

Scoring criteria

Expression of Interest for Country Research Teams

Expressions of interest will receive a binary 'invited to bid' or 'not invited to bid' assessment. This will be communicated to applicants by 7 September 2015.

In addition, bidders will receive a score (see details below) as well as information on the relative placing of this score (i.e. whether their Eol ranked in the top, middle or bottom third of Eols received). Feedback will be provided against the criteria below. The score, rank and feedback is intended to inform further development of Eols into proposals for those invited to bid, or – for those not invited to bid – possible revisions to Eols should the applicant choose to re-submit to the second call in 2016.

Bidders intending to submit an Eol for a country other than Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Pakistan or Vietnam will need to make a compelling case for studying another country before moving on to the overall Eol review process. Providing that a compelling case is made, the bid will be assessed on equal terms with bids for the seven listed countries against the criteria below.

Non-RISE country review criterion	Score
Does the potential bidder make a compelling case for studying another country/context that is on the DFID priority list? Note. The Country Selection Criteria will be used as the basis for this assessment.	Pass/ Fail

Bidders that have submitted an Eol for Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Vietnam, or have passed the 'Non-RISE preferred country review criterion' above will be scored on the criteria listed below. Eols will be scored out of 5 for each criterion and scores will be multiplied by the criterion's weight. The sum of the products is the overall score.



Oxford Policy Management



BLAVATNIK
SCHOOL of GOVERNMENT



Center
for Global
Development



Criteria	Details	Weight
1. Research focus:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - System's focus: Is/are the reform(s), innovation(s), or system element(s) that are the focus of the research at the system or sub-system level? Does the research focus have potential for learning about education systems? - Relevance: Do/does the bidder(s) make a compelling case for why the reform(s), innovation(s), or system element(s) will affect large-scale changes in learning for all? Does the bidder demonstrate recognition of potential constraints to the implementation of the reform? - Do/does the bidder(s) make clear what elements will lead to better performance in learning outcomes across subgroups such as gender, wealth, ethnicity, and rurality? - Ambition: Is the research focus ambitious enough in scope and scale? That is to say, does the research focus inform and generate change at the system level and examine how to improve learning outcomes for substantial proportions of national or state-level populations? 	25
2. Quality of the proposed research methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appropriateness: Are the approach and methods proposed rigorous and appropriate to the research focus? - Does the EoI outline a convincing and researchable causal identification or plausibility narrative from the proposed reform(s), innovation(s), or system element(s) to improved learning outcomes for all? - Multi-disciplinarity: Does the research proposed use a mix of research methods and a variety of disciplines appropriate to the research focus? 	25
3. Quality of proposed lead researchers	<p>Qualifications of up to three key staff.</p> <p>Does the team proposed reflect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proven world class track record of research and publication in relevant disciplines; - Multiple years of experience working in proposed country, national language(s) ability, relationships with proposed implementers, policymakers, and other education stakeholders; - Policy experience and experience working in education policy and implementation. 	20

4. Organisational capabilities of lead organisation and research partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the proposed consortium have the ability to implement large scale and long term research projects in country? - Relevance: Lead organisation and/or partners' experience relevant to the reform(s), innovation(s), or system element(s) being studied. To what extent have the lead and/or partners worked in this area of education before? What strengths do they bring to studying this/these reform(s), innovation(s), or system element(s)? 	15
5. Demonstrable in-country embeddedness and track record of policy engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the lead organisation and/or partners demonstrate embeddedness in domestic policy dialogue, including relationships with policymakers and other key stakeholders who could be influenced by study results? - Does the lead organisation and/or partners' experience include an understanding of how policy works as well as a track record or history of working with implementing partners or other actors involved in education policy reform? 	15
Total		100