Call for Research Projects: Promoting the Integration of Digital Technologies to Strengthen the Educational Pathways of Socioeconomically Vulnerable Populations in Latin America and the Caribbean

EVALUATION GUIDELINES 2025

A. RELEVANCE

1. PROJECT RELEVANCE		
Assesses the relevance of the project in relation to the thematic focus of the selected call.		
RATING	**NO (unsatisfactory)**	**YES (satisfactory)**
Justification:		
2. PROPONENT ORGANIZATION BACKGROUND		
Assesses the background, technical capacities, and reliability of the proponent organization for carrying out the project.		
RATING	**NO (unsatisfactory)**	**YES (satisfactory)**
Justification:		
• **If both relevance criteria are satisfactory, the project is considered relevant.** • **If either criterion is unsatisfactory, the project is deemed not relevant and will not proceed to technical evaluation. Therefore, please provide detailed justification for any unsatisfactory ratings.**		

B. PRIORITIZATION

Indicate the level of priority assigned to this proposal based on its expected contribution to the objectives of this call. Consider the project's potential impact or tangible effects in the country or countries involved.					
SCORE	**1 (Unsatisfactory)**	**2 (Fair)**	**3 (Good)**	**4 (Very Good)**	**5 (Excellent)**
Justification:					

C. TECHNICAL EVALUATION

1. CONCEPTUAL CLARITY, FEASIBILITY, AND INNOVATION OF THE PROPOSAL (40%)					
1.1 DESCRIPTION AND RELEVANCE OF THE PROBLEM (25%)					
Assesses the extent to which the problem or situation to be addressed is clearly identified in the proposal and whether it is relevant in light of the objectives and thematic focus of the call.					
SCORE	**1 (Unsatisfactory)**	**2 (Fair)**	**3 (Good)**	**4 (Very Good)**	**5 (Excellent)**
Justification:					
1.2 GENERAL AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES AND EXPECTED RESULTS (25%)					
Assesses the clarity, pertinence, feasibility, and coherence of the general objective, specific objectives, and expected results of the project. Evaluates the extent to which the proposal addresses one or more of the defined research lines.					
SCORE	**1 (Unsatisfactory)**	**2 (Fair)**	**3 (Good)**	**4 (Very Good)**	**5 (Excellent)**
Justification:					
1.3 RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (25%)					
Assesses the adequacy of the research design and methodology, considering: the relevance, currency, and thoroughness of the literature review; the justification of the methodological strategy selected to achieve the project's objectives; the practical usefulness of the proposed outputs; and the inclusion of mitigation strategies to address potential challenges and limitations of the proposed methodology.					
SCORE	**1 (Unsatisfactory)**	**2 (Fair)**	**3 (Good)**	**4 (Very Good)**	**5 (Excellent)**
Justification:					
1.4 INNOVATION, IMPACTS AND SCALABILITY (25%)					
Assesses the application of innovative approaches, the originality of the concepts presented, and their potential to generate meaningful transformation within the relevant field of knowledge. Evaluates the extent to which the project's expected results and impacts contribute to addressing the identified problem, and whether the project has the potential to be scaled up or replicated in other contexts at the international level.					
SCORE	**1 (Unsatisfactory)**	**2 (Fair)**	**3 (Good)**	**4 (Very Good)**	**5 (Excellent)**
Justification:					

2 BUDGET AND OTHER RESOURCES (20%)					
Assesses whether the budget is well structured to support the planned activities and achieve the expected objectives and results. Consider whether the requested budget categories are appropriate, and also take into account the additional resources available to the project.					
SCORE	**1 (Unsatisfactory)**	**2 (Fair)**	**3 (Good)**	**4 (Very Good)**	**5 (Excellent)**
Justification:					
3 CAPACITY OF THE RESEARCH TEAM (20%)					
Assesses whether the research team possesses the qualifications, competencies, and scientific background required to carry out the project. Consider the roles and responsibilities assigned. If more than one organization is involved, assess whether their collaboration is relevant to the project.					
SCORE	**1 (Unsatisfactory)**	**2 (Fair)**	**3 (Good)**	**4 (Very Good)**	**5 (Excellent)**
Justification:					
4 WORK PLAN (20%)					
Assesses the coherence of the activities and their timeline in relation to the objectives and methodology. Consider whether the timeframes and the team members' assigned responsibilities are appropriate for proper project implementation.					
SCORE	**1 (Unsatisfactory)**	**2 (Fair)**	**3 (Good)**	**4 (Very Good)**	**5 (Excellent)**
Justification:					
5 OVERALL ASSESSMENT					
Summarize the main strengths and weaknesses of this project.					
Justification:					

D. COMMITTEE'S OVERALL EVALUATION

COMMITTEE'S OVERALL ASSESSMENT
Committee's overall assessment and feedback to the proponent organization: