SFU – UBC Implementation Science Institute  
EVALUATION RUBRIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>RATING SCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Potential Impact on career trajectory** (4 points) | **1**  
No discernible impact or relevance to career trajectory: The applicant's proposal shows no clear connection between the implementation science institute and their career goals.  
**2**  
Limited potential impact or relevance: The connection between the implementation science institute and the applicant's career trajectory is mentioned but not well-defined.  
**3**  
Moderate potential impact on career trajectory: The proposal demonstrates a reasonable connection between the implementation science institute and the applicant's career goals.  
**4**  
High potential impact on career trajectory, clearly defined: The proposal clearly and convincingly illustrates how the implementation science institute will significantly impact and advance the applicant's career trajectory. |
| **Commitment and interest in implementation science research** (4 points) | **1**  
No demonstrated commitment or interest.  
**2**  
Demonstrates some interest but lacks a commitment to the future pursuit of implementation science.  
**3**  
Moderate level of commitment to pursuing implementation science work.  
**4**  
Strong commitment and genuine interest in implementation science; participation in the institute important for future research plans. |
| **Overall quality and quantity of applicant's scholarship and research (relevant to stage in career, academic rank)** (4 points) | **1**  
Research contributions do not align with their career stage. Limited or no evidence of scholarly activities.  
**2**  
Show some degree of quantity and quality. Some alignment with career stage or academic rank. Limited evidence of scholarly activities.  
**3**  
Applicant’s scholarship and research demonstrate a good balance between quality and quantity. Research contributions are largely aligned with their career stage and academic rank. Evidence of regular scholarly activities.  
**4**  
Research contributions exceed expectations for their career stage and academic rank. Consistent, high-quality scholarly activities. Contributions have made or have the potential to significantly impact their field. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept paper: Quality and fit of implementation science project (4 points)</th>
<th>Project lacks quality or fit for implementation science. No understanding of what implementation science is/is not.</th>
<th>Project has limited quality or fit for implementation science. Some knowledge about what implementation science is/is not.</th>
<th>Project demonstrates moderate quality and fit for implementation science. Moderate knowledge of what implementation science is/is not.</th>
<th>High-quality, innovative project closely aligned with implementation science. Knowledgeable of implementation science (with room to grow).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project incorporates considerations to EDI in health research (4 points)</td>
<td>No considerations to EDI.</td>
<td>Incorporates limited considerations to EDI, basic acknowledgment of the importance of EDI, but strategies and practices may be vague or lacking detail.</td>
<td>Shows a substantial incorporation of considerations related to EDI.</td>
<td>Demonstrates a comprehensive and deeply embedded approach to EDI in health research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter of support from department dean/director (3 points)</td>
<td>No letter of support. Limited support or unclear.</td>
<td>A basic level of support from the department dean or director.</td>
<td>Strong and clearly indicated support.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability and commitment to attend full implementation science institute (2 points)</td>
<td>Not available to attend the IS institute in full.</td>
<td>Strong evidence of availability and commitment to attend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Score (25)**