

**Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine
Collaborative Research and Innovation Fund
Scoring Rubric**

Score	Descriptor	Definition
5	Outstanding	Excellent application with minimal shortcomings.
4	Excellent	Application excels in many aspects, and reasonably addresses all others.
3	Very good	Application excels in some areas; Improvements are necessary to address other areas.
2	Good	Acceptable but major revisions are required.
1	Not Acceptable	Not acceptable; serious flaws/gaps.

<p>Project Rationale and Experimental Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was the rationale of the project strong, with clear linkages to well-articulated goal(s)? Is the experimental design appropriate to fulfil the goal(s)? Are the expected results linked to project goals/objectives? Originality, significance, and expected contribution to knowledge? 	/5
<p>Feasibility of Research Project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the experimental outcomes feasible and attainable by the applicants within 2 years? Besides the resources requested through CRIF, are all other necessary resources for the project available (e.g., patient samples, ethics approvals, animal/cell models, equipment)? 	/5
<p>Applicants and Expertise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the application co-developed (or appear to have been co-developed) by the two applicants? Do the applicants have complementary expertise required for the proposed project? 	/5
<p>Appropriateness of Budget</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the proposed budget appropriate for the project? 	/5
<p>Potential for External funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were plans for subsequent external competitive submissions provided? Is there potential for the applicants to make future contributions? 	/5