

Vellayan Community Fund Evaluation Criteria

Assessment Criteria	What reviewers should assess
Background (10%)	Clearly describes the community/public health problem, its magnitude and relevance, and the evidence gap that the proposed project intends to address. The background should demonstrate why the issue is important to the target community and provide appropriate supporting evidence.
Objectives (10%)	Objectives are clear, specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound (SMART). The objectives should directly address the identified community problem and be logically aligned with the proposed methodology, outputs and expected impact.
Methodology (15%)	Provides a clear and appropriate study design, target population/community, sampling strategy, intervention or activities, data collection methods, outcome measures and data analysis. The methodology should be scientifically sound, ethically appropriate, culturally/community appropriate, and sufficiently detailed to achieve the stated objectives.
Significance of Output / Benefit to the Community (25%)	Demonstrates how the expected outputs will provide direct and meaningful benefits to the participating community. Consider relevance to community needs, improvement in knowledge or practices, reduction of health risks, acceptability of interventions, empowerment of participants, and potential usefulness of findings to community health programmes.
Measurable Societal Impact / Return on Investment (15%)	Demonstrates quantifiable benefits arising from the project relative to the resources invested. Assessment may include measurable changes in health-risk exposure, KAP, intervention uptake/adherence, community participation, cost per participant protected, cost per outcome achieved, or potential savings from improved prevention. Projects should identify clear indicators and, where possible, establish baseline and post-intervention measurements.
Feasibility (10%)	Assesses whether the project can realistically be completed within the proposed time, budget and available resources. Consider availability of personnel, expertise, equipment, community access, recruitment, stakeholder support, logistics, ethical approval, risk management and the practicality of implementing the proposed activities in the community.
Scientific Merit (15%)	Assesses the quality, rigour and originality of the research. The study should have a sound conceptual basis, appropriate study design, valid and reliable measurements, suitable statistical analysis, and potential to generate credible and reproducible evidence. The project should demonstrate an appropriate balance between scientific rigour and community applicability.