

# External Grant Review Committee Report

---

External Grant Review Committee  
Report to Council  
June 23, 2022

## TERRITORY ACKNOWLEDGMENT

---

We acknowledge with respect the Lekwungen peoples on whose traditional territory the city of Victoria stands and where we've been conducting our work, and the Songhees, Esquimalt and WSÁNEĆ peoples whose historical relationships with the land continue to this day.

## INTRODUCTION

---

In October 2017, Council received a report on the pilot project initiated in 2017 to use an external grant review committee to assist it in its annual deliberations on Strategic Plan Grants. The mandate of the pilot "Strategic Plan Grant Review Committee" according to its Terms of Reference was to

*"... review all applications received by the City under the Strategic Plan Grants program and to make recommendations to City Council on the annual Strategic Plan Grants to be funded by the City.*

*The Committee's recommendations will be guided by the City's Strategic Plan and in particular the evaluation matrix specifically established for Strategic Plan Grants."*

Council decided to formalize this approach and created the External Grant Review Committee. This Committee has provided recommendations on the Strategic Plan Grants since 2017. All members of the original pilot committee have completed their terms or resigned due to other commitments. Council appointed new members to the Committee at the beginning of 2022. Members of the Committee include:

- Chris Tilden (Chair) (he/him)
- Priyanka Lopez (she/her)
- Luca Piscetta (they/them)
- Lindsay Shojania (she/her)
- Catherine West (she/her)

Since October 2017, Council has agreed to a number of recommendations to update the application process itself. The changes were greatly appreciated by the Committee and facilitated review of the project applications. A few more suggestions for improvement have been made to staff as a result of the 2022 review process, and are outlined in the section called "Suggestions for 2023", below.

The committee received support from the City Clerk's office and Finance Department. The committee would like to take this opportunity to thank staff for their support preparing material and providing the committee with background information essential to a full assessment of the applications. Layla Monk, Manager of Revenue, Crystal-Ann Anderson, Deputy City Clerk/Manager Legislative Services, and Sydney Stoltz, Committee Secretary, provided invaluable input and assistance through the 2022 deliberations as the committee needed to adapt to an online meeting process.

This is the third year that Strategic Plan Grants were submitted under the 2019-2022 Strategic Objectives and the last to be submitted with the current Council.

A total of \$512,160 is available for the grant program in 2022, an increase of \$39,545 from 2021. Ninety eligible applications were received, totaling \$1,535,600, an increase from the sixty-seven eligible applications totaling \$1,359,423 received in 2021 and an increase from the sixty-five eligible applications totaling \$1,209,931 received in 2020.

## **SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES**

---

The Committee met five times. These meetings, per COVID-19 protocols, were conducted virtually as they were in 2020 and 2021.

### **March 25, 2022:**

- New members were introduced.
- Review of Terms of Reference and selection of Committee Chair
- Staff reviewed with the committee the grant process and how the applications were reviewed by the previous committee.
- Set up a process for determining the allocation of the grants.
- Setting discussion guidelines for the duration of 2021 External Grant Review Committee (EGRC)

### **May 3, 2022 | May 10, 2022 | May 18, 2022:**

- Two half-day sessions plus a final meeting were conducted online to review and discuss committee members' results to make the final determination for grant allocations.
- Reviewed opportunities for improvements to applications and the review process.

### **June 1, 2022:**

- Finalization of External Grant Review Committee Report

The Committee's timeline was designed to meet deadlines for Council's meeting on June 23, 2022.

## EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

---

The elements of the evaluation framework adopted by the Committee are the same as those used in 2021 and included the updated Weighted Strategic Plan Objectives that Council adjusted:

### 1. Council Weighted Strategic Plan Objectives:

OBJECTIVE	COUNCIL RANKING 2020	COUNCIL RANKING 2021	COUNCIL RANKING 2022
Prosperity and Economic Inclusion	3.88	5.88	5.00
Health, Well-Being and a Welcoming City	4.50	5.00	4.75
Sustainable Transportation	5.63	4.75	4.50
Climate Leadership and Environmental Stewardship	5.25	5.38	4.00
Reconciliation and Indigenous Relations	4.75	5.38	3.50
Strong, Livable Neighborhoods	5.50	5.25	3.50
Affordable Housing	6.00	5.88	2.75

In 2018, grant applications were instructed to select the one objective that was most applicable. This process was continued for 2022. Applicants could select multiple objectives but were only weighted on the primary objective as identified by the applicant.

Of the applications submitted, 66.7% of applications selected Health, Well-Being and a Welcoming City as the most applicable objective, with the remaining applications split between the remaining six objectives. This trend is a continuation from 2021 and 2020, when the Health, Well-Being and a Welcoming City Strategic Plan Objective represented 62.7% and 61.5% of all applications received.

<b>OBJECTIVE</b>	<b>NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS RECEIVED 2020</b>	<b>NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS RECEIVED 2021</b>	<b>NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS RECEIVED 2022</b>
Affordable Housing	4	5	4
Prosperity and Economic Inclusion	5	6	10
Climate Leadership and Environmental Stewardship	6	3	10
Reconciliation and Indigenous Relations	3	2	2
Strong, Livable Neighborhoods	7	9	3
Health, Well-Being and a Welcoming City	40	42	60
Sustainable Transportation	0	0	1

## 2. Criteria used for analysis grant applications.

**Capacity of an organization to deliver the project (20%):** Project aligns and advances organization mission and mandate; organization has experience and capacity to undertake project successfully; the people who will lead and implement the project have relevant experience; and strong leadership is evident.

**Evidence of Need (20%):** Demonstrated strong evidence of need for the project, project addresses a City Strategic Plan Objective.

**Project Builds Community Resilience (30%):** Project increases community resiliency to withstand significant community changes; Project benefits a priority target population (or environmental area); expected results are well-considered and will have significant impact; applicant identifies appropriate methods for evaluating project results; project will involve appropriate partners/amplify impact through collaboration; community impacts are reasonable, well-considered and are applicable to the project.

**Project Feasibility (30%):** Work plan is detailed and feasible with stated timelines; budget expenses are appropriate and well considered amounts are identified for proposed activities; budget revenues include adequate funding sources to meet project expenses; other sources of funding are identified as potential or confirmed, including in-kind sources.

Each application was given a score between 1 and 5 in each category and scores were weighted according to the percentages above.

## 3. Approach used by EGRC for determining Merit Score.

The four criteria established by Council were each given a score between 1 and 5. An application could earn a maximum non-weighted score of 5.

The non-weighted score is then multiplied by the Strategic Plan weighting to get a final weighted score.

Example:

Capacity of an organization to deliver the project (20%) - Rating of 5 – Score of 1.00

Evidence of Need (20%) – Rating of 3 – Score of .60

Project Builds Community Resiliency (30%) - Rating of 4 – Score of 1.20

Project Feasibility (30%) - Rating of 4 - Score of 1.20

Total Non-Weighted Score – 4 (1 + .60 + 1.20 + 1.20)

Strategic Plan Objective - Health, Well-Being and a Welcoming City

Strategic Plan Weighting – 4.75

Final Weighted Score – 19.00

The Strategic Plan Objective weighting plays an important factor in determining the final score. With the weighting for 2022, applications submitted under Affordable Housing with a weighting of 2.75 could only earn a maximum score of 13.75, whereas applications under Prosperity and Economic Inclusion could earn a maximum score of 25.00.

Due to this disparity, applications specifically under Affordable Housing, even if they scored high in all four (4) of the evaluation criteria would not receive a high final weighted score and no application under this objective was recommended for funding as Council was indicating the other objectives were to be more strongly considered.

<b>OBJECTIVE</b>	<b>STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE WEIGHTING 2022</b>	<b>MAXIMUM FINAL WEIGHTED SCORE POSSIBLE 2022</b>
Prosperity and Economic Inclusion	5.00	25.00
Health, Well-Being and a Welcoming City	4.75	23.75
Sustainable Transportation	4.50	22.50
Climate Leadership and Environmental Stewardship	4.00	20.00
Reconciliation and Indigenous Relations	3.50	17.50
Strong, Livable Neighborhoods	3.50	17.50
Affordable Housing	2.75	13.75

For comparative analysis, the weighting and maximum scores for the six (6) Strategic Plan Objectives for 2020 and 2021.

<b>OBJECTIVE</b>	<b>STRATEGIC PLAN OBJECTIVE WEIGHTING 2020   2021</b>	<b>MAXIMUM FINAL WEIGHTED SCORE POSSIBLE 2020   2021</b>
Prosperity and Economic Inclusion	3.88   5.88	19.40   29.40
Health, Well-Being and a Welcoming City	4.50   5.00	22.50   25.00
Sustainable Transportation	5.63   4.75	28.15   23.75
Climate Leadership and Environmental Stewardship	5.25   5.38	26.25   26.90
Reconciliation and Indigenous Relations	4.75   5.38	23.75   26.90
Strong, Livable Neighborhoods	5.50   5.25	27.50   26.25
Affordable Housing	6.00   5.88	30.00   29.40

#### 4. Overall Evaluation Taking Multiple Factors into Consideration

The combination of scores from 1 and 2 above resulted in a total “Merit Score” for each grant application as outlined in 3. Scores ranged from a high of 21.38 to a low of 5.60. The average was 15.67 and the median was 15.87. Forty-nine applications scored at and above the mean while forty-one fell below.

In assessing the final recommended awards for 2022, the committee applied a process so that the higher the final weighted merit score would result in a greater percentage of the eligible amount requested being received. With the overall breadth and quality to the applications presented, the committee wanted to provide funding to as many applications that were forwarded to the EGRC.

The committee established the following framework for allocation of the recommendation funding:

- Applications with a final weighted score of 12.00 or above would be considered for funding.
- The higher the final weighted score would generally receive a greater percentage of their request, with applications above 18.00 receiving between 60-80% of their ask.
- For applications below a final weighted score of 18.00 some judgement and discretion were applied and compared against the funding level recommended and the minimum funding level requested in order to make the project feasible.
- Considerations were given looking at the minimum funding level requested compared to the funding level recommended based on the percentage of funding formula.
- Where there was a large gap at the percentage level recommended for funding based on the final weighted score and the minimum funding level required, those applications were recommended to be excluded from funding and other applications that were comparatively closer to that minimum ask, those applications were recommended for funding.
- As previously established, the committee to set a minimum grant of \$2,500 that thirteen (13) applications were recommended for that level of funding. In 2021, five (5) applications were recommended for that funding level.

Given demand relative to funds available (\$1,535,600 eligible versus \$512,160 available), only one (1) application received full funding and that was due to setting the minimum funding level of \$2,500 which represented the full ask of one application. No notional maximum was set, but awards of approximately \$30,000 (or 5.9% of total funds available to be awarded) for a single grant were considered at or near maximum.

For all applications, the average funding level recommended is 36.12%, the median is 33.00%.



The largest grant amount recommended is \$32,000 (Victoria Sexual Assault Centre); the smallest is \$2,500 recommended as the minimum funding level to the thirteen (13) applications. The average recommended award is \$5,690; the median is \$4,520.

## RESULTS

---

Each Committee member completed the agreed upon template and the results were consolidated. The Committee met on May 3, 2022 and May 10, 2022 to review and make final decisions and recommendations to Council regarding the allocation of grant funds. A third, and shorter session on May 18, 2022 was conducted to finalize the decision making.

The results, including recommended grants and comments on each application, are summarized in the tables below. Table 1 shows applications sorted by merit scores; Table 2 shows comments for each application.

**Table 1. Victoria Strategic Plan Grants: Total Merit Scores and Suggested Awards**

ORGANIZATION NAME	REQUESTED	ELIGIBLE	MERIT	SUGGESTED AWARD
Victoria Sexual Assault Centre	40,000	40,000	21.38	32,000
Canadian Paraplegic Association (BC), Operating as Spinal Cord Injury BC	8,000	8,000	20.80	6,400
Bridges for Women Society	30,000	30,000	20.67	24,000
Peers Victoria Resource Society	15,000	15,000	20.43	12,000
Fairfield Gonzales Community Association	34,500	34,500	20.01	27,600
Pacific Training Centre for the Blind Society (PTCB)	15,000	15,000	19.95	10,500
Good Night Out Vancouver Society	14,550	14,550	19.95	10,185
Osteoporosis Canada	8,780	6,585	19.87	4,610
Victoria Immigrant and Refugee Centre Society	10,000	10,000	19.71	7,000
The Mustard Seed Street Church	20,000	20,000	19.63	14,000
Victoria Multicultural Society	17,120	17,120	19.50	11,984

Burnside Gorge Community Association	15,000	15,000	<b>19.48</b>	<b>10,500</b>
Voices in Motion Choral Society	10,500	10,500	<b>19.48</b>	<b>7,350</b>
Victoria Conservatory of Music	9,500	9,500	<b>19.44</b>	<b>6,650</b>
Monoceros Education Society	6,484	6,484	<b>19.32</b>	<b>4,539</b>
United Way Southern Vancouver Island	30,000	30,000	<b>19.16</b>	<b>21,000</b>
Maritime Museum of British Columbia Society	6,525	6,525	<b>19.04</b>	<b>4,568</b>
Community Social Planning Council of Greater Victoria	9,500	9,500	<b>18.92</b>	<b>5,700</b>
Cook Street Village Activity Centre Society (New Horizons)	8,375	8,375	<b>18.84</b>	<b>5,025</b>
Victoria Brain Injury Society	15,000	15,000	<b>18.76</b>	<b>9,000</b>
Victoria Rainbow Kitchen Society	15,000	15,000	<b>18.60</b>	<b>9,000</b>
Quadra Village Community Centre (/Downtown Blanshard Advisory)	25,000	25,000	<b>18.42</b>	<b>15,000</b>
Big Brothers Big Sisters of Victoria and Area ('Community Mentoring' program)	8,000	8,000	<b>18.37</b>	<b>4,800</b>
Fateh Care Charity Society	27,500	27,500	<b>18.29</b>	<b>16,500</b>
Cine-Vic Society of Independent Filmmakers	8,000	8,000	<b>17.89</b>	<b>4,000</b>
Leadership Victoria Society	7,500	7,500	<b>17.75</b>	<b>3,750</b>
FED Urban Agriculture Society	10,000	10,000	<b>17.46</b>	<b>5,000</b>
University of Victoria (Application 2 - WITS Program)	16,000	16,000	<b>17.30</b>	<b>12,000</b>

Greater Victoria Volunteer Society 'dba' Volunteer Victoria	10,000	10,000	<b>17.26</b>	<b>5,000</b>
Victoria Arts Council	12,000	12,000	<b>17.14</b>	<b>6,000</b>
Silver Threads Service	3,130	3,130	<b>16.94</b>	<b>2,500</b>
Crisis Intervention & Public Information Society of Greater Victoria 'dba' NEED2 Suicide Prevention Education & Support (School workshops program)	25,000	25,000	<b>16.78</b>	<b>10,000</b>
Bike Victoria Society (Formerly Greater Victoria Bike to Work Society*)	10,000	10,000	<b>16.65</b>	<b>4,000</b>
Soap for Hope Canada Society (Formerly Disaster Aid Canada)	20,000	20,000	<b>16.63</b>	<b>8,000</b>
The Diverters Foundation	7,700	5,775	<b>16.58</b>	-
Farm to School BC (PHA Public Health Association of British Columbia)	9,000	9,000	<b>16.55</b>	<b>3,600</b>
Friends of Bowker Creek Society	3,000	3,000	<b>16.40</b>	<b>2,500</b>
Victoria Disability Resource Centre	12,000	12,000	<b>16.33</b>	<b>4,800</b>
Story Studio Writing Society (Story Studio)	3,000	3,000	<b>16.31</b>	<b>2,500</b>
LifeCycles Project Society ('Establishing Strong Connections' Program)	25,000	25,000	<b>16.23</b>	<b>13,000</b>
University of Victoria (Application 1 - Chair in Transgender Studies)	15,538	15,538	<b>16.22</b>	<b>6,215</b>
Oaklands Community Association	41,512	41,512	<b>16.15</b>	<b>25,000</b>
Community First Foundation 'dba' Backpack Buddies	20,000	20,000	<b>15.99</b>	<b>6,000</b>

Downtown Victoria Business Association	11,000	11,000	<b>15.91</b>	<b>3,300</b>
Vancouver Island School of Arts	10,000	7,500	<b>15.91</b>	<b>5,000</b>
Alter Arts Society	30,000	30,000	<b>15.83</b>	<b>9,000</b>
Bayanihan Cultural and Housing Society 'dba' Bayanihan Community Centre	15,000	15,000	<b>15.83</b>	-
Human-Nature Counselling Society	12,500	12,500	<b>15.71</b>	<b>4,500</b>
Junior Achievement B.C (JABC)	8,000	8,000	<b>15.67</b>	<b>2,500</b>
Agrarians Foundation 'dba' Young Agrarians	13,500	13,500	<b>15.52</b>	-
Creating Community Wellness Society	7,210	6,215	<b>15.52</b>	<b>2,900</b>
North Park Neighbourhood Association	18,500	18,500	<b>15.44</b>	<b>5,550</b>
Balfour's Friends Foundation	2,500	2,500	<b>15.36</b>	<b>2,500</b>
Victoria Innovation, Advanced Technology and Entrepreneurship Council (VIATEC)*	20,000	20,000	<b>15.33</b>	<b>6,000</b>
Ocean Ambassadors Canada	16,298	16,184	<b>15.27</b>	<b>4,855</b>
Ballet Victoria Society	10,000	10,000	<b>15.12</b>	<b>5,000</b>
Fernwood Neighbourhood Resource Group Society	30,000	30,000	<b>15.12</b>	<b>9,000</b>
Sport of Life Society	30,000	30,000	<b>15.04</b>	-
KidSport Greater Victoria	20,000	20,000	<b>14.92</b>	<b>5,000</b>
The Proulx Global Education and Community Foundation	14,280	12,585	<b>14.92</b>	-
Pacifica Housing Advisory Association	20,500	20,500	<b>14.80</b>	<b>5,125</b>

Vancouver Island Counselling Centre for Immigrants and Refugees (VICCIR)	40,000	40,000	<b>14.67</b>	<b>10,000</b>
The Victoria Youth Empowerment Society* (YES)	13,000	13,000	<b>14.58</b>	-
Victoria Literacy Connection Society	7,000	7,000	<b>14.41</b>	<b>2,500</b>
Living Edge Community	10,000	10,000	<b>14.41</b>	<b>2,500</b>
Wear2Start Society	20,000	20,000	<b>14.41</b>	-
Victoria Community Health Cooperative	5,327	5,327	<b>14.21</b>	<b>2,500</b>
Worker Solidarity Network	19,300	19,300	<b>14.00</b>	-
Seniors Serving Seniors Association of BC	10,000	10,000	<b>13.85</b>	<b>2,500</b>
Chinese Community Services Center of Victoria	10,000	10,000	<b>13.79</b>	<b>2,500</b>
Capital Region Food Share Network Society	15,000	11,250	<b>13.22</b>	-
Big Brothers Big Sisters of Victoria and Area ('Big Impact' program)	15,000	15,000	<b>13.07</b>	<b>3,750</b>
Peninsula Streams Society	18,000	18,000	<b>12.93</b>	<b>4,405</b>
Threshold Housing Society	40,000	40,000	<b>12.83</b>	-
Stigma-Free Society (Formerly Bipolar Disorder Society of BC)	5,000	5,000	<b>12.43</b>	<b>2,500</b>
Victoria Compost and Conservation Education Society (Compost Education Centre)*	10,000	10,000	<b>12.40</b>	<b>2,500</b>
Community Options for Children and Families	10,000	10,000	<b>12.11</b>	<b>2,500</b>
Victoria Coalition for Survivors of Torture	5,000	5,000	<b>11.88</b>	-

Synergy Sustainability Institute	9,400	9,400	<b>11.80</b>	-
Society for Kids at Tennis (KATS)	10,000	10,000	<b>11.68</b>	-
Mental Health Society of Greater Victoria	22,500	22,500	<b>11.52</b>	-
Victoria Women's Transition House Society (VWTH)	40,000	40,000	<b>11.46</b>	-
Umbrella Society for Addictions and Mental Health	25,000	25,000	<b>11.26</b>	-
Victoria Supply Creative Reuse Society	51,602	51,602	<b>10.80</b>	-
Theatre SKAM Association	24,000	24,000	<b>10.65</b>	-
Capital Region Food and Agriculture Initiative Roundtable Society	12,000	12,000	<b>9.06</b>	-
Action Committee of People with Disabilities	94,761	94,761	<b>8.62</b>	-
Together Against Poverty Society	20,000	19,457	<b>8.48</b>	-
Greater Victoria Acting Together	12,300	12,300	<b>6.16</b>	-
Canadian Orca Rescue Society	35,500	28,125	<b>5.60</b>	-
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,556,692</b>	<b>1,535,600</b>		<b>512,160</b>

**Table 2. Victoria Strategic Plan Grants: Application Comments  
(Sorted by Merit Score Ranking)**

Organization	Comments
1. Victoria Sexual Assault Centre	Organizational capacity, project needs and the building of community resilience is strong. Project feasibility, work plan and outcomes is generally stated but adaptable.
2. Canadian Paraplegic Association (BC), Operating as Spinal Cord Injury BC	Organizational capacity is strong. Project needs, the building of community resilience, project feasibility, work plan and outcomes is clearly outlined and adaptable.
3. Bridges for Women Society	The long history in delivering programs in community in addition to the staff and volunteer support being solid was noted. The budget and funding sources were sound. Project objectives could be stronger. A very strong target audience – diverse women with barriers to employment.
4. Peers Victoria Resource Society	Organizational capacity, project needs and the building of community resilience is strong. Project feasibility, work plan and outcomes is generally stated but adaptable.
5. Fairfield Gonzales Community Association	Large staff and volunteer base. Success measures largely unquantifiable. Diverse funding. A high ask, broad audience appeal with the expansion of food access programs.
6. Pacific Training Centre for the Blind Society (PTCB)	Organizational capacity, project needs and the building of community resilience is solid. Project feasibility, work plan and outcomes is clearly outlined and adaptable.
7. Good Night Out Vancouver Society	Small staffing. Success measures strong. Mentions needing full funding but can scale back program. No other program currently in existence in Victoria. Proposed project does involve appropriate partners.
8. Osteoporosis Canada	Organizational capacity, project needs and the building of community resilience is solid. Project feasibility, work plan and outcomes is clearly stated and adaptable.
9. Victoria Immigrant and Refugee Centre Society	Organizational capacity is strong. Project needs and the building of community resilience is solid and best placed with strategic priority. Project



	feasibility, work plan and outcomes is clearly stated and adaptable.
10. The Mustard Seed Street Church	Large org and big annual core budget with large operating budget where 67% is donations. Program is part of their core mission.
11. Victoria Multicultural Society	Organizational capacity is strong. Project needs and the building of community resilience is solid and best placed with strategic priority. Project feasibility, work plan and outcomes is clearly stated and adaptable. Honoria noted.
12. Burnside Gorge Community Association	Organizational capacity is strong. Project needs and the building of community resilience is solid. Project feasibility, work plan and outcomes is clearly stated and adaptable.
13. Voices in Motion Choral Society	Organizational capacity is strong. Project needs and the building of community resilience is solid.. Project feasibility, work plan and outcomes is clearly stated and adaptable. Project specific activities rather than an extension of program delivery. The funding requested and budget was noted as reasonable.
14. Victoria Conservatory of Music	Large, established organization with capacity and longevity to deliver the programs. Overall funding of organization outside of program not provided, but for staffing levels likely has very diversified funding sources.
15. Monoceros Education Society	Organizational capacity, project needs and the building of community resilience is solid. Project feasibility, work plan and outcomes is clearly stated and adaptable.
16. United Way Southern Vancouver Island	Organizational capacity, project needs and the building of community resilience is strong. Project feasibility, work plan are clearly outlined. Project outcomes have defined success measures. The long history in the community was noted and the collaborative efforts of four agencies was noted.
17. Maritime Museum of British Columbia Society	Organizational capacity, project needs and the building of community resilience is strong. Project feasibility, work plan and outcomes are clearly outlined. A good mix of staff and volunteer supporting the project was noted.
18. Community Social Planning Council of Greater Victoria	Organizational capacity, project needs and the building of community resilience is strong. Project feasibility, work plan and its adaptability is

	limited. The impact of the project within the community was noted.
19. Cook Street Village Activity Centre Society (New Horizons)	Only one objective, staff and volunteer levels on hand to support program. Strongly meets criteria with strength to maintain and evaluate success of a community kitchen.
20. Victoria Brain Injury Society	Clear objectives to train new peer supporters, and capacity to deliver program can be adjusted based on funding levels.
21. Victoria Rainbow Kitchen Society	Organizational capacity, project needs and the building of community resilience is strong. Project feasibility, work plan and outcomes are clearly outlined and adaptable.
22. Quadra Village Community Centre (/Downtown Blanshard Advisory)	Organizational capacity, project needs and the building of community resilience is strong. Project feasibility, work plan and outcomes are clearly outlined and adaptable.
23. Big Brothers Big Sisters of Victoria and Area ('Community Mentoring' program)	Large organization with long history in community and nationally. Large budget, success measurements well considered, lots of funders.
24. Fateh Care Charity Society	Small staff and volunteer hours. Partnerships with other orgs relevant. Few funding sources. Diversified funding. More success measures. Only 2. Quantifiable Food bank concept is not new, however, the novelty of this program is the service is mobile.
25. Cine-Vic Society of Independent Filmmakers	Organizational capacity, project needs and the building of community resilience is strong and clearly outlined. Project feasibility, work plan and outcomes are adaptable. The project has a small ask for substantial impact of investment.
26. Leadership Victoria Society	Organizational capacity, project needs and the building of community resilience is strong. Project feasibility, work plan and outcomes are clearly outlined and adaptable. The project being volunteer driven with quantifiable measurements is noted.
27. FED Urban Agriculture Society	Organizational capacity is strong. The project needs, the building of community resilience, work plan feasibility and outcomes are clearly outlined and adaptable. Partnerships and organization being primarily volunteer driven to support staff is noted.

28. University of Victoria (Application 2 - WITS Program)	Organizational capacity, project needs and the building of community resilience is strong. Project feasibility, work plan and outcomes are clearly outlined and adaptable.
29. Greater Victoria Volunteer Society 'dba' Volunteer Victoria	This application is a consortium of 30 member organizations. A need to seek additional funding sources than just the city is noted. Curious about the capacity of youth to be doing an audit of the organization in terms of how they will be supported through equity work and the likely increase/backlash of harm that accompanies anti-racist, anti-colonial work is noted.
30. Victoria Arts Council	Small organization that has diversified funding sources with clear objectives for program.
31. Silver Threads Service	The diversity of funding and the mix of staff and volunteers is a positive. The measurement of success and outcomes are strong. This organization seems to be able to have a worthwhile and meaningful impact for a modest investment
32. Crisis Intervention & Public Information Society of Greater Victoria 'dba' NEED2 Suicide Prevention Education & Support (School workshops program)	Large volunteer hours, good number of staff. Diverse funding. Success measures could be strong.
33. Bike Victoria Society (Formerly Greater Victoria Bike to Work Society*)	The applicant is an established organization with meaningful reach and impact. The project is one of the few applications around transportation.
34. Soap for Hope Canada Society (Formerly Disaster Aid Canada)	Diverse funding, and well detailed application with strong success measures.
35. The Diverters Foundation	Small staff and volunteer. Good success measures and diverse funding. The City of Victoria is the only funding source. Project has the potential to gentrify jobs and labour that accessible primarily to street connected peoples.
36. Farm to School BC (PHA Public Health Association of British Columbia)	Small staff and volunteer hours with few funding sources listed. Organization has listed partnerships with other orgs relevant.
37. Friends of Bowker Creek Society	All volunteer run, board is strong contributors in absence of no paid employees. Small grant request for celebration.
38. Victoria Disability Resource Centre	Organizational capacity is strong. Project needs and the building of community resilience is solid and best placed with strategic priority. Project

	feasibility, work plan and outcomes is clearly stated and adaptable.
39. Story Studio Writing Society (Story Studio)	Small grant request for innovative project idea. Mostly volunteer driven, and partners consulted for advice.
40. Life Cycles Project Society ('Establishing Strong Connections' Program)	Organizational capacity is strong as it is a known organization with good staff and volunteers. Project need, the building of community resilience and the work plan feasibility is stated generally. Work plan is not clearly stated or adaptable. Activity as outlined is the current service delivery model and not project specific. Diverse funding sources and partnerships is noted.
41. University of Victoria (Application 1 - Chair in Transgender Studies)	Organizational capacity is strong. Project needs and the building of community resilience is solid. Project feasibility, work plan and outcomes is clearly stated and adaptable. Deferred funding from prior year(s) needs to be expended.
42. Oaklands Community Association	Organizational capacity is strong. Project needs, the building of community resilience and work plan feasibility is stated broadly. Project outcomes lack specifics and activities are an extension of core operations.
43. Community First Foundation 'dba' Backpack Buddies	Organizational capacity and project needs is strong. Activities are an extension of core services. Building of community resilience is weak. Feasibility and work plan adaptability is questionable.
44. Downtown Victoria Business Association	All staff, no volunteers. Received 1.2 million in funding annually from city. Success measures light but quantifiable.
45. Vancouver Island School of Arts	Organizational capacity, project needs and the building of community resilience is solid. Project feasibility, work plan and outcomes is clearly stated and adaptable. Small staff and no volunteers. Low success measures. Smaller grant, but only city funding. Min 5k.
46. Alter Arts Society	The organization will not be able to carry our the deliverables without hiring someone. While various funders listed, most are pending. Objectives are light in their outcomes, and mostly creating baseline measurements. Organization has

	included approach. ERGC wonders whether volunteers have capacity to deliver the program.
47. Bayanihan Cultural and Housing Society 'dba' Bayanihan Community Centre	Primarily volunteer driven. Long history in community. Primarily funded by the city.
48. Human-Nature Counselling Society	Organizational capacity is strong. Project needs, and the building of community resilience is broadly stated. Project feasibility, work plan and outcomes is clearly stated and adaptable. Indication of staff and volunteers reasonable and diverse funding sources is noted.
49. Junior Achievement B.C (JABC)	Organizational capacity is strong, project needs and the building of community resilience is solid and clearly stated. Work plan feasibility is sound and adaptable with quantifiable success measures. A large staff and volunteer base with diverse funding sources is noted.
50. Agrarians Foundation 'dba' Young Agrarians	This is a well thought out proposal with diverse funding sources. The project objectives are well laid out.
51. Creating Community Wellness Society	Organization is all volunteer, no paid staff. Thorough application with strong success measures, All volunteer. City is only funder listed and suggest organization expand ask to other granters.
52. North Park Neighbourhood Association	Organizational capacity, project needs and the building of community resilience is fair. Work plan feasibility is stated generally and more details needed regarding its adaptability. Activities are an extension of core activities not project specific.
53. Balfour's Friends Foundation	Smaller grant request. Organization is all volunteer with long history in providing services. Various funders listed, and while low number of people impacted (5), project is seeking a modest investment with the potential to have meaningful impact
54. Victoria Innovation, Advanced Technology and Entrepreneurship Council (VIATEC)*	Organizational capacity is strong. Project needs, the building of community resilience and project feasibility is generally stated and more details needed in the "how". Work plan and outcomes need to be adjusted. Budget is not project specific.
55. Ocean Ambassadors Canada	Organizational capacity is fair. Project needs, the building of community resilience is solid and work

	plan feasibility is clearly stated. Work plan is adaptable and activities are project specific.
56. Ballet Victoria Society	This organization has a long history in delivering programs and marginalized communities are embedded within its programming. The project has a substantive reach including to communities and peoples who may not otherwise be able to access the ballet (i.e. 100,000 views.)
57. Fernwood Neighbourhood Resource Group Society	Large organization of staff and volunteers and diversified funding sources with strong success measures.
58. Sport of Life Society	Large staffing with minimal volunteers listed. Strong core funding, with success measures quantifiable.
59. KidSport Greater Victoria	Organizational capacity, the project needs and the building of community resilience is fair. Work plan feasibility is generally stated and its adaptability is questionable. Organization is mostly volunteer driven with diverse funding sources. Lots of objectives, measurements are light on quantifiable data.
60. The Proulx Global Education and Community Foundation	Organizational capacity is strong with ongoing programs. Project needs and the building of community resilience is weak. Work plan feasibility and adaptability needs more details. City of Victoria is noted as sole funder and annual budget is limited.
61. Pacifica Housing Advisory Association	Organizational capacity, the project needs and the building of community resilience is strong. Project feasibility, work plan and outcomes is clearly stated and adaptable.
62. Vancouver Island Counselling Centre for Immigrants and Refugees (VICCIR)	Organizational capacity is strong with the extension of existing services due to increased operational demand. More details are need regarding the work plan feasibility and outcomes as it is not clear. The long history of the organization along with the complement of staff and volunteers is noted.
63. The Victoria Youth Empowerment Society* (YES)	Organizational capacity is strong with the evident of an on-going program. Project needs and the building of community resilience as outlined is weak. Budget cost information is needed. Project

	feasibility, work plan and outcomes needs more details.
64. Victoria Literacy Connection Society	Organizational capacity is strong. Project needs and the building of community resilience is solid. Project feasibility, work plan and outcomes is clearly stated and adaptable. The impact of funding request in relation to the impact within the community is noted.
65. Living Edge Community	Organizational capacity, the project needs and the building of community resilience is strong. Work plan feasibility and outcomes is clearly stated and adaptable. The complement of staff and volunteers is noted in addition to diverse funding sources and existing partnerships is noted.
66. Wear2Start Society	Organizational capacity is strong. The project needs and the building of community resilience is solid. Work plan feasibility is clearly outlined and adaptable.
67. Victoria Community Health Cooperative	The city of Victoria is the only funder. Organization has a small staff that is mostly volunteer. The project outlines a small grant request. There is a potential for this project to duplicate already existing services and programs in the CRD.
68. Worker Solidarity Network	Organizational capacity, the project needs and the building of community resilience is strong. Project feasibility, work plan and outcomes is clearly stated and adaptable.
69. Seniors Serving Seniors Association of BC	Project application note mostly volunteers with diverse funding source. The project success measures seem somewhat light.
70. Chinese Community Services Center of Victoria	Organizational capacity, the project needs and the building of community resilience is strong. Project feasibility, work plan and outcomes is clearly stated and adaptable. The impact of funding request in relation to the impact within the community is noted.
71. Capital Region Food Share Network Society	Organizational capacity, the project needs and the building of community resilience is generally stated. The work plan feasibility and its outcomes require clarity and more information.
72. Big Brothers Big Sisters of Victoria and Area ('Big Impact' program)	Large organization with long history in community and nationally. Large budget, success measurements well considered, less funders for this program. Community Mentoring is a stronger

	program, suggest focus on objectives of business development and partners.
73. Peninsula Streams Society	Organizational capacity is strong. Project needs and the building of community resilience is broadly stated. Project feasibility, work plan and outcomes are outlined with other funding sources noted.
74. Threshold Housing Society	Organizational capacity is strong. More information and clarify is needed regarding the project needs and the building of community resilience. Costs are ongoing salary and/or operational and not project specific. Work plan feasibility and outcomes are stated broadly and it's adaptability limited. The complement of staff, the level of existing core funding and partnerships is noted.
75. Stigma-Free Society (Formerly Bipolar Disorder Society of BC)	Diverse core funding with well considering success measures. A large percentage of people accessing the program do not reside in the CRD. The funding approach and the connection to the K-12 School district is noted. The organization should consider working through the provincial government.
76. Victoria Compost and Conservation Education Society (Compost Education Centre)*	The application notes diverse funding sources with the project objectives and outcomes of success very detailed. There is a lack of information about the role that the city plays in this partnership and how they will be included in its creation and application.
77. Community Options for Children and Families	Organizational capacity is strong, the project needs and the building of community resilience is solid. Project feasibility, work plan and outcomes is clearly stated and adaptable.
78. Victoria Coalition for Survivors of Torture	Small staff and partners. The committee recognized that there was not a tangible centering of survivors in the proposed program.
79. Synergy Sustainability Institute	Strong and diverse core funding. Success measures and articulation of program are well understood. Most of the application is toward R&D (Research and Development) including the minimum funding level. What level of funding is provided by businesses in the sector? Is any business in these emerging sectors leaders and could take on some of the R&D costs.



80. Society for Kids at Tennis (KATS)	Application notes large staff but no volunteers. Success measures quantifiable. Organization notes program will move forward if not in receipt of project funding.
81. Mental Health Society of Greater Victoria	More information and clarity is need regarding the organizational capacity, the project needs and the building of community resilience. More information on the work plan and it's outcomes to determine feasibility and adaptability. Product development not a service delivery. Potential for this project to be duplicative and misaligned with needs of service users – information not accessible to those who are street connected.
82. Victoria Women's Transition House Society (VWTH)	Organizational capacity, the project needs and the building of community resilience is solid. Project feasibility, work plan and outcomes is clearly stated and adaptable.
83. Umbrella Society for Addictions and Mental Health	Organizational capacity, the project needs and the building of community resilience is strong. Project feasibility, work plan and outcomes is clearly stated and adaptable.
84. Victoria Supply Creative Reuse Society	Organizational capacity, the project needs and the building of community resilience is generally stated. More information and clarity on the work plan and it's outcomes to determine feasibility is needed. Work plan seems to be ambitious with other funding sources needing to be confirmed.
85. Theatre SKAM Association	Organizational capacity is strong with the continuing program. The project needs and the building of community resilience as outlined is strong. Project feasibility, work plan and outcomes is clearly stated and adaptable.
86. Capital Region Food and Agriculture Initiative Roundtable Society	Organizational capacity, the project needs and the building of community resilience is stated generally. Project feasibility, work plan and outcomes is broadly outlined and its adaptability limited.
87. Action Committee of People with Disabilities	The grant request is approximately 20% of the total budget for the Strategic Plan Grants for 2022, and is about 50% of the total project budget with even larger percentage when removing volunteer (in kind) contribution, and 33% of the annual budget with a small PT staffing. ERGC could not find meaningful way to pair down grant request in line with other funding recommendations to fund

	a portion of the request. Suggest having partners more listed and involved and sharing budgets across all partners.
88. Together Against Poverty Society	Organizational capacity, the project needs and the building of community resilience is strong. Ongoing/operational salary is project specific. Project feasibility, work plan and outcomes is clearly stated and adaptable. City of Victoria is the only funding source noted.
89. Greater Victoria Acting Together	Organizational capacity, the project needs and the building of community resilience is clearly outlined. Project specific. Full operations budget not provided and duplicate administrative costs noted. The complement of staff and volunteers seem reasonable and youth led. City of Victoria is noted as the only funding source.
90. Canadian Orca Rescue Society	More details and clarity is required on the organizational capacity, project needs and the building of community resilience. Product development rather than a service delivery and measurable are not quantifiable.

## **SUGGESTIONS TO IMPROVE FUNDING AND REVIEW PROCESS**

---

The ERGC is proposing the following recommendations to improve the effectiveness of the Strategic Plan Funding Grant Program.

### **Recommendations for City Council**

1. Establish a working committee that includes representation from the ERGC to work with the City to review and update the Grant Policy to incorporate any recommended changes and policy updates such as equitable committee representation, updated terms of reference, etc.
2. Determine 3 or 4 (as opposed to 8) strategic priorities valued by council. The difference between the top and bottom weighting and thus prioritizing of the topics means that effectively, the bottom priorities are not possibility eligible for funding, even if receiving full marks from the EGRC. This means that organizations, city staff and EGRC members spend valuable time on applications which will never be funded. This also sets up false expectation from non-profits in the CRD and has the potential to create resentment and frustration from grant applicants.
3. Establish a cap on funding requests at 30,000 and increase the allocation of funds to align with increased demand (**90 applications** vs. 67 last year)

### **Recommendations for City Staff (as directed by Council)**

#### Logistics

1. Adjust the process used to determine allocations including extending the time allotted to the EGRC to adjudicate, discuss and review applications. The time pressure impacted the health and well-being of committee members as there was not adequate time to support the intentional building of the committee as a container for challenging and important dialogue. This includes having meetings specifically attributed to the roles and responsibilities of committee members, the opportunity for members to self-locate and share the lenses with which they come at this work and mutual agreement and buy in regarding decision making processes, shared values and approaches and access needs. The lack of adequate time directly impacts the diligence given to funding allotments.
2. Create a package of materials which will be used throughout the EGRC adjudication process to deliver to all EGRC members during the first meeting including a walkthrough with the opportunity to engage with, challenge and refine the established frameworks
3. Offer in-person opportunities for EGRC to connect as videoconferencing is not accessible for all

## Communication

1. Coordinated by city staff, the Grant Policy, the prior year's review process including ERGC recommendations and the status of reporting on the funding of prior year funding be reviewed by the ERGC prior to beginning the new year process
2. Communicate and determine the role(s) of city staff in the grant review process including scope, capacity to offer advice, support and role
3. Increase transparency and intention put into scheduling of EGRC meetings including participation from all members, understanding of anti-oppression/anti-racist principles and practices, clear and definitive deadlines for response and rational for decision making processes
4. Meaningfully involve the Staff appointed to the ERGC in the policy call out / information sessions with the general public and document and share this information at the start of the review process.

## Application Updates

1. Change the wording to the question on volunteerism from “How many volunteer staff at organization?” to How many ongoing/active volunteers do you have? To align with policy
2. Add question on application to justify selection of strategic plan objective to ensure appropriate weighted scoring, such as “please provide a brief rational regarding the primary strategic plan objective selected in the previous question”
3. Adjust the language of the questions regarding funding levels to  
Does your project require full funding or will scope be reduced depending on what is awarded?  
 Full Funding Required  Project Scope Will Be Reduced  
Even with a reduced project scope, is there a minimum funding required from the City of Victoria to successfully implement the project?  
Please indicate that amount and any rationale to support this

**Please see Appendix A for the EGRC’s list of working recommendations and suggestions for future committees.**

## **RECOMMENDATIONS TO COUNCIL**

---

The External Grant Review Committee makes the following recommendations to Council:

1. Approve the Grants and amounts proposed in Table 1, above.
2. Review, discuss and approve recommendations to improve the Strategic Plan Grant program.

## **APPENDIX A: Working Recommendations for EGRC Members**

---

1. A review of the funding methodology is recommended. Considerations for the decision to fund should be based on the merit of a project application as opposed in comparison to other project applications.
2. Funding methodology be determined, understood and agreed to prior to the review process.
3. The application review process be determined, understood and agreed to prior to the review process including the use of working documents.
4. The assignment of the roles of the committee members be determined and the assigned tasks, where possible at the outset of the review process.
5. The status of prior year project funding and its reporting is a consideration in assessment of current year applications.
6. A consistent lens be applied when reviewing the applications such as a collective review of a sample of 5 applications by all committee members in attendance in order to acquire a consistent lens prior for conducting individual reviews or a similar approach.
7. Select a project management software tool to support the logistics and work of the committee and reduce the use of e-mails as the main correspondence mechanism
8. Reduce length of meetings from 4 hours to 2 hours and provide detailed agendas to support committee members to do the necessary preparatory work.
9. A few more meetings at the beginning of the process to get to know one another before deciding on who may chair the committee, what methodology and approach to use and what the criteria will be when coming to decisions would be supportive