**Appendix 2: Quality review scoring system**

Assessment of the quality and development relevance of the proposals will be performed by panel members from the UK and Egypt. Proposals with an average score of less than 30 points are considered not fundable. Equally, only proposals that have clearly articulated relevance to economic development and social welfare of Egypt will be considered for funding.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Section 1: Relevance to economic development and social welfare | Score | Range |
| The proposal clearly articulates a plausible route for the project to lead to positive impact on the lives of Egyptians and contribute to the economic development and social welfare of Egypt and within a reasonable timeframe (within 10 years).  Please see guidance for applicants for further details. |  | **YES/NO** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Section 2: Relevance to gender equality | Score | Range |
| * Have measures been put in place to ensure equal and meaningful opportunities for people of different genders to be involved throughout the project? This includes the development of the project, the project team, and the beneficiaries of the project. * The expected impact of the project (benefits and losses) on people of different genders, both throughout the project and beyond. * The impact on the relations between people of different genders and people of the same gender. For example, changing roles and responsibilities in households, society, economy, politics, power, etc. * How will any risks and unintended negative consequences on gender equality be avoided or mitigated against, and monitored? * Are there any relevant outcomes and outputs being measured, with data disaggregated by age and gender (where disclosed)? |  | **Sufficient/**  **Insufficient** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Section 3: Relevance to Impact on the Environment | Score | Range |
| What is the expected impact of the proposed project on the climate and environment (both throughout the project and beyond)? When answering, please consider:   * How can any negative impact be reduced? * Have you considered possible alternatives to national and/or international travel such as virtual delivery? If alternatives are not possible, please provide justification why travel is essential to ensure project outcomes and impact and what measures you will take to limit the carbon footprint of any travel used to deliver the project. |  | **Sufficient/**  **Insufficient** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section4: Project Proposal quality and relevance**  **POTENTIAL TO DELIVER GGP IMPACTS AND OUTCOMES (40%)** | |
| 1. Proposal must clearly explain what the project will achieve and how this will contribute to increasing joint teaching programme between UK and Egypt HEIs including digital delivery (0 – 10 points) 2. Proposal must propose a realistic action plan to achieve the target outcomes with defined impacts that can be monitored and evaluated (0 – 10 points) 3. Proposal must demonstrate measurable, tangible, and sustainable impacts that bring value and benefit to the UK and Egypt (0 – 10 points) 4. Priority will be given to projects that demonstrate (0 – 10 points):    * Significant growth potential for the UK and Egypt (e.g., creation of a new TNE partnership or Joint Teaching Programme including digital delivery)    * Access to other sources of funding and/or in-kind contribution or partnership    * Ways for wider HEIs and the sector to also benefit from the project |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ALLIGNMENT WITH TNE GRANT STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES (30%)** | |
| 1. Proposal must show a clear understanding of and fully address TNE grant strategic objectives (0 – 10 points) 2. Proposal must clearly explain what the project will achieve and how this will contribute to creating opportunities for development of individuals involved in the project (0 – 10 points) 3. Proposal must show ability to generate outcomes that are of benefit to wider HE sectors in the UK and Egypt (0 – 10 points) |  |
| **CAPACITY TO DELIVER ON TIME AND WITHIN BUDGET (30%)** | |
| 1. Project must be led by a team with the skills and experience necessary to successfully deliver the proposed activities (0 – 10 points) 2. Proposal must have a clear budget that can be realistically executed (0 – 10 points) 3. Proposal must fully address the operational requirements as follows (0 – 10 points):    * *Value for money*: Projects must achieve the best possible outcomes with the funding and resources available, while ensuring funding and resources are used effectively, economically and without waste.    * *Deliverability*: Proposals must incorporate a credible implementation plan with realistic milestones for progressing the different elements of the project to completion on time and within budget. This will require a team with relevant skills and experience.    * *Affordability and sustainability*: Project proposals must be affordable in relation to the overall funding available and be financially sustainable with benefits that can endure beyond the funding period.    * *Partnership*: Project must have 1 UK university and 1 Egypt university. Letters of support from relevant authority within the universities must be attached to the proposal.    * *Monitoring & Evaluation Plan*: Project must have a clear monitoring and evaluation plan. The plan should explain what the key performance indicators are and how monitoring will be carried out. Tangible milestones should be set, with an explanation as to how they will be measured. A risk management plan should also be included.    * *EDI (Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion)*: Measures are in place to ensure equal and meaningful opportunities for people of different background, races, faith background, ages, gender, sexual orientation, and dis/ability to be involved throughout the project. This includes involvement as people who run the project, project activity participants and also beneficiaries. |  |
| **TOTAL SCORE (MAX 100 POINTS)** | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **POINT INTERPRETATION** | |
| 9 - 10 | **Excellent** – Overall the response demonstrates that the Applicant meets all areas of the requirements. |
| 7 - 8 | **Good** – Overall the response demonstrates that the Applicant meets all areas of the requirement and but lacks trivial evidence or argument in one or two areas. |
| 5 - 6 | **Adequate** – Overall the response demonstrates that the Applicant meets all areas of the requirement, but some evidence or argument is missing. |
| 3 - 4 | **Poor** – The response does not demonstrate that the Applicant meets the requirement in one or more areas. |
| 0 - 2 | **Unacceptable** – The response is non-compliant with the requirements of the Call for Proposal and/or no response has been provided. |
| **REVIEWER NOTES** | |