

# Plural Publishing Scholarship Reviewer Rubric

## PhD and SLP Master's/AuD/SLPD

### **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 the mentor's letter of support**

- 5 = Nomination letter provides extremely strong support of the applicant and applicant's research plan; contains multiple examples to support claims of excellence and feasibility of research proposal
- 4 = Nomination letter provides strong support of the applicant and contains examples to support claims of strength
- 3 = Nomination letter provides support of the applicant, but does not contain examples to support claims
- 2 = Nomination is neutral, but does not raise any concerns
- 1 = Nomination letter raises one or more concerns or expressly states the student does not have the recommender's full support or that support comes with some reservation
- 0 = Item missing from application/unable to judge