# **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 Valu Review	v Resi	ults	Su	Alignmer	ategi	h City c Pla points	ın, 20	Great 019 –	ter · 202	7		Advance			F Pop		tion	Hea	alth				Eı Emi	ommunity nergy and ssions Plan 10 points)	Sp L Ma (1	rks, Open pace and Leisure ester Plan 0 points)	Final Score Overall
			5-9: A 1-5: E 0: Ins	Average (son Below Average sufficient (no a es are based	ne dem le (note alignme on hov	nonstra ed <b>app</b> ent wit	ation o <b>blicabl</b> th prior	r align l <b>e</b> strat rities, r	ment t tegic p no res <sub>i</sub> nonstr	to supportion to support to suppo	port applices with limited provided) alignment wellignment wellign	o support applica cable priorities); ted demonstration with applicable p pplicable prioriti	on of su	uppor	rt or a	man	y prio	rities	were	indic	ated.		orgar conce 4-7: / with t 1-3: E provide conce	Excellent (clearly nization supports a epts of plan); Average (demonst the concepts of place of place of place of place of place of plan); sufficient (no answered)	y identifies and aligns trates son an); ery limited nto alignm	s how with  ne alignment d information nent with	70 – 100 Close Alignment 50 and 70 Some Alignment 0 – 50 Unclear Alignment
Recipient Organization	Initial Grant Year	Grant Amount	S	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 Vallee)	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 Valu Review	v Resi	ults	Sı	Alignmen		c Pla	in, 20			7		Advance			<b>Pop</b>		tion l	Heal	lth				Eı Emi	ommunity nergy and ssions Plan 10 points)	Sp L Ma	ks, Open pace and eisure ster Plan		Final Score Overall
Older Ad	lult Ce	entres	5-9: 7 1-5: 1 0: Ins	Average (som Below Average sufficient (no a es are based	ne deme (note alignme on how	nonstra ed <b>app</b> ent wit w well	ation o <b>blicabl</b> th prior	r align l <b>e</b> strat rities, r	ment tegic p no res monsti	to supporioritie ponse	oort applicates with limited provided)	o support applical able priorities); ted demonstration with applicable pri pplicable prioritie	of su	ippor	t or a	many	priori		vere	indica	ated.		7-10: organ conce 4-7: A with t 1-3: E provid conce	Excellent (clearly ization supports arepts of plan); werage (demonstrate concepts of plangelow Average (verded, little insight intept of plan); ufficient (no answering the concepts)	identifies nd aligns ates <b>som</b> n); y <b>limited</b> to alignm	with  ne alignment  I information ent with		70 – 100 Close Alignment 50 and 70 Some Alignment 0 – 50 Unclear Alignment
Recipient Organization	Initial Grant Year	Grant Amount		Score	sset Management and ervice Excellence	Economic Capacity and nvestment Readiness	Climate Change	lousing	Create a Healthier and More Vibrant Community	Advance Caring Services Post-Pandemic		Score	ndigenous Youth	amilies	Compassionate City	lousing	Age-Friendly Strategy	Resiliency	Jental Health	Play Opportunities	Iolistic 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	40	ш <u>-</u>			02	40	11.0	Excellent					/		_	Ь			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 Valu Reviev Youth		ults	Alignment Strat	egic Pl		)19 –			ry		Advance			o <b>f Pc</b> poi			on H	lealt	:h				Community Energy and Emissions Plan (10 points)	S <sub>i</sub> Ma	rks, Open pace and Leisure aster Plan (0 points)	Final Score Overall
			5-9: Average (s 1-5: Below Ave 0: Insufficient (s Scores are base	ome der rage (not no alignmed on ho	nonstrat ed <b>appl</b> ent with w well a	tion or icable in priorit	aligni strat ties, r	ment to egic priono responsive responsive to the contraction of the co	suppo orities onse po ted alig	rt applic with limi rovided) gnment w	o support applicable priorities); ted demonstration with applicable priorities	of su	ippoi	rt or a	/ ma	ıny pı	rioritie		re in	dicate	ed.	or co 4- wi 1- pr	10: Excellent (clearly ganization supports incepts of plan); 7: Average (demons in the concepts of plan); 8: Below Average (vovided, little insight incept of plan); Insufficient (no answers	and align strates <b>so</b> llan); ery <b>limite</b> into alignr	s with  me alignment  d information  ment with	70 – 100 Close Alignment 50 and 70 Some Alignment 0 – 50 Unclear Alignment
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			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.	) Excellent	6.5	Average	86.3

2022 Valu Review Commun	v Res	ults	10-1 5-9: 1 1-5: 0: In:	Average (son Below Averag sufficient (no a res are based	(15 (learly ne dem le (note alignme	demon demon denstrati ed appli ent with	strate ion or icable priori	es appraiding stratities, i	proach and the second s	and aliço suppo iorities onse p	ort applic with limi rovided)	Advance o support applicate cable priorities); ited demonstration with applicable prioritie	ole pri	oritie	poir es); et or a	alignr	ment	); iorities		cated.		7-10: orgar conce 4-7: A with t 1-3: E provide	nergy and missions Plan 10 points) Excellent (clearl dization supports epts of plan); werage (demons he concepts of plan Below Average (v ded, little insight i ept of plan); ufficient (no answ	y identifi and align trates so lan); ery limit nto align	Leis laste (10 por less howers with ome all ted informent	r Plan pints) w n lignment prmation	5 A	Final Score Overall  0 – 100 Close dignment 0 and 70 Some dignment – 50 Unclear dignment
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-rileitui Strategy Resiliency	 Play Opportunities	Holistic Health	Healthy Streets		Score		Sco	ore		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	Ex	cellent		73.5
Carol Richard Park Community Association	2004	\$16,000	12.0	Excellent							9.5	Average										0.0	Insufficient	6.5	Av	erage		70.0
Kukagami Campers' Association	2005	\$10,000	12.5	Excellent							10.0	Excellent										0.0	Insufficient	0.0	Ins	sufficient		69.0
Penage Road Community Centre	2004	\$16,000	8.5	Average			•				6.5	Average										9.0	Excellent	10.0	) Ex	cellent		82.5
Skead Recreation Centre	2001	\$16,000	11.0	Excellent			•				10.0	Excellent										1.0	Below Average	6.0	Av	erage		75.8
Wahnapitae Community Centre	2001	\$16,000	8.5	Average							8.0	Average										6.0	Average	7.5	Ex	cellent		76.0

2022 Valu Review	w Res	ults	Ali	gnment w Strate	gic Pla		019 -			ıry		Advance			f <b>Po</b> poin		ition	Hea	ilth				E:	ommunity nergy and imissions Plan 10 points)	N	arks, Open Space and Leisure laster Plan (10 points)	Final Score Overall
Оресп		into	5-9: 1-5: 0: Ir	Average (sor Below Average asufficient (no	me dem ge (note alignme	onstra ed <b>app</b> ent wit	tion or licable h prior	r align <b>e</b> strat rities, i	ment to tegic pr no resp nonstra	suppo iorities onse p	ort applic with lim rovided) gnment v	o support applical cable priorities); ited demonstration with applicable priorities	of su	pport	t or a	many	/ priori	ties w	vere ir	ndica	ited.		organ conc 4-7: / with to 1-3: I provi conc	Excellent (clearly nization supports epts of plan); Average (demonst the concepts of pl Below Average (voided, little insight in ept of plan); sufficient (no answ	and alig trates <b>s</b> e an); ery <b>limi</b> t nto aligr	ome alignment ted information nment with	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		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 Valu Review Operat	w Res	ults	10-15 5-9: A 1-5: E 0: Ins	verage (som Below Averag ufficient (no a es are based	clearly ne demie (note alignm	o Pla points demo nonstra ed app ent wit	n, 20 nstrate tition or licable h prior	es appraises arrities,	proach nment tegic p no res	n and all to supportionities sponse	oort appl s with lir provided lignment	Advance to support applicalicable priorities); mited demonstration it with applicable prioriti	able properties	rioriti uppo	point ies); ort or a	aligni	ment);	ities v		ndicate	ed.	7-10 orga of pl 4-7: with 1-3: prov	ommunity nergy and Emissions Plan 10 points) Excellent (clearl inization supports an); Average (demons the concepts of pl Below Average (v ided, little insight i cept of plan); sufficient (no ansy	y identifiand aliguatrates solan); ery limit	ome alignment ted information nment with	Final Score Overall  70 – 100 Close Alignment 50 and 70 Some Alignment 0 – 50 Unclear Alignment
Recipient Organization	Initial Grant Year	Grant Amount	S	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	110000000000000000000000000000000000000	nealiny Sueets	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 Valu Revie		ults	Sı	Alignmer udbury Str		Plan, 2			27		Advance			<b>Pop</b> points		ion Healt	th			Er E	ommunity nergy and missions Plan 10 points)	Le	Parks, Open Space and sisure Master Plan (10 points)	Final Score Overall
Julin			5-9: / 1-5: l 0: Ins	Average (sor Below Average sufficient (no	ne demonige (noted alignment	stration  ipplical with pri	or alig ble stra orities vers de	inment ategic , no res	t to support to support to the suppo	port <b>app</b> s with <b>li</b> provide	nt to support applicable priorities); imited demonstration d) nt with applicable periorities e applicable priorities	on of su	uppoi	rt or a	many	priorities w	/ere i	ndicate	ed.	orgar of pla 4-7: A with t 1-3: E provide		and alig trates <b>s</b> o lan); ery <b>limi</b> t nto aligr	ome alignment ted information nment with	70 – 100 Close Alignment 50 and 70 Some Alignment 0 – 50 Unclear Alignment
Recipient Organization	Initial Grant Year	Grant Amount		Score	Asset Management 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  Amount increases annually with property tax rate	9.0	Average						11.0	Excellent									2.5	Below Average	8.0	Excellent	70.8
Coniston Curling Club	2021	\$2,035.61  Amount increases annually with property tax rate	6.3	Average						9.0	Average									1.5	Below Average	8.0	Excellent	74.8
Copper Cliff Curling Club	2021	\$4,905.26  Amount increases annually with property tax rate	11.0	Excellent						11.5	Excellent									8.5	Excellent	8.0	Excellent	86.8
Sudbury Curling Club Inc.	2021	\$6,098.90  Amount increases annually with property tax rate	10.5	Excellent						11.0	Excellent									7.5	Excellent	8.0	Excellent	82.5

2022 Valu Reviev Commu Net	v Resi	ults	10-1: 5-9: / 1-5: I 0: Ins	Average (som Below Average sufficient (no a	(15 po	emonst applic t with p	trates on or a sable swers	approalignment strate	oach nent to egic pro o resp	and aliques of supportion of supportions of support	ort applic with lim provided)	Advance o support applicable priorities); ited demonstration with applicable priorities	<b>ible</b> pri	(15	poin es); t or a	ts)	ent);	ties v		ıdicat	ed.		7-10: I organi of plar 4-7: Av with th		Lei  ly identificand align strates so lan); ery limite into align	ns with concepts  me alignment  ed information  ment with		Final Score Overall  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	ļ	83.0
Flour Mill	2009	\$2,500	10.0	Excellent							10.0	Excellent								•			5.0	Average	7.0	Excellent		76.0
Garson/Falco nbridge	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 Valu Reviev Commu Net	w Res	ults	10-1 5-9: 1-5: 0: Ir	Average (som Below Average sufficient (no a	(15 p (15 p clearly do le demor e (noted alignmen	emons applied with	19 – ) strates on or a cable prioriti	appralignn strate	roach nent to egic pro resp	and aligo supporiorities	rt applica with limit rovided) anment w	Advar support applicable priorities); ted demonstrati	cable pri	(15	es); et or a	ints)	ent);	ities w		ndicat	ed.		7-10 orga cond 4-7: with 1-3: prov	nergy and missions Plan 10 points) : Excellent (cleanization supports tepts of plan); Average (demonthe concepts of plan); Below Average (ided, little insight	rly identics and aliquestrates solan);	gns with  some alignment  ited information		Final Score Overall  70 – 100 Close Alignment 50 and 70 Some Alignment 0 – 50 Unclear Alignment
Recipient Organization	Initial Grant Year	Grant Amount	10.0	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	10.0	Score	Indigenous Youth	Families	A Compassionate City	Housing	Age-Friendly Strategy	Resiliency	Mental Health	Play Opportunities	Holistic Health	Healthy Streets	0: In	sept of plan); sufficient (no ans	swer prov	Score  Excellent		Final overall score for entire evaluation, not total of row
South End	2009	\$2,500	10.0	Excellent							10.0	Excellent											8.0	Excellent	10.0	Excellent	-	85.0
South Ellu	2009	\$2,300	10.0	LXCCHCIT							10.0	LAGGIGIT											0.0	Exocitent	10.0	Executivity		03.0
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 Valu Reviev Commu Net	w Res	ults	10- 5-9: 1-5: 0: II	lignment wit Strategi points)  15: Excellent (cl.: Average (some i: Below Average insufficient (no all pres are based of erage to Exceller	early de demor	emons estration applicate with proveil an	strates on or a cable prioriti	approalignm strate es, no	oach anent to egic pro responstra	and aligo suppo iorities onse po	ort application with limit rovided)	support applic able priorities); ted demonstrati	able pride	orities pport	s); t or a	lignm <sup>(</sup>	ent);	ies we		dicated	i.	(10) 7-11 org. con 4-7 with 1-3 pro-	community Inergy and Emissions Plan points) D: Excellent (clea anization support cepts of plan); Average (demor the concepts of Below Average ( vided, little insigh cept of plan); nsufficient (no ans	Le (10 rly ident s and ali strates plan); very lim t into alig	igns with  some alignment  nited information gnment with	Final Score Overall  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 nvestment Readiness	Climate Change	Housing	Create a Healthier and More Vibrant Community	Advance Caring Services Post-Pandemic		Score	ndigenous Youth	<sup>-</sup> amilies	A Compassionate City	Housing	Age-Friendly Strategy	Resiliency	Mental Health	Play Opportunities	Healthy Streets		Score		Score	Final overall score for entire evaluation, not total of row
Walden	2009	\$2,500	11.5	5 Excellent	4.00				02	40	10.0	Excellent	1									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