Ministry for Pacific Peoples
Te Manatū mō ngā Iwi ō te Moana-nui-ā-Kiwa

# Appendix C: Assessment matrix and scoring bands

## C1. Language revitalisation outcomes (30%)

| Score | Descriptor | Evidence standard |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Poor | Little or no evidence of language learning or increased use. |
| 2 | Adequate | Some language outcomes, but weak links or limited opportunities. |
| 3 | Good | Clear outcomes and reasonable opportunities to learn, practise or use the language. |
| 4 | Very good | Strong outcomes with regular, meaningful learning and use. |
| 5 | Excellent | Compelling evidence connecting learning, regular use and intergenerational transmission. |

## C2. Community-led and culturally grounded design (15%)

| Score | Descriptor | Evidence standard |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Poor | Little evidence of community priorities or involvement. |
| 2 | Adequate | Some consultation, but involvement is limited or symbolic. |
| 3 | Good | Community needs are clear and members contribute to design or delivery. |
| 4 | Very good | Speakers, elders or leaders have meaningful roles and the initiative responds well to need. |
| 5 | Excellent | The language community leads design and delivery, reflecting its values and aspirations. |

## C3. Sustainability and ongoing language use (10%)

| Score | Descriptor | Evidence standard |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Poor | Benefits are unlikely to continue after funding. |
| 2 | Adequate | Some benefits may continue, but ongoing use is limited. |
| 3 | Good | Some ongoing use, reusable resources or stronger skills are likely. |
| 4 | Very good | Clear plans support ongoing learning, resource use or partnerships. |
| 5 | Excellent | Lasting language use, stronger capability and long-term benefits are highly credible. |

## C4. Youth and intergenerational engagement (10%)

| Score | Descriptor | Evidence standard |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Poor | Little evidence of youth or intergenerational involvement. |
| 2 | Adequate | Involvement is present but limited. |
| 3 | Good | Meaningful opportunities exist to participate together. |
| 4 | Very good | Strong involvement is built into delivery. |
| 5 | Excellent | Young people lead or strong language transmission between generations is embedded. |

## C5. Capability (20%)

| Score | Descriptor | Evidence standard |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Poor | No evidence of relevant delivery capability. |
| 2 | Adequate | Limited experience and significant delivery concerns. |
| 3 | Good | Relevant experience and a realistic delivery plan. |
| 4 | Very good | Strong experience and evidence of successful similar delivery. |
| 5 | Excellent | Extensive experience, strong delivery record and continuous improvement. |

## C6. Budget (10%)

| Score | Descriptor | Evidence standard |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Poor | No budget or an unsuitable budget. |
| 2 | Adequate | Important costs may be missing or ineligible; value is unclear. |
| 3 | Good | Adequate budget and reasonable value for money. |
| 4 | Very good | Clear budget and good value for money. |
| 5 | Excellent | Complete, well-supported budget and excellent value for money. |

## C7. Timeframe (5%)

| Score | Descriptor | Evidence standard |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Poor | No timeline or it cannot meet requirements. |
| 2 | Adequate | Timeline lacks enough detail to demonstrate delivery. |
| 3 | Good | Timeline meets requirements. |
| 4 | Very good | Detailed and realistic timeline meets requirements. |
| 5 | Excellent | Complete, well-planned timeline covers all milestones and requirements. |