



First Nations Health Authority  
Health through wellness

# Proposal Scoring Criteria



## 1. Scoring criteria & weights

Each application will be evaluated based on five main criteria, weighted as follows:

Evaluation category	Weights (%)
Project relevance & alignment	25%
Project design & feasibility	20%
Cultural & community integration	15%
Impact & sustainability	20%
Organizational capacity & readiness	20%

Total Score: **100 Points**

## 2. Scoring scales

Each section will be rated using a **5-point scale**, where:

- 1 = Poor (Not aligned, vague, or incomplete)
- 2 = Fair (Somewhat aligned, but weakly developed)
- 3 = Good (Meets basic expectations, clear but lacks strong details)
- 4 = Very Good (Well-developed and strong alignment)
- 5 = Excellent (Highly detailed, well thought-out, and strongly aligned with program goals)

## 3. Evaluation breakdown by sections

### A. Project relevance & alignment (25%)

- Does the project directly address the focus areas? (Q10, Q11)
- How well does it respond to the HIV situation and challenges in the community? (Q12, Q13, Q14)
- Does the project align with community needs? (Q22)

**Scoring:**

- 1-2 points:** Project does not align with the funding focus areas
- 3 points:** Project partially aligns but lacks strong justification
- 4-5 points:** Project strongly aligns and clearly justifies its need

### B. Project Design & Feasibility (20%)

- Are the project objectives SMART and tied to the identified needs? (Q19, Q20)
- Are the proposed activities well-defined and realistic? (Q23, Q24, Q25, Q26)
- Will the project utilize any technology/innovation in any phase of the project (Q27)
- Does the applicant have a detailed work plan and timeline? (Q28, Q30)

**Scoring:**

- 1-2 points:** Vague or unrealistic goals, missing clear plans
- 3 points:** Somewhat clear objectives, but activities need improvement
- 4-5 points:** Well-structured, feasible, and detailed plan

### C. Cultural & Community Integration (15%)

- Does the project incorporate Indigenous cultural knowledge and practices? (Q25, Q26)
- How will the project engage the target community? (Q21, Q22, Q26)
- Does the applicant demonstrate an understanding of Indigenous cultural, social, and geographic contexts? (Q17)

#### Scoring:

- **1-2 points:** Limited or no cultural relevance
- **3 points:** Some engagement but needs better integration
- **4-5 points:** Strong cultural components and community engagement

### D. M&E, impact & sustainability (20%)

- How will the project measure success and improve program implementation? (Q33, Q35)
- Are key performance indicators (KPIs) well-defined? (Q34)
- Does the project have a plan for long-term sustainability? (Q37, Q38)

#### Scoring:

- **1-2 points:** No clear evaluation or sustainability plan
- **3 points:** Some monitoring and sustainability strategies
- **4-5 points:** Well-defined impact measurement and sustainability plan

### E. Organizational capacity & readiness (20%)

- Does the organization have experience with similar projects? (Q39, Q41)
- Is there a team in place to implement the project? (Q29, Q40)
- Are financial accountability and risk management plans in place? (Q31, Q32, Q42, Q43)

#### Scoring:

- **1-2 points:** Weak experience, lack of team, no risk/financial planning
- **3 points:** Some relevant experience but needs more planning
- **4-5 points:** Strong experience, well-staffed, and good risk/financial planning

## 4. Evaluating open-ended questions

For open-ended responses, scoring will follow a content analysis approach, assessing:

- **Clarity & coherence:** Is the response clear and logically structured?
- **Relevance:** Does it directly address the question?
- **Depth & specificity:** Does it provide examples, data, or detailed reasoning?

## 5. Scoring guide for open-ended questions (Used in Sections A-E):

Each section will be rated using a **5-point scale**, where:

**1** = Off-topic or very weak response

**2** = Vague or incomplete, missing key details

**3** = Partially relevant, lacks depth or specific examples

**4** = Mostly detailed and relevant, but minor gaps in clarity or depth

**5** = Highly detailed, well-structured, clear, and directly relevant response

#### Examples:

##### Q12: How would you describe the current HIV situation in your community?

- **1-2 points:** Broad statements with no real insight
- **3 points:** General mentions of challenges but lacks specific examples
- **4-5 points:** Provides data, describes specific issues like stigma, testing access, or specific barriers

##### Q20: What are the main objectives of your project?

- **1-2 points:** Vague goals without a clear plan
- **3 points:** General objectives without specific metrics
- **4-5 points:** SMART objectives with clear targets (e.g., "Conduct 10 workshops with 300 participants, achieving 75% knowledge improvement in 6 months.")

## 6. Ranking applications & selection process

After scoring all responses, applications will be ranked based on their total scores.

- **Top-scoring applications (80-100 points):** Strongly aligned, well-planned projects. **Priority funding.**
- **Mid-tier applications (60-79 points):** Meets criteria but needs some improvements. **Consider for funding with minor revisions.**
- **Low-scoring applications (Below 60 points):** Weak alignment or feasibility issues. **Not recommended for funding.**

## 7. Final considerations

**Tiebreaker criteria:** If multiple applications have similar scores, preference will be given to:

1. Projects serving high-need communities (based on Q12, Q13)
2. Applications demonstrating strong community engagement (Q17, Q27)
3. Projects with well-defined impact measurement plans (Q38, Q39)

# Proposal Scoring Criteria