Faculty Resident Scholarship Program Application Scoring Rubric

QI Project

Faculty Applicant:

Resident Mentee:

Reviewer Name:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Score (**1-5**) | Comments |
| **QI Project** |
| **Need and Problem Description**5 (Outstanding): Clearly articulates a pressing local problem supported by data. References relevant literature or guidelines.3 (Good): Describes the problem adequately; some data or literature acknowledged.1 (Poor): Problem is vague or lacks evidence of significance |  |  |
| **Aims and QI Methodology**5 (Outstanding): SMART aim with measurable targets; clearly defines QI model used (e.g., PDSA, Lean, Six Sigma, etc) and rationale.3 (Good): Aim is defined but lacks specificity; methodology named but not fully justified.1 (Poor): No clear aim or methodology described. |  |  |
| **Content and QI tools**5 (Outstanding): Thoroughly describes setting, staffing, resources, and stakeholders; intervention is replicable. At least one QI tools (Fishbone, Process Map, Key Driver Diagram etc) is utilized.3 (Good): Basic context provided; some details missing; limited replicability\*. One QI tool is mentioned, but not yet utilized.1 (Poor): Minimal context, unclear who is involved, or intervention vague. No QI tools are mentioned.\*For a QI project to have replicability it should have: * *a clear definition of both the problem and the intervention*
* *standardized protocols and processes to ensure consistency*
* *detailed documentation of methods, tools, and resources used (such as training materials, technology, and staff time)*
* *well-defined and measurable outcome measures*
* *consideration of contextual factors, allowing adaptation to different environments.*
 |  |  |
| **Measures and Data Plan**5 (Outstanding): Includes clear process and outcome measures with baseline data; demonstrates feasibility of data collection and analysis.3 (Good): Measures listed but lack baseline or collection plan; partially defined.1 (Poor): Vague or missing measures; no plan to assess progress. |  |  |
| **PDSA cycles and Analysis**5 (Outstanding): Defines data analysis methods (Run Charts, SPC charts, etc) and iterative improvement cycles (e.g., multiple PDSA cycles).3 (Good): Analysis approach mentioned but lacks depth; iterative process unclear.1 (Poor): No analysis described; no feedback or adaptation plan. |  |  |
| **Impact, Sustainability, and Spread**5 (Outstanding): Describes meaningful impact; includes sustainability plan and spread strategy; considers cost effectiveness. Use of Impact/Effort Matrix.3 (Good): Impact likely; mentions sustainability but lacks clear approach.1 (Poor): Long term benefits and sustainability not addressed |  |  |
| **Stakeholders and Resources**5 (Outstanding): Team has relevant experience and leadership support; stakeholders and resources are well detailed.3 (Good): Team described but lacks clarity in roles or resources1 (Poor): Team lacks QI experience; resources unclear or unrealistic |  |  |
| **Mentorship** |
| **Resident Contributions**5 (High): Proposal outlines plan for resident to be deeply engaged in all project phases (design, implementation, evaluation). Clear plan for mentorship by attending. Responsibilities are well-described.3 (Moderate): Resident will play a moderate role (e.g., data collection or reporting). Mentorship described but lacks structure.1 (Low): Resident involvement is mentioned but not clearly involved. Mentorship vague or absent. |  |  |
| **Career Trajectories**5 (Outstanding): Project clearly aligns with both resident’s and mentor’s long-term goals (e.g., academic promotion, QI fellowship, publication, leadership in QI). Opportunities for dissemination (presentations, posters, papers) identified.3 (Good): Some alignment with future goals, but not fully articulated. Dissemination plans unclear.1 (Poor): Project appears isolated or disconnected from ongoing work; no clear impact on career advancement. |  |  |
| **Overall Score** |
| **Overall Score (out of 45) and Comments**  |  |  |