



EVALUATION RUBRICS FOR DESK EVALUATION LOCAL CHALLENGE FUND (LCF)

Research Proposals under the **Local Challenge Fund (LCF)** will be assessed by review panels/ expert evaluators based on the following **Evaluation Criteria**. The reviewers will comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal against each criteria and assign score on the basis of **Grading Scale**. An overall score will also be assigned to the application on the grading scale:

Evaluation Criteria

Criteria for Evaluation	Weightage	Score (1-7) (Refer to Grading Scale)
Relevance to the Locally Relevant Socio-Economic Issue - Does the proposal clearly identify the Locally Relevant Socio-Economic Issue, and describe what aspects of the Issue that the proposed research program will address? - Is the Locally Relevant Socio-Economic Issue significant and important enough to merit an LCF award? - Does the proposal articulate a clear and reasonable vision with regards to the research program addressing the Locally Relevant Socio-Economic Issue? - If addressed in the proposal, does the proposal effectively describe activities that contribute to addressing the SDGs?	20	
Research - Does the proposal provide sufficient background context for the project research, including an understanding of the available literature? - Does the proposal clearly demonstrate the role of local stakeholders in helping define the problem and the research agenda? - Does the proposal present a compelling case for the research plan to address the Locally Relevant Socio-Economic Issue? - Does the proposal describe an integrated research plan to address particular aspects of the Locally Relevant Socio-Economic Issue? Is the scope of the proposed research feasible and reasonable in the LCF timeframe and with the anticipated LCF budget? - Does the proposed research plan contribute scientifically to addressing the Locally Relevant Socio-Economic Issue? - Is the proposed research plan consistent with an LCF Project? - What is the scientific merit of the proposed research? - Does the dissemination plan effectively communicate the anticipated research results to all relevant stakeholders, including local partners?	20	

Local Partnerships (maximum 15 points) • Has the proposed LCF project established the necessary local partnerships to define and address the Locally Relevant Socio-Economic Issue? • Has the proposed LCF project effectively consulted with the relevant local collaborators? How well has this input been incorporated into the proposal? • Do the local partners have sufficient resources available to fulfill their commitments to the project? How does the LCF project leverage resources – financial and otherwise – that the local partners may have? • Does the proposed LCF project have an effective plan for incorporating local stakeholders into the project activities? • Is there a prior record of partnership between the local partners and the university-based project team? • Do the local partners add significant value to the proposed LCF project? • Does the proposal present a compelling case that LCF research results will be taken up by the local partners to address the Locally Relevant Socio-Economic Issue?	15	
Project Academic and Sectoral Collaborators • Has the proposed LCF project established the necessary partnerships to succeed in its vision and goals? • Does the proposal clearly describe why the academic partners were selected to contribute to the proposed LCF project? • Do the academic partners have sufficient resources available to fulfill their commitments to the project? How does the LCF project leverage other funding that the academic partners may have? • Has the proposed LCF project effectively engaged with the relevant sectoral (non-academic) collaborators? • Does the proposed LCF project have an effective plan for incorporating sectoral partnerships into the research program? • Does the proposal describe how the proposed partners – academic and/or sectoral - add value to the proposed LCF project? • Comment on the financial commitment and other contributions of the sectoral partners to the proposed LCF. • Is there a record of achievement for sectoral-academic partnerships involving those who will contribute to the LCF project?	10	
Team Capacity to Implement LCF Research Project • Does the research team – including local partners - have the appropriate track record to deliver on the research program? • Is the PI qualified to lead the LCF research project with multiple partners? Is the project management plan clearly delineated? • Is the project timeline reasonable? Does the proposal describe appropriate milestones to be delivered during the project lifetime? • Does the research team have the physical resources and facilities available to implement the proposed research plan (these can be on-site at the host institution, available through partners, or planned purchases through the proposed LCF award)? • Is the project budget reasonable? Is the budget appropriately allocated to ensure that the project goals can be achieved? • Does the proposal describe an adequate risk management strategy?	15	
Institutional Capacity to Implement LCF Research Project • Does the institution have a record of supporting research projects? • Does the institution have effective policies and practices in place to manage large awards? • Does the project strengthen the research capacity of the host institution? For example, in terms of research facilities, new partnerships, or alignment with institutional priorities. • Comment on the commitment of the Vice-Chancellor to the proposed LCF project.	10	

Integration of Proposal Elements - Does the proposal put forward an integrated workplan for an LCF award? - Does the proposal address all considerations in an achievable manner? - Does the proposal present a compelling case for support? - Does the proposal inspire confidence in the capacity of the faculty, institution and partners to deliver on the goals? - Are the anticipated project milestones deliverable on the timeline proposed? - How will the proposed LCF award address the Locally Relevant Socio-Economic Issue in a manner that is best achievable through partnership between academic and local stakeholders?	10	
---	----	--

Grading Scale

Grading Scale	Description
7- Outstanding	Exceptionally strong proposal with negligible weaknesses
6-Excellent	Very strong proposal with negligible weaknesses
5-Very Good	Very strong Proposal with minor weaknesses
4-Good	Strong proposal with minor weaknesses
3-Average	Proposal having some strengths but moderate weaknesses
2-Weak	Proposal having few strengths with major weaknesses
1-Poor	Proposal having very few strengths with numerous major weaknesses