Scoring Matrix

The scoring matrix including review criteria, score of high, medium or low and weighting of score.

Review Criteria	High (4-5)	Medium (2-3)	Low (0-1)	Weighting of score
Target Population Section 2, Q5	• Target population(s) are appropriate for the proposed project • Clearly identifies intent to serve Indigenous peoples	• Target population (s) are somewhat appropriate for the proposed project • Somewhat identifies intent to serve Indigenous peoples	• Target population (s) are not sufficient for the proposed project • Does not identify intent to serve Indigenous peoples	5
Project summary Section 3, Q2	• Clearly describes what the project will do and how it aligns with the corresponding Areas of Focus outlined in the strategy	• Somewhat describes what the project will do and how it aligns with the corresponding Areas of Focus outlined in the strategy	• Does not describe what the project will do or how it aligns with the corresponding Areas of Focus outlined in the strategy	5
Service Access, Coordination and Capacity Section 3, Q4	• Ways to increase **service access** are identified (e.g., access to services through community hubs or mobile clinics and relationships with staff at existing hubs) • Ways to increase **service coordination** are identified (e.g., opportunities to coordinate services to	• Ways to increase **service access** are somewhat identified • Ways to increase **service coordination** are somewhat identified • Ways to increase **capacity** are somewhat identified	• Ways to increase **service access** are not identified • Ways to increase **service coordination** are not identified • Ways to increase **capacity** are not identified	10

Review Criteria	High (4-5)	Medium (2-3)	Low (0-1)	Weighting of score
	address other areas of focus • Ways to **increase capacity** are identified e.g., services that provide peer support, social prescriptions, ways to increase social connectivity or referral pathways established with other service agencies			
Leveraging the voices of lived expertise Section 3, Q5	• Clearly identifies how community members with lived expertise helped shape the proposal • Clearly identifies how people with lived expertise will help co-create the project • Clearly identifies opportunities to integrate peer support models into existing community work • Clearly describes how the organization will develop respectful and meaningful relationships with the Indigenous community and ensure	• Somewhat identifies how community members with lived expertise helped shape the proposal • Somewhat identifies how people with lived expertise will help co-create the project • Somewhat identifies how opportunities to integrate peer support models into existing community work • Somewhat describes how the organization will develop respectful and meaningful relationships with the Indigenous community and ensure	• Little to no identification of how community members with lived expertise helped shape the proposal • Little to no identification of how people with lived expertise will help co-create the project • Little to no identification of opportunities to integrate peer support models into existing community work • Little to no identification of how the organization will develop respectful and meaningful	10

Review Criteria	High (4-5)	Medium (2-3)	Low (0-1)	Weighting of score
	representation in projects, services and committees that is reflective of the local Indigenous community	representation in projects, services and committees that is reflective of the local Indigenous community	relationships with the Indigenous community and ensure representation in projects, services and committees that is reflective of the local Indigenous community	
Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Section 3, Q6	• Clearly identifies how Diversity, Equity and Inclusion will be integrated into project design to ensure services meet the needs of specific populations and into hiring and training practices to make services inclusive, culturally safe and equitable	• Somewhat identifies how Diversity, Equity and Inclusion will be integrated into project design to ensure services meet the needs of specific populations and into hiring and training practices to make services inclusive, culturally safe and equitable	• Little or no identification of how Diversity, Equity and Inclusion will be integrated into project design to ensure services meet the needs of specific populations and into hiring and training practices to make services inclusive, culturally safe and equitable	5
Changing mindsets Section 3, Q7	• Clearly identifies ways to help people better understand the experience of poverty and the role they can play	• Somewhat identifies ways to help people better understand the experience of poverty and the role they can play	• Little or no identification of ways to help people better understand the experience of poverty and the role they can play	5
Championing income solutions to poverty Section 3, Q8	• Clearly identifies ways to support key messaging around the need for	• Somewhat identifies ways to support key messaging around the	• Little or no identification of ways to support key messaging around the	5

Review Criteria	High (4-5)	Medium (2-3)	Low (0-1)	Weighting of score
	income solutions to end poverty	need for income solutions to end poverty	need for income solutions to end poverty	
Leveraging local assets Section 3, Q9	• Clearly describes how existing working groups or networks informed the proposal and how the proposed project aligns with their priorities and complements their services • Clearly identifies local service clubs and associations the applicant will engage with to help implement and sustain the proposed project • Clearly demonstrates why the applicant is best positioned to deliver the proposed project (e.g., track record of success, capacity or unique position to serve target population, long-standing partnerships which provide additional benefits to service delivery)	• Somewhat describes how existing working groups or networks informed the proposal and how the proposed project aligns with their priorities and complements their services • Somewhat identifies local service clubs and associations the applicant will engage with to help implement and sustain the proposed project • Somewhat demonstrates why the applicant is best positioned to deliver the proposed project • Somewhat identifies how alternate forms of funding will be pursued to sustain the project	• Little to no description of how existing working groups or networks informed the proposal and how the proposed project aligns with their priorities and complements their services • Little to no identification of local service clubs and associations the applicant will engage with to help implement and sustain the proposed project • Little to no demonstration of why the applicant is best positioned to deliver the proposed project • Little to know identification of how alternate forms of funding will be pursued to sustain the project	10

Review Criteria	High (4-5)	Medium (2-3)	Low (0-1)	Weighting of score
	• Clearly identifies how alternate forms of funding will be pursued to sustain the project (e.g., develop business case or submit other funding applications)			
Project Collaborations Section 4	• Partnerships include all those referenced in the project description under "Agency key activities" • Significant in-kind contributions are identified across the project lifecycle (e.g., project co-design, co-delivery of services and co-evaluation) and values are reasonable • All partnerships identified are established • Letters of support are provided from all identified partners	• Partnerships include at least one referenced in the project description under "Agency key activities" • Some in-kind contributions are identified at one or more stages of the project lifecycle and values are somewhat reasonable • Partnerships identified are a mix of established vs. under development • Letters of support are provided from at least one identified partner	• Partnerships do not include any referenced in the project description under "Agency key activities" • No in-kind contributions are identified • All partnerships identified are under development. • No letters of support are provided	10
Budget Section 5	• Budget is specific and realistic (e.g., salaries are justified based on qualifications	• Budget is somewhat specific and realistic, but requires further clarity • Budget is somewhat aligned with project activities required to	• Budget is incomplete, lacks clarity or is unrealistic • Admin cost is over 10 per cent of total budget	15

Review Criteria	High (4-5)	Medium (2-3)	Low (0-1)	Weighting of score
	• Admin cost does not exceed 10 per cent of total budget • Budget is clearly aligned with project activities required to deliver the project and achieve and outcomes (e.g., staff training, space, equipment, honorariums, transportation or food costs to support participation)	deliver the project and achieve and outcomes	• Budget lacks alignment with project activities required to deliver the project and achieve and outcomes	
Work Plan Section 6	• Activities include all "Agency Key Activities" listed in the project descriptions • Tasks are realistic and clearly linked to activities (e.g., recruit participants, conduct assessments, deliver intervention, measure results) • Targets include all requested outputs e.g., # of participants and outcomes identified in project descriptions • Targets are achievable, specific and measurable	• Activities include some of the "Agency Key Activities" listed in the project descriptions • Tasks are somewhat realistic and linked to activities • Targets include most of the requested outputs and outcomes identified in project descriptions • Some targets are achievable, specific and measurable • Evaluation methods are somewhat aligned with	• Activities do not include any of the "Agency Key Activities" listed in the project descriptions • Tasks are not realistic or are not linked to activities • Targets include few or no outputs and outcomes identified in project descriptions • Targets are not achievable, specific and measurable • Evaluation methods are limited or absent from the workplan	20

Review Criteria	High (4-5)	Medium (2-3)	Low (0-1)	Weighting of score
	• Evaluation methods are aligned with the targets they are intended to measure • There is a clear link between the work plan and other components of the application • Overall, the work plan demonstrates a clear approach to implementation	the targets they are intended to measure • There is a clear link between most elements of the work plan and other components of the application • Overall, the work plan demonstrates a somewhat clear approach to implementation	• There are missing links between the work plan and other components of the application • Overall, the work plan does not demonstrate a clear approach to implementation	