

# Gill Baker and David Mitchell Memorial Award

## Evaluation Criteria

### Entry Criteria

#### 1. Feasibility (Yes/No)

- **Definition:** Based on planning and activity completed to date, the project has a reasonable likelihood of being successfully completed in accordance with the planned outcomes. Yes or No.
- **Commentary:** *As we will be assessing planned projects alongside completed projects, we will need to be able to screen out planned projects that have an unacceptable level of uncertainty regarding their completion (eg. They may not be completed or may be completed but with much lower than planned outcomes). Hence, 'Feasibility' needs to be more of an entry or inclusion criteria (ie. Yes or No) rather than evaluation criteria (rated 1-10). Otherwise, all planned projects would be rated lower than completed projects. That is, there would be some uncertainty associated with the feasibility of a planned project, whereas if a project is completed, then there is no question as to its feasibility.*

### Evaluation Criteria

#### 1. Environmental Benefits (1-10) - Weight 50%

- **Definition:** The extent to which the project addresses environmental issues and/or improves sustainability (e.g. amount of solar energy, water usage saved, extent of conservation, extent of biodiversity enhancement).
- **Rating:**
  - 1 = Minimal or no measurable impact
  - 10 = Significant, measurable, and long-lasting environmental benefits

#### 2. Community Involvement and Social Impact (1-10) - Weight 25%

- **Definition:** The extent to which the project involves and benefits local communities (including parishioners), raises awareness, and promotes public engagement with environmental issues relative to the size of the parish.
- **Rating:**
  - 1 = No community involvement or social impact.
  - 10 = Strong community and parishioner participation, high potential for social and environmental change

### **3. Return on Investment (1-10) – Weight 12.5%**

- **Definition:** The amount of resources (eg. cost and time) required to complete the project relative to the environmental benefit and community involvement.
- **Rating:**
  - 1 = Poor value, high investment with relatively low level of benefits
  - 10 = Excellent value, delivering significant outcomes for a relatively small investment

### **4. Scalability and/or Replicability (1-10) – Weight 12.5%**

- **Definition:** The extent to which the project concept (the idea behind the specific project) can be expanded, adapted, or replicated in other communities or contexts.
- **Rating:**
  - 1 = The project concept cannot be adapted/extended or replicated.
  - 10 = The project is easily and inherently scalable or replicable in a variety of locations and contexts.

#### **Notes:**

1. Criteria 2 and 3 are relative to the size of the parish, so this should help to normalise the capability of small parishes relative to the larger ones.
2. Criteria 1-4 will be explicitly included in the entry form.