



Catalyst Grant Scoring Rubric

Guiding Criteria	Inadequate (Score 0-2.0)	Fair (Score 2.1-3.0)	Good (Score 3.1-4.0)	Excellent (Score 4.1-5.0)
Multi-disciplinarity	Research team consists of a single discipline	Research teams consists of more than one disciplines but all from the same Division. Unclear explanation of how multidisciplinary is reflected in the research	Research team consists of more than one disciplines from different Divisions, with an explanation for how multidisciplinary is reflected in the research	Research team consists of more than one disciplines from multiple Divisions and Campuses, and a clear explanation for how multidisciplinary is reflected in the research
Trainee involvement (post-graduate and undergraduate students; post-doctoral fellows)	Research team does not include any trainee, and proposal does not allow engagement of trainees	Research team does not include any trainee, but proposal indicates active engagement	Research team consists of trainees	Research team consists of trainees at various levels, and proposal includes effective mentorship and capacity building plans
Relevance to the research questions and themes of IFP	Proposal lacks relevance, or inadequately explained	Proposal loosely align with questions and themes	Proposal aligns well with questions and themes	Proposal has excellent alignment with questions and themes, and indicates how the ideas can be further developed
Research design and methodology	Design and methodology are considered inappropriate or infeasible	Design and methodology are appropriate, but inadequately explained or lacks justification. Deliverables and timeline appear feasible	Design and methodology are appropriate, clearly explained and justified (e.g., data source, alternative methods). Deliverables and timeline are clear and attainable	Design and methodology are excellent, and also describes strategies for external funding application and partnership development
Research impact	Proposed project lacks impact or inadequately described	Proposed project's potential impact is unclear or loosely defined	Proposed project has important, clearly defined impact	Proposed project may generate new knowledge, with potential for major impact
Relevance to practice and policy	Proposal is not considered relevant to practice and policy	Proposal may have relevance to practice and policy, or inadequately explained. Limited potential for broader engagement	Proposal has clear relevance to practice and policy, and potential for community and stakeholders engagement	Proposal has clear important relevance to practice and policy; and includes named knowledge users in the community, and/or engagement of stakeholders
Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI best practices - https://research.utoronto.ca/se-cure/EDI-tips-and-resources_GENERAL_May2021.pdf)	Proposal lacks information on, or does not incorporate EDI-practices and health equity lens	Proposal minimally addresses EDI-practices and health equity, or information provided is insufficient for evaluation	Proposal adequately addresses EDI-practices and health equity, and incorporates into research design and outcomes plans for engagement	Proposal adequately and clearly addresses EDI-practices and health equity, and incorporates into research design and outcomes; has important implications to reduce health inequities; experience in engagement with such affected communities
Budget justification	Budget is unclear or not well justified	Budget demonstrates clear use of funds, but lacks adequate justification	Budget demonstrates clear use of funds, with adequate justification for expenses	Budget demonstrates proper and clear use of funds, including appropriate leverage of existing research environment