

GUIDELINES FOR THE RELEVANCE AND TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT

**EDUCATION SECTOR FUND "DIGITAL INCLUSION: EDUCATION WITH NEW HORIZONS"
 2018 CALL**

The following is a basic guide to the assessment of the projects. Each item and sub item is accompanied by a set of guiding questions to help undertake the assessment. While these questions are the basis of the assessment, it does not follow that the rating of each item or subitem should not incorporate or be based on other aspects that the evaluator may deem applicable. In addition, it is clear that in some cases it will not be possible to answer all the guiding questions.

A. ELEGIBILITY ASSESSMENT

Is the proposal a research project?		
RATING	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory
Support your assessment:		
<p>Is the submitted proposal in line with the objectives of the Fund as defined in the Terms and Conditions of the Call?</p> <p>Is the topic to be addressed consistent with any of the lines of research defined in the Terms and Conditions of the Call?</p>		
SCORE	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory
Support your assessment:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the two criteria are satisfactory, the PROJECT IS ELEGIBLE • If either of the criteria is UNSATISFACTORY, the PROJECT IS INELEGIBLE and will not go through to technical assessment. Therefore, special attention is requested for supporting this assessment. 		

B. RELEVANCE AND PRIORITIZATION ASSESSMENT

¿How would you assess the proposal considering the relevance of the topic and its potential to effectively transfer knowledge -as stated in the project-?

SCORE	NON-PRIORITIZED	PRIORITIZED

Support your assessment:

A. TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT

1. 1. TECHNICAL-SCIENTIFIC CONTENT (40%)					
1.1 Originality and contribution to the field of knowledge (30%)					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the implementation of the project justified and relevant in the context of the current status of knowledge? • Is there evidence of a suitable, updated and comprehensive review of relevant literature for the implementation of the Project? • Is the problem to be solved appropriately delimited and raised? 					
SCORE	Unsatisfactory (1-3)	Fair (4-6)	Good (7-8)	Very good (9-10)	Outstanding (11-12)
Support your assessment:					
1.2. General objective, specific objectives and expected results (30%)					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the general objective, specific objectives and expected results stated clearly and are they feasible to achieve? • Are they consistent with the issues raised by the project? 					
SCORE	Unsatisfactory (1-3)	Fair (4-6)	Good (7-8)	Very good (9-10)	Outstanding (11-12)

Support your assessment:					
1.3. Research design and methodology (20%)					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the research design and methodology properly stated? • Is the proposed methodology adequate for the objectives of the Project? • Does the research design contemplate any of the epistemological approaches identified as priorities (learning analytics, foresight, benchmarking)? • Does the research design reflect the interdisciplinary nature of the proposal? 					
SCORE	Unsatisfactory (1-3)	Fair (4-6)	Good (7-8)	Very good (9-10)	Outstanding (11-12)
Support your assessment:					
1.4. Work plan (20%)					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the activities consistent with the proposed objectives and methodology? • Do the schedule and responsibilities planned in the work packages contribute to proper implementation of the project? • Is the distribution of time for each activity suitable? 					
SCORE	Unsatisfactory (1-3)	Fair (4-6)	Good (7-8)	Very good (9-10)	Outstanding (11-12)
Support your assessment:					
2. CONTRIBUTIONS AND IMPACT OF THE PROJECT (30%)					
2.1. Project contributions (35%)					
<input type="checkbox"/> Does the project involve a significant contribution to knowledge?					

Does the project contribute to one or more lines of research?
 Does the project take into consideration the gender perspective?

SCORE	Unsatisfactory (1-3)	Fair (4-6)	Good (7-8)	Very good (9-10)	Outstanding (11-12)

Support your assessment:

2.2. Impact (35%)

- Will the expected results have a significant impact on scientific knowledge?
- Do the expected results contribute to understanding the relationship between digital technologies and learning?
- Are the impacts described as measurable in the project and are they relevant to the field of knowledge?
- Are the research results likely to be transferred to or shared with the educational community or the public that took part in the study?

SCORE	Unsatisfactory (1-3)	Fair (4-6)	Good (7-8)	Very good (9-10)	Outstanding (11-12)

Support your assessment:

2.3. Promotion and dissemination (10%)

- Does the proposal include promotion and dissemination mechanisms for sharing research results?
- Does the proposal include participation in conferences, presentations, national or international seminars and/or generating/participating in publications aimed to share/transfer knowledge?

SCORE	Unsatisfactory (1-3)	Fair (4-6)	Good (7-8)	Very good (9-10)	Outstanding (11-12)

Support your assessment:

2.4. Intelectual property and transfer (5%)					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● In case it applies, does the proposal states clear mechanisms for protecting intellectual property (patents, licencing, etc.)? ● Does the proposal include suitable mechanisms for enduring that research products are open, accessible and can be reused? 					
SCORE	Unsatisfactory (1-3)	Fair (4-6)	Good (7-8)	Very good (9-10)	Outstanding (11-12)
Support your assessment:					
2.5. Ethical considerations 10%					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Is the selection of the ethical framework appropriately justified? ● Does the proposal include all the necessary measures for guaranteeing compliance with the ethical framework? 					
SCORE	Unsatisfactory (1-3)	Fair (4-6)	Good (7-8)	Very good (9-10)	Outstanding (11-12)
Support your assessment:					
3. RESOURCES FOR PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION (25%)					
3.1. Human resources (70%)					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Do the researchers have the necessary training, skills and/or scientific background for the proper conduct of this research? ● Are the members' duties and responsibilities clearly and properly defined? ● Is the dedication of the different participants in the project appropriate for their roles? Is the amount of time and effort suited to the scope of the Project? ● Does the project contemplate the building of inter-institutional partnerships with other national and/or international institutions to enrich the research proposal? 					

SCORE	Unsatisfactory (1-3)	Fair (4-6)	Good (7-8)	Very good (9-10)	Outstanding (11-12)

Support your assessment:

3.2. Other resources and budget (30%)

- Is the budget well-structured for the undertaking of the planned activities and achievement of the Project objectives?
- Does the project have complementary means of funding?

SCORE	Unsatisfactory (1-3)	Fair (4-6)	Good (7-8)	Very good (9-10)	Outstanding (11-12)

Support your assessment:

OVERALL JUDGMENT OF EXTERNAL ASSESSMENT

SCORE	Projects with major observations (1 - 8)	Projects with minor observations (9-10)	Outstanding project (11- 12)
-------	--	---	---------------------------------

Support your assessment:

GLOBAL ASSESSMENT OF THE ASSESSMENT AND MONITORING COMMITTEE – CES

1. Judgment

Should this application be funded?

YES

NO

2. Global Rating

Outstanding project	(11- 12)
Project with minor observations	(9-10)
Project with major observations	(1 - 8)
Support your assessment:	