

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.

Attachment 2 – 2022 Value for Money Review Results																													
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: Excellent (clearly demonstrates approach and alignment to support applicable priorities); 5-9: Average (some demonstration or alignment to support applicable priorities); 1-5: Below Average (noted applicable strategic priorities with limited demonstration of support or alignment); 0: Insufficient (no alignment with priorities, no response provided) Scores are based on how well answers demonstrated alignment with applicable priorities, not how many priorities were indicated. Average to Excellent scores are considered to be advancing the applicable priorities indicated in columns below.												7-10: Excellent (clearly identifies how organization supports and aligns with concepts of plan); 4-7: Average (demonstrates some alignment with the concepts of plan); 1-3: Below Average (very limited information provided, little insight into alignment with concept of plan); 0: Insufficient (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				
Club 50 de Rayside-Balfour	2009	\$12,000	9.0	Average					<div></div>		11.0	Excellent			<div></div>		<div></div>			<div></div>	<div></div>		3.5	Below Average	7.0	Excellent			
Club Accueil Age D'Or Azilda	2001	\$14,100	9.5	Average					<div></div>		11.0	Excellent			<div></div>		<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>			0.0	Insufficient	7.0	Excellent			
Le Rendez-vous de Vallée Est (formerly Centre Club d'Age D'Or de la Vallée)	2001	\$17,080	9.0	Average		<div></div>			<div></div>		11.0	Excellent		<div></div>	<div></div>		<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>		4.0	Average	7.0	Excellent			
Club Amical du Nouveau Sudbury	2014	\$19,354	11.0	Excellent					<div></div>		0.0	Insufficient											0.0	Insufficient	7.0	Excellent			
Nickel Centre Seniors Club	2005	\$6,700	11.0	Excellent			<div></div>		<div></div>		5.0	Average		<div></div>	<div></div>		<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>	<div></div>			5.0	Average	7.0	Excellent			
Final overall score for entire evaluation, not total of row																													
74.5																													
72.8																													
75.5																													
70.8																													
75.3																													

Attachment 2 – 2022 Value for Money Review Results																												
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: Excellent (clearly demonstrates approach and alignment to support applicable priorities); 5-9: Average (some demonstration or alignment to support applicable priorities); 1-5: Below Average (noted applicable strategic priorities with limited demonstration of support or alignment); 0: Insufficient (no alignment with priorities, no response provided) Scores are based on how well answers demonstrated alignment with applicable priorities, not how many priorities were indicated. Average to Excellent scores are considered to be advancing the applicable priorities indicated in columns below.														7-10: Excellent (clearly identifies how organization supports and aligns with concepts of plan); 4-7: Average (demonstrates some alignment with the concepts of plan); 1-3: Below Average (very limited information provided, little insight into alignment with concept of plan); 0: Insufficient (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
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	

Attachment 2 – 2022 Value for Money Review Results																											
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	
			10-15: Excellent (clearly demonstrates approach and alignment to support applicable priorities); 5-9: Average (some demonstration or alignment to support applicable priorities); 1-5: Below Average (noted applicable strategic priorities with limited demonstration of support or alignment); 0: Insufficient (no alignment with priorities, no response provided) Scores are based on how well answers demonstrated alignment with applicable priorities, not how many priorities were indicated. Average to Excellent scores are considered to be advancing the applicable priorities indicated in columns below.										7-10: Excellent (clearly identifies how organization supports and aligns with concepts of plan); 4-7: Average (demonstrates some alignment with the concepts of plan); 1-3: Below Average (very limited information provided, little insight into alignment with concept of plan); 0: Insufficient (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	
Rayside Balfour Youth Action Network	2007	\$60,000	9.5	Average	●	●			●		13.0	Excellent	●	●				●	●	●	●	●	10.0	Excellent	6.5	Average	86.3

Attachment 2 – 2022 Value for Money Review Results																														
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				
			10-15: Excellent (clearly demonstrates approach and alignment to support applicable priorities); 5-9: Average (some demonstration or alignment to support applicable priorities); 1-5: Below Average (noted applicable strategic priorities with limited demonstration of support or alignment); 0: Insufficient (no alignment with priorities, no response provided) Scores are based on how well answers demonstrated alignment with applicable priorities, not how many priorities were indicated. Average to Excellent scores are considered to be advancing the applicable priorities indicated in columns below.															7-10: Excellent (clearly identifies how organization supports and aligns with concepts of plan); 4-7: Average (demonstrates some alignment with the concepts of plan); 1-3: Below Average (very limited information provided, little insight into alignment with concept of plan); 0: Insufficient (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		
Beaver Lake Sports and Cultural Club	2004	\$16,000	9.0	Average				<div></div>	<div></div>		9.0	Average		<div></div>	<div></div>						<div></div>	<div></div>		10.0		Excellent	7	Excellent	73.5	
Carol Richard Park Community Association	2004	\$16,000	12.0	Excellent				<div></div>	<div></div>		9.5	Average		<div></div>	<div></div>			<div></div>			<div></div>			0.0		Insufficient	6.5	Average	70.0	
Kukagami Campers' Association	2005	\$10,000	12.5	Excellent			<div></div>		<div></div>		10.0	Excellent		<div></div>			<div></div>			<div></div>		<div></div>	0.0	Insufficient		0.0	Insufficient	69.0		
Penage Road Community Centre	2004	\$16,000	8.5	Average			<div></div>		<div></div>		6.5	Average		<div></div>	<div></div>		<div></div>	<div></div>		<div></div>			9.0	Excellent		10.0	Excellent	82.5		
Skead Recreation Centre	2001	\$16,000	11.0	Excellent			<div></div>		<div></div>		10.0	Excellent		<div></div>	<div></div>		<div></div>	<div></div>					1.0	Below Average	6.0	Average	75.8			
Wahnapitae Community Centre	2001	\$16,000	8.5	Average					<div></div>		8.0	Average		<div></div>							<div></div>			6.0	Average	7.5	Excellent	76.0		

Attachment 2 – 2022 Value for Money Review Results																													
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			
			10-15: Excellent (clearly demonstrates approach and alignment to support applicable priorities); 5-9: Average (some demonstration or alignment to support applicable priorities); 1-5: Below Average (noted applicable strategic priorities with limited demonstration of support or alignment); 0: Insufficient (no alignment with priorities, no response provided) Scores are based on how well answers demonstrated alignment with applicable priorities, not how many priorities were indicated. Average to Excellent scores are considered to be advancing the applicable priorities indicated in columns below.										7-10: Excellent (clearly identifies how organization supports and aligns with concepts of plan); 4-7: Average (demonstrates some alignment with the concepts of plan); 1-3: Below Average (very limited information provided, little insight into alignment with concept of plan); 0: Insufficient (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		

Attachment 2 – 2022 Value for Money Review Results																												
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		
			10-15: Excellent (clearly demonstrates approach and alignment to support applicable priorities); 5-9: Average (some demonstration or alignment to support applicable priorities); 1-5: Below Average (noted applicable strategic priorities with limited demonstration of support or alignment); 0: Insufficient (no alignment with priorities, no response provided) Scores are based on how well answers demonstrated alignment with applicable priorities, not how many priorities were indicated. Average to Excellent scores are considered to be advancing the applicable priorities indicated in columns below.										7-10: Excellent (clearly identifies how organization supports and aligns with concepts of plan); 4-7: Average (demonstrates some alignment with the concepts of plan); 1-3: Below Average (very limited information provided, little insight into alignment with concept of plan); 0: Insufficient (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	

Attachment 2 – 2022 Value for Money Review Results																													
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: Excellent (clearly demonstrates approach and alignment to support applicable priorities); 5-9: Average (some demonstration or alignment to support applicable priorities); 1-5: Below Average (noted applicable strategic priorities with limited demonstration of support or alignment); 0: Insufficient (no alignment with priorities, no response provided) Scores are based on how well answers demonstrated alignment with applicable priorities, not how many priorities were indicated. Average to Excellent scores are considered to be advancing the applicable priorities indicated in columns below.										7-10: Excellent (clearly identifies how organization supports and aligns with concepts of plan); 4-7: Average (demonstrates some alignment with the concepts of plan); 1-3: Below Average (very limited information provided, little insight into alignment with concept of plan); 0: Insufficient (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		

Attachment 2 – 2022 Value for Money Review Results																												
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: Excellent (clearly demonstrates approach and alignment to support applicable priorities); 5-9: Average (some demonstration or alignment to support applicable priorities); 1-5: Below Average (noted applicable strategic priorities with limited demonstration of support or alignment); 0: Insufficient (no alignment with priorities, no response provided) Scores are based on how well answers demonstrated alignment with applicable priorities, not how many priorities were indicated. Average to Excellent scores are considered to be advancing the applicable priorities indicated in columns below.										7-10: Excellent (clearly identifies how organization supports and aligns with concepts of plan); 4-7: Average (demonstrates some alignment with the concepts of plan); 1-3: Below Average (very limited information provided, little insight into alignment with concept of plan); 0: Insufficient (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	