

## **NADP Adjudication Guidelines**

### Introduction

- Attention to detail in writing project applications, adjudication and final reports is very important for several reasons:
  - First, the NADP must withstand the rigorous audit scrutiny under the accountability requirements adopted by the federal government. It must also stand-up to program review and evaluation by Treasury Board under the Policy on Transfer Payments. We must be able to prove the results we say we achieved, assess performance against those results, and thereby demonstrate program efficiency, effectiveness, and value for money. This has to be done in such a way that all the information and activities will be transparent to people without any knowledge or affinity to archives, no willingness to give the benefit of the doubt to applicants, and whose job is almost predisposed to finding problems, errors and inconsistencies.
  - Second, we need to indicate the amount of direct and in-kind investment made by other partners in this cost-shared program;
  - Third, we need to demonstrate clearly how Canada's national archival collection is a shared cultural resource that is used by the federal government, is relevant to and benefits Canadians and therefore, the federal government, in partnership with provincial and territorial governments, has a role to play in sustaining the infrastructure needed to preserve and make available Canada's documentary heritage to Canadians; and
  - Consequently, show that the NADP objectives, outcomes and funding are a priority and a responsibility that the federal government shares with other jurisdictions.

### Adjudication Records and Documentation

- Adjudicating bodies must fully document in writing the reasons for an assigned score, and rank projects according to their outcomes and the extent to which they contribute towards achieving the objective under which each application is submitted, using the adjudication scoring grid.
- Only one scoring grid, containing the average of all adjudicators' score and the score explanations, need to be submitted to CCA per project.
- If an adjudicating body wishes to modify in any way the applicant's proposal, it should be mentioned on the adjudication grid that the applicant is aware and agreeable to the change.
- All original applications must be forwarded to the CCA Secretariat, including the applications recommended for funding and those approved but for which no funding is available. Please note that adjudication bodies must not write on an original application unless it is clearly stated that the change has been approved by the applicant.

- Adjudicating bodies should provide a list that identifies clearly the ranking of the applications and specify if the applications are recommended for funding, approved but with no funding available, or not approved. [A template in Excel format is available at [http://www.cdncouncilarchives.ca/NADP\\_10-11.html](http://www.cdncouncilarchives.ca/NADP_10-11.html)]
- Copy of the minutes of the adjudication meeting including a motion recommending the applications for funding must be sent to the CCA Secretariat (the titles of the approved applications must be included in the motion).

### Adjudication Process

- Adjudication bodies should use the scoring grid for the current year. Modifications might occur from year to year.
- Adjudication bodies must make certain that the total funding requested by their council and their member-institutions does not exceed the provincial/territorial allocation.
- Applications submitted by a council must not be adjudicated by the provincial adjudication body. There should be no scoring grid associated with those applications, nor should they be ranked.
- The representative signing the application on behalf of its council cannot sign an application submitted by the institution where he/she is employed or serves as a volunteer.
- Applications must be adjudicated under the objective the applicant has agreed to even though it may not be the best fit. For example, an applicant might insist on submitting a project proposal under objective #1 for arrangement and description of materials addressing Objective #3. In this situation, the project application must be adjudicated under objective 1 and not objective 3 even though it may negatively affect the application's score.
- Applications that do not fit under an objective should be rejected.
- Applications should be scored fairly and consistently. A superior project that proposes doing almost the same thing as an inferior project must be scored higher.
- Adjudication bodies should assign scores that are consistent with the adjudication criteria.
- All members of an adjudication body must use only one set of adjudication criteria under the objective a project application is submitted, choosing the most relevant one for the content of the project.
- Project applications must be adjudicated according to:
  - How well their outcomes match the adjudication criteria, national and local priorities, and how well they help make progress towards achieving the objective under which each is submitted; and
  - Whether the financial match meets the NADP requirements.
- Project applications should **not** be adjudicated according to:
  - The size of the institution. Institutions with more staff or more highly paid staff may be in a better position to provide a match but it does not mean that their project outcomes are better;

- The amount of funding requested. Projects should be scored and ranked according to which ones produce the best outcomes regardless of whether the amount of funding requested is large or small; and
- The size or scope of the project. Projects should be scored and ranked according to which ones produce better outcomes regardless of project size or scope.
- If an institution has previously received funding for a NADP project (unless the applicant is considered “delinquent” in reporting or project execution)
- Funding should be allocated based only on merit (i.e., the relevance and impact of a project’s results measured in terms of the contribution it makes towards achieving a NADP objective).
- Archival projects submitted under objective 4 are to be carefully scrutinized with a view to funding proposals that make strategic and developmental progress against the objective.

#### Reviewing Application Content – Things to Consider

- Applications should be adjudicated based on the information included in the application form only and not based on the personal knowledge or archival interpretive skills of the adjudicators.
- Adjudicators should ensure that the applications are complete. Previously, missing pieces of information have included:
  - Proof of legal status
  - Attachments
  - Original signature from the applicant (photocopies of the signed application are not accepted)
  - Original signature from the council’s representative in the grey section appearing on the last page of the application – except for applications submitted by the council
  - Sections not completed
  - Indication of cash or in-kind contribution (C/I), or confirmed or pending (C/P) in the budget sheets
- Adjudicators should insure that all important information is written on the application.

#### For objective 1:

- Extent of material
- Inclusive dates
- Standards that will be used
- Confirmation that descriptions will be uploaded to ARCHIVESCANADA.ca

#### For objective 2:

- Copyright ownership on articles, films, etc.

- Projects that have a main focus of arrangement and description should be applied under objective 1 even if awareness activities are involved.

For objective 3:

- Arrangement and description of materials concerning aboriginal holdings should be under this objective, not objective #1.

For objective 5:

- Standards used
- Are the preservation activities based on a global preservation assessment's recommendations?

For all applications:

- Adjudicators should pay particular attention to budget sheets. Calculation errors are a simple and common mistake.
- Project administration costs cannot exceed 15% of the project's total other costs. To calculate the maximum allowed for project management costs, go to Table B2. Add all costs, NADP and applicant contribution, excluding Line 9 - Project Management. Multiply the total by 15%. This is the maximum amount you may allocate towards Project Management.
- Ensure that the payment schedule reflects the timeline.
- If applicable, please verify that GST payable is included within the project costs. If the organization expects to receive a rebate (in part or in whole), the net amount of GST payable for an expense should have been identified by the organization.
- Ensure that the 50% match is respected for institutions that are not volunteer-based.
- Capital purchases should be made in applications from the institution that will receive the item, rather than as part of a broader Council application.