FY23 APPLICATION SCORING SYSTEM

December 2021

CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	POINTS	SCORING BREAKDOWN	FOCUS	METRICS FOR EVALUATION
Community Participation	Does the Sponsor have active Big Sky Community participation?	5	◯ No evidence **(0)** ◯ Some evidence **(3)** ◯ Strong evidence **(5)**	Collaboration	• Volunteers • Members • Sposnorships • Donors
Program Expense Ratio	What percentage of expenses are "Programming" related?	5	◯ Below 50% **(0)** ◯ 51-69.9% **(3)** ◯ Above 70% **(5)**	Efficiency	• Sponsor Expenses (administration, fundraising, programming) ○ Current year budgeted
Revenue Reliance	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	• Sponsor Revenues ○ Current year budgeted
Resort Tax Track Record	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	• FY21 Awards • FY22 Awards • Payment requests • Project applications • Impact Reports
Forecasting Accuracy	How accurate was the Sponsor forecasted request last year?	5	◯ +/- 30% or more variance **(0)** ◯ +/- 16-29% variance **(3)** ◯ +/- 0-15% variance **(5)**	Planning	• Forecasted requests ○ FY22 Applications • FY23 request

CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	POINTS	SCORING BREAKDOWN	FOCUS	METRICS FOR EVALUATION
Matching Funds	What portion of the project is funded by matching funds?	10	○ Less than 20% **(0)** ○ 20-39% **(4)** ○ 40-59% **(6)** ○ 60-79% **(8)** ○ 80% or greater **(10)**	Collaboration	• Project revenues
"Our Big Sky" Alignment	Is this project addressing a community need outlined in the Our Big Sky plan?	10	○ Meets no outlined initiatives **(0)** ○ Meets an outlined initiative (10)	Collaboration	• "Our Big Sky" plan
Partnerships	Does the project demonstrate collaboration?	5	○ 0 partners **(0)** ○ 1-3 partners **(3)** ○ 4+ partners **(5)**	Collaboration	• Partner support statements
Direct Expense Ratio	What portion of the request is for Direct expenses?	5	○ 0-19% **(0)** ○ 20-39% **(2)** ○ 40-59% **(3)** ○ 60-79% **(4)** ○ 80-100% **(5)**	Efficiency	• Project expenses
SMART Accountability	Does the project demonstrate and articulate SMART metrics?	10	☐ **SPECIFIC** deliverables **(2)** ☐ **MEASURABLE** goals **(2)** ☐ **ACHIEVABLE** goals **(2)** ☐ **RELEVANT** deliverables **(2)** ☐ **TIME BOUND** milestones **(2)**	Efficiency	• Deliverables • Goals • Milestones

CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION	POINTS	SCORING BREAKDOWN	FOCUS	METRICS FOR EVALUATION
Financial Sustainability	Will the project result in operating costs requiring Resort Tax funding?	5	◯ Yes **(0)** ◯ No **(5)**	Planning	• Project budget forecast
Longevity of Deliverable(s)	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	• Deliverable(s)
Quality of Proposal	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 description **(3)** ☐ Application outlined project specifics, not org. level detail **(3)** ☐ Sponsor attended training session or consultation **(3)**	Planning	• Application responses • Budgets • Attendance ○ Training session or consultation
Resort Tax Annuity	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	• Application responses • Forecasted requests

SCORE BREAKDOWN

SPONSOR VS PROJECT	
SPONSOR	30
PROJECT	70

SCORE FOCUS	
COLLABORATION	30
EFFICIENCY	35
PLANNING	35