Faculty Resident Scholarship Program Application Scoring Rubric

Research Project

Faculty Applicant:

Resident Mentee:

Reviewer Name:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Score (**1-5**) | Comments |
| **Research Project** | | |
| **Aims and Research Question**  5 (Outstanding): Clearly articulates a thoughtful research question and specific aims. References relevant literature.  3 (Good): Describes a research question and specific aims  1 (Poor): Question/aims are vague or poorly defined |  |  |
| **Methodology**  5 (Outstanding): Study design is well stated and suited to answer the research question with appropriate measures and outcomes  3 (Good): Study design is defined but lacks specificity or is not best suited to answer research question  1 (Poor): No clear methodology described or inappropriate measures |  |  |
| **Analysis**  5 (Outstanding): Defines data analysis plan that is clear, realistic, and addresses the research question  3 (Good): Analysis approach mentioned but is lacking depth or not sufficient to achieve project goals  1 (Poor): No analysis described or inappropriate analysis plan |  |  |
| **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 resources  1 (Poor): Team lacks relevant experience; resources unclear or unrealistic |  |  |
| **Protocol Development/IRB Approval**  5 (Outstanding): Project is IRB approved  3 (Good): Protocol development is reasonable and timeline for achieving IRB approval is appropriate  1 (Poor): IRB approval uncertain or unrealistic in proposed timeframe |  |  |
| **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, research fellowship, publication, leadership in research). 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 30) and Comments** |  |  |