

Guidelines for Proposal Evaluation

Multi-Disciplinary Grants-Faculty of Medicine (MDG-FoM)

Preamble

This document gives the guidelines for the disbursement of the funds available for multi-disciplinary research-Faculty of Medicine

Implementation plan

- Faculty Research Committee (FRC) will call for applications once a year
- Proposals will be requested in a designated template
- The number of grants to be awarded per-year will be determined by the FRC
- Duration of the grant: 2 years with 1 year extension if necessary
- An applicant can maximally be included as PI in one project funded by MDG-FoM scheme
- A PI of an active MDG-FoM is eligible to reapply as a PI only after completion and submission of the final report of an ongoing project.
- Six monthly progress reports should be sent to the FRC
- Grants will be awarded in two categories
 - Established researchers
 - Seed funding or pilot projects
 - **Seed funding** - for those within the first year after returning with a PhD or overseas training after MD, or those within the first year of appointment if recruited directly at senior lecturer grade
 - **Pilot projects** - anyone can apply for provided that the concept is novel
 - If funding is limited, proposals for seed funding will be given preference over pilot projects
- Maximum amount for established researcher path – to be determined based on available funds
- Maximum amount for seed funding/pilot projects pathway – to be determined based on available funds
- Evaluation
 - Panel will be appointed by the FRC
 - Panel members should not have applied for an MDG-FoM in the same year
 - Each proposal will be evaluated by two content experts in relation to the major discipline of the study (one of whom should be outside of the University of Peradeniya)
 - At least one of the two should be an expert in study design and at least one person should have a track record of securing grants.
 - Final decision will be taken by the FRC

Type 1: Established Researchers (Senior Lecturers and Professors)

This rubric allocates a total of 100 points, distributed across the criteria.

Criteria	Weight	Scoring Guidelines
Proposal Quality (40%)	40 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clarity of Objectives (5 points): Goals are specific, measurable, and realistic.• Integration of Disciplines (5 points): Explicit and realistic plans to merge methods or knowledge from at least two/three disciplines.• Innovation (10 points): Proposal demonstrates novelty, a clear departure from existing approaches or justifiable local relevance• Availability of pilot data (20 marks): The researchers have demonstrated availability of pilot data or preliminary work from the same team, in the area
Team Composition (25%)	25 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Multidisciplinary Representation (5 points): Team includes experts from at least two distinct disciplines.• Proven Track Record (15 points): Demonstrated history of impactful research/publications.• Collaborative Experience (5 points): Evidence of prior successful interdisciplinary collaboration.
Impact (10%)	10 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Scientific Impact (7.5 points): Proposal shows potential for significant contributions to knowledge at least in local context• Societal Impact (2.5 points): Project outcomes clearly benefit society, policy, or industry.
Feasibility and Budget (25%)	25 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Sound Methodology (15 points): Methods are detailed, realistic, and replicable.• Budget Justification (5 points): Allocations are proportional to goals and resources.• Timeline Realism (5 points): Objectives achievable within the project timeframe.

KPI for successful completion:

- At least 1 full text paper in a journal with an impact factor > 2 or in a Q3 or above category journal
- At least 2 conference proceedings
- Completion of a MPhil/PhD would be considered more favorably in the subsequent applications

Type 2: Seed Funding (Early-Career Researchers or Pilot Projects)

This rubric allocates a total of 100 points with an emphasis on potential and growth.

Criteria	Weight	Scoring Guidelines
Proposal Quality (40%)	40 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Idea Novelty (15 points): Proposal presents an innovative idea with clear potential at least in local contextAlignment with the PIs training (10 points): Project aligns with training of the PI or the track record (for pilot projects) or a clear justification why a pilot project is being done in an area where the PI is not an expertFeasibility (15 points): Goals are realistic, and methods are well-defined and appropriate for the project's scope.
Team Composition (20%)	20 points	<p><i>For seed funding</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Diverse Collaboration (5 points): Team includes members from at least two distinct disciplines.For seed funding: Capacity Building (15 points): Includes plans developing capacity under a collaborator with a track record <p><i>For pilot projects</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Diverse collaboration – 15 pointsCapacity building – 5 points
Potential Impact (30%)	30 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Pathway to Future Funding (30 points): Proposal outlines potential for scaling up or applying for larger grants.
Resource Use (10%)	10 points	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Efficient Budgeting (5 points): Budget allocations are well-justified and realistic.Use of Existing Infrastructure (5 points):

KPI for successful completion:

- At least 1 full text paper in a journal with an impact factor > 1
- At least 1 conference proceeding