

INACSL In-Kind Vendor Grant Rubric

Grant title: _____

Reviewer: _____

Criteria	Score Options	Score
<p>Criteria 1 - Alignment with INACSL Mission and Research Priorities</p> <p>Criteria Statement: The proposed project demonstrates a clear connection to INACSL’s mission and aligns with at least one of the stated research priorities.</p>	<p>0 - Does not align with INACSL mission and research priorities or is missing</p> <p>1 - The project somewhat aligns with the INACSL mission and mentions at least one research priority, but the connection is weak or underdeveloped</p> <p>2 - The project fully aligns with the INACSL mission and addresses at least one research priority. The connection is clear and appropriately described</p> <p>3 - The project clearly and explicitly aligns with the INACSL mission and strongly supports at least one stated research priority. The connection is well-developed</p>	
Comments/Feedback for Author:		
<p>Criteria 2 - Significance</p> <p>Criteria Statement: The proposal articulates the importance of the issue or need and demonstrates potential impact for the nursing community.</p>	<p>Description</p> <p>0 - Description of the issue/need is not included</p> <p>1 - The issue/need is unclear</p> <p>2 - Partially explains why the issue/need is important</p> <p>3 -Fully explains why the issue/need is important</p>	
	<p>Potential Impact</p> <p>0 - Description of potential impact on the nursing community is not significant/is not included</p> <p>1 - Potential impact on the nursing community is minimally significant</p> <p>2 - Potential impact on the nursing community is moderate</p> <p>3 - Potential impact on the nursing community is significant</p>	
Comments/Feedback for Author:		
<p>Criteria 3 - Research Question(s) or Hypotheses</p> <p>Criteria Statement: Research question(s) and/or hypotheses are relevant to advancing the science.</p>	<p>0- Research question(s) or hypotheses are not included</p> <p>1-Research question(s)/hypotheses lack relevance</p> <p>2- Research question(s)/hypotheses hold some relevance in advancing the science</p> <p>3-Research question(s)/hypotheses are highly relevant in advancing the science</p>	
Comments/Feedback for Author:		
<p>Criteria - 4 IRB/Ethics Approval</p> <p>Criteria Statement: The proposal includes appropriate discussion of IRB or ethics approval, <i>or</i> provides a clear rationale for why it is not required.</p>	<p>0 - No mention of IRB/ethics approval, and no rationale is provided for exemption or non-submission</p> <p>1 - IRB/ethics approval is required but not yet submitted, or rationale for not obtaining approval is unclear, incomplete, or partially inaccurate</p> <p>2 - IRB/ethics approval has been submitted and is pending (if required), or rationale for not obtaining approval is mostly accurate but may lack detail</p> <p>3 - IRB/ethics approval has been obtained (if required), or a</p>	

	clear and accurate rationale is provided explaining why approval is not needed	
Comments/Feedback for Author:		
Criteria 5 – Methodology: Design Criteria Statement: The research design is appropriate for answering the research question.	0 - The research design is not included 1 - The research design is not appropriate for answering the research question/hypotheses 2 - The research design is somewhat appropriate for answering the research question/hypotheses 3 - The research design is appropriate for answering the research question/hypotheses	
Comments/Feedback for Author:		
Criteria 6 – Methodology: Sample Description Criteria Statement: The sample population is clearly defined.	0 - The sample population description is not included 1 - The sample population description is unclear and/or incomplete 2 - The sample population description is somewhat clear 3 - The sample population description is clearly defined	
Comments/Feedback for Author:		
Criteria 7 – Instruments Criteria Statement: The proposal identifies appropriate instruments/tools to appropriate to measure intended outcomes.	0 - Instruments/tools are unrelated or do not align with the intended outcomes/or are not provided 1 - Limited connection to intended outcomes; questionable relevance or appropriateness 2 - Generally appropriate for measuring intended outcomes; some justification provided 3 - Strong alignment with intended outcomes; tools are well-justified	
Comments/Feedback for Author:		
Criteria 8 - Methodology: Data Collection Criteria Statement: The methods for data collection are clearly described.	0 - Data collection methods are not included 1 - Data collection methods are unclear and/or incomplete 2 - Data collection methods are somewhat clear 3 - Data collection methods are clear	
Comments/Feedback for Author:		
Criteria 9 - Methodology: Analysis Criteria Statement: The data analysis plan is clearly articulated, including the technical/statistical methods that will be used to analyze the data.	0 - Data analysis methods are not included 1 - Data analysis methods are unclear and/or incomplete 2 - Data analysis methods are somewhat clear 3 - Data analysis methods are clear	
Comments/Feedback for Author:		
Criteria 10 – Methodology: Limitations	0 - Study limitations are not included	

<p>Criteria Statement: The proposal clearly identifies potential study limitations</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 - Study limitations are unclear 2 - Study limitations are somewhat clear 3 - Study limitations are clear 	
<p>Comments/Feedback for Author:</p>		
<p>Criteria 11 – Evaluation Outcomes</p> <p>Criteria Statement: Desired outcomes are described in alignment with the research question/hypotheses.</p>	<p>Alignment with Research Question/Hypotheses</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 0 - Desired outcomes are not included 1 - Desired outcomes are poorly described or do not align with the research question/hypotheses 2 - Desired outcomes vaguely described in alignment with the research question/hypotheses 3 - Desired outcomes are described in alignment with the research question/hypotheses 	
<p>Comments/Feedback for Author:</p>		
<p>Criteria 12 – Project Timeline</p> <p>Criteria Statement: The project timeline, from inception to completion, is provided.</p>	<p>Complete</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 0 - Project timeline is not included 1 - Project timeline is present but incomplete 2 - Project timeline is mostly complete 3 - Project timeline, from inception to completion, is complete 	
<p>Comments/Feedback for Author:</p>		
<p>Criteria 13 - References</p> <p>Criteria Statement: References are included and reflect current work (minimum of 3 published w/in 5 years).</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 0 - References are not included 1 - References are included, but fewer than 3 are published within the last 5 years, or relevance is limited 2 - All required references are included, and at least 3 are current (within the last 5 years). Citations are generally appropriate and support the proposal 3 - All references are relevant, well-integrated, and properly cited. At least 3 are published within the last 5 years and clearly support the proposal components 	
<p>Comments/Feedback for Author:</p>		
<p>Criteria 15 - Writing Style</p> <p>Criteria Statement: The proposal is well-written, free from major grammatical or spelling errors, and demonstrates clarity and professionalism throughout</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 0 - Contains frequent grammatical and/or spelling errors that interfere with clarity. The writing lacks professionalism and is difficult to follow 1 - Occasional grammatical or spelling errors, but they do not significantly interfere with understanding. The writing is somewhat clear and professional 2 - The proposal is well-written, clear, and professional throughout. It is free from major grammatical or spelling errors and easy to understand 3 - Writing is exceptionally clear, concise, and engaging. Free from any grammatical or spelling errors. Demonstrates a high level of professionalism and polish throughout. 	
<p>Comments/Feedback for Author:</p>		

Total Score	
General Comments for Author:	
Comments for Review Team (Confidential from Author):	

scored in the section "Methodology - Analysis Procedure") [Score range 0-5]

Description and timeline incomplete.	0	
Description and timeline complete.	1	
Description and timeline is not appropriate.	0	
Description and timeline is appropriate.	1	
Comments/Feedback for author:		
Criteria - Budget (Score clarity, and expenses) [Score range 0-6]		
Not included.	0	/6
Budget is unclearly written.	1	
Budget is somewhat clearly written.	2	
Budget is clearly written.	3	
Expenses are not justified.	1	
Expenses are somewhat justified.	2	
Expenses are justified.	3	
Comments/Feedback for author:		
Criteria - References [Score range 0-3]		
Not included.	0	/3
Not pertinent.	1	
Pertinent but incomplete or dated references.	2	
Pertinent and complete.	3	
Comments/Feedback for author:		
General criteria - IRB/Ethics Approval [Score range 0-2]		
Discussion regarding IRB/Ethics approval not included	0	/2
IRB/ethics approval required: Approval not discussed and/or IRB proposal has not been submitted	0	
IRB/ethics approval required: Rationale for not submitting or obtaining IRB approval is inaccurate.	1	
IRB/ethics approval not required: Rational for not obtaining IRB approval is inaccurate/unclear	1	
IRB/ethics approval required: Approval obtained, or proposal has or will be submitted for approval	2	
IRB/ethics approval not required: Rational for not obtaining IRB approval is clearly described.	2	
Comments/Feedback for author:		
General criteria - Writing Style [Score range 1-3]		
Poor writing style (i.e., grammatical errors, poor sentence structure, spelling errors).	1	/3
Writing is mostly clear. Occasional errors present.	2	
Strong and clear style of writing demonstrated throughout.	3	
Comments/Feedback for author:		
Total		/60
General Comments for author		

Comments for review team (confidential from author)