

	Example criteria for assessing scores				
Assessment dimension	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Surplus/deficit</b>	For example: the charity has achieved a significant aggregate deficit out-turn over the last 3 years and has set a significant deficit budget for the coming year.	For example: either the charity has achieved a significant aggregate deficit out-turn over the last 3 years but has set a broadly break-even or slight deficit budget for the coming year.	For example: either the charity has achieved an aggregate deficit out-turn over the last 3 years or has set a significant deficit budget for the coming year (but not both).	For example: the charity has achieved an aggregate broadly break-even or slight surplus out-turn over the last 3 years and has set at least a break-even budget for the coming year.	For example: the charity has achieved a significant aggregate surplus out-turn over the last 3 years and has set at least a break-even budget for the coming year.
<b>Reserves</b>	For example: the charity's reserves are at a level well below the level required by the charity's reserves policy and there is a significant risk the charity will not be able to meet its cashflow or working capital requirements.	For example: the charity's reserves are at a level below the level required by the charity's reserves policy but there is no appreciable significant risk the charity will not be able to meet its cashflow or working capital requirements.	For example: the charity has free reserves broadly in line with the requirements of the charity's reserves policy.	For example: the charity will have free reserves in excess of the requirements of the charity's reserves policy (after taking into account any deficit forecast further coming year) but the Trustees are not yet confident to invest e.g. in new ideas, income generation etc.	For example: the charity will have free reserves in excess of the requirements of the charity's reserves policy (after taking into account any deficit forecast further coming year) such that the Trustees are confident to invest e.g. in new ideas, income generation etc. but the level of free reserves is not so high as to impact negatively on fundraising.
<b>Income diversity/ success rates</b>	For example: the charity is almost completely reliant on one or two main funders, contracts or grants for its continued viability and it has had few significant income generation successes in the last year.	For example: the charity is reliant on a small number of funders, contracts or grants such that it would just about be able to manage loss of one of its larger funding sources and/or it has had only limited income generation success in the last year.	For example: the charity is reliant on a small number of funders, contracts or grants such that it would be able to manage loss of one of the larger funding sources relatively easily and/or it has had some income generation successes in the last year.	For example: the charity is reliant on a limited number of funders, contracts or grants such that it would be able to manage loss of any of its funding sources relatively easily and/or it has had good income generation success in the last year.	For example: the charity is not reliant on a limited number of funders, contracts or grants and it has had good income generation success in the last year.

	Example criteria for assessing scores				
Assessment dimension	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Funding predictability</b>	For example: almost all funding has less than 12-18 months left to run and there are poor prospects for renewal and/or new funding sources and/or historic funding from individual giving and/or legacies has been highly volatile.	For example: the majority (but not all) of funding has less than 12-18 months left to run and there are limited prospects for renewal and/or new funding sources and/or historic funding from individual giving and/or legacies has been generally volatile.	For example: at least half of funding has less than 12-18 months left to run but there are reasonable prospects for renewal and/or new funding sources and/or historic funding from individual giving and/or legacies has been somewhat variable.	For example: a minority of funding has less than 12-18 months left to run but some larger contracts/grants end at similar dates albeit there are reasonable prospects for renewal and/or new funding sources and/or historic funding from individual giving and/or legacies has been generally stable or growing.	For example: only a small a minority of funding has less than 12-18 months left to run and there are good prospects for renewal and/or new funding sources and/or historic funding from individual giving and/or legacies has been very stable and/or consistently growing.
<b>Impact</b>	For example: performance against the outputs and outcomes targets and KPIs set by funders and in the charity's strategic and operational plans is weak with most targets and KPIs not being met. The charity is not able to communicate convincingly its impact in any areas of its work.	For example: performance against a significant proportion of the outputs and outcomes targets and KPIs set by funders and in the charity's strategic and operation plans is weak with some a number of areas of service where targets/KPIs are consistently not being met. The charity is not able to communicate convincingly its impact in more areas of its work.	For example: performance against the outputs and outcomes targets and KPIs set by funders and in the charity's strategic and operation plans is patchy and/or inconsistent. The charity is able to communicate its impact in some areas but not others.	For example: performance against the most of the outputs and outcomes targets and KPIs set by funders and in the charity's strategic and operation plans is strong but with some areas of service where targets/KPIs are consistently not being met. The charity is able to communicate its impact coherently and probably holds some accreditations and/or awards	For example: performance against the outputs and outcomes targets and KPIs set by funders and in the charity's strategic and operation plans is strong with almost all targets and KPIs being met or exceeded. The charity is able to communicate its impact compellingly and likely holds a number of accreditations and/or awards
<b>Relationships with stakeholders/partners</b>	For example: the charity has poor and deteriorating relationships with most key stakeholders and partners, many of whom exhibit outright hostility towards the charity, which is likely experiencing persistent bad press.	For example: the charity has poor but improving relationships with key stakeholders and partners, some of whom exhibit outright hostility towards the charity, which may also be experiencing bad press.	For example: the charity has reasonable relationships with key stakeholders and partners, whose overall views of the charity are broadly balanced/neutral. The charity is likely experiencing some good and some bad press.	For example: the charity has positive relationships with key stakeholders and partners, whose overall views of the charity are positive. The charity is experiencing mostly positive press coverage.	For example: the charity has positive relationships with almost all key stakeholders and partners, whose views of the charity are positive and supportive. The charity achieves consistently positive press coverage.

	Example criteria for assessing scores				
Assessment dimension	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Workforce capability and capacity</b>	For example: the charity's workforce has a number of significant skills or capacity shortcomings and/or none of the targets and KPIs set in the charity's strategic and operation plans for workforce efficiency (e.g. utilisation rates and sickness absence) are being met.	For example: the charity's workforce has some significant skills or capacity shortcomings and/or only a few targets and KPIs set in the charity's strategic and operation plans for workforce efficiency (e.g. utilisation rates and sickness absence) are being met.	For example: the charity's workforce has some skills or capacity shortcomings and/or some targets and KPIs set in the charity's strategic and operation plans for workforce efficiency (e.g. utilisation rates and sickness absence) are being met.	For example: the charity mostly has a well-trained workforce with capacity to meet demand and most targets and KPIs set in the charity's strategic and operation plans for workforce efficiency (e.g. utilisation rates and sickness absence) are being met or exceeded.	For example: the charity has a well-trained workforce with capacity to meet demand and is meeting all targets and KPIs set in the charity's strategic and operation plans for workforce efficiency (e.g. utilisation rates and sickness absence) are being exceeded.
<b>Leadership, governance and infrastructure</b>	For example: the charity has all of the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Insufficient strategic, management and infrastructure capacity.</li> <li>2. shortcomings in leadership and governance.</li> <li>3. Overheads are significantly above overheads an acceptable level compared to overall expenditure.</li> </ol>	For example: the charity has two of the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Insufficient strategic, management and infrastructure capacity.</li> <li>2. shortcomings in leadership and governance.</li> <li>3. Overheads are significantly above overheads an acceptable level compared to overall expenditure.</li> </ol>	For example: the charity has one of the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Insufficient strategic, management and infrastructure capacity.</li> <li>2. shortcomings in leadership and governance.</li> <li>3. Overheads are significantly above overheads an acceptable level compared to overall expenditure.</li> </ol>	For example: the charity has sufficient strategic and management capacity and few shortcomings in leadership and governance (such as some skills gaps amongst Trustees), whilst maintaining overheads at an acceptable level compared to overall expenditure. The charity probably holds some accreditations and/or awards.	For example: the charity has sufficient strategic and management capacity, effective leadership and governance and maintains overheads at an acceptable level compared to overall expenditure. The charity likely holds a number of accreditations and/or awards.