Reidvale Neighbourhood Centre – Expression of Interest Grading Matrix

Evaluation Criteria	Poor	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Financial Sustainability	No financial plan. No secured income. Heavy reliance on speculative funding with no evidence of sustainability. High risk of financial failure.	Limited financial information. Some funding sources identified, but no secured commitments. No clear budget or long-term financial strategy.	Basic financial plan with partial secured funding. Moderate financial risk. Some revenue-generation strategies identified by not fully developed.	Solid financial planning with a mix of income sources. Some secured revenue streams. Moderate risk mitigation strategies in place.	Fully developed, sustainable financial model. Multiple secured income streams (e.g. room hire, grants, partnerships). Clear strategy for financial sustainability and risk mitigation.
Alignment with Community Needs	Proposal does not reflect the community needs. No consultation with local stakeholders, Plans are exclusive or profit-driven.	Limited understanding of community priorities. No clear strategy for engaging of benefiting local residents.	Addresses some community needs but lacks strong engagement strategy. Limited evidence of community involvement.	Well-aligned with community needs. Clear engagement plan to include diverse groups. Some partnerships with local organisations.	Deep integration with community priorities. Strong partnerships. Demonstrates codesign or participatory

Evaluation Criteria	Poor	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
					planning with local residents.
Operational Capacity and Management Experience	No experience managing community facilities. No governance structure proposed.	Limited relevant experience. Weak management structures. No clarity on roles or responsibilities.	Some experience with facility management. Basic governance structure proposed but lacks accountability measures.	Experienced leadership team. Clear governance framework with oversight and accountability mechanisms.	Proven track record in managing community assets. Strong governance structure. Evidence of successful operational management in similar facilities.
Service Delivery and Programming	No plan for service delivery. High risk of underutilisation of space.	Limited service offerings. Unclear strategy for programming. No partnerships or external engagement.	Some planned programming that meets community needs but lacks diversity or strategic planning.	Well-developed service plan with a range of community- focused activities. Clear strategy for partnerships and stakeholder engagement.	Comprehensive evidence-based programming. Strong local partnerships. Plans for service expansion and long-term sustainability.
Risk Management and Contingency Planning	No risk assessment or contingency planning. High risk of failure.	Some risk factors identified but no clear mitigation strategy.	Basic risk assessment with limited contingency planning.	Clear risk mitigation strategies. Defined contingency plans.	Comprehensive risk management framework. Financial, operational, and governance risks

Evaluation Criteria	Poor	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
					are proactively addressed.
Space Utilisation and Revenue Generation	No plan for maximising space usage. No revenue-generating strategies.	Limited strategy for generating revenue or optimising space utilisation.	Some revenue generation strategies identified by not fully developed.	Well-planned space utilisation with effective income generation strategies.	Highly efficient space management. Strong financial strategy ensuring sustainable revenue streams.
Governance and Accountability	No governance structure or accountability mechanisms. No transparency.	Weak governance framework. No stakeholder involvement.	Basic governance model with limited transparency.	Clear governance framework with accountability measures.	Strong governance model. Community representation and transparent decision-making processes.
Partnerships and Collaboration	No partnership or engagement with local organisations.	Minimal partnerships. No clear collaboration strategy.	Some partnership proposed but not well-developed.	Strong partnerships with other community organisations, or a strong track-record of similar delivery elsewhere.	Well-established collaborative network. Demonstrates capacity to leverage partnerships for funding and service delivery, or a strong track-record of similar service delivery elsewhere.

Grading Matrix - EOI Future Lease of Reidvale Neighbourhood Centre

Evaluation Criteria	Poor	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Maintenance and Facility Management	No maintenance plan. High risk of facility deterioration.	Basic maintenance plan but lacks a long-term strategy.	Some maintenance strategies identified but not comprehensive.	Clear facility management plan with allocated resources.	Comprehensive, long-term maintenance plan. Sustainable financial strategy for ongoing upkeep.
Contribution to RHA's Strategic Goals	No alignment with RHA's objectives.	Minimal alignment with RHA's goals.	Sole alignment with RHA's objectives.	Strong alignment with RHA's mission.	Fully aligned with RHA's strategic mission. Demonstrates commitment to community empowerment and regeneration.