Funding Rationale Over the Years (2018 – 2021)

City Enrichment Fund

2018 Funding Rationale

Application Final Rating	Returning Programs	New Programs
Rating greater than 79	2% increase over 2017.1	100% of Funding Request. ²
60 ≤ Rating ≥ 79	Maintain 2017 funding level. ¹	75% of funding Request. ²
Rating less than 60	Funding not Recommended.	Funding not Recommended ³ .

¹ 2016 funding levels honoured for Sports and Active Lifestyle.

2019 Funding Rationale

Application Final Rating	Returning Programs	New Programs
Rating greater than 79	2% increase over 2018.	100% of funding request. 1
60 ≤ Rating ≥ 79	Maintain 2018 funding level.	70% of funding request. ¹
Rating less than 60	Funding not recommended.	Funding not recommended.

¹ Contingent upon funds remaining in program envelope

Note: Returning and new programs were prioritized over program expansion requests within the respective program envelope

² Contingent upon funds remaining in program envelope.

³ Applicants in the *Arts – Creation and Presentation* stream received funding if they scored greater than or equal to 70.

Phased Approach due to Covid: 2020 and 2021 (Revised funding years)

2020 Proposed Funding Rationale

Application Final Rating	Returning Programs	New Programs
Score of 80 and Above	2% increase over 2019.	75 % of funding request.1*
Score of 60 -79	Maintain 2019 funding base.	50% of funding request.1*
Rating less than 60	Funding not recommended.	Funding not recommended.

¹ Contingent upon funds remaining in program envelope *Applicants in Arts – Creation & Presentation Stream received funding based on 2019 funding rationale

Note: Returning and new programs were prioritized over program expansion requests within the respective program envelope

2021 Proposed Funding Rationale

Based on 2020 Status	Returning Programs
No Change (to 2020 funding levels)	Maintain 2020 Levels
Modified & Cancelled	Based on 2019 Levels

Application Final Rating	New Programs
Score of 80 and Above	75 % of funding request.1*
Score of 60 -79	50% of funding request.1 *
Rating less than 60	Funding not recommended.

¹ Contingent upon funds remaining in program envelope and achieving a passing score.

Note: Returning and new programs were prioritized over program expansion requests within the respective program envelope