

EVALUATION GUIDELINES

1. Assessment of Applications

Only submitted application that fulfill the eligibility criteria and have necessary documents will be processed for evaluation by the subject experts as explained below:

1.1. Independent Expert Evaluation:

The applications will be assigned for assessment to two experts keeping in view the specialization of the applicant. The experts will evaluate applications on the prescribed assessment proforma in accordance with the following guidelines:

1.1.1.Evaluation of Research Proposal (Section 1)

This section accounts for 40 points with following 4 (four) assessment areas (each bearing 10 points):

- a) Scientific quality, innovativeness and novelty of research plan or proposal?
- b) Relevance of the proposed research to contemporary global challenges
- c) Significance of proposed research to national issues/ challenges
- d) Contribution of expected results to social sphere, development of science & technology/ potential for creation of new knowledge

The evaluator is required to identify the strengths and weakness (in the designated place) and their level (through drop down menu) such as exceptional, very strong, or strong for strengths and negligible, minor, moderate or major for weaknesses. Then assign the grade as per following grading scale to each item above:

%age	Proposal Category	Grading Scale Explanation	Recommendation
90-100	Exceptional	Exceptionally strong proposal	Recommend
80.89.99	Outstanding	Exceptionally strong proposal with negligible weaknesses	Recommend
70 -79.99	Excellent	Very Strong proposal with negligible weaknesses	Recommend
60-69.99	Very Good	Very Strong Proposal with minor weaknesses	Resubmit after modification
50-59.99	Good	Strong proposal with moderate weaknesses	Reject
40-49.99	Average	Proposal having some strengths but moderate weaknesses	Reject
30-39.99	Weak	Proposal having few strengths with major weaknesses	Reject
20-29.99	Poor	Proposal having very few strengths with numerous major weaknesses	Reject
0-19.99	Very Poor	Proposal fraught with weaknesses	Reject

The reviewer will assign marks to individual item whereas the system will automatically perform summation. The system will only allow grading in line with the scale provided e.g if the proposal has average strengths and moderate weaknesses; the overall score can not be more than 49.99% or less than 40% marks.

1.1.2.Impact (Section 2)

This section accounts for 20 points with following 4 (four) assessment areas (each bearing 5 points):

- a) Potential impact on applicant's professional career
- b) Potential of acquiring skills in terms of career development
- c) Transfer of knowledge in and outside parent organization through conferences, publications, public outreach activities as a result of this fellowship
- d) Ability to create a long-term network/ attract collaborative partners (academia/ industry)

The evaluator is required to identify the pros and cons of the possible impact of proposed research, if any, on the applicant's career/ research capability, parent organization and society at large. The evaluators are required to assess each item mentioned above. The marks assigned in each item should coincide with the comments recorded in the assessment of both sections. For example an applicant scoring less than 70% marks in Section 1 is not supposed to score more than 70% marks in this section as well.

1.1.3.Evaluation Of Host Institution (Section 3)

This section accounts for 20 points with following 4 (four) assessment areas (each bearing 5 points):

- a) Ranking of Host Institution
- b) Access to equipment and high impact research collaborators (not available in Pakistan)
- c) Standing of host supervisor
- d) Financial waiver (Bench/Tuition fee, experimentation cost etc.)

The evaluator needs to be convinced that conducting proposed research at the host institute will be beneficial for all parties involved. It will yield more benefits to the individual, society and country than it will cost. The evaluator may adopt following grading scale if the host institution and the host department are of equal ranking:

QS world Ranking	Corresponding points
1-20	5
21-50	4
51-100	3
101-150	2
151-200	1

However, if the host institution ranking is very high but the specific department where the scholar intends to conduct research is not rated that high or vice versa, the assigned marks and comments should reflect this disparity.

Item (b) is not limited to scientific and technological researches only. However, its explanation will differ as far as Art and Humanities, Social Sciences, Management Sciences or other non-technical areas are concerned. The possibility of exposure and training of the prospective awardee that is not available in Pakistan may be rated according to the field of specialization.

The standing of the host supervisor will be evaluated through his/her CV and research achievements in the proposed area of research. The supervisor must have demonstrated ability and expertise in the targeted area.

Applicants are encouraged to secure fee waiver from the host institution/ department. If the host institute is charging full fee (USD 6000/- or more), the applicant will get 0 point for this question. 5 indicates that no fee /experimentation cost is involved. If the applicant has been granted a partial waiver but the discounted fee is still around USD 6000/-, this will mean no waiver at all and will be scored accordingly.

1.1.4.General Instructions

The experts will provide written commentary describing the reasons for their recommendations. They are required to provide detailed comments in each section especially in case of negative assessment. Any vague comments such as “technical grounds”, “low score”, “poor profile”, “poor/unsatisfactory submission”, “poorly written proposal”, “not upto mark” shall not be entertained by the project office. The purpose is to provide extensive guidance, through evaluation, to weak/average candidates so that they can learn and improve not to discourage them to progress further. No item or section can be left blank as it will not allow submission of assessment form. Similarly, extra care should be exercised to mark 0 in any area/section and should be justified by detailed opinion (preferably with references).

1.2. Assessment submission to the Project Office:

After recording the grades in above mentioned 3 (three) section of the assessment proforma, the appointed expert will record recommendations section as per following yardstick:

1.2.1.Rejected.

The applicant has an over-all score of less than 60%. The evaluator has identified cogent reasons of rejection in each area where the applicant falls short of the benchmark. The comments provide comprehensive advice to the applicant as to which area needs improvement.

1.2.2.Resubmit after Modification:

The applicant has an over-all score of 60% or more but less than 70%. The evaluator has commented extensively on the sections that need revision. The evaluator believes that application can meet the bench mark, if modified in accordance with the advice provided in the assessment proforma. The project office will mark such application on the online portal which in turn will automatically inform the applicant about decision via email under copy to project office. The applicant will be required to re-submit application within 15 days of the email, otherwise the decision will be revised as rejected. An application can only be returned once for modifications in the light of advice of the subject expert/ reviewer. If the proposal still needs improvement (after one re-submission), it shall be rejected.

1.2.3.Recommended

The applicant has an over-all score of 70% or above. The strengths and positive comments in each section outweigh the weaknesses and flaws, if any. The evaluator believes that the applicant should be shortlisted and called for interview to undertake assessment in section 4.

1.3. Review of Preliminary Assessment by Project Office:

After completing three sections, and preliminary recommendations, the evaluator will submit the assessment to project office. The project office will review each assessment proforma. If the assessment proforma from both experts is filled with all the necessary details and graded in accordance with the guidelines, it will be shared with the applicant along with decision. The project office will not reveal the identity of the expert at any cost. In case the recommendations of both the reviewers differ, the application will be assigned to another evaluator. The recommendation of the third evaluator will be final and no further evaluations will be conducted.

1.4. Shortlisting & Interview:

The applications recommended by at least two evaluators, on the basis of Section 1-3 of the assessment proforma, will be shortlisted for the interview phase. The applicant will be required to give 3-5 minute presentation comprising the following before the panel experts duly approved by Advisor, HEC.

- Main theme and novelty of proposed research
- Impact of proposed research on society, parent organization and applicant's career
- Excellence of host institute in the area of research
- Fee waiver (if any)
- Personal competence (i.e relevant publications, patents, teaching excellence, etc)

The primary purpose of the interview is to grade the competence of shortlisted applicants as explained below:

1.4.1. Competence of Researcher

- a) Quality of publications in HEC recognized journals (Impact Factor/ journal categories)
- b) Impact/ result of the applicant's past research activities (patents/publications/ teaching)
- c) Independent thinking, creativity, leadership and mentoring abilities
- d) Presentation and communication skills

The evaluators will be required to assess the publication portfolio of the applicants beforehand while assessing the impact of proposed research on the applicant's output. The tendency of publications in large groups not directly related to the specialization of the applicant shall not be weighed heavily on the applicant's portfolio.

The applicant should demonstrate ability to clearly disseminate his/her ideas, grasp of the subject area and cognizance of each aspect of the submitted application. The mode of communication will only be **English** language. The panel may revise the assessment in Section 1-3, by recording reasons in writing, in case the applicant fails to present his/her case effectively.

Absconding from the interview session will tantamount to willful withdrawal of application.

1.5. Final Decision:

The applicant obtaining more than 60% marks in the interview phase (while retaining assessments in section 1-3) will be provisionally selected for award of fellowship. The award of fellowship will be confirmed after submission of required documents and fulfilment of other

pre-departure formalities with the project office. In all other cases the decision of the panel, with reasons, will be communicated to applicant via email.

2. Completion of Postdoc and Assessment of Achievement(s)

Two Post-Doctoral Research Reports (soft copy) duly signed/endorsed by the host supervisor outlining achievements and deliverables attained during research will be submitted to the project office. The report will be shared with the initial reviewers/ subject experts who had recommended award of fellowship. The reviewers/ experts will provide detailed opinion whether the award of fellowship has yielded desired results or otherwise. In case of non-availability of primary reviewers, new reviewers will be assigned.