

SFU-UBC Implementation Science Training Initiative _Oct 2024

EVALUATION RUBRIC

CRITERIA	RATING SCALE				SCORE (25)
	1	2	3	4	
Potential Impact on Career Trajectory (4 points)	No discernible impact or relevance to career trajectory: The applicant's proposal shows no clear connection between the IS program and their career goals.	Limited potential impact or relevance: The connection between the IS program and the applicant's career trajectory is mentioned but not well-defined.	Moderate potential impact on career trajectory: The proposal demonstrates a reasonable connection between the IS program and the applicant's career goals.	High potential impact on career trajectory, clearly defined: The proposal clearly and convincingly illustrates how the IS program will significantly impact and advance the applicant's career trajectory.	
Interest in IS Research and Commitment to Building Capacity (4 points)	No demonstrated commitment or interest in IS, or demonstrated efforts to build IS capacity or mentor others.	Demonstrates some interest but lacks a commitment to the future pursuit of implementation science. Some awareness of IS capacity building and mentoring but lacks concrete plans to contribute.	Moderate level of commitment to pursuing implementation science work. Moderate potential to contribute to IS capacity building, with initial plans or actions for mentoring trainees or colleagues.	Strong commitment and genuine interest in implementation science; participation in the program important for future research plans. Strong focus on IS capacity building, with clear, actionable plans for mentoring others and actively strengthening IS capacity within BC.	
Overall quality and quantity of applicant's scholarship and research (relevant to stage in career, academic rank). (4 points)	Research contributions do not align with their career stage. Limited or no evidence of scholarly activities.	Show some degree of quantity and quality. Some alignment with career stage or academic rank. Limited evidence of scholarly activities.	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.	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.	
Concept paper: Quality and Fit of Implementation Science Project (4 points)	Project lacks quality or fit for implementation science. No understanding of what implementation science is/is not.	Project has limited quality or fit for implementation science. Some knowledge about what implementation science is/is not.	Project demonstrates moderate quality and fit for implementation science. Moderate knowledge of what implementation science is/is not.	High-quality, innovative project closely aligned with implementation science. Knowledgeable of implementation science (with room to grow).	

Project incorporates considerations to EDI in health research (4 points)	No considerations to EDI included.	Incorporates limited considerations to EDI, basic acknowledgment of the importance of EDI, but strategies and practices may be vague or lacking detail.	Shows a substantial incorporation of considerations related to EDI.	Demonstrates a comprehensive and deeply embedded approach to EDI in health research.	
Letter of support from Department dean/director (3 points)	No letter of support.	A basic level of support from the department dean or director.	Strong and clearly indicated support.		
Ability and Commitment to attend full 2 year IS training program (including mandatory two in-person intensives, quarterly webinars and monthly mentor meetings) (2 points)	Not available to attend the IS training program in full.	Strong evidence of availability and commitment to attend.			
Total Score					