HIFI Awards Evaluation Rubric

	0	0.5	1	2	3	4	5
Compelling context (max 3): The extent to which the initiative sets out a compelling¹ context, clearly identifying an existing or emerging issue or opportunity	The project does not set out a compelling context, AND does not clearly identify an existing or emerging issue or opportunity		The project does not set out a compelling context, OR does not clearly identify an existing or emerging issue or opportunity	The project sets out a relatively compelling context and identifies an existing or emerging issue or opportunity	The project sets out a compelling context and clearly identifies an existing or emerging issue or opportunity		
Deliverable addresses context (max 1): The extent to which the deliverable relates to the context as described	It is unclear how the deliverable relates to the context and advances the work in the field	The deliverable relates to the context to an extent and it is relatively clear how the deliverable will advance the work in the field	The deliverable relates to the context and it is clear how the deliverable will advance the work in the field				
Potential impact of deliverable (max 5): The quality and potential impact ² of the deliverable	Low quality deliverable and the potential impact of the deliverable is unclear		Low quality deliverable but the potential impact is clear OR good quality deliverable but the potential impact is unclear	Good quality deliverable and the potential impact is somewhat clear	Good quality deliverable with good potential impact	High quality deliverable with good potential impact	High quality deliverable with strong potential impact (e.g. an IM platform to bridge the gap between GPs and specialists to improve access to care in remote areas)

Last updated: February 24, 2023

Interdisciplinary and cross-faculty collaboration (max 3): The extent to which the initiative represents a true interdisciplinary and cross-faculty collaboration Inclusion of trainees³ (max 1)	No trainees are included as part	A trainee is a part of the project	Good interdisciplinary mix of collaborators from at least two different faculties, but it is unclear how the interdisciplinary nature of the collaboration adds value to the project and impacts the outcomes A trainee is a part of the project	Good interdisciplinary mix of collaborators from at least two different faculties, and it is somewhat clear how the interdisciplinary nature of the collaboration adds value to the project and impacts the outcomes	Excellent interdisciplinary mix of collaborators from at least two different faculties, and it is clear how the interdisciplinary nature of the collaboration adds value to the project and impacts the outcomes	
	of the project team	team but either the role is unclear, or does not have a meaningful role in the collaboration (e.g. only gain knowledge or collect data)	team and they have a clear and meaningful role in the collaboration			
A true cross-campus collaboration (max 1): A cross campus collaboration is considered as a collaboration that involves coapplicants from	All UBC collaborators are from the same UBC campus (either Vancouver or Okanagan)	•	Collaborators from both UBC campuses (UBC Vancouver and UBC Okanagan) are represented			

both UBC Vancouver and UBC Okanagan					
Addresses Equity, diversity and inclusion (EDI) (max 1): Equity, diversity and inclusion ⁴ of both the team and the project is addressed	EDI is not addressed in EITHER the team's composition OR in the project	EDI is addressed in the team's composition OR in the project	EDI is addressed in both the team's composition and the project		
Application requirements (max 1)	The application does not meet all requirements (e.g. information is missing, word limits are exceeded)		All application requirements are met (e.g. no missing information, written within word limits)		

NOTES

For applications that exceed page/word limits, reviewers are to use their discretion. Reviewers are under no obligation to read or consider information provided beyond the page/word limits.

¹What makes a project compelling:

- Serving a marginalized population (e.g. Illicit drug users, older adults)
- Novel idea or approach to an existing problem
- New and/or comprehensive collaboration to benefit people or society
- New technology to benefit people or society
- People or society oriented and inclusive

²Some potential impact considerations:

- Reach of the project compared with the size of the population affected by the problem being addressed.
- How effective the deliverable will be in achieving the overall goals of the initiative i.e. generate funding, lead to a grant application, produce new guidance, strike an important collaboration, etc.

Who is considered a trainee? Please refer to this definition of a trainee set by CIHR:

- an individual who is enhancing their research skills through actual involvement in research and who works under the formal supervision of an independent researcher; or
- an independent researcher who has taken a leave of absence from their academic or research position.

For example:

- an undergraduate student engaged in research at an academic institution;
- a graduate student enrolled in a graduate course of study at an academic institution;
- a postdoctoral fellow (post-PhD) at a academic or research institution;
- a post-health professional degree fellow (e.g., nursing, physiotherapy, medicine, dentistry) at an academic or research institution.

Please note, funding towards UBC trainees is preferred. It is possible for the funding to support an external trainee, but only if there is a compelling reason for this and not at the expense of a trainee from UBC participating.

⁴Please refer to the UBC Equity & Inclusion Office's Glossary of Terms for definitions on equity, diversity and inclusion: https://equity.ubc.ca/resources/equity-inclusion-glossary-of-terms/