INACSL In-Kind Vendor **Grant Rubric**

Grant title: _____

Reviewer: _____

	Score	Total
Criteria - Alignment with INACLS mission and research priorities [Score range 0-2]		
Does not align with INACSL mission and research priorities.	0	**/2**
Somewhat aligns with INACSL mission and research priorities.	1	
Aligns with INACSL mission and research priorities.	2	
Comments/Feedback for author:		
Criteria - Significance (Score both the description of the issue/need & the benefits for the nursing community) [Score range 0-6]		
Not included.	0	**/6**
Description of the issue/need is unclear.	1	
Minimal benefits for the nursing community.	1	
Partially explains why the issue/need is important.	2	
Moderate benefits for the nursing community.	2	
Fully explains why the issue/need is important	3	
Significant benefits for the nursing community.	3	
Comments/Feedback for author:		
Criteria - Question and/or hypotheses (Score both the clarity and relevance) [Score range 0-6]		
Not included.	0	**/6**
Research question(s)/hypothesis lack clarity.	1	
Research question(s)/hypothesis lack relevance.	1	
Research question(s)/hypothesis are somewhat clearly stated.	2	
Research question(s)/hypothesis hold minimal relevance in advancing the science of clinical simulation	2	
Research question(s)/hypothesis are clearly stated.	3	
Research question(s)/hypothesis are relevant in advancing the science of clinical simulation	3	
Comments/Feedback for author:		
Criteria - Methodology – DESIGN (Score both clarity and appropriateness) [Score range 0 – 6]		
Not included.	0	**/6**
Design is unclear.	1	
Design is somewhat clear.	2	
Design is clear.	3	
Design is not appropriate.	0	
Design is appropriate.	3	
Comments/Feedback for author:		
Criteria - Methodology – DATA COLLECTION (Score clarity) [Score range 0 – 3]		
Not included.	0	**/3**
Data collection is unclear and/or incomplete.	1	
Data collection is somewhat clear.	2	
Data collection is clear.	3	
Comments/Feedback for author:		

Criteria - Methodology – ANALYSIS PROCEDURE (Score clarity) [Score range 0 – 3]		
Not included	0	**/3**
Analysis is unclear and/or incomplete.	1	
Analysis is somewhat clear.	2	
Analysis is robust.	3	
Comments/Feedback for author:		
Criteria - Methodology – SAMPLE DESCRIPTION (Score clarity) [Score range 0 – 3]		
Not included	0	**/3**
Description of sample is unclear and/or incomplete.	1	
Description of sample is somewhat clear.	2	
Description of sample is clear.	3	
Comments/Feedback for author:		
Criteria - Methodology – LIMITATIONS (Score clarity) [Score range 0 – 3]		
Not included	0	**/3**
Limitations are unclear and/or incomplete.	1	
Limitations are somewhat identified.	2	
Limitations are clearly identified.	3	
Comments/Feedback for author:		
Criteria - Outcomes (Score clarity and appropriateness) [Score range 0-4]		
Not included.	0	**/4**
Desired outcomes are not described clearly.	1	
Desired outcomes are somewhat described clearly.	2	
Desired outcomes are described clearly.	3	
Outcomes are not appropriate to research question.	0	
Outcomes are appropriate to research question.	1	
Comments/Feedback for author:		
Criteria - Evaluation of outcomes (Score clarity, completeness and appropriateness) Note: This is not data analysis, which is scored in the section "Methodology - Analysis Procedure") **[Score range 0-5]**		
Not included.	0	**/5**
Evaluation process is unclearly written.	1	
Evaluation process is somewhat unclearly written.	2	
Evaluation process is clearly written.	3	
Evaluation process is incomplete.	0	
Evaluation process is complete.	1	
Evaluation process is not appropriate.	0	
Evaluation process is appropriate.	1	
Comments/Feedback for author:		
Criteria - Project Description and Timeline (Score clarity, completeness and appropriateness) [Score range 0-5]		
Not included.	0	**/5**
Description and timeline is written unclearly.	1	
Description and timeline is somewhat written unclearly.	2	
Description and timeline is clearly written.	3	

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)