



IDM Masterclass Funding Evaluation Framework

Purpose: To support the development and delivery of high-quality masterclasses that enhance postgraduate education, capacity development, and collaborative research across the IDM and UCT.

Evaluation Criteria Overview (Total Score: 100 Points)

Evaluation Category	Weight	Max Points
1. Scientific and Educational Merit	25%	25
2. Contribution to Capacity Building and Transformation	20%	20
3. Relevance to IDM and UCT Research and Training Priorities	15%	15
4. Quality and Feasibility of Implementation Plan	15%	15
5. Participant Reach and Accessibility	10%	10
6. Budget Justification and Cost- Effectiveness	10%	10
7. Evaluation and Sustainability Plan	5%	5
TOTAL	100%	100

1. Scientific and Educational Merit (25 pts)

- Quality of the academic content and learning objectives
- Use of innovative or interdisciplinary teaching approaches
- Contribution to advancing technical, analytical, or conceptual skills.
- Strong applications will:
 - Provide a clear and structured curriculum or agenda
 - Involve recognised experts or leaders in the field
 - Integrate theory with practical or applied components

IDM Education Working Group

Chair: Virginie Rozot | Co-chair: Tariq Ganief Members: Ruby Bunjun, Caron Jacobs, Elisa Nemes & Monika Looney





2. Contribution to Capacity Building and Transformation (20 pts)

- Plans to train early-career researchers, postgraduates, or technical staff (how many?)
- Strategies to promote equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI)
- Strong applications will:
 - Involve co-facilitation by emerging scientists
 - Embed mentorship or post-masterclass follow-up

3. Relevance to IDM and UCT Research and Training Priorities (15 pts)

- Clear alignment with IDM strategic themes (e.g., TB, HIV, AMR, immunology, molecular biology, global health)
- Links to national or regional research priorities
- Relevance to the needs of local postgraduate training

4. Quality and Feasibility of Implementation Plan (15 pts)

- Well-developed plan, timeline, and division of responsibilities
- Clarity on logistical arrangements (venue, registration, technical setup)
- Plans for hybrid/online accessibility (if applicable)

5. Participant Reach and Accessibility (10 pts)

- Expected number and diversity of participants.
- Accessibility for regional or national students (travel bursaries, hybrid models)
- Inclusion of open access materials or recordings

6. Budget Justification and Cost-Effectiveness (10 pts)

- Clear budget breakdown (e.g., venue, materials, speaker fees, travel)
- Reasonable and justified costs aligned with proposed outputs.
- Evidence of co-funding or in-kind contributions

7. Evaluation and Sustainability Plan (5 pts)

- Clear mechanism to collect participant feedback.
- Plans to assess learning outcomes and impact.
- Strategies to continue the initiative (e.g., follow-up events, networks, toolkits)

Final Recommendation Threshold

- 85-100: Fund in full strong strategic value
- 70-84: Fund meets core criteria
- 60-69: Fund if resources allow or request revision
- <60: Not recommended at this time.

IDM Education Working Group

Chair: Virginie Rozot | Co-chair: Tariq Ganief Members: Ruby Bunjun, Caron Jacobs, Elisa Nemes & Monika Looney