 10)

Local communities participate superficially and only as consultees at the application stage. No attempt has been made to identify or consult groups from the 6 strands of diversity (i.e. faith, race, age, gender, disability and sexual orientation).	A community group who has security of tenure over the woodland makes the application. Additionally, considerable research has been done to identify all potential user groups, including groups from the 6 strands of diversity, and these have been involved in an inclusive planning process.
---	---

10. To what extent does the proposal improve opportunities for woodland recreation?

Lower scoring (e.g. 0 to 2)

High scoring (e.g. 8 to 10)

Woodland recreation is not a key direct feature of this application. The application is not likely to	There is a significant emphasis on the use of woodland for recreation contained within the
---	--

encourage or facilitate future independent use of woodland for recreation by participants in this proposal, nor is it likely to facilitate an improvement in the quality of woodland visit experienced by participants in the future.	proposals. The project is likely to leave a legacy of participants who are much more likely to make use of woodlands for recreation in the future and as a result of project outcomes such as increased awareness, knowledge, confidence, fitness and community cohesion.
---	---

11. Does the proposal provide opportunities for health improvement in woodlands?

Lower scoring (e.g. 0 to 2)

High scoring (e.g. 8 to 10)

The proposal has limited scope for contributing to health improvement through use of woodland.. It does not demonstrate any consultation or involvement with local health providers or key target groups such as young people, NHS staff, disabled groups and people from surrounding communities. There is little connection with the outcomes detailed in the Forestry Commission Scotland 'Woods for Health' strategy and little possibility of these being delivered through this proposal.	The proposal is likely to significantly enhance opportunities for health improvement through the use of woodland. There is a clear connection and relevance to the Forestry Commission 'Woods for Health' strategy and the proposal will contribute to the delivery of a number of the objectives of this strategy. The proposal makes use of a partnership approach with other organisations responsible for health improvement.
---	---

12. To what extent do the proposals benefit socially excluded groups?

Lower scoring (e.g. 0 to 2)

High scoring (e.g. 8 to 10)

Groups from the 6 strands of diversity (i.e. faith, race, age, gender, disability and sexual orientation) are not involved in planned activities.	Activities are focused on involving minority groups in activities that increase engagement and promote access to woodlands and forests by individuals from the 6 strands of diversity.
---	--

13. What evidence of stakeholder support do the proposals demonstrate?

Lower scoring (e.g. 0 to 2)

High scoring (e.g. 8 to 10)

No evidence of stakeholder support.	The proposal contains information regarding the types of stakeholders, their involvement and support. It provides evidence of sustained support for the proposal through a continued involvement and/or commitment to delivery. There is clear evidence of a partnership approach being adopted for the delivery of the proposal.
-------------------------------------	---

Woodland in and around Towns and Forestry for People

14. To what extent do the costs appear realistic?

Lower scoring (e.g. 0 to 2)

High scoring (e.g. 18 to 20)

<p>The operational costs detailed in the application are based on the applicants estimates of cost alone. The costs are significantly higher than might reasonably be expected for the operations when viewed in the light of the specifications that have been provided and a knowledge of the context of the application.</p>	<p>The operational costs detailed in the application are based on at least two tenders or quotes.</p>
---	---

15. To what extent does the proposal provide value for public money?

Lower scoring (e.g. 0 to 2)

High scoring (e.g. 18 to 20)

<p>The application contains work proposals that have not been identified in a management plan or strategy, nor through a public consultation process. Much of the work proposed for funding through the challenge funds is already taking place. The project will have little material effect on the condition or use of the site. The level of additionality is very low.</p>	<p>The proposals meet an identified need (for example WIAT management proposals accord with an approved management plan) This need is not currently being met and will not be met without support from the challenge funds i.e. there is a high level of additionality likely to result from the application. The cited benefits will be conferred to a significant number of people.</p>
--	---

16. To what extent does partnership funding support the proposals? Woodland Officer to tick appropriate box based on the intervention rate being sought by the applicant.

Score	5	10	15
FCS contribution > 70% of total project costs	FCS contribution between 45 and 70% of total project costs	FCS contribution < 45% of total project costs	

17. To what extent are the proposals likely to benefit people from socially deprived communities? Woodland Officer to tick appropriate box (if proposals cover more than one SIMD class then selection should be based on the predominant class on an area basis)

Score 2	4	6	8	10
SIMD 20 - 100%	SIMD 15 - 20%	SIMD 10 - 15%	SIMD 5 - 10%	SIMD 0 - 5%

An explanation of SIMD can be found at <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/SIMD>