

## Interpreting 2022 Value for Money Review Results

### Evaluation Process

The basis used for the assessment included fully expending funds in alignment with agreements, furthering City goals and objectives, organizational viability, demonstration of affordable access to recreation and volunteer analytics. These grants were not initially approved based on alignment with City strategies and policies. This review provides a picture of how these grants compare against current Council direction. 2022 Annual grant recipients were directed to an online application based on the Council approved [evaluation criteria](#). Below is a summary of the questions on the online application:

- Organizational Viability and Financial Stability (20 points)
- Alignment with the City of Greater Sudbury Strategic Plan, 2019—2027 (15 points)
- Advancement of Population Health Priorities (15 points)
- Community Energy and Emissions Plan (CEEP) (10 points)
- Parks, Open Space and Leisure Master Plan (POSLMP) Principles and Action Items (10 points)
- Volunteerism (15 points)
- Affordable Access to Recreation/Public Benefit (15 points)

The evaluations were completed by the Coordinator of Community Initiatives and Quality Assurance and a staff member from the Division most familiar with the subject matter of the grant. The Director of Leisure Services then reviewed the evaluation scores for consistency. The Auditor General's Office reviewed the evaluation process and provided suggestions to improve the consistency of the process.

### Results

#### Alignment with City Plans and Policies

These grants were not initially approved to be in alignment with current and specific City plans, so it was important that the scoring did not penalize recipients for not advancing all priorities. Rather, the scores are based how **clearly** the recipient organization demonstrated approach and alignment to support **applicable** priorities, not how many priorities were supported.

#### Final Score Overall

The higher scores demonstrate groups that were able to easily correlate their services with current Council direction, expended funds in alignment with agreements, demonstrated organizational viability and affordable access to recreation.

2022 Value for Money Review Results  Older Adult Centres			Alignment with City of Greater Sudbury Strategic Plan, 2019 – 2027 (15 points)		Advancement of Population Health (15 points)														Community Energy and Emissions Plan (10 points)		Parks, Open Space and Leisure Master Plan (10 points)		Final Score Overall					
			10-15: <b>Excellent</b> (clearly demonstrates approach and alignment to support <b>applicable</b> priorities); 5-9: <b>Average</b> ( <b>some</b> demonstration or alignment to support <b>applicable</b> priorities); 1-5: <b>Below Average</b> (noted <b>applicable</b> strategic priorities with <b>limited</b> demonstration of support or alignment); 0: <b>Insufficient</b> (no alignment with priorities, no response provided)  Scores are based on how well answers demonstrated alignment with <b>applicable</b> priorities, not how many priorities were indicated. Average to <b>Excellent</b> scores are considered to be advancing the <b>applicable</b> priorities indicated in columns below.														7-10: <b>Excellent</b> (clearly identifies how organization supports and aligns with concepts of plan); 4-7: <b>Average</b> (demonstrates <b>some</b> alignment with the concepts of plan); 1-3: <b>Below Average</b> (very <b>limited</b> information provided, little insight into alignment with concept of plan); 0: <b>Insufficient</b> (no answer provided)		70 – 100 Close Alignment 50 and 70 Some Alignment 0 – 50 Unclear Alignment									
Recipient Organization	Initial Grant Year	Grant Amount	Score		Asset Management and Service Excellence	Economic Capacity and Investment Readiness	Climate Change	Housing	Create a Healthier and More Vibrant Community	Advance Caring Services Post-Pandemic	Score		Indigenous Youth	Families	A Compassionate City	Housing	Age-Friendly Strategy	Resiliency	Mental Health	Play Opportunities	Holistic Health	Healthy Streets	Score		Score		Final overall score for entire evaluation, not total of row	
Club 50 de Rayside-Balfour	2009	\$12,000	9.0	Average				●		11.0	Excellent			●		●			●	●			3.5	Below Average	7.0	Excellent		74.5
Club Accueil Age D'Or Azilda	2001	\$14,100	9.5	Average				●		11.0	Excellent			●		●	●	●	●				0.0	Insufficient	7.0	Excellent		72.8
Le Rendez-vous de Vallée Est (formerly Centre Club d'Age D'Or de la Vallée)	2001	\$17,080	9.0	Average		●		●		11.0	Excellent		●	●		●	●	●	●	●			4.0	Average	7.0	Excellent		75.5
Club Amical du Nouveau Sudbury	2014	\$19,354	11.0	Excellent				●		0.0	Insufficient												0.0	Insufficient	7.0	Excellent		70.8
Nickel Centre Seniors Club	2005	\$6,700	11.0	Excellent			●	●		5.0	Average		●	●		●	●	●	●				5.0	Average	7.0	Excellent		75.3

2022 Value for Money Review Results Older Adult Centres			Alignment with City of Greater Sudbury Strategic Plan, 2019 – 2027 (15 points)								Advancement of Population Health (15 points)								Community Energy and Emissions Plan (10 points)		Parks, Open Space and Leisure Master Plan (10 points)		Final Score Overall					
			<p>10-15: <b>Excellent</b> (clearly demonstrates approach and alignment to support <b>applicable</b> priorities);                      5-9: <b>Average</b> (some demonstration or alignment to support <b>applicable</b> priorities);                      1-5: <b>Below Average</b> (noted <b>applicable</b> strategic priorities with <b>limited</b> demonstration of support or alignment);                      0: <b>Insufficient</b> (no alignment with priorities, no response provided)</p> <p>Scores are based on how well answers demonstrated alignment with <b>applicable</b> priorities, not how many priorities were indicated.                      Average to <b>Excellent</b> scores are considered to be advancing the <b>applicable</b> priorities indicated in columns below.</p>															<p>7-10: <b>Excellent</b> (clearly identifies how organization supports and aligns with concepts of plan);                      4-7: <b>Average</b> (demonstrates <b>some</b> alignment with the concepts of plan);                      1-3: <b>Below Average</b> (very <b>limited</b> information provided, little insight into alignment with concept of plan);                      0: <b>Insufficient</b> (no answer provided)</p>				<p>70 – 100 Close Alignment                      50 and 70 Some Alignment                      0 – 50 Unclear Alignment</p>						
Recipient Organization	Initial Grant Year	Grant Amount	Score		Asset Management and Service Excellence	Economic Capacity and Investment Readiness	Climate Change	Housing	Create a Healthier and More Vibrant Community	Advance Caring Services Post-Pandemic	Score	Indigenous Youth	Families	A Compassionate City	Housing	Age-Friendly Strategy	Resiliency	Mental Health	Play Opportunities	Holistic Health	Healthy Streets	Score		Score		Final overall score for entire evaluation, not total of row		
Onaping Falls Golden Age Club	2004	\$9,527	9.0	Average			●		●		11.0	Excellent		●	●		●	●	●	●			3.5	Below Average	7.0		Excellent	71.0
One Eleven Senior Citizens Centre	2001	\$12,000	9.0	Average				●			11.0	Excellent		●	●	●	●	●	●		●		4.5	Average	7.0		Excellent	72.3
Parkside (Older Adult Centre Sudbury)	2001	\$12,000	9.0	Average	●		●	●	●		13.0	Excellent		●	●		●	●	●				3.5	Below Average	7.0		Excellent	78.8
Rayside-Balfour Seniors Craft Shop	2001	\$5,700	9.0	Average	●	●		●			11.0	Excellent		●	●		●	●	●				3.0	Below Average	7.0		Excellent	74.3

2022 Value for Money Review Results Youth Centre			Alignment with City of Greater Sudbury Strategic Plan, 2019 – 2027 (15 points)							Advancement of Population Health (15 points)							Community Energy and Emissions Plan (10 points)		Parks, Open Space and Leisure Master Plan (10 points)		Final Score Overall						
			<p>10-15: <b>Excellent</b> (clearly demonstrates approach and alignment to support <b>applicable</b> priorities);                      5-9: <b>Average</b> (some demonstration or alignment to support <b>applicable</b> priorities);                      1-5: <b>Below Average</b> (noted <b>applicable</b> strategic priorities with <b>limited</b> demonstration of support or alignment);                      0: <b>Insufficient</b> (no alignment with priorities, no response provided)</p> <p>Scores are based on how well answers demonstrated alignment with <b>applicable</b> priorities, not how many priorities were indicated.                      Average to Excellent scores are considered to be advancing the <b>applicable</b> priorities indicated in columns below.</p>														7-10: <b>Excellent</b> (clearly identifies how organization supports and aligns with concepts of plan); 4-7: <b>Average</b> (demonstrates <b>some</b> alignment with the concepts of plan); 1-3: <b>Below Average</b> (very <b>limited</b> information provided, little insight into alignment with concept of plan); 0: <b>Insufficient</b> (no answer provided)				70 – 100 Close Alignment 50 and 70 Some Alignment 0 – 50 Unclear Alignment						
Recipient Organization	Initial Grant Year	Grant Amount	Score		Asset Management and Service Excellence	Economic Capacity and Investment Readiness	Climate Change	Housing	Create a Healthier and More Vibrant Community	Advance Caring Services Post-Pandemic	Score		Indigenous Youth	Families	A Compassionate City	Housing	Age-Friendly Strategy	Resiliency	Mental Health	Play Opportunities	Holistic Health	Healthy Streets	Score		Score	Final overall score for entire evaluation, not total of row	
Rayside Balfour Youth Action Network	2007	\$60,000	9.5	Average	●	●			●		13.0	Excellent	●	●				●	●	●	●	●	10.0	Excellent	6.5	Average	86.3

2022 Value for Money Review Results Community Centres			Alignment with City of Greater Sudbury Strategic Plan, 2019 – 2027 (15 points)				Advancement of Population Health (15 points)										Community Energy and Emissions Plan (10 points)		Parks, Open Space and Leisure Master Plan (10 points)		Final Score Overall							
			<p>10-15: <b>Excellent</b> (clearly demonstrates approach and alignment to support <b>applicable</b> priorities);                      5-9: <b>Average</b> (some demonstration or alignment to support <b>applicable</b> priorities);                      1-5: <b>Below Average</b> (noted <b>applicable</b> strategic priorities with <b>limited</b> demonstration of support or alignment);                      0: <b>Insufficient</b> (no alignment with priorities, no response provided)</p> <p>Scores are based on how well answers demonstrated alignment with <b>applicable</b> priorities, not how many priorities were indicated.                      Average to <b>Excellent</b> scores are considered to be advancing the <b>applicable</b> priorities indicated in columns below.</p>															<p>7-10: <b>Excellent</b> (clearly identifies how organization supports and aligns with concepts of plan);                      4-7: <b>Average</b> (demonstrates <b>some</b> alignment with the concepts of plan);                      1-3: <b>Below Average</b> (very <b>limited</b> information provided, little insight into alignment with concept of plan);                      0: <b>Insufficient</b> (no answer provided)</p>				<p>70 – 100 Close Alignment                      50 and 70 Some Alignment                      0 – 50 Unclear Alignment</p>						
Recipient Organization	Initial Grant Year	Grant Amount	Score		Asset Management and Service Excellence	Economic Capacity and Investment Readiness	Climate Change	Housing	Create a Healthier and More Vibrant Community	Advance Caring Services Post-Pandemic	Score		Indigenous Youth	Families	A Compassionate City	Housing	Age-Friendly Strategy	Resiliency	Mental Health	Play Opportunities	Holistic Health	Healthy Streets	Score		Score		Final overall score for entire evaluation, not total of row	
Beaver Lake Sports and Cultural Club	2004	\$16,000	9.0	Average				●	●		9.0	Average		●	●					●	●		10.0	Excellent	7	Excellent		73.5
Carol Richard Park Community Association	2004	\$16,000	12.0	Excellent				●			9.5	Average		●	●			●		●			0.0	Insufficient	6.5	Average		70.0
Kukagami Campers' Association	2005	\$10,000	12.5	Excellent			●	●			10.0	Excellent		●			●		●		●		0.0	Insufficient	0.0	Insufficient		69.0
Penage Road Community Centre	2004	\$16,000	8.5	Average			●	●			6.5	Average		●	●		●	●		●			9.0	Excellent	10.0	Excellent		82.5
Skead Recreation Centre	2001	\$16,000	11.0	Excellent			●	●			10.0	Excellent		●	●		●	●					1.0	Below Average	6.0	Average		75.8
Wahnapiitae Community Centre	2001	\$16,000	8.5	Average				●			8.0	Average		●						●			6.0	Average	7.5	Excellent		76.0

2022 Value for Money Review Results Special Events			Alignment with City of Greater Sudbury Strategic Plan, 2019 – 2027 (15 points)							Advancement of Population Health (15 points)										Community Energy and Emissions Plan (10 points)		Parks, Open Space and Leisure Master Plan (10 points)		Final Score Overall				
			<p>10-15: <b>Excellent</b> (clearly demonstrates approach and alignment to support <b>applicable</b> priorities);                      5-9: <b>Average</b> (some demonstration or alignment to support <b>applicable</b> priorities);                      1-5: <b>Below Average</b> (noted <b>applicable</b> strategic priorities with <b>limited</b> demonstration of support or alignment);                      0: <b>Insufficient</b> (no alignment with priorities, no response provided)</p> <p>Scores are based on how well answers demonstrated alignment with <b>applicable</b> priorities, not how many priorities were indicated.                      Average to <b>Excellent</b> scores are considered to be advancing the <b>applicable</b> priorities indicated in columns below.</p>										7-10: <b>Excellent</b> (clearly identifies how organization supports and aligns with concepts of plan); 4-7: <b>Average</b> (demonstrates <b>some</b> alignment with the concepts of plan); 1-3: <b>Below Average</b> (very <b>limited</b> information provided, little insight into alignment with concept of plan); 0: <b>Insufficient</b> (no answer provided)				70 – 100 Close Alignment 50 and 70 Some Alignment 0 – 50 Unclear Alignment											
Recipient Organization	Initial Grant Year	Grant Amount	Score		Asset Management and Service Excellence	Economic Capacity and Investment Readiness	Climate Change	Housing	Create a Healthier and More Vibrant Community	Advance Caring Services Post-Pandemic	Score		Indigenous Youth	Families	A Compassionate City	Housing	Age-Friendly Strategy	Resiliency	Mental Health	Play Opportunities	Holistic Health	Healthy Streets	Score		Score		Final overall score for entire evaluation, not total of row	
Anderson Farm Museum and Heritage Society (Fall Fair)	2008	\$2,500	8.0	Average		●	●		●		10.5	Excellent	●	●	●		●	●		●	●		6.5	Average	5.5	Average		78.3
Onaping Falls Lions Club Inc. (Cavalcade of Colours)	2004	\$1,500	8.0	Average					●		6.0	Average		●									0.0	Insufficient	0.0	Below Average		55.8
Science North Science Nord (Canada Day)	2006	\$30,000	9.0	Average		●	●		●		9.5	Average	●	●	●		●	●		●			0.0	Insufficient	6.5	Average		70.5
Sudbury Multicultural-Folk Arts Association (Canada Day)	2020	\$11,000	6.5	Average		●	●		●		5.5	Average	●	●									3.5	Below Average	2.5	Below Average		60.5

2022 Value for Money Review Results Operating Costs			Alignment with City of Greater Sudbury Strategic Plan, 2019 – 2027 (15 points)								Advancement of Population Health (15 points)								Community Energy and Emissions Plan (10 points)		Parks, Open Space and Leisure Master Plan (10 points)		Final Score Overall					
			<p>10-15: <b>Excellent</b> (clearly demonstrates approach and alignment to support <b>applicable</b> priorities);                      5-9: <b>Average</b> (some demonstration or alignment to support <b>applicable</b> priorities);                      1-5: <b>Below Average</b> (noted <b>applicable</b> strategic priorities with <b>limited</b> demonstration of support or alignment);                      0: <b>Insufficient</b> (no alignment with priorities, no response provided)</p> <p>Scores are based on how well answers demonstrated alignment with <b>applicable</b> priorities, not how many priorities were indicated.                      Average to <b>Excellent</b> scores are considered to be advancing the <b>applicable</b> priorities indicated in columns below.</p>															7-10: <b>Excellent</b> (clearly identifies how organization supports and aligns with concepts of plan); 4-7: <b>Average</b> (demonstrates <b>some</b> alignment with the concepts of plan); 1-3: <b>Below Average</b> (very <b>limited</b> information provided, little insight into alignment with concept of plan); 0: <b>Insufficient</b> (no answer provided)				70 – 100 Close Alignment 50 and 70 Some Alignment 0 – 50 Unclear Alignment						
Recipient Organization	Initial Grant Year	Grant Amount	Score		Asset Management and Service Excellence	Economic Capacity and Investment Readiness	Climate Change	Housing	Create a Healthier and More Vibrant Community	Advance Caring Services Post-Pandemic	Score		Indigenous Youth	Families	A Compassionate City	Housing	Age-Friendly Strategy	Resiliency	Mental Health	Play Opportunities	Holistic Health	Healthy Streets	Score		Score		Final overall score for entire evaluation, not total of row	
Northern Ontario Railroad Museum & Heritage Centre	2001	\$106,430	9.0	Average		●	●		●		9.5	Average		●	●		●	●		●		●	0.0	Insufficient	5.5	Average		71.3
Rainbow Routes Association	2009	\$45,000	13.0	Excellent	●	●	●	●	●		12.0	Excellent		●	●		●	●		●	●	●	8.0	Excellent	10	Excellent		91.0
New Hope Outreach Services (Samaritan Centre)	2012	\$27,000	14.0	Excellent	●	●		●	●		14.5	Excellent	●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	8.0	Excellent	0.0	Below Average		77.5
Sudbury Rainbow Crime Stoppers Inc.	2011	\$50,000	12.0	Excellent	●	●	●		●		14.0	Excellent	●		●								0.0	Insufficient	4.5	Average		65.5
Sudbury Shared Harvest	2021	\$30,000	13.5	Excellent			●		●		12.0	Excellent		●	●		●	●					8.0	Excellent	9.5	Excellent		88.0

2022 Value for Money Review Results Curling Clubs			Alignment with City of Greater Sudbury Strategic Plan, 2019 – 2027 (15 points)				Advancement of Population Health (15 points)										Community Energy and Emissions Plan (10 points)		Parks, Open Space and Leisure Master Plan (10 points)		Final Score Overall						
			<p>10-15: <b>Excellent</b> (clearly demonstrates approach and alignment to support <b>applicable</b> priorities);                      5-9: <b>Average</b> (some demonstration or alignment to support <b>applicable</b> priorities);                      1-5: <b>Below Average</b> (noted <b>applicable</b> strategic priorities with <b>limited</b> demonstration of support or alignment);                      0: <b>Insufficient</b> (no alignment with priorities, no response provided)</p> <p>Scores are based on how well answers demonstrated alignment with <b>applicable</b> priorities, not how many priorities were indicated.                      Average to <b>Excellent</b> scores are considered to be advancing the <b>applicable</b> priorities indicated in columns below.</p>															<p>7-10: <b>Excellent</b> (clearly identifies how organization supports and aligns with concepts of plan);                      4-7: <b>Average</b> (demonstrates <b>some</b> alignment with the concepts of plan);                      1-3: <b>Below Average</b> (very <b>limited</b> information provided, little insight into alignment with concept of plan);                      0: <b>Insufficient</b> (no answer provided)</p>				<p>70 – 100 Close Alignment                      50 and 70 Some Alignment                      0 – 50 Unclear Alignment</p>					
Recipient Organization	Initial Grant Year	Grant Amount	Score		Asset Management and Economic Capacity and Investment Readiness	Climate Change	Housing	Create a Healthier and More Vibrant Community	Advance Caring Services Post-Pandemic	Score		Indigenous Youth	Families	A Compassionate City	Housing	Age-Friendly Strategy	Resiliency	Mental Health	Play Opportunities	Holistic Health	Healthy Streets	Score		Score		Final overall score for entire evaluation, not total of row	
Capreol Curling Club	2021	\$4,675.55 <small>Amount increases annually with property tax rate</small>	9.0	Average				●		11.0	Excellent		●		●				●	●		2.5	Below Average	8.0	Excellent		70.8
Coniston Curling Club	2021	\$2,035.61 <small>Amount increases annually with property tax rate</small>	6.3	Average				●		9.0	Average		●	●	●				●			1.5	Below Average	8.0	Excellent		74.8
Copper Cliff Curling Club	2021	\$4,905.26 <small>Amount increases annually with property tax rate</small>	11.0	Excellent		●	●	●		11.5	Excellent		●	●	●				●			8.5	Excellent	8.0	Excellent		86.8
Sudbury Curling Club Inc.	2021	\$6,098.90 <small>Amount increases annually with property tax rate</small>	10.5	Excellent	●	●	●	●		11.0	Excellent		●	●	●				●			7.5	Excellent	8.0	Excellent		82.5

2022 Value for Money Review Results  Community Action Networks			Alignment with City of Greater Sudbury Strategic Plan, 2019 – 2027 (15 points)								Advancement of Population Health (15 points)										Community Energy and Emissions Plan (10 points)		Parks, Open Space and Leisure Master Plan (10 points)		Final Score Overall			
			<p>10-15: <b>Excellent</b> (clearly demonstrates approach and alignment to support <b>applicable</b> priorities);                      5-9: <b>Average</b> (<b>some</b> demonstration or alignment to support <b>applicable</b> priorities);                      1-5: <b>Below Average</b> (noted <b>applicable</b> strategic priorities with <b>limited</b> demonstration of support or alignment);                      0: <b>Insufficient</b> (no alignment with priorities, no response provided)</p> <p>Scores are based on how well answers demonstrated alignment with <b>applicable</b> priorities, not how many priorities were indicated.                      Average to <b>Excellent</b> scores are considered to be advancing the <b>applicable</b> priorities indicated in columns below.</p>															7-10: <b>Excellent</b> (clearly identifies how organization supports and aligns with concepts of plan); 4-7: <b>Average</b> (demonstrates <b>some</b> alignment with the concepts of plan); 1-3: <b>Below Average</b> (very <b>limited</b> information provided, little insight into alignment with concept of plan); 0: <b>Insufficient</b> (no answer provided)				70 – 100 Close Alignment 50 and 70 Some Alignment 0 – 50 Unclear Alignment						
Recipient Organization	Initial Grant Year	Grant Amount	Score		Asset Management and Service Excellence	Economic Capacity and Investment Readiness	Climate Change	Housing	Create a Healthier and More Vibrant Community	Advance Caring Services Post-Pandemic	Score		Indigenous Youth	Families	A Compassionate City	Housing	Age-Friendly Strategy	Resiliency	Mental Health	Play Opportunities	Holistic Health	Healthy Streets	Score		Score		Final overall score for entire evaluation, not total of row	
Azilda	2009	\$2,500	10.0	Excellent		●	●		●		10.0	Excellent		●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	8.0	Excellent	10.0	Excellent		89.0
Capreol	2009	\$2,500	10.0	Excellent		●	●		●		10.0	Excellent		●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	5.0	Average	7.0	Excellent		81.5
Chelmsford	2010	\$2,500	10.0	Excellent			●		●		10.0	Excellent		●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	5.5	Average	7.0	Excellent		78.5
Coniston	2009	\$2,500	10.0	Excellent		●	●	●	●		10.0	Excellent		●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	8.0	Excellent	10.0	Excellent		87.5
Copper Cliff	2009	\$2,500	10.0	Excellent			●		●		10.0	Excellent		●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	8.0	Excellent	9.0	Excellent		82.0
Donavan/Elm -West	2009	\$2,500	10.0	Excellent			●		●		10.0	Excellent	●	●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	8.0	Excellent	7.0	Excellent		83.0
Flour Mill	2009	\$2,500	10.0	Excellent			●		●		10.0	Excellent		●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	5.0	Average	7.0	Excellent		76.0
Garson/Falconbridge	2009	\$2,500	10.0	Excellent			●	●	●		10.0	Excellent		●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	8.0	Excellent	7.0	Excellent		81.0
Kingsmount - Bell Park	2020	\$2,500	10.0	Excellent			●		●		10.0	Excellent		●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	5.0	Average	7.0	Excellent		74.0
Minnow Lake	2009	\$2,500	10.0	Excellent			●		●		10.0	Excellent		●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	8.0	Excellent	8.5	Excellent	80.5	

2022 Value for Money Review Results  Community Action Networks			Alignment with City of Greater Sudbury Strategic Plan, 2019 – 2027 (15 points)				Advancement of Population Health (15 points)										Community Energy and Emissions Plan (10 points)		Parks, Open Space and Leisure Master Plan (10 points)		Final Score Overall						
			10-15: <b>Excellent</b> (clearly demonstrates approach and alignment to support <b>applicable</b> priorities); 5-9: <b>Average</b> (some demonstration or alignment to support <b>applicable</b> priorities); 1-5: <b>Below Average</b> (noted <b>applicable</b> strategic priorities with <b>limited</b> demonstration of support or alignment); 0: <b>Insufficient</b> (no alignment with priorities, no response provided)  Scores are based on how well answers demonstrated alignment with <b>applicable</b> priorities, not how many priorities were indicated. Average to <b>Excellent</b> scores are considered to be advancing the <b>applicable</b> priorities indicated in columns below.										7-10: <b>Excellent</b> (clearly identifies how organization supports and aligns with concepts of plan); 4-7: <b>Average</b> (demonstrates <b>some</b> alignment with the concepts of plan); 1-3: <b>Below Average</b> (very <b>limited</b> information provided, little insight into alignment with concept of plan); 0: <b>Insufficient</b> (no answer provided)				70 – 100 Close Alignment 50 and 70 Some Alignment 0 – 50 Unclear Alignment										
Recipient Organization	Initial Grant Year	Grant Amount	Score		Asset Management and Service Excellence	Economic Capacity and Investment Readiness	Climate Change	Housing	Create a Healthier and More Vibrant Community	Advance Caring Services Post-Pandemic	Score		Indigenous Youth	Families	A Compassionate City	Housing	Age-Friendly Strategy	Resiliency	Mental Health	Play Opportunities	Holistic Health	Healthy Streets	Score		Score		
Onaping Falls	2009	\$2,500	10.0	Excellent			●		●		10.0	Excellent		●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	8.0	Excellent	8.0	Excellent	86.0
South End	2009	\$2,500	10.0	Excellent			●		●		10.0	Excellent		●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	8.0	Excellent	10.0	Excellent	85.0
Uptown	2010	\$2,500	10.0	Excellent			●		●		10.0	Excellent		●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	5.0	Average	7.0	Excellent	82.0
Valley East	2009	\$2,500	10.0	Excellent			●	●	●		10.0	Excellent		●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	8.0	Excellent	7.0	Excellent	84.5

2022 Value for Money Review Results  Community Action Networks			Alignment with City of Greater Sudbury Strategic Plan, 2019 – 2027 (15 points)		Advancement of Population Health (15 points)										Community Energy and Emissions Plan (10 points)		Parks, Open Space and Leisure Master Plan (10 points)		Final Score Overall								
			10-15: <b>Excellent</b> (clearly demonstrates approach and alignment to support <b>applicable</b> priorities); 5-9: <b>Average</b> (some demonstration or alignment to support <b>applicable</b> priorities); 1-5: <b>Below Average</b> (noted <b>applicable</b> strategic priorities with <b>limited</b> demonstration of support or alignment); 0: <b>Insufficient</b> (no alignment with priorities, no response provided)  Scores are based on how well answers demonstrated alignment with <b>applicable</b> priorities, not how many priorities were indicated. Average to <b>Excellent</b> scores are considered to be advancing the <b>applicable</b> priorities indicated in columns below.										7-10: <b>Excellent</b> (clearly identifies how organization supports and aligns with concepts of plan); 4-7: <b>Average</b> (demonstrates <b>some</b> alignment with the concepts of plan); 1-3: <b>Below Average</b> (very <b>limited</b> information provided, little insight into alignment with concept of plan); 0: <b>Insufficient</b> (no answer provided)		70 – 100 Close Alignment 50 and 70 Some Alignment 0 – 50 Unclear Alignment												
Recipient Organization	Initial Grant Year	Grant Amount	Score		Asset Management and Service Excellence	Economic Capacity and Investment Readiness	Climate Change	Housing	Create a Healthier and More Vibrant Community	Advance Caring Services Post-Pandemic	Score		Indigenous Youth	Families	A Compassionate City	Housing	Age-Friendly Strategy	Resiliency	Mental Health	Play Opportunities	Holistic Health	Healthy Streets	Score		Score		Final overall score for entire evaluation, not total of row
Walden	2009	\$2,500	11.5	Excellent		●	●		●		10.0	Excellent		●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	8.5	Excellent	7.5	Excellent	82.0
Ward 1	2009	\$2,500	10.0	Excellent			●		●		10.0	Excellent		●	●		●	●	●	●	●	●	5.0	Average	7.0	Excellent	80.0
Ward 8	2012	\$2,500	10.0	Excellent		●	●		●		14.5	Excellent	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	10.0	Excellent	10.0	Excellent	94.5