



Maria Nowak Research Fellowship

Selection Criteria: Definitions and Ranking

Description

The following indicators are designed to give definitions for the ranking in the Maria Nowak Research Fellowship selection criteria. The marks are from **one (1) to five (5), with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest** possible mark. The objective is to clarify what the various rankings mean and give further information as to why the mark was given.

Guidelines for filling out the selection criteria

For each row, determine the description most suitable for the participant. Choose the mark that is the closest to describing the participant's selection. Please keep in mind that a mark of one (1) means that the candidate did not fulfil the designated criteria and that a mark of five (5) means that the candidate exceeded expectations for the pertinent criteria.

Criteria	Question	Valuation	Weight	Guidelines & Examples
Research Question	What is your research need? What would be the main goal of the research? What are your main research questions?	1-5	25%	<p>5 (Excellent): The research need, the goal of the research and the research questions are clear and well-articulated. The organisation took time to think through the research activity and has a clear plan on how to conduct it.</p> <p>1 (Poor): The research need, the goal of the research and the research questions are not clear and are poorly articulated. The organisation did not put sufficient thought and planning into the proposed research.</p>
Relevance	How is research tackling the call main topic (underserved population)? What type of insight can the research provide with regards to underserved population?	1-5	25%	<p>5 (Excellent): The proposed research contributes to building evidence and insights on the impact of the applicant's activities on target groups facing barriers to financial inclusion and entrepreneurship, such as women, migrants and refugees, youth, rural populations, people with disabilities and seniors. Additionally/alternatively, the research lays the groundwork for developing new activities or strategies tailored to the needs of the target groups, and/or explores new approaches to reinforce / expand and the scope of microfinance activities.</p> <p>1 (Poor): The proposed research does not contribute to building evidence and insights on the impact of the applicant's activities on target groups facing barriers to financial inclusion and entrepreneurship, neither it serves as a foundation to design new activities relevant to them.</p>
Feasibility	How will you make sure that the research is implemented within the proposed timeline and budget? What will be the milestones of the assignment? How are you planning to support the researcher?	1-5	25%	<p>5 (Excellent): The timeline of the proposal is feasible within the planned timeframe (8 months) for the researcher. The scope/implementation of the proposal is feasible with the proposed budget of 10,000 EUR. The proposal identifies clear and concrete milestones to reach. The proposal clearly states how the researcher will have access to the data/resources needed and a stable contact within the organisation.</p> <p>1 (Poor): The timeline proposed is clearly not feasible in 8 months nor in line with the planned budget of 10,000. Proposal does not indicate clearly how the researcher will be supported and/or it does not support the researcher enough for a successful research assignment.</p>
Impact	Which use would you make of the results? What will change for your organisation? Would you conduct this research anyway?	1-5	25%	<p>5 (Excellent): The organisation has a clear objective and direction of the use it will make of the results of the research assignment. The impact of the proposal is highly relevant and will bring significant change/new opportunities to the organisation. There is a clear added value for EMN in supporting the research (additionality).</p> <p>1 (Poor): The organisation has not a clear objective of what use it will make of the results and/or it doesn't explain it well. The proposal does not bring any concrete change to the organisation and/or the impact is not clearly presented. The proposed assignment seems repetitive and something which the organisation would have pursued anyway.</p>