GRANT TITLE:_____ REVIEWER:_____

INACSL Spunt Grant Scoring Rubric

Criteria	Possible Points			Score
	Poor (1-2)	**Marginal (3-5)**	**Proficient (6-7)**	
Introduction/ Background	Minimally explains the background on the issue. The gaps in the literature are unclear.	At times, background information is unclear or lacks importance. Partially explains why the issue is important.	Presents a sound scientific background and explanation of rationale to an important topic. Presents a complete and thorough explanation of why the issue is important with supporting evidence.	
Literature Review	Describes individual studies and lacks synthesis and key articles relevant to the topic of inquiry.	Describes mostly current articles and identifies common themes related to study topic.	Presents a thorough synthesis and analysis of the literature: identifies what is known and the knowledge gaps. Lists current and reputable articles. Includes classic or key articles relevant to the topic of inquiry.	
Problem Statement/ Objective of the Study/Research Questions	Research question(s)/purpose statement lack clarity and/or importance, and lack alignment with the literature review. Problem/objective(s) hold a low priority in advancing the science of simulation.	Problem statement/ objective(s), or research question(s) are listed, somewhat link to literature review, and hold relevance to simulation research priorities.	Explicitly and clearly states the problem/objective(s), research question(s), and if applicable, hypotheses. Research question(s) are derived through the literature review and hold importance to advancing the science of simulation. Problem/objective(s) align with INACSL mission and research priorities.	
Study Design	Design is unclear or inconsistent.	Approach is clearly explained. Notes IRB or ethics approval. Describes the setting, participants, data sources/ measurement data analysis plan, timetable, and plan for dissemination. Some threats to internal validity are present.	Approach clearly explained and appropriate for research question. Notes IRB or ethics approval. Describes robust plans for the setting, participants, data sources/measurement, timetable, plan for dissemination of results, and methods consistent with reporting guidelines for health care simulation research*	
Simulation Design	Simulation design lacks clarity.	Describes the simulation and debriefing method. Provides size of groups, timing of simulation, and qualifications of facilitator(s).	Clearly describes the simulation including the process used to validate the simulation as well as debriefing method. Employs measures to enhance consistency of the simulations. Justifies size of groups, timing of simulation, and qualifications of facilitator(s).	
Contribution to the Science of Simulation	The results do not make a contribution to the science of simulation.	The results make a moderate contribution to the science of simulation.	The results will make a significant contribution to the science of simulation. They add new information that enhances overall understanding of the problem with potential to influence policy or make a grand impact.	
Budget	Budget lacks clarity or feasibility	Budget is clear and expenses are justified	Budget is clear, accurate, feasible, and expenses are well justified	
Writing Style	Poor writing style exhibited.	Writing is mostly clear. Occasional errors present. Uses APA or AMA format and cites references.	Strong and clear style of writing demonstrated throughout. Uses APA or AMA format and cites references.	
Qualifications	CV demonstrates no prior history of publications	CV demonstrates 1-3 publications in simulation	CV demonstrates a track record of publications in simulation. PI holds CNE, CHSE or CHSE-A	
Total Score			_____points out of 63	

Rubric developed by Foronda and Greenawalt (2016). Content was used from the following publications:

*Cheng, A., Kessler, D., Mackinnon, R., Change, T.P., Nadkarni, V.M, Hunt, E.A., et al., (2016). Reporting guidelines for health care simulation research. Extensions to the CONSORT and STROBE statements. *Clinical Simulation in Nursing*, 12, A3-A13.

Fey, M. K., Gloe, D., & Mariani, B. (2015, December). Assessing the quality of simulation-based research articles: A rating rubric. *Clinical Simulation in Nursing,* 11(12), 496-504. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1016/j.ecns.2015.10.005.