

BRITISH COLUMBIA VISION ZERO IN
ROAD SAFETY GRANT PROGRAM
Application Scoring Guide

Updated October 20, 2023

In Partnership With



VISION ZERO BC

PHASE ONE: ELIGIBILITY			
1. Does the project proposed have a clear alignment with VZ principles/thinking?	Pass	Fail	Revision
2. Is the Community located in British Columbia?	Pass	Fail	
3. Does the project have a budget that includes only eligible costs? Quotes must be provided for all external costs (e.g. external labour, services, materials)	Pass	Fail	Revision
4. Does the project include an evaluation plan?	Pass	Fail	Revision
5. Does the project take place on non-MOTI roads?	Pass	Fail	Revision
6. Given the project's goal and objectives, does it seem feasible? Can it be completed within the project year?	Pass	Fail	Revision
7. Has municipal approval been provided for projects that require it?	Pass	Fail	Revision
STATUS	PASS/FAIL/REVISION NEEDED		

**VISION
ZERO BC**

PHASE TWO: APPLICATION CRITERIA			
QUESTION	SCORE		
	(1 – 2 pts) Does not meet expectations	(3 – 4 pts) Meets expectations	(5 – 6 pts) Exceeds expectations
<p>Question 1: PROJECT NEED</p> <p><i>Score x 2 for a total of: 12 Points</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there evidence of WHY this project is needed? • Did the application provide rationale or an explanation of community needs? • Does the proposal provide evidence of a road safety issue that needs to be addressed? 	<p>The application has not clearly articulated the problem they wish to solve.</p> <p>The extent of the problem is minor.</p>	<p>The application has clearly articulated the problem they wish to solve.</p> <p>The extent of the problem is moderate.</p>	<p>The application has provided extensive rationale and articulated the extent of the problem they wish to solve.</p> <p>The extent of the problem is significant.</p>
<p>Question 2: POTENTIAL FOR IMPACT</p> <p><i>Score x 2 for a total of: 12 Points</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is evidence of the effectiveness of what is being proposed included in the application? • Does the application describe how this project would assist in meeting the need(s) identified? 	<p>No evidence of the effectiveness of the intervention is provided.</p> <p>The application has not clearly articulated how this project would assist in meeting the need identified.</p>	<p>Some evidence of effectiveness provided.</p> <p>The application has clearly articulated how this project would assist in meeting the need (e.g. quantitative evidence, description of community engagement, expert opinion).</p>	<p>Compelling evidence of effectiveness provided.</p> <p>The application has strongly articulated how this project would assist in meeting the need(s) identified (e.g. quantitative evidence, surveys from the community, community</p>

**VISION
ZERO BC**

	No mention of sustainability or proposed project gains unlikely to be sustained.	Sustainability of the proposed solution has been addressed and/or there is a reasonable expectation that gains will be sustained.	engagement, expert opinion or other relevant information). The application has articulated plans to ensure this project will be sustained over time.
<p>Question 3: EQUITY GROUNDED APPROACH</p> <p><i>Score x 3 for a total of: 18 Points</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the project take place in a rural/remote community? • Does the project serve an under-resourced group? • Does the project consider equity as part of planning, engagement, or evaluation? 	The application has not articulated whether the project takes place in a rural/remote or Indigenous community, serves an under-resourced group, reflects an Indigenous perspective, or considers equity as part of their approach. The project has not articulated how this project will benefit under-resourced populations in planning, communications, delivery and/or evaluation.	The application clearly articulates whether the project takes place in a rural/remote or Indigenous community, how it will serve an under-resourced group, reflects an Indigenous perspective, and/or considers equity as part of their approach. Under-resourced populations are included in planning, communications, delivery and/or evaluation.	The project takes place in a rural/remote community and the application has clearly articulated how it will benefit an Indigenous community. The application has also provided relevant/useful additional information that informs adjudicators about intersecting equity factors (e.g. How this project can impact other under-resourced groups, such as low-income, older adults).
<p>Question 4: EVALUATION</p> <p><i>Score x 2 for a total of: 12 Points</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the application describe how success will be measured?* 	The application does not provide or provides a very minimal evaluation plan,	The application has clearly articulated a satisfactory evaluation plan, data	The application has articulated a well thought out, robust and detailed evaluation plan,

**VISION
ZERO BC**

	metrics, qualitative information, or data.	collection metrics and methods.	data collection metrics and methods.
<p>Question 5: BUDGET</p> <p><i>Score x 1 for a total of: 6 Points</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the use of funds appropriate? • Is the budget complete with no missing items? • Are all calculations correct? • Is the budget supported by official expense quotes for labour, services, and supplies? • Is there justification for budget items? 	<p>Upon reading the application, the reviewer has significant concerns regarding key aspects of the budget.</p>	<p>The application provides a clear budget with no concerns identified.</p>	<p>The application provides a well thought out, specific, and detailed budget:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Budget accuracy (i.e., calculations are correct, and justification/quotes are provided); and 2. Budgeted items are feasible against the overall scope and reach of the project 3. Budget is consistent with cost-effective delivery/implementation of the project

* *Note for adjudicators regarding Stream 2:* Evaluation practices for Indigenous applications *may* be unique and built on Indigenous traditions, knowledge, and cultural practices rather than Westernized methods of evaluation. Vision Zero strives to respect Indigenous self-determination, which includes building space for Indigenous ways of evaluating a project. Adjudicators will work with Indigenous applicants to understand their plans to measure success, recognizing that Indigenous people may have their own evaluation methodologies.

**VISION
ZERO BC**

PHASE THREE: BONUS			
QUESTION	SCORE		
	1 pt	2 pts	3 pts
<p>Bonus Question: PARTNERSHIPS</p> <p><i>Score x 1 for a total of: 3 points</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the project have at least one partnership mentioned? • If so, can these partners be expected to make meaningful contributions? • Have any partners made dedicated funding contributions to the project? 	<p>The application lists one partner but does not identify their role.</p> <p>The application does not articulate why partnerships are not needed.</p>	<p>The application has provided some details about partnerships with a brief description of their role.</p> <p>If the program does not need any partnerships, the application mentions this and provides adequate rationale.</p>	<p>The application has provided extensive information about multiple partnerships and has articulated their project contributions, which will be significant and highly beneficial to the project's success and/or sustainability.</p> <p>The application articulated how it has/will engage the community as a collective partnership.</p>