# Transformations Conference Bid Evaluation Rubric



Use in conjunction with the Bid Guidelines for complete host requirements.

## **Executive Committee (XCOM)**

This rubric guides the evaluation of Expressions of Interest (EOIs) and Full Bids to host future Transformations Conferences. It ensures a transparent, balanced, and values-based assessment that reflects the Transformations Community's Four Ts — Transdisciplinarity, Translocalism, Transformative Learning, and Temperance.

Each bid is evaluated across six major categories. Scores are assigned on a **1–5 scale**, with 5 indicating exceptional alignment or capacity. Reviewers are encouraged to include qualitative comments highlighting strengths, gaps, and recommendations for co-development.

## **Scoring Scale**

Score	Descriptor	Meaning
5 – Excellent	Exemplary alignment	Fully meets and exceeds expectations; model example for the series.
4 – Strong	High alignment	Meets all key criteria; minor areas for improvement.
3 – Adequate	Acceptable	Meets most requirements; gaps can be addressed through collaboration.
2 – Limited	Weak alignment	Some potential but lacks sufficient evidence or capacity.
1 – Insufficient	Misaligned	Major gaps; not suitable for advancement.

## **Evaluation Categories**



Category	Weight	Evaluation Focus	Meaning
1. Strategic Fit & Vision	20%	Alignment with TC's mission and Four Ts.	<ul> <li>Does the proposal express a clear transformational vision?</li> <li>How well does it integrate the Four Ts?</li> <li>Is there a compelling link between local context and global relevance?</li> </ul>
2. Event Concept & Innovation	20%	Quality, creativity, and inclusivity of the proposed format.	<ul> <li>Does the design include innovative and participatory elements?</li> <li>Are arts, wellbeing, and reflective practices integrated?</li> <li>Does it foster diverse forms of knowing and learning?</li> </ul>
3. Institutional Capacity & Partnerships	20%	Organizational strength and collaborative potential.	<ul> <li>Does the host have experience with major international convenings?</li> <li>Are there clear institutional commitments and support structures?</li> <li>Are local and global partnerships well-developed?</li> </ul>
4. Venue, Logistics & Accessibility	15%	Adequacy and inclusivity of facilities and logistics.	<ul> <li>Are the proposed venues accessible and appropriately scaled?</li> <li>Is there a credible hybrid participation strategy?</li> <li>Are sustainability measures embedded in logistics?</li> </ul>
5. Financial Feasibility & Risk Management	15%	Soundness of financial planning and risk mitigation.	<ul> <li>Is the budget realistic and balanced?</li> <li>Are contingency plans clear and credible?</li> <li>Are proposed sponsors and funding streams appropriate?</li> </ul>
6. Legacy, Learning & Contribution	10%	Long-term impact and integration into the global Transformations ecosystem.	<ul> <li>Does the bid articulate a legacy plan (publications, networks, follow-on projects)?</li> <li>How will learnings be shared post-event?</li> <li>Does it contribute to the continuity of the series?</li> </ul>

## **Evaluation Process**



#### 1. Initial Screening (EOIs):

- ► Conducted by the TC Secretariat and Evaluation Panel.
- ► EOIs scored primarily on Strategic Fit, Institutional Capacity, and Vision.
- ▶ Top candidates invited to submit Full Bids.

#### 2. Full Bid Review:

- Comprehensive review using all six categories.
- ▶ Each reviewer submits individual scores and comments.
- ▶ The Evaluation Panel synthesizes findings and prepares a recommendation for the Executive Committee (XCOM).

#### 3. Calibration & Consensus:

- ▶ Reviewers meet to discuss scoring variances and ensure fairness.
- ► The XCOM approves the final recommendation by consent-based decision-making.

#### 4. Feedback to Applicants:

- ▶ Each applicant receives a summary of strengths and improvement areas.
- ► Constructive feedback encourages future collaboration or hosting opportunities.

### **Reviewer Guidance**

- ► Consider both capacity and alignment a smaller institution with strong transformational ethos may merit high marks.
- ▶ Use comments to identify potential areas for TC support (communications, hybrid facilitation, fundraising, etc.).
- ▶ Maintain confidentiality and impartiality throughout the review.
- ▶ Document any conflicts of interest before evaluation.