

IDEC - Stantec Innovation Partnership Grant

Reviewer Rubric

Purpose

The Innovation Partnership Grant is a joint initiative of IDEC and Stantec. It funds a research collaboration among an interior design educator, a student (graduate or rising senior undergraduate) from a CIDA-accredited program, and a Stantec interior design practitioner. The team investigates a research question tied to one of three Stantec-defined themes (Technology, Health Education, or Neuroinclusivity) in the context of educational or education-adjacent environments.

Reviewer Instructions

- If the proposal does not clearly relate to Technology, Health Education, or Neuroinclusivity in an educational or education-adjacent environment, note this in the comments; a substantial mismatch should be reflected in a low Criterion 1 score. Stantec has stated the three themes are of equal interest. Do not privilege one theme over another.
- All five criteria are equally weighted (20% each), consistent with Stantec's selection framework.
- Score each criterion on a 1–5 scale using the anchored descriptors. Use whole numbers only.
- Document specific strengths, concerns, and the basis for the scores in the Reviewer Comments section. These narrative comments are shared with Stantec.
- Disqualify any proposal that includes identifying information in the blind sections (title, abstract, methodology, workplan, or research application).

Scoring Scale

Score	Meaning
5 - Exemplary	Substantially exceeds expectations; a model response on this criterion.
4 - Strong	Clearly meets expectations with notable strengths.
3 - Adequate	Meets expectations; competent but not distinctive.
2 - Developing	Partially meets expectations; notable gaps.
1 - Insufficient	Does not meet expectations; significant problems.

Evaluation Criteria

Stantec's five stated selection criteria are used verbatim and are equally weighted at 20% each.

Applicant ID: _____

1. A Compelling Question

Weight: 20%

The research initiative is creative, forward-thinking, and has potential to make a significant impact on how interior designers improve quality of life. The proposal clearly relates to one of the three research themes (Technology, Health Education, or Neuroinclusivity) within the context of an educational or education-adjacent environment.

5	Question is highly original and forward-thinking. It demonstrates clear potential to substantively influence how interior designers improve quality of life. Theme connection is explicit, well-developed, and firmly situated within an educational or education-adjacent environment.
4	Question is clearly framed, connected to a theme, and shows strong potential impact. Minor opportunities to sharpen originality or framing.
3	Question is identifiable and connects to a theme; impact potential is moderate or somewhat general.
2	Question is uninspired, only loosely tied to a theme, or shows limited potential impact on the field.
1	Question does not connect meaningfully to any of the three research themes, or lacks a defensible claim of impact.

Score for Criterion 1: _____ / 5

2. A Comprehensive Workplan

Weight: 20%

The workplan outlines the scope of work, timeline, budget, milestones, and deliverables (including intermediate report, IDEC conference submission, and whitepaper). It describes the roles and strategic integration of the interior design educator, student, and Stantec practitioner, showing how each will be an active participant and how their strengths and perspectives will be leveraged.

5	Workplan is detailed, realistic, and internally consistent with Stantec's phased schedule. Scope, timeline, budget, and milestones are clearly articulated. Roles of educator, student, and Stantec practitioner are specifically defined and demonstrate equal, meaningful contribution that leverages each party's strengths.
4	Workplan is well developed and feasible. Minor gaps in timeline, budget alignment, or role definition.
3	Workplan is present and workable but under-specified in scope, sequencing, or partner integration.
2	Workplan has notable gaps in timeline, budget, or deliverables; one or more partner roles are under-defined or unequal.

1	No credible workplan; deliverables missing; partner integration is unspecified or incoherent.
----------	---

Score for Criterion 2: _____ / 5

3. Sound Research Methodology

Weight: 20%

The research methodology is well-articulated and uses any combination of quantitative or qualitative methods. Methods are appropriate to the research question and meet ethical standards.

5	Methodology is rigorous, fully appropriate to the research question, clearly described, and persuasively justified. Data collection and analysis approach are sound. Ethical considerations (e.g., IRB/consent) are addressed.
4	Methodology is appropriate and well described. Minor clarifications would strengthen the design.
3	Methodology is identifiable and reasonable but under-specified or only partially aligned with the question.
2	Methodology is poorly described, weakly matched to the question, or ethical considerations are unclear.
1	Methodology is missing, incoherent, or fundamentally unsuited to the research question.

Score for Criterion 3: _____ / 5

4. Application to Practice

Weight: 20%

The proposal demonstrates how the research can be applied to shift interior design practice, processes, and outcomes.

5	Proposal makes a persuasive, concrete case for how findings will shift practice, processes, or outcomes for interior designers. The pathway from research to applied use is specific, credible, and actionable.
4	Clear, credible connection to practice; specific pathways to application are described.
3	Practice implications are stated but general or under-developed.
2	Connection to practice is vague or asserted without support.
1	No meaningful connection to interior design practice, processes, or outcomes.

Score for Criterion 4: _____ / 5

5. Student / Academic Qualifications

Weight: 20%

Student and educator CVs demonstrate rigor and academic excellence appropriate to the proposed research. The educator's letter of reference supports capacity to complete the work. (Score this criterion only after Criteria 1–4 are complete.)

5	Student and educator credentials, prior work, and letter of reference strongly demonstrate the rigor, experience, and capacity required to complete this research successfully within the grant period.
4	Team credentials clearly support their capacity to complete the work; minor gaps in supporting evidence.
3	Team credentials are adequate for the proposed scope; some questions about capacity or depth of relevant experience.
2	Notable concerns about the team's capacity to complete the work at the level required by the proposal.
1	Credentials and reference do not support the team's ability to complete the proposed research.

Score for Criterion 5: _____ / 5

Scoring Summary

Criterion	Raw Score (1–5)	Weight	Weighted (Raw × Weight)
1. A Compelling Question	_____	0.20	_____
2. A Comprehensive Workplan	_____	0.20	_____
3. Sound Research Methodology	_____	0.20	_____
4. Application to Practice	_____	0.20	_____
5. Student / Academic Qualifications	_____	0.20	_____
TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORE (out of 5.00)			_____

Reviewer Comments

These narrative comments will be shared with Stantec alongside the scores.

Selected theme (Technology / Health Education / Neuroinclusivity) and theme-fit assessment:

Key strengths of the proposal:

Methodological / workplan concerns or gaps:

Assessment of team roles and integration (educator + student + Stantec practitioner):

Overall recommendation (Fund / Fund with reservations / Do not fund):
