Scoring Rubric for Proposal Evaluation: Understanding and Addressing Health and Social Inequities Exacerbated by the COVID Pandemic

REQUIRED CRITERIA	EXEMPLARY (4 pts)	GOOD (3 pts)	ADEQUATE (2 pts)	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (1 pt)	MISSING (0 pts)
Proposal demonstrates novel, innovative, and/or inventive research with the potential to improve understanding and yield meaningful and sustained solutions to systemic social, environmental, and economic issues affecting marginalized communities (Weighted 30%)	Strong proposal	Reasonably strong proposal	Partially strong proposal	Vague proposal	Poor match
Consistent with rank, investigators have expertise in the area and have a promising or proven track record of external funding and scholarly outcomes (e.g., publications and presentations) (Weighted 20%)	Consistent with rank investigators have extensive expertise in the area and a promising or proven record of external funding and scholarly outcomes	Investigators have sufficient expertise in and a promising or proven record of external funding and scholarly outcomes	Investigators have sufficient expertise but not a strong record of external funding and scholarly outcomes Both the experting of the Investigation and scholarly record are weather than the expertion of the Investigation and scholarly record are weather than the expertion of the Investigation of the Investigation and scholarly record are weather than the expertion of the Investigation of the Investigation and scholarly record are weather than the expertion of the Investigation and scholarly record are weather than the expertise of the Investigation and scholarly record of external funding and scholarly outcomes.		Expertise of investigators is insufficient
Proposal promotes transdisciplinary collaboration and an intent to train and mentor students or staff in conducting research and securing grants (Weighted 15%)	Strongly promotes transdisciplinary collaboration and valuable training experiences	Reasonably promotes transdisciplinary collaboration and training experiences	Partially promotes transdisciplinary collaboration and training experiences	Acknowledged criteria, but inadequate justification provided	Fails to address
Proposed research can be initiated and completed within 12 months and is likely to produce useful pilot data (Weighted 15%)	Well-detailed and realistic timeline	Detailed and reasonable timeline	Fairly reasonable timeline	Unrealistic timeline	No timeline provided
Proposal describes capacity of the research to leverage external funding and scholarly activity and identifies specific funding, community, and scholarly projects that will be pursued (Weighted 20%)	Clearly describes capacity for long-term funding and scholarship	Reasonable description of capacity	Partial description of capacity	Vague description of capacity	Does not describe long-term potential

Budget aligns with the proposed proje	ct:	Yes	No (Reviewers should provide constructive feedback
Proposal Includes matching funds:	Yes	No	