

Appendix 6

Scoring Form

UK-China EMaDA Research and Materials Development Awards

For British Council use only.

Principal Applicant :

Reviewer :

Recommendation (Fundable: H / M / L) :

Recommendation (Non Fundable) :

POTENTIAL TO DELIVER IMPACTS AND OUTCOMES (40%)

1. Proposal must clearly explain what the project will achieve and how this will support identified needs within the scope of 1. Partner requirements; 2. national priorities and (if different) 3. Identified research areas (0 – 10 points)
2. Proposal must demonstrate how conducted research, or any English teacher professional development resources developed, will support higher quality English language teaching, assessment and learning (0 – 10 points)
3. Proposal must demonstrate how any English teacher professional development resources created represent an innovative and relevant approach to ensure impact, reach, inclusion, value for money and sustainability (0 – 10 points)
4. Monitoring and evaluation: Proposals must have a clear monitoring and evaluation plan with proposed KPIs and milestones. 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 completed in the application form. (0 – 10 points)

ALIGNMENT WITH GRANT STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES (30%)

1. Proposal must show a clear understanding of and fully address proposed outcomes related to the relevant project (0 – 20 points)
2. Proposal must clearly explain what short, mid or long term benefits there may be to the proposed project (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, including area of focus, geographical familiarity, previous experience in similar research areas or partnerships. (0 – 10 points)
2. Proposal must have a clear, relevant 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 delivery 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.
 - *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 with people who run the project, project activity participants and also beneficiaries.

TOTAL SCORE (MAX 100 POINTS)

POINT	INTERPRETATION
90 - 100	Excellent – Overall the response demonstrates that the Applicant meets all areas of the requirements.
70 - 90	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.

50 - 70	Adequate – Overall the response demonstrates that the Applicant meets all areas of the requirement, but some evidence or argument is missing.
30 - 50	Poor – The response does not demonstrate that the Applicant meets the requirement in one or more areas.
0 - 30	Unacceptable – The response is non-compliant with the requirements of the RFP and/or no response has been provided.

REVIEWER NOTES
