

Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Caucus (EDICa): Flexible Fund Assessment Criteria Rubric

**These are guidelines and will be used in conjunction with the balanced portfolio approach, for example, ensuring a breadth of topics and ensure representation of research and innovation sectors.*

	0 – not able to assess/poor	1 – fair	2 – satisfactory	3 – good	4 – excellent	5 - outstanding
Proposal adopts a co-design approach and includes how key stakeholders/research end users will be engaged in the project.	Proposal does not adopt a co-design approach (thus is not eligible).	Proposal has contradictory statements about co-design and other methods of design.	Proposal engages in co-design at a surface level.	Proposal consults with relevant individuals/communities for co-design.	Proposal engages with relevant individuals/communities for co-design.	Proposals adopts a strong co-design approach and includes how key stakeholders/research end users will be engaged in the project.
Proposal addresses an evidence gap (e.g. piloting an intervention/creation of new evidence base),	Proposal does not outline a convincing evidence gap.	Proposal responds to an evidence gap in an abstract or tangential manner.	Proposal outlines a generic evidence gap but does so without providing a robust review of known responses/interventions and/or known evaluation of these.	Proposal responds to a generic evidence gap and includes some support to demonstrate the evidence gap and/or known interventions but lacks detail and information.	Proposal responds to a specific evidence gap, setting out established insights from the extant literature.	Proposal responds to a specific evidence gap, including a detailed account of relevant prior interventions and a clear articulation of potential new insights from the proposed research.
Proposal will create impact e.g. improving working lives for marginalised people across the R&I space.	Proposal does not create impact e.g. improving working lives for marginalised people across the R&I space.	Proposal indicates what impact may be possible but does not set out how will be achieved/or impact is not realistic.	Proposal sets out an incomplete plan of how impact will be achieved.	Proposal sets out a plan for how impact will be achieved but impact likely to be modest.	Proposal sets out a realistic and well thought through plan of how impact will be achieved although scope for impact is not considerable.	Impact plan is realistic, tangible and innovative – impact likely to be considerable and reach beyond the immediate project/team.

Proposal engages with, or is led by, early career researcher(s) (ECR) or early career innovators (ECI)*	Proposal does not engage with and is not led by any ECR(s)/ECI(s).	Proposal engages with ECR(s)/ECI(s) at a surface level but does not embed needs of ECR(s)/ECI(s).	Proposal consults with ECR(s)/ECI(s).	Proposal is co-designed with ECR(s)/ECI(s).	Proposal is led by ECR(s)/ECI(s).	Proposal is both led by and co-designed by ECR(s)/ECI(s).
Proposal has interdisciplinary and cross-sector partnerships which reflect the range of R&I workplaces**	Proposal has no interdisciplinary and cross-sector partnerships.	Proposal has contradictory statements about interdisciplinary and cross-sector partnerships and competing approaches.	Proposal engages with interdisciplinary and cross-sector partnerships.	Proposal consults with and/or reflects upon interdisciplinary and cross-sector partnerships.	Proposal is co-designed with interdisciplinary and cross-sector partnerships.	Proposal has strong interdisciplinary and cross-sector partnership(s) involved in co-design and which reflect the range of R&I workplaces.
The quality of the EDI plan***	The EDI plan does not exist or does not demonstrate how applicants will include EDI in the project.	The EDI plan considers how the project will include EDI but objectives are not clear and realistic.	The EDI plan considers how the project will include EDI for their project team only and has clear and realistic objectives.	The EDI plan considers how the project will include EDI for their project team and co-design and has clear and realistic objectives.	The EDI plan considers how the project will include EDI for their project team, co-design and dissemination of findings, and has clear and realistic objectives.	The EDI plan considers how the project will include EDI for their project team, co-design, dissemination of findings, training and has clear and realistic objectives.
Value for money	There is no budget to assess.	A high-level budget has been presented but it is not broken down and/or sequenced.	A budget is presented with some indication of spend categories and sequence of spend.	A detailed budget is presented with clear delineation of spend categories covering a plausible total level of resource.	A detailed budget is presented which sets out appropriate levels of resource in each category.	A clear, detailed and justified budget sets out a realistic level of resource to achieve the outcomes set out in the proposal.
Robustness of the methodology	No methodology is set out.	A basic statement of methods is presented but this may either lack	A basic set of methods are presented and these methods are	A set of methods are presented which address both the outcomes set	A robust set of methods are described which are appropriate to	A sophisticated account is provided of the methods to be

		detail or contain inconsistencies.	internally consistent.	out in the proposal and potential difficulties in delivering those outcomes.	the ontology and epistemology of the planned research.	used, including the strengths and weaknesses of the approach chosen as well as the feasibility in the time/resource available.
--	--	------------------------------------	------------------------	--	--	--

Additional notes

Note: Some sections include a maximum word limit. We do not expect applicants to use the entire word limit, if not required.

*There is no standard definition of ECR and ECI in the research and innovation sector. Therefore, to be considered an Early Career Researcher or Early Career Innovator applicants must have a minimum of 2 of the following 5 criteria:

1. Have not previously been a PI or lead on an externally funded project or led a significant programme of work in a commercial or non-academic setting
2. Precariously employed, e.g., currently employed via a temporary contract of employment
3. Recent returner from a career break (e.g., maternity, caring responsibility, sickness, unpaid sabbatical)
4. Change of career track or returning after substantial administrative responsibility
5. Recent change in career (e.g. industry to academia or academia to industry)

Please see FAQ for more information

**For example, businesses, museums, universities, trade unions or international partners

***The EDI Plan, required as part of every application, must set out how applicants will include equality, diversity and inclusion considerations in all aspects of how the project operates. e.g. recruitment of team, co-design, training, dissemination – and the degree to which objectives are clear and realistic.