

SCHEDULE 1

Appendix I

Evaluation Criteria for Annual Selection Process

The parties may, by mutual agreement, modify or add to the evaluation criteria and/or amend the points system for ranking Applications. Following the first year of the ASP, the Evaluation Committee may make recommendations to the Government and the BCMA for changes in the Application Form or the Evaluation Criteria.

Criteria	Descriptor	Maximum Rating Available	Evaluation Committee Member Rating	Scoring Guide - Degree to which the Application clearly demonstrates, in a measurable fashion, that it meets the evaluation criteria
A. Solution - Patients		Total = 100		
Maintains or improves access to medical services by patients (1.(b))	The availability of medical services to the patient population served	15		Up to 33% of maximum points available Maintains or minimally improves access to medical services
Maintains or improves quality of medical services to patients (1.(b))	Positive patient experience and evidence based improved health outcomes to patients	15		34% - 66% of maximum points available Moderately improves access to medical services
Maintains or increases quantity of medical services to patients (1.(b))	Maintains or adds value by increasing patient services	10		67% - 100% of maximum points available Significantly improves access to medical services

<p>B. Solution - Service Delivery Maintains or enhances service delivery through team-based approaches (1. (d))</p>	<p>Other health professionals are utilized working collaboratively to effectively/efficiently deliver the services</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>Demonstrated linkages that integrate services effectively/efficiently across different settings</p>	<p>Utilization of other professionals that improve that delivery of services</p>	<p>Multiple health care professionals working collaboratively to obtain significant improvements in service delivery</p>
<p>C. Solution - System Management Aligns with MoH/Health Authority priorities (1. (a))</p>	<p>The proposal achieves MOH strategic and/or HA operational priorities</p>	<p>7.5</p>	<p>Application minimally aligns with Government and/or Health Authority priorities</p>	<p>Application moderately aligns with one or more Government and/or Health Authority priorities</p>	<p>Application significantly aligns with one or more Government and/or Health Authority priorities</p>
<p>Contributes to improvements in the management of physician services (1. (c))</p>	<p>The proposal contributes to the effective management of the proposed services and the health system</p>	<p>7.5</p>	<p>Application addresses Health Authority management issues/objectives</p>	<p>Application enables Health Authority to obtain improvements in the management of services</p>	<p>Application demonstrates a significant improvement in the management of services</p>
<p>D. Proponent Capacity</p>	<p>Applicant's have expertise/experience/manpower to provide the required services</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>Demonstrates minimum credentials, training, experience and manpower required to perform the services</p>	<p>Moderately exceeds required credentials, training, experience and manpower to perform the services</p>	<p>Significantly exceeds credentials, training, experience and manpower to perform the services</p>
<p>Capacity to attract and retain necessary human resources (1. (g))</p>	<p>Applicant's ability to provide physicians and other professional services</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>Current workforce not in place</p>	<p>Application has a reasonable plan in place for recruitment/retention</p>	<p>Application has a plan in place with demonstrated achievable recruitment/retention</p>
<p>E. Cost</p>	<p>The net cost of the proposed services to Ministry/HAs (absolute dollar amount and percentage increase)</p>	<p>15</p>	<p>Significant increase in cost</p>	<p>Moderate increase in costs</p>	<p>Marginal increase in costs</p>
<p>Cost to government and health authority for providing physician services 1. (h))</p>					