

**National League for Nursing
Nursing Education Research Grant Proposal Review Rubric**

The Proposal Review Rubric below is being used for the 2011 grant cycle. Components of the rubric are not weighted. Components that are not applicable for a given proposal are not included in the percentage score. Applicable components that are missing will receive a 0 and the component will be included in the percentage score. We will provide only the summary comments to applicants on a pilot basis.

PROPOSAL REVIEW RUBRIC 2011 Grant Cycle					
	<i>Excellent = 4</i>	<i>Good = 3</i>	<i>Fair = 2</i>	<i>Poor = 1</i>	<i>0 or NA*</i>
Consistency with one or more of the NLN Nursing Education Research Priorities http://www.nln.org/research/priorities.htm	Highly consistent with one or more of the sub-topics	Consistent with one or more of the sub-topics	Some consistency with one or more of the sub-topics	Little consistency with the sub-topics	
Clarity/Feasibility of any mentoring aspects of the study	Mentoring plan is very clear and feasible	Mentoring plan is clear and feasible	Mentoring plan fairly clear and feasible	Mentoring plan has little clarity and/or feasibility	
Soundness of plan to maintain consistency among multiple study sites (if appropriate)	Clear study protocol including plan for regular communication and checks for consistency	Clear study protocol including plan for regular communication	No plan, but study protocol is clear	No plan and study protocol is not clear	
Clarity of purpose	Very clear purpose	Clear purpose	Purpose mostly clear	Purpose not clear	
Adequacy of background and need for the study to advance nursing education science	Background clearly identifies need for the study	Background provides some need for the study	Background and need for the study not very clear	Limited background or need for the study	
Significance to nursing education (i.e., outcomes proposed, impact anticipated, potential to improve nursing education)	Very high significance for nursing education	High significance for nursing education	Fair significance for nursing education	Limited significance for nursing education	

PROPOSAL REVIEW RUBRIC 2011 grant cycle

	<i>Excellent = 4</i>	<i>Good = 3</i>	<i>Fair = 2</i>	<i>Poor = 1</i>	<i>0 or NA*</i>
Review of literature	Literature cited is very pertinent and timely	Literature cited is mostly pertinent and timely	Literature review lacks pertinence or is dated	Literature review lacks pertinence <u>and</u> is dated	
Soundness/ Appropriateness of sample selection and retention	Sample very appropriate in size and selection. Plans to recruit/retain subjects are very clear and feasible.	Sample mostly appropriate in size and selection. Plans to recruit/retain subjects are mostly clear and feasible.	Sample size and selection fairly well considered. Plans to recruit/retain subjects are fairly clear and/or feasible.	Sample size and selection not well considered. Plans to recruit/retain subjects are not clear or feasible.	
Diversity of sample regarding gender and race/ethnicity	Plans to recruit a diverse sample are very clear and feasible or lack thereof clearly justified	Plans to recruit a diverse sample are mostly clear and feasible or lack thereof mostly justified	Plans to recruit a diverse sample are fairly clear and feasible or lack thereof fairly justified	Plans to recruit a diverse sample lack clarity, feasibility, or justification	
Clarity/Adequacy/ Feasibility of data collection methods	Data collection methods are clear, feasible and methodologically rigorous	Data collection methods are mostly clear, feasible and rigorous	Data collection methods are fairly clear, feasible and rigorous	Data collection methods lack clarity, feasibility and rigor	
Validity and reliability of instruments used for data collection	Approaches to enhance credibility and trustworthiness and/or use instruments with acceptable reliability and validity are very clearly described	Approaches to enhance credibility and trustworthiness and/or use instruments with acceptable reliability and validity are mostly clear	Approaches to enhance credibility and trustworthiness and/or use instruments with acceptable reliability and validity are fairly clear	Approaches to enhance credibility and trustworthiness and/or use instruments with acceptable reliability and validity are poorly described	

PROPOSAL REVIEW RUBRIC 2011 grant cycle					
	<i>Excellent = 4</i>	<i>Good = 3</i>	<i>Fair = 2</i>	<i>Poor = 1</i>	<i>0 or NA*</i>
Soundness/ Appropriateness of data analysis methods	Analyses very appropriate to method, research question(s), and demonstrate high level of rigor	Analyses mostly appropriate to method, research question(s), and demonstrate moderate rigor	Analyses fairly appropriate to method, research question(s), but demonstrate limited rigor	Analyses not appropriate to method and/or research question(s), demonstrating very limited rigor	
Extent to which findings can be generalized	Findings highly generalizable as appropriate to method	Findings mostly generalizable as appropriate to method	Limited generalizability of findings beyond study setting	Poor generalizability of findings	
Adequacy of protection of human subjects and plan for seeking IRB approval	Procedures to protect human subjects and seek IRB approval very well described	Procedures to protect human subjects and seek IRB approval mostly well described	Procedures to protect human subjects and seek IRB approval fairly well described	Procedures to protect human subjects and seek IRB approval poorly described	
Plan for dissemination	Very appropriate and well described	Mostly appropriate and described	Fair appropriateness and description	Poor appropriateness and description	
Overall scholarly merit	Highly rigorous in all aspects	Mostly rigorous	Fair rigor	Poor rigor	
Clarity of timetable and reasonableness of completing the study in no more than two years	Very feasible and clear timetable	Mostly feasible and clear timetable	Fair feasibility and clarity in timetable	Poor feasibility and clarity in timetable	
Clarity and adequacy of budget	Budget very clear and expenses well justified	Budget mostly clear and justified	Budget fairly clear and justified	Poor budget clarity and justification	
Overall cohesiveness/ coherency of the proposal	Very cohesive, coherent proposal	Mostly cohesive and coherent proposal	Fairly organized and clear	Poorly organized, unclear	

PROPOSAL REVIEW RUBRIC 2011 grant cycle					
	<i>Excellent = 4</i>	<i>Good = 3</i>	<i>Fair = 2</i>	<i>Poor = 1</i>	<i>0 or NA*</i>
Clarity of writing ... jargon-free syntax	Very well written	Mostly well written	Fairly well written	Many typographical and grammatical errors	
Innovativeness of the project.	Innovative/futuristic	Mostly innovative/futuristic	Much similar research is available on this topic	Very limited in innovation	
TOTAL SCORE (Maximum 84 [21 x 4])					
Count (Total Answers)					
Total Possible Score Based on components addressed					
Percentage					
*0 means the component was not addressed in the application, but was applicable NA means the component was not applicable Percentage score is only calculated on components that are applicable					
OVERALL COMMENTS: Please provide overall strengths and weaknesses of the study and the proposed budget <u>to be shared with applicant(s) & NERAC</u>					
I recommend this study for funding. (Y/N)					
I recommend funding this study in the amount of \$_____					
Rationale for your funding related recommendation to					

be shared only with NERAC					
--------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

Revised: 12/6/10