**DSI Catalyst Grant full proposal rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Poor** | **Fair** | **Good**  | **Outstanding**  |
| **A. Rationale, Objectives, & Goals** | Rationale is provided but is unclearly linked to the stated objectives and goals.  | Rationale is clear and linked to the objectives and goals; however, some are overly broad or general. | Rationale is strong with clear linkages to well-articulated objectives and goals that are specific enough to gauge the success of the project.  | Rationale, objectives, and goals collectively create a clear understanding of the significant need for the research and a keen interest in its results. |
| **Maximum: 4 points** | 0 points | 1 point | 2-3 points | 4 points |
| **B. Impact & Alignment** [DSI Mission](https://datasciences.utoronto.ca/dsi-home/about-vision-mission-values/)  *A score of 0 means the project is not fundable.*  | Impact is poorly explained and alignment with the DSI mission and/or co-sponsored subcall is weak. | Project impact is explained and somewhat aligned with the DSI mission and/or co-sponsored subcall. | Project impact is clearly explained and is well-aligned with the DSI mission and/or co-sponsored subcall. | Project impact will significantly advance the DSI mission and/or co-sponsored subcall and has strong potential to catalyze future activity at the DSI in related topics. |
| **Maximum: 4 points** | 0 points | 1 point | 2-3 points | 4 points |
| **C. Research Design & Methods** Tier 1: “Novelty” indicates a new data science methodological approach or novel application of existing approach to an unsolved problemTier 2: “Novelty” is expanded to include novel applications of existing data science methodological approaches to catalyze new research methodologies in a domain | Research design and methods are not clearly explained or are inappropriate for the problem. Proposal lacks novelty. | Research design and methods are clearly explained and appropriate. Data and data sources are clearly described. Expected results are linked to project objectives and goals. Proposal has limited novelty. | Research design and methods are clearly explained and appropriate. Data and data sources are clearly described. Expected results are linked to project goals and objectives. Methodological choice is justified by contrasting with alternatives. Proposal is novel. | Per good + research approach goes well beyond achieving the goals and objectives of the original project and has potential for broader applicability to problems in other contexts. |
| **Maximum: 6 points** | 0 points | 1-2 points | 3-4 points | 5-6 points |
| **D. EDI in Research Design & Methods**[DSI EDI Statement](https://datasciences.utoronto.ca/dsi-home/about-vision-mission-values/#edi)EDI Resources*A score of <2 means the project is not fundable.* | If appropriate, likelihood and degree of EDI impact due to research design and methods is low. The EDI components of data collection, methods, and/or community engagement do not align with the DSI’s EDI statement. | If appropriate, likelihood and degree of EDI impact due to research design and methods is modest. The EDI components of data collection, methods, and/or community engagement somewhat align with the DSI’s EDI statement. | If appropriate, likelihood and degree of EDI impact due to research design and methods is robust. The EDI components of data collection, methods, and/or community engagement align with the DSI’s EDI statement. | If appropriate, likelihood and degree of EDI impact due to research design and methods is outstanding. The EDI components of data collection, methods, and/or community engagement have excellent alignment with the DSI’s EDI statement. |
| **Maximum: 3 points** | 0 points | 1 point | 2 points | 3 points |
| **E. EDI in Collaboration, Recruitment, & Training**[DSI EDI Statement](https://datasciences.utoronto.ca/dsi-home/about-vision-mission-values/#edi)EDI Resources*A score of <2 means the project is not fundable.* | Likelihood and degree of impact of EDI due to collaboration, training, and recruitment is low. The EDI components of collaboration, training, and recruitment are not aligned with the DSI’s EDI statement. | Likelihood and degree of impact of EDI due to collaboration, training, and recruitment is modest. The EDI components of collaboration, training, and recruitment somewhat align with the DSI’s EDI statement. | Likelihood and degree of impact of EDI due to collaboration, training, and recruitment is robust The EDI components of collaboration, training, and recruitment align with the DSI’s EDI statement. | Likelihood and degree of impact of EDI due to collaboration, training, and recruitment is outstanding The EDI components of collaboration, training, and recruitment have excellent alignment with the DSI’s EDI statement. |
| **Maximum: 3 points** | 0 points | 1 point | 2 points | 3 points |
| **F. Roles, Expertise, & Collaboration** | Roles of CRT members and trainees are poorly described. Limited or no discussion of collaboration, recruitment, and training plans. CRT lacks data science expertise. | Roles of CRT members and trainees are described. Some discussion of collaboration, recruitment, and training plans. At least one Co-PI has some expertise in a data science-related field. Team members provide somewhat complementary expertise. | Roles of CRT members and trainees are clearly described. Thorough discussion of collaboration, recruitment, and training plans. At least one Co-PI has strong expertise in a data science-related field. Team members provide complementary expertise. | Per good + CRT members are highly complementary and perfectly suited for the project. Collaboration, recruitment, and training plans go beyond meeting original project goals and are likely to drive additional collaborative research that extends past the end of the project, supporting future research opportunities. |
| **Maximum: 4 points** | 0 points | 1 point | 2-3 points | 4 points |
| **G. Timeline & Milestones** | Timeline is unrealistic. Milestones include limited details and are hard to measure. | Timeline is realistic but some milestones may be hard to achieve. Milestones are detailed and some are measurable, providing a roadmap towards achieving objectives.  | Timeline is realistic. Milestones are very detailed and all are measurable. They provide a coherent roadmap towards achieving project objectives.  | Per good + contingency plans in place to ensure successful completion of project if challenges are encountered.  |
| **Maximum: 4 points** | 0 points | 1 point | 2-3 points | 4 points |
| **H. Feasibility & Budget**[DSI EDI Statement](https://datasciences.utoronto.ca/dsi-home/about-vision-mission-values/#edi)EDI Resources | Many aspects of the project do not appear feasible, research environment is not appropriate, or budget includes inappropriate items. | Most aspects of project appear feasible. Research environment provides support for completing the project. Budget includes limited justification of expenses. | Project is entirely feasible. Research environment provides excellent support for completing the project successfully. A detailed budget justification is provided for all expenses. | Per good + budget demonstrates judicious use of requested funds and leverages existing research environment to the fullest. Project expenses are clearly linked to the feasibility of the project. |
| **Maximum: 4 points** | 0 points | 1 point | 2-3 points | 3-4 points |
| **Maximum: 30 points** |  |  |  |  |