Adjudication Criteria for Catalyst Grant Applications

Criteria / Point	Poor	Fair	Good	Outstanding
Project rationale, goals, and objectives (max 4 points)	Rationale is provided but with unclear linkages to the stated goals and objectives.	Rationale is clear and linked to the goals and objectives, though some may be overly broad or general.	Rationale is strong with clear linkages to well-articulated goals and objectives that are specific enough to gauge the success of the project.	Per good + project rationale, goals, and objectives collectively create a clear understanding of the significant need for the research and a keen interest in its results.
Project impact and alignment with the DSI Mission and/or Thematic Programs	Project impact is poorly explained and alignment with the DSI mission or the Thematic Programs is weak.	Project impact is explained and somewhat aligned with the DSI mission or Thematic Programs.	Project impact is clearly explained and is well-aligned with the DSI mission or the Thematic Programs.	Per good + project impact will significantly advance DSI mission or Thematic Programs and has strong potential to catalyze future activity at the DSI in related topics.
Research approach and methods * Novelty = new methodological approach or novel application of existing approach to an unsolved problem	Research approach is not clearly explained or is inappropriate for the problem. Proposal lacks novelty*.	Research approach is clearly explained and appropriate. Data and data sources are clearly described. Expected results are linked to project goals and objectives. Proposal has limited novelty*.	Research approach is 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.
CRT members and trainees' roles, collaboration and training plans	Roles of CRT members and trainee are poorly described. Limited or no discussion of collaboration and training plans. CRT lacks data science expertise.	Roles of CRT members and trainees are described. Some discussion of collaboration 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 and training plans (e.g., joint research group meetings, sharing of space/resources, joint supervision of trainees). 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 and training plans go beyond meeting original project goals and are likely to drive additional collaborative research that extend past the end of the project, supporting future research opportunities.

Criteria / Point	Poor	Fair	Good	Outstanding
Project milestones and timelines	Project milestones include limited details and are hard to measure. Timeline is unrealistic.	Project milestones are detailed and some are measurable. They provide a roadmap towards achieving project objectives. Timeline is realistic but some milestones may be hard to achieve.	Project milestones are very detailed and all are measurable. They provide a coherent roadmap towards achieving project objectives. Timeline is realistic.	Per good + contingency plans in place to ensure successful completion of project if challenges encountered.
Feasibility, research environment, and budget justification	Many aspects of 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.
Equity, diversity and inclusion (EDI) considerations	EDI considerations are mentioned but appear to be an afterthought.	EDI considerations are considered for some aspects of the project, such as in forming the team or in the research approach.	EDI considerations are interwoven throughout the entire proposal, including objectives, team, and methodology. Research approach articulates a comprehensive plan with respect to EDI (e.g., through considering bias in data sources, incorporating fairness in algorithms or methodology development, or interpreting and disseminating the results through a lens of stakeholder diversity).	Per good + team members have actively sought to improve their understanding of EDI (e.g., relevant training is completed/planned for team members in areas of unconscious bias, sex and gender-based analysis, etc.).