

**University Grants Commission of Bangladesh
Higher Education Acceleration and Transformation Project
Academic Transformation Fund**

CHAPTER 12

**MARK DISTRIBUTION MATRICES FOR ARP EVALUATION
OF SUB-PROJECTS**

***Higher Education Acceleration and Transformation Project
Academic Transformation Fund***

***Evaluation Form for
Area Review Panel Member & External Reviewer***

Sub-project N°:

Sub-project Title:

***Proposal Submitting Entity
(Department/Faculty/Institute/Center/School).....***
.....

Proposal Endorsing University:

Total Marks Given.....

Evaluator*:

(Name, position, institution)

Mobile Number.....

Email.....

Signature:

Date:

* Evaluators are requested to complete this form in FULL.

**Summary of
Distribution of Marks for Evaluation of Sub-projects for W-1 and W-3a**

[Note: All sub-criteria as set out below will be individually scored. If any sub-criterion is not scored, the evaluation of the Sub-project will be considered as incomplete. Please award marks for each item up to one decimal place]

EVALUATION CRITERIA	MARKS
1. Clarity and Quality of Strategic Analysis and Proposal Design	20.0
<i>1.1 Strategic analysis and background data</i>	<i>5.0</i>
<i>1.2 Objectives and expected results</i>	<i>5.0</i>
<i>1.3 Proposal design</i>	<i>5.0</i>
<i>1.4 Innovation nature</i>	<i>5.0</i>
2. Quality and Clarity of the Milestones and Performance Indicators	10.0
<i>2.1 Milestones</i>	<i>5.0</i>
<i>2.2 Performance indicators</i>	<i>5.0</i>
3. Access to Higher Education and Research	10.0
<i>3.1 Faculty, Postgraduate student and researcher access to quality research facilities and opportunities.</i>	<i>5.0</i>
<i>3.2 Improvement of quality of undergraduate and graduate program</i>	<i>5.0</i>
4. Justification of the Budget	10.0
<i>4.1 Coherence with proposal design and expected results</i>	<i>5.0</i>
<i>4.2 Rationale and justification</i>	<i>5.0</i>
5. Quality of the Management Plan	10.0
<i>5.1 Work plan</i>	<i>5.0</i>
<i>5.2 Financial and procurement plans</i>	<i>5.0</i>
6. Experiences of SPMT	20.0
<i>6.1 Number of Completed Research projects (National &International)</i>	<i>10.0</i>
<i>6.2 Number of Q1 Publications and Citation of SPMT</i>	<i>10.0</i>
7. Clarity of Impact Analysis	10.0
<i>7.1 Impact analysis</i>	<i>5.0</i>

7.2 <i>Realism and relevance</i>	5.0
8. Sustainability	10.0
8.1 <i>Institutional commitment and engagement</i>	5.0
8.2 <i>Institutional commitments for future investments</i>	5.0
Total marks	100.0

EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR W-1 & 3a

1. Clarity and quality of the strategic analysis, objectives and expected results and innovative nature of the proposal		/20
1.1 Strategic analysis and background data		/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How is the overall quality of the strategic analysis (strength, weaknesses, opportunities and threats) and the background data used to establish the progression of institutional academic capacity in time? 		
1.2 Objectives and expected results		/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are the proposal specific objectives and expected results clear, coherent and realistic? 		
1.3 Design		/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How is the overall quality of the proposal design, as related to coherence between strategic analysis, problem statement, expected results and outcomes, benefits and overall viability? 		
1.4 Innovative nature		/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what extent the proposal and proposed activities reflect academic innovation, new management practices and tuning with the student (or researcher) needs? 		
2. Quality and clarity of the milestones and performance indicators to measure progress, results and impact		/10
2.1 Milestones		/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what extent the milestones described indicate the crucial activities and expected results considered in the proposal? 		

2.2 Performance indicators							/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what extent the performance indicators are relevant to the specific objectives, design of the proposal and expected results and outcomes? 							
3. Access to Higher Education and Research							/10
3.1 Access to quality research facilities and opportunities							/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what extent Faculty, Postgraduate student and researcher access to quality research facilities and opportunities (Window-1 and Window 3: Research (a))? 							
3.2 Relevance with undergraduate and graduate degree programs							/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what extent the proposal is relevance with the existing undergraduate and graduate programs? 							
4. Clarity and justification of the proposal budget							/10
4.1 Coherence with proposal design and expected results							/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what extent the proposed investments for all the activities (e.g., updating of curricula, academic staff development, procurement of equipment/ instruments/ teaching-learning materials, training of academic staff and students, collection of books for library, scholarships and fellowships, increased funding for research) conform to the proposal design and lead to the stated specific objectives and expected results and outcomes? 							
4.2 Rationale and justification							/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what extent the amounts requested for each item of expenditure in the proposal are rational and justified? 							
5. Quality and clarity of the proposed work, financing and procurement plans							
5.1 Work and Training plan							/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How is the clarity and quality of the work plan, its relevance to the proposal objectives and coherence with proposal activities and actions? 							
5.2 Financial and procurement plans							/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How is the clarity and quality of the financial and procurement plan, its relevance to the proposal objectives and coherence with proposal activities and actions? 							
6. Experience of SPMT							/20
6.1 Number of completed similar research projects							/10

▪ Number of projects completed by SPMT.									
▪ The value of completed project/s in BDT.									
6.2 Publications/Citations of SPMT	/10								
▪ Number of Publications are published in index journals.									
▪ Number of citations in google scholar.									
7. Impact the sub-project will have on environment/eco-system, gender inequality, employment, poverty reduction, academic programs, human development, research, food security, production innovation, governance and disaster management	/10								
7.1 Impact analysis	/5								
▪ How is the clarity and quality of the impact analysis?									
7.2 Realism and relevance	/5								
▪ To what extent the impact analysis is realistic and relevant to the proposal objectives and expected results and outcomes?									
8. Academic and financial sustainability of the implementation after the ATF support has ended	/10								
8.1 Institutional commitment and engagement in the proposal									
▪ To what extent the fund recipient institution's commitment and engagement is reflected in the proposal?									
8.2 Institutional commitments for future investments	/5								
▪ To what extent institutional commitments would induce future investments, academic improvement, processes and outcomes envisaged in the sub-project?									
Total Marks	/100								

Summary of Distribution of Marks for Evaluation of Sub-projects for W-3b

[Note: All sub-criteria as set out below will be individually scored. If any sub-criterion is not scored, the evaluation of the Sub-project will be considered as incomplete. Please award marks for each item up to one decimal place]

EVALUATION CRITERIA	MARKS
1. Clarity and Quality of Strategic Analysis and Proposal Design	20.0
<i>1.1 Strategic analysis and background data</i>	<i>5.0</i>
<i>1.2 Objectives and expected results</i>	<i>5.0</i>
<i>1.3 Proposal design</i>	<i>5.0</i>
<i>1.4 Innovation nature</i>	<i>5.0</i>
2. Quality and Clarity of the Milestones and Performance Indicators	10.0
<i>2.1 Milestones</i>	<i>5.0</i>
<i>2.2 Performance indicators</i>	<i>5.0</i>
3. Access to Higher Education and Research	10.0
<i>3.1 Faculty, Postgraduate student and researcher access to quality research facilities and opportunities.</i>	<i>5.0</i>
<i>3.2 Improvement of quality of undergraduate and graduate program</i>	<i>5.0</i>
4. Justification of the Budget	10.0
<i>4.1 Coherence with proposal design and expected results</i>	<i>5.0</i>
<i>4.2 Rationale and justification</i>	<i>5.0</i>
5. Quality of the Management Plan	10.0
<i>5.1 Work plan</i>	<i>5.0</i>
<i>5.2 Financial and procurement plans</i>	<i>5.0</i>
6. Experience of SPMT	20.0
<i>6.1 Number of Completed Research projects</i>	<i>5.0</i>
<i>6.2 Number of Publications and Citation of SPMT</i>	<i>5.0</i>
<i>6.3 Number of Patent</i>	<i>5.0</i>
<i>6.4 Yearly turnover of the industry</i>	<i>5.0</i>
7. Clarity of Impact Analysis	10.0

7.1 <i>Impact analysis</i>	5.0
7.2 <i>Realism and relevance</i>	5.0
8. Sustainability	10.0
8.1 <i>Institutional commitment and engagement</i>	5.0
8.2 <i>Institutional commitments for future investments</i>	5.0
Total marks	100.0

EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR W-3b

1. Clarity and quality of the strategic analysis, objectives and expected results and innovative nature of the proposal		/20
1.1 Strategic analysis and background data		/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How is the overall quality of the strategic analysis (strength, weaknesses, opportunities and threats) and the background data used to establish the progression of institutional academic capacity in time? 		
1.2 Objectives and expected results		/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are the proposal specific objectives and expected results clear, coherent and realistic? 		
1.3 Design		/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How is the overall quality of the proposal design, as related to coherence between strategic analysis, problem statement, expected results and outcomes, benefits and overall viability? 		
1.4 Innovative nature		/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what extent the proposal and proposed activities reflect academic innovation, new management practices and tuning with the student (or researcher) needs? 		
2. Quality and clarity of the milestones and performance indicators to measure progress, results and impact		/10

2.1 Milestones						/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent the milestones described indicate the crucial activities and expected results considered in the proposal? 						
2.2 Performance indicators						/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent the performance indicators are relevant to the specific objectives, design of the proposal and expected results and outcomes? 						
3. Access to Higher Education and Research						/10
3.1 Access to quality research facilities and opportunities						/5
1.1 To what extent Faculty, Postgraduate student and researcher access to quality research facilities and opportunities (Window-1 and Window 3: Research (a))						
3.2 Relevance with undergraduate and graduate degree programs						/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent the proposal is relevance with the existing undergraduate and graduate programs? 						
4. Clarity and justification of the proposal budget and Quality and clarity of the proposed work, financing and procurement plans						/20
4.1 Coherence with proposal design and expected results						/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent the proposed investments for all the activities (e.g., updating of curricula, academic staff development, procurement of equipment/ instruments/ teaching-learning materials, training of academic staff and students, collection of books for library, scholarships and fellowships, increased funding for research) conform to the proposal design and lead to the stated specific objectives and expected results and outcomes? 						
4.2 Rationale and justification						/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent the amounts requested for each item of expenditure in the proposal are rational and justified? 						
5. Quality and clarity of the proposed work, financing and procurement plans						
5.1 Work and Training plan						/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is the clarity and quality of the work plan, its relevance to the proposal objectives and coherence with proposal activities and actions? 						

5.2 Financial and procurement plans	/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is the clarity and quality of the financial and procurement plan, its relevance to the proposal objectives and coherence with proposal activities and actions? 	
6 Experience of SPMT	/20
6.1 Number of completed similar research projects	/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of projects completed by SPMT. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Value of completed project in BDT. 	
6.2 Publications/Citations of SPMT	/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of Publications are published in index journals. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of citations in google scholar. 	
6.3 Number of Patents	/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How many patents acquired by the SPMT? 	
6.4 Yearly Turnover of the Industry	/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How much turnover of the industry? 	
7. Impact the sub-project will have on environment/eco-system, gender inequality, employment, poverty reduction, academic programs, human development, research, food security, production innovation, governance and disaster management	/10
7.1 Impact analysis	/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is the clarity and quality of the impact analysis? 	
7.2 Realism and relevance	/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent the impact analysis is realistic and relevant to the proposal objectives and expected results and outcomes? 	
8. Academic and financial sustainability of the implementation after the ATF support has ended	/10
8.1 Institutional commitment and engagement	/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What extent the fund recipient institution's commitment and engagement is reflected in the proposal? 	

8.2 Institutional commitments for future investments					/5					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what extent institutional commitments would induce future investments, academic improvement, processes and outcomes envisaged in the sub-project? 					<table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20px; height: 20px;"></td> <td style="width: 20px; height: 20px;"></td> <td style="width: 20px; height: 20px;"></td> <td style="width: 20px; height: 20px;"></td> <td style="width: 20px; height: 20px;"></td> </tr> </table>					
Total Marks					/100					

Summary of Distribution of Marks for Evaluation of Sub-projects for W-2, W-4 & W-5

[Note: All sub-criteria as set out below will be individually scored. If any sub-criterion is not scored, the evaluation of the Sub-project will be considered as incomplete. Please award marks for each item up to one decimal place]

EVALUATION CRITERIA	MARKS
1. Clarity and Quality of Strategic Analysis and Proposal Design	20.0
<i>1.1 Strategic analysis and background data</i>	<i>5.0</i>
<i>1.2 Objectives and expected results</i>	<i>5.0</i>
<i>1.3 Proposal design</i>	<i>5.0</i>
<i>1.4 Innovation nature</i>	<i>5.0</i>
2. Quality and Clarity of the Milestones and Performance Indicators	10.0
<i>2.1 Milestones</i>	<i>5.0</i>
<i>2.2 Performance indicators</i>	<i>5.0</i>
3. Access to Higher Education and Research	15.0
<i>3.1 Student access to quality undergrad and graduate programs (Window2: Improvement of Teaching-Learning Infrastructure)</i>	<i>5.0</i>
<i>3.2 Improvement of quality of undergraduate and graduate program</i>	<i>5.0</i>
<i>3.3 No of students and faculty members benefited</i>	<i>5.0</i>
4. Justification of the Budget	10.0
<i>4.1 Coherence with proposal design and expected results</i>	<i>5.0</i>
<i>4.2 Rationale and justification</i>	<i>5.0</i>
5. Quality of the Management Plan	10.0
<i>5.1 Work plan</i>	<i>5.0</i>
<i>5.2 Financial and procurement plans</i>	<i>5.0</i>
6. Experience of SPMT	10.0
<i>6.1 Number of Completed Research projects</i>	<i>5.0</i>
<i>6.2 Number of Publications and Citation of SPMT</i>	<i>5.0</i>
7. Clarity of Impact Analysis	10.0
<i>7.1 Impact analysis</i>	<i>5.0</i>

7.2 <i>Realism and relevance</i>	5.0
8. Sustainability	15.0
8.1 <i>Institutional commitment and engagement</i>	5.0
8.2 <i>Institutional commitments for future investments</i>	5.0
Total marks	100.0

EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR W-2, W-4 & W-5

1. Clarity and quality of the strategic analysis, objectives and expected results, and innovative nature of the proposal		/20
<i>1.1 Strategic analysis and background data</i>		<i>/5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How is the overall quality of the strategic analysis (strength, weaknesses, opportunities and threats) and the background data used to establish the progression of institutional academic capacity in time? 		
<i>1.2 Objectives and expected results</i>		<i>/5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are the proposal specific objectives and expected results clear, coherent and realistic? 		
<i>1.3 Design</i>		<i>/5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How is the overall quality of the proposal design, as related to coherence between strategic analysis, problem statement, expected results and outcomes, benefits and overall viability? 		
<i>1.4 Innovative nature</i>		<i>/5</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what extent the proposal and proposed activities reflect academic innovation, new management practices and tuning with the student (or researcher) needs? 		
2. Quality and clarity of the milestones and performance indicators to measure progress, results and impact		/10
<i>2.1 Milestones</i>		<i>/5</i>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent the milestones described indicate the crucial activities and expected results considered in the proposal? 							
2.2 Performance indicators							
/5							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent the performance indicators are relevant to the specific objectives, design of the proposal and expected results and outcomes? 							
3. Access to Higher Education and Research							
/15							
3.1 Student access to quality undergrad and graduate programs (Window2: Improvement of Teaching-Learning Infrastructure)							
/5							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extend Student access to quality undergrad and graduate programs (Window2: Improvement of Teaching-Learning Infrastructure) 							
3.2 Number of benefited students							
/5							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of students directly benefited 							
3.2 Number of benefited faculty members							
/5							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of faculty members directly benefited 							
4. Clarity and justification of the proposal budget							
/10							
4.1 Coherence with proposal design and expected results							
/5							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent the proposed investments for all the activities (e.g., updating of curricula, academic staff development, procurement of equipment/ instruments/ teaching-learning materials, training of academic staff and students, collection of books for library, scholarships and fellowships, increased funding for research) conform to the proposal design and lead to the stated specific objectives and expected results and outcomes? 							
4.2 Rationale and justification							
/5							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent the amounts requested for each item of expenditure in the proposal are rational and justified? 							
5. Quality and clarity of the proposed work, financing and procurement plans /10							
5.1 Work and Training plan							
/5							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is the clarity and quality of the work plan, its relevance to the proposal objectives and coherence with proposal activities and actions? 							

5.2 Financial and procurement plans									/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is the clarity and quality of the financial and procurement plan, its relevance to the proposal objectives and coherence with proposal activities and actions? 									
6. Experience of SPMT									/10
6.1 Number of completed similar research projects									/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of projects completed by SPMT. 									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Value of completed project in BDT. 									
6.2 Publications/Citations of SPMT									/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of Publications are published in indexed (Q1 & Q2) journals. 									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of citations in google scholar. 									
7. Impact the sub-project will have on environment/eco-system, gender inequality, employment, poverty reduction, academic programs, human development, research, food security, production innovation, governance and disaster management									/10
7.1 Impact analysis									/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is the clarity and quality of the impact analysis? 									
7.2 Realism and relevance									/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent the impact analysis is realistic and relevant to the proposal objectives and expected results and outcomes? 									
8. Academic and financial sustainability of the implementation after the ATF support has ended									/10
8.1 Institutional commitment and engagement									
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What extent the fund recipient institution's commitment and engagement is reflected in the proposal? 									
8.2 Institutional commitments for future investments									/5

▪ To what extent institutional commitments would induce future investments, academic improvement, processes and outcomes envisaged in the sub-project?						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Total Marks

/100

GENERAL COMMENTS

Please give criteria-wise specific comments in the following table. The comments are expected to be in conformity with the evaluation marks.

Evaluation Criteria
1. Clarity and Quality of Strategic Analysis and Proposal Design
2. Quality and Clarity of the Milestones and Performance Indicators
3. Relevance to the Country and Benefits
4. Justification of the Budget

5. Quality of the Management Plan

6. Institutional Engagement and Sub-Project Management

7. Clarity of Impact Analysis

8. Sustainability

Any other comments:

<i>Overall</i>	Deficient	Weak	Fair	Good	Excellent
----------------	-----------	------	------	------	-----------

- Please tick one

University Grants Commission of Bangladesh
Academic Transformation Fund
Complementary Selection Criteria for UGCBATF

Basic Selection Principles

1. All proposals at the university level have been screened by Planning & Development Division according to prescribed criteria in Table 4 of the *ATFOM* and prioritized to comply with **ATF** funding cap.
2. All sub-project proposals have been evaluated by AEP/ARPs and EE/ERs according to prescribed criteria in Table 5 of the *ATFOM*.
3. Only competent proposals will be considered for approval. Final selection by **UGCBATF** will consider some complementary selection criteria described below. Proposals which have been disapproved after this review should have clear justifications for being so.
4. No deficient proposal will be considered for approval.
5. Proposal writers would have the right to know **ARP** and **ER** evaluation markings and **UGCBATF** final selection making arguments. This will be the basis for improvement and submission of the disapproved proposals to the next round of **ATF** proposal call.
6. **UGCBATF** may readjust **ATF** allocation to university groups, individual universities and between rounds if it finds that equity principles demand such readjustment due to uneven or less or abundant response to proposal call from the institutions in the first round.
7. **UGCBATF**'s decision will be final in respect of a proposal being finally selected for **ATF** grant.

Complementary Selection Criteria (UGCBATF)

1. **Relevance to Bangladesh.** To what extent is the sub-project relevant to current or likely future social and economic problems of Bangladesh? Will the sub-project address or tackle an important Bangladeshi social or economic problem?
2. **Education policy.** Will the sub-project contribute to the achievement of the government's policy goals for tertiary education?
3. **Student accessibility of acquired resources.** Will the sub-project lead to channels of greater access to university academic programs by secondary education graduates and adult learners already in the workplace? Will the sub-project enable the institutions to respond to the pressures and opportunities of greater access without compromising academic standards and quality? Does the proposal contain elements that seek to encourage women's employment in society and to professional positions? Does the proposal envisage access to the resources to academics outside the entity itself?
4. **Improvement of quality.** Will the sub-project lead to overall improvement in the quality of educational infrastructure, academic programs, research capabilities and services and diminish national disparities in education quality offered by different universities?
5. **Justification of Budget.** To what extent the proposed investments will help to achieve the stated objectives and the budget is commensurate with the work/activities to be undertaken by the sub-project?
6. **Contribution to building of knowledge economy.** Will the sub-project enhance students', teachers' and researchers' access to connectivity, digital library and other ICT applications and develop their skills for establishing digital Bangladesh?

If the review of a sub-project proposal indicates a positive outcome with reference to above queries then it has the merit for final selection.