IVS Clinical Education Seed Grant Reviewer Rubric

Strength of the research project description – background and statement of the problem

5 = The background and statement of the problem are exceptionally clear, concise, and provide an in-depth understanding of the research context.

4 = The background is clear, concise, and provides a thorough understanding of the research context, laying a solid foundation for the problem statement.

3 = The background and statement of the problem are generally clear and provides some depth in understanding the research context, though there may be areas for improvement.,

2 = The background is somewhat unclear or lacks depth, hindering a comprehensive understanding of the research context before the problem statement.

1 = The background and statement of the problem are unclear, vague, or lacking any depth, making it challenging to grasp the research context.

0 = Item missing from application/unable to judge

Strength of research project description – specific aims/objectives

5 = The specific aims/objectives are exceptionally clear, concise, and precisely defined. It is easy to understand the intended focus of the research without ambiguity.

4 = The specific aims/objectives are clear and well-defined, though there may be minor points that could be clarified for better precision.

3 = The specific aims/objectives are generally clear but may require some additional clarification to enhance precision.

2 = The specific aims/objectives are somewhat unclear or lack the necessary precision, making it challenging to fully understand the research focus.

1 = The specific aims/objectives are unclear, vague, or overly broad, hindering a clear understanding of the research goals.

0 = Item missing from application/unable to judge

Strength of the research project description – methods and outcome measures

5 = The research design and outcome measures are well-defined, and the methodology is appropriate for addressing the research question. It demonstrates a thorough understanding of research methods.

4 = The research design and outcome measures are mostly clear, and the methodology is generally appropriate. Some minor improvements or clarifications may be needed.

3 = The research design and outcome measures are present but may lack some clarity or coherence.

2 = The research design and outcome measures are unclear or poorly defined, and the methodology is not well-suited for addressing the research question.

1 = The research design and outcome measures are so poorly described that it is impossible to evaluate their appropriateness.

0 = Item missing from application/unable to judge

Strength of research project description – analysis plan

5 = The analysis plan is exceptionally clear and appropriate for the project. It is easy to understand the plan without ambiguity.

4 = The analysis plan is clear and well-defined, though there may be minor points that could be clarified for better precision.
3 = The analysis plan is generally clear but may require some additional clarification to enhance precision or there are concerns about the appropriateness of the planned analyses.
2 = The analysis plan is somewhat unclear or lacks the necessary precision, making it challenging to fully understand it.
1 = The analysis plan is unclear, vague, or overly broad, hindering a clear understanding.
0 = Item missing from application/unable to judge

Strength of research project description – timeline
5 = The proposed timeline is highly realistic, considering the complexity of the research problem and the available resources.
4 = The proposed timeline is realistic and considers the complexity of the research problem.
3 = The proposed timeline is generally realistic but may require some adjustments.
2 = The proposed timeline is somewhat unrealistic, with overly ambitious deadlines or inadequate consideration of the research problem's complexity.
1 = The proposed timeline is highly unrealistic, with little consideration for the complexity of the research problem or the time required for each activity.
0 = Item missing from application/unable to judge

Strength of applicant/project personnel (based on letter of support)
5 = Strongly demonstrates the qualifications and experience required for the grant
4 = Meets the basic qualifications and experience required for the grant; solid candidate.
3 = Some qualifications and experience are present, but there are gaps between personnel qualifications and goals of project
2 = Qualifications and experience are limited with significant gaps between personnel qualifications and goals of project.
1 = Does not possess the necessary background or qualifications to complete the project.
0 = Item missing from application/unable to judge