

Patient Partners' Research in Sepsis (PPRS): Small Research Grant Competition Evaluation Rubric

To use this rubric, the grant proposal would be evaluated on each of the criteria below, and a score of 4, 3, 2, or 1 would be assigned based on the degree to which the proposal meets each criterion. The overall score for the grant proposal would be the weighted average of the scores for the criteria.

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)
Potential	The proposal clearly identifies a significant knowledge gap and/or builds upon knowledge to inform future research. It provides a compelling rationale for why the proposed research is necessary and important.	The proposal identifies a knowledge gap but may not fully explain its significance or provide a strong rationale for why the proposed research is necessary.	The proposal identifies a knowledge gap but may not provide a clear or convincing rationale for why the proposed research is important.	The proposal does not clearly identify a knowledge gap or provide a rationale for why the proposed research is necessary.
Impact	The proposal outlines a clear and significant impact on sepsis, sepsis survivors, and/or caregivers. It also includes well-defined and appropriate measures of impact that will allow for effective evaluation.	The proposal outlines a moderate impact on sepsis, sepsis survivors, and/or caregivers. It includes some measures of impact, but they may not be well-defined or appropriate.	The proposal outlines a limited impact on sepsis, sepsis survivors, and/or caregivers. It includes few or no measures of impact.	The proposal does not outline any clear impact on sepsis, sepsis survivors, and/or caregivers. It does not include any measures of impact.
Feasibility	The proposal outlines a realistic and well-thought-out work plan that	The proposal outlines a work plan that is generally feasible but may have some weaknesses in terms	The proposal outlines a work plan that is questionable in terms of feasibility or may have	The proposal outlines a work plan that is not feasible or employs

	employs appropriate study design and methods.	of study design or methods.	significant weaknesses in terms of study design or methods.	inappropriate study design or methods.
Timeline	The proposal provides a realistic timeline, with defined milestones and deliverables that are achievable based on the activities and resources. Tasks and responsibilities are clearly defined and allocated within the timeline.	The proposal provides a mostly realistic timeline, with some unrealistic milestones and deliverables based on the activities and resources. Tasks and responsibilities are mostly clearly defined but may not be fully allocated within the timeline.	The proposal provides a somewhat unrealistic timeline, with milestones and deliverables being somewhat unachievable based on the activities and resources. Tasks and responsibilities are somewhat unclear or not fully allocated within the timeline.	The proposal timeline is unrealistic and not achievable. Tasks and responsibilities are poorly defined and not allocated within the timeline.
Budget	The budget provided is realistic and appropriate, and it aligns clearly with the proposal objectives. The estimates are reasonable, with clear explanation of how the costs were calculated.	The budget provided is generally appropriate, and some clearly links with the proposal objectives were provided. Some estimates are not reasonable, and some explanations of how the costs were calculated were missing.	The budget provided is questionable, and how it aligns with the proposal objectives is not clear. The estimates provided are questionable, with some information lacking on how the costs were calculated.	The budget provided is not realistic or appropriate, and there is no clear link to the proposal objectives. No explanation provided on how the costs were calculated.
Readability	The proposal is written in clear and concise language that is easy to understand.	The proposal is generally well-written but may have some minor readability issues.	The proposal is somewhat difficult to read or understand due to poor organization or language use.	The proposal is poorly written and difficult to understand due to significant issues with organization or language use.