*Format:* The RFP proposal should follow the formatting of this template: all text should be double-spaced, Times New Roman 12-point font, with 1-inch margins.

*Length:* Maximum of 8 pages total, and observe the recommended maximum page limits for each required section as laid out below.

*Content*: The proposal document should describe the project in sufficient detail to allow reviewers to determine its feasibility and potential impact on development policy. The background/motivation section is to be extremely concise. The proposal should focus on the nuts and bolts of the study and the proposed budget. For example, if the project includes a survey, description of survey content (and survey questions, if these have already been developed), and detail about the data collection approach should be provided; if the project involves a game, the game design should be described in sufficient detail for reviewers to judge it. The proposal should include the following sections:

1. **Introduction and background** (1.5 pages)

i) An outline of the research hypothesis and relevance to the Fund’s mission (see Project Guidelines below).

ii) Very concise background/motivation.

2. **Methodology and research approach** (5 pages)

i) Detailed description of methods and identification strategy (for empirical proposals intended to estimate a causal effect).

ii) Detailed explanation of outcome variables, and their measurement

iii) Explanation of the availability of data (for empirical proposals).

iv) If a randomized trial: power calculations, sample size and description of sample stratification (to achieve similar control and treatment groups). We strongly encourage stratification to provide more power for given sample size and cost.***RFPs that do not incorporate stratification should state why stratification is not appropriate for the proposal*** ***RFPs that do not meet this rule will be considered ineligible and not be evaluated by the committee. [[1]](#footnote-1)***

v) If the proposal is to work with a private firm: a convincing case that Weiss Fund support is necessary and why the firm cannot fund the project itself. The Fund seeks to avoid giving a competitive advantage to any particular private firm and may disqualify proposals on these grounds. Any distortion of the market towards a particular firm would be considered as subtracting from the net social benefit of the project and hence the benefits to society beyond the private firm would have to be commensurately greater for the project to be considered favorably.

3. **Timeline and budget** (1.5 pages)

i) Project timeline

ii) Budget narrative and cost-effectiveness explanation (see budget guidelines below for instructions).

iii) If student applicant: description of research background and evidence of ability to complete the project.

4. **Appendix (optional).** This can contain tables, figures, survey questions/instrument, protocols, devices used, etc. The appendix will not count towards the page limit but may not include a continuation of the proposal narrative.

1. A good primer on designing randomized evaluations is Glennerster, R., & Takavarasha, K. (2013). *Running randomized evaluations: A practical guide.* *JSTOR,*[www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt4cgd52](http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt4cgd52). Another useful resource that discusses methods to improve balance on observables, and advantages of stratification, is Bruhn, Miriam, and David McKenzie. “In Pursuit of Balance: Randomization in Practice in Development Field Experiments.” *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, vol. 1, no. 4, 2009, pp. 200–232. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)