

## Review criteria for scoring Thematic Window 1

### FIRST PASS SCORING

**Note: The final 5% for the first cut score will be added by the GMS based on 3ie membership of either the applicant, the implementing agency, or the funder.**

<b>Criterion:</b> Qualifications of proposed staff: 20%										
<b>Description and requirements:</b> Qualifications include the skills and experience of the proposed team in conducting impact evaluations. The proposed principal investigators (PIs) should have the set of skills to implement the proposed design. Points are awarded for team members with prior experience of implementing rigorous impact evaluations consistent with 3ie's Principles of Impact Evaluation. Factors include: (1) experience of the PIs in conducting quality impact evaluations; (2) team member experience in managing fieldwork in a developing country; and (3) proven success in communicating and disseminating research/evaluation findings beyond the academic community.										
<b>Reviewer comments (not more than 250 words):</b>										
<b>Select a point score based on how well the requirements for this criterion are met.</b>										
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not met			Weakly met			Sufficiently met			Exceeded	

<b>Criterion:</b> Involvement and capacity building of developing country researchers/evaluators and developing country organizations : 15%										
<b>Description and requirements:</b> This criterion concerns the substance of the involvement of developing country evaluators/researchers and organisations in the proposed study as well as the efforts designed to build local capacity to produce impact evaluations and contribute to policy influence. Developing country researchers are defined as developing country nationals resident in a developing country during the majority of the duration of the study. Lower scores reflect developing country nationals and organisations primarily involved in and receiving training in logistical or survey activities. Higher scores reflect developing country nationals serving as analysts and, when necessary, receiving capacity building in research methodologies. Higher scores also reflect greater institutional collaboration between mature and emerging research organisations. The highest scores reflect significant participation of developing country PIs and applications with a developing country organization as the grant holder (and receiving institutional capacity building as necessary). Credit should also be given for the participation of developing country researchers as sector specialists and/or to conduct qualitative analysis.										
<b>Reviewer comments (not more than 250 words):</b>										
<b>Select a point score based on how well the requirements for this criterion are met.</b>										
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not met			Weakly met			Sufficiently met			Exceeded	

**Criterion: Quality of technical proposal: internal validity: 30%**

**Description and requirements:** Technical quality concerns whether the proposed impact evaluation addresses the questions of ‘what works, why and for how much?’ using the best available methodology. Studies should be: (1) feasible, i.e. the information can be collected and analyzed in ways that make it possible to attribute impact to a particular program; and (2) rigorous if it meets accepted standards of evidence for attributing impact to a particular program (see 3ie’s Principles of Impact Evaluation). Reviewers should also assess the strength of gender analysis and appropriate disaggregation of data in the proposal. Reviewers should assess: the identification strategy, treatment of spillovers and contamination, adequacy of power calculations, treatment of sub-groups (in particular gender), and ethical issues. For applications to carry out CGE-type of studies, reviewers should assess the quality of the dataset, the plausibility of the calibration assumptions, model closure, the nature of the simulations and the internal validity of the social protection impact estimates upon which the study will be based. For applications to analyze context, reviewers should assess whether the proposed inclusion/exclusion criteria for evaluations are appropriate and whether the proposed methodology(ies) for analyzing the results of those evaluations is systematic and will yield credible and robust findings.

**Reviewer comments (not more than 250 words):**

**Select a point score based on how well the requirements for this criterion are met.**

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not met			Weakly met			Sufficiently met			Exceeded	

**Criterion: Quality of technical proposal: external validity: 30%**

**Description and requirements:** Reviewers should assess: incorporation of intervention’s theory of change into the evaluation design, the use of mixed-methods as appropriate, and cost-effectiveness or cost-benefit analysis. Reviewers should also assess the way in which the design ensures policy relevance and research uptake.

**Reviewer comments (not more than 250 words):**

**Select a point score based on how well the requirements for this criterion are met.**

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not met			Weakly met			Sufficiently met			Exceeded	

## SECOND PASS SCORING

<b>Criterion:</b> Policy relevance: 40%										
<b>Description and requirements:</b> Policy relevance has two dimensions: (1) alignment with national and international priorities, and (2) the importance of the intervention. Alignment is defined as the extent to which the objectives of the intervention to be evaluated are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, and global priorities. To meet this requirement, the issues addressed by the proposal should be consistent with national and international policies, and enduring, meaning that the proposal addresses policy questions that are likely to continue being important in 5 to 10 years time. Importance is defined as having either (i) substantial scale or expected effect size (i.e., affecting a large number of people, implying large resource outlays, or having large effects on a sub-population), or (ii) innovative intervention (not evaluation) design, with the potential be scaled up. In addition, the Social Protection Thematic Window places a priority on low income countries, so the coverage and relevance to low income countries should be reflected in the policy relevance score.										
<b>Reviewer comments (not more than 250 words):</b>										
<b>Select a point score based on how well the requirements for this criterion are met.</b>										
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not met		Weakly met			Sufficiently met			Exceeded		

<b>Criterion:</b> Potential policy impact: 40%										
<b>Description and requirements:</b> Potential policy impact is the extent to which the study has the potential to influence national, regional and international policy. Potential policy impact is measured against factors in the evaluation process which make policy impact more likely. Policy impact is also a function of policy relevance and evaluation design, which are assessed under different headings. The factors assessed for policy impact are: (1) the engagement of key stakeholders in identification of the evaluation questions; (2) proven demand for the study, including clear indication of intended use of evaluation findings by the implementing agency; and (3) the quality of the policy influence strategy for the study.										
<b>Reviewer comments (not more than 250 words):</b>										
<b>Select a point score based on how well the requirements for this criterion are met.</b>										
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not met		Weakly met			Sufficiently met			Exceeded		

**Criterion: Cost: 20%**

**Description and requirements:** This criterion includes two dimensions: total price reasonableness and best value. Total price reasonableness is an assessment of whether the total requested budget for the project is an appropriate price for the scale of the work to be undertaken (e.g. the number of surveys, the amount of analysis, etc.) in the country or region where the evaluation will take place. Best value is an assessment of whether the evaluation (taking into account quality, relevance, and impact) for the total requested budget is a good value compared to other possible evaluations. In making the best value assessment, reviewers can consider other 3ie applications reviewed or outside information they may have on actual or potential impact evaluations and their costs. For awarded grantees, 3ie and GDN will conduct a line item review of the budgets, so line items do not need to be reviewed here, although reviewers are welcome to make comments on line items if you would like.

**Reviewer comments (not more than 250 words):**

**Select a point score based on how well the requirements for this criterion are met.**

○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not met			Weakly met			Sufficiently met			Exceeded	

Possible review statuses

Reject	Major revisions	Minor changes	Accept
--------	-----------------	---------------	--------