

## Scoring definitions and attributes for OPEN funding schemes

Panel members will give each proposal a score on a scale from 1 to 6 that reflects their assessment of how well the proposal meets the assessment criteria outlined in the scoring grid below.

### OPEN Fellowship Scheme

Applicants to this scheme must also demonstrate in their proposal how the Fellowship will contribute to:

- The professional development of the Fellow, including details of the skills and experience the Fellow will develop, how those will be developed, and how the host will support integration of the Fellow within the host.
- Building capacity for academic-policy engagement within the Host organisation.

### Scoring grid

Score	Summary	Attributes	Definition	Band
6	Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grounded in excellent research</li> <li>• Highly likely to advance policymakers' understanding, to clarify or expand the range of options open to them</li> <li>• Highly likely to address public policy challenge(s) identified as such by the policy partner(s); clear, logical pathway from activities, via outputs, to outcomes and goal; identification of key assumptions, risks, and issues that may affect implementation</li> <li>• Input of Policy Partner and other stakeholders clear and appropriate</li> <li>• Clear arrangements for monitoring, evaluation, and learning, enabling partners and others to learn from project, reflected in: provision for iterative learning; theory of change; opportunities to share learning</li> <li>• Excellent value for money; costs clear and well justified</li> </ul>	Fundable	A
5	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grounded in excellent research</li> <li>• Likely to advance policymakers' understanding, to clarify or expand the range of options open to them</li> <li>• Likely to address public policy challenge(s) identified as such by Policy Partner(s); clear, logical pathway from activities, via outputs, to outcomes and goal; identification of key</li> </ul>	Fundable	A

Score	Summary	Attributes	Definition	Band
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>assumptions, risks, and issues that may affect implementation</li> <li>Input of Policy Partner and other stakeholders clear and appropriate</li> <li>Clear enabling partners and others to learn from project, reflected in: provision for iterative learning; opportunities to share learning</li> <li>Good value for money; costs clear and well justified</li> <li>No more than a modest number of minor, fixable faults</li> </ul>		
4	Minor weaknesses/concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grounded in excellent research</li> <li>Likely to advance policymakers' understanding, to clarify or expand the range of options open to them</li> <li>May address public policy challenge(s) identified as such by Policy Partner(s); key assumptions, risks, or issues unmitigated</li> <li>Input of Policy Partner or other stakeholders needs clarifying</li> <li>Arrangements for monitoring, evaluation, and learning need clarifying</li> <li>Good value for money; costs clear and well justified</li> <li>A few major (or several minor) fixable faults</li> </ul>	Fundable	B
3	Moderate weaknesses/concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Link to research weak or unclear</li> <li>Unlikely to advance policymakers' understanding, to clarify or expand the range of options open to them</li> <li>Unlikely to address public policy challenge(s)</li> <li>Inadequate arrangements for monitoring, evaluation, and learning</li> <li>Questionable value for money; unjustified use of public funds</li> </ul>	Not fundable	C
2	Significant weaknesses/concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Link to research weak or unclear</li> <li>Value for money poor or unclear; unjustified use of public funds</li> </ul>	Not fundable	C
1	Severe weaknesses/concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Link to research weak or unclear</li> <li>Value for money poor; unjustified use of public funds</li> </ul>	Not fundable	C

Published: 18 July 2024