

Appendix 6

Scoring Form

UK-ID Partnerships for ELT Teacher Professional Development Grants

For British Council use only.

Principal Applicant :

Reviewer :

Recommendation (Fundable: H / M / L) :

Recommendation (Non Fundable) :

POTENTIAL TO DELIVER DIGITAL INNOVATION TPD IMPACTS AND OUTCOMES (40%)

1. Proposal must clearly explain what the project will achieve and how this will contribute to supporting English teacher professional development of English teachers and professionals working in Indonesian schools and higher education institutions (0 – 10 points)
2. Proposal must demonstrate how the English teacher professional development resources developed will represent high quality TPD resources including, but limited to, any audio, video, or printed material as well as adopting best practice principles in design and user experience. (0 – 10 points)
3. Proposal must demonstrate how the English teacher professional development resources developed represent an innovative approach to digital delivery 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. 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. (0 – 10 points)

ALIGNMENT WITH GRANT STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES (30%)

1. Proposal must show a clear understanding of and fully address UK-ID Partnerships for ELT Teacher Professional Development grant strategic objectives (0 – 10 points)
2. Proposal must show ability to generate outcomes meet the UK-ID Partnerships for ELT Teacher Professional Development grant strategic objectives (0 – 10 points)
3. Proposal must clearly explain what kind of opportunities they will create for individuals in the UK and Indonesia, and how this will be (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. For example, e.g., experience of face to face and online delivery of teacher education and an understanding of teacher education in ODA operating contexts, including East Asia and/or Indonesia (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 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 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 RFP and/or no response has been provided.

REVIEWER NOTES
