

EVALUATION CRITERIA – Institutional Capacity Building Grant (25 points maximum)

| | Insufficient (1) | Satisfactory (2) | Good (3) | Excellent (4) | Outstanding (5) |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| Alignment with Trent's Research Priorities | Project lacks relevance to Trent's strategic research directions. No clear alignment with institutional priorities. | Project shows some relevance to Trent's Strategic Research Plan (or research priorities) but lacks clarity or depth . | Project aligns reasonably with Trent's strategic directions and institutional priorities, with some evidence of strategic relevance or institutional benefits. | Project clearly supports Trent's research priorities and strategic goals with well-articulated connections. | Project strongly advances Trent's strategic research mission and institutional priorities, with high potential for advancing institutional goals and enhanced reputation. |
| Potential to build or enhance institutional research capacity | No evidence of contribution to Trent's research ecosystem or capabilities. | Limited potential to enhance institutional research capacity. | Demonstrates potential to build or enhance Trent's research infrastructure or expertise. | Clearly contributes to strengthening Trent's research ecosystem and institutional capabilities. | Significantly enhances Trent's research capacity, infrastructure, and long-term institutional positioning. |
| Feasibility and clarity of the proposed implementation plan | Plan is unclear, unrealistic , or lacks sufficient detail (to be discussed). | Plan is minimally defined with limited clarity in objectives, timelines, or methodologies. | Plan is adequately defined with reasonable objectives and outcomes. | Plan is well-defined, realistic , and includes clear objectives, timelines, and methodologies, and outcomes. | Plan is comprehensive, highly feasible , and includes robust objectives, timelines, and anticipated outcomes. |
| Evidence of meaningful collaboration among faculty members | No evidence of collaboration or interdisciplinary engagement. | Limited collaboration ; interdisciplinary aspects are weak or unclear. | Reasonable collaboration with clear roles for multiple faculty; some interdisciplinary engagement. | Strong collaboration and interdisciplinary engagement with shared leadership; well-integrated team with complementary expertise. | Meaningful, substantive collaboration with clear interdisciplinary integration and shared leadership. |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|
| Budget Justification and plans for future funding | Budget is unjustified or misaligned with project goals. No clear plan for future external funding or institutional positioning. | Budget is partially justified but lacks clarity or efficiency. Limited plans for future funding; unclear institutional impact. | Budget is adequately justified and reasonably aligned with project goals. Preliminary plans for future funding and institutional positioning. | Budget is well justified, cost-effective , and aligned with project objectives. Clear plans for leveraging project outcomes to secure future external funding. | Budget is clearly justified , balanced, and demonstrates excellent value for money. Strong, strategic plans for future funding success and institutional advancement. |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|