

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

The Proposal Review Rubric below addresses grant proposal criteria used to review each grant submission. Components of the rubric are weighted in three categories. 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 who are not funded.

PROPOSAL REVIEW RUBRIC					
	<i>Excellent = 4</i>	<i>Good = 3</i>	<i>Fair = 2</i>	<i>Poor = 1</i>	<i>Missing = 0</i>
A. Advancing the Science of Nursing Education (30%)					
A1. Purpose with direct linkage to NLN Research Priorities in Nursing Education	Very clear purpose. Description with strong linkage to NLN Research Priorities	Clear purpose. Description with adequate linkage to NLN Research Priorities	Purpose mostly clear. Description with weak linkage to NLN Research Priorities	Purpose not clear. Description with inadequate linkage to NLN Research Priorities	Linkage to NLN Research Priorities not addressed
A2. Background to support the need for the study to advance the science of nursing education	Background clearly identifies need for the study	Background provides some need for the study	Background to support need for the study not very clear	Limited background to support need for the study	Need not addressed in background
A3. Review of relevant literature	Literature cited is very pertinent and timely	Literature cited is mostly pertinent and timely	Literature review lacks pertinence or is outdated	Literature review lacks pertinence <u>and</u> is outdated	Relevant literature not addressed
A4. Significance to nursing education	Very high significance for nursing education	High significance for nursing education	Fair significance for nursing education	Limited significance for nursing education	Significance for nursing education not addressed
A5. Theoretical, conceptual, or philosophical basis	Theoretical, conceptual, or philosophical basis for study is very clear and relevant	Theoretical, conceptual, or philosophical basis for study is clear and relevant	Limited clarity and relevance for theoretical, conceptual, or philosophical basis of study	No clarity or relevance for theoretical, conceptual, or philosophical basis of study.	Theoretical, conceptual, or philosophical not addressed

PROPOSAL REVIEW RUBRIC					
	<i>Excellent = 4</i>	<i>Good = 3</i>	<i>Fair = 2</i>	<i>Poor = 1</i>	<i>Missing = 0</i>
B. Methodological Soundness (50%)					
B1. Research Design	Design or methodology is most appropriate for research question/s	Design or methodology is appropriate for research question/s	Design or methodology needs to be revised to be appropriate for research question/s	Design or methodology is not appropriate for research question/s	Research design not identified
B2. Sampling approach: selection, size, recruitment and retention	Sample very appropriate in size and selection. Plans to recruit and retain subjects are very clear and feasible.	Sample mostly appropriate in size and selection. Plans to recruit and retain subjects are mostly clear and feasible.	Sample size and selection fairly well considered. Plans to recruit and retain subjects are fairly clear and/or feasible.	Sample size and selection not well considered. Plans to recruit and retain subjects are not clear or feasible.	Sampling approach not addressed
B3. <u>Diversity</u> of sample	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	Diversity of sample not addressed
B4. Data collection protocol (plan to maintain consistency among multiple study sites, if appropriate)	Data collection protocol is clear, feasible and methodologically rigorous	Data collection protocol is mostly clear, feasible and rigorous	Data collection protocol is fairly clear, feasible and rigorous	Data collection protocol lacks clarity, feasibility or rigor	Data collection protocol is not addressed
B5. Instrumentation (quantitative, e.g., reliability and validity; qualitative trustworthiness)	Approaches to enhance credibility and trustworthiness and/or use of instruments with acceptable reliability and validity are very	Approaches to enhance credibility and trustworthiness and/or use of instruments with acceptable reliability and validity are mostly	Approaches to enhance credibility and trustworthiness and/or use of instruments with acceptable reliability and validity are fairly	Approaches to enhance credibility and trustworthiness and/or use of instruments with acceptable reliability and validity are poorly	Instrumentation not addressed

PROPOSAL REVIEW RUBRIC					
	<i>Excellent = 4</i>	<i>Good = 3</i>	<i>Fair = 2</i>	<i>Poor = 1</i>	<i>Missing = 0</i>
	clearly described	clear	clear	described	
B6. Data analysis procedures	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	Data analysis procedures not addressed
B7. Protection of human subjects	Procedures to protect human subjects and seek IRB approval very well described or lack thereof clearly justified	Procedures to protect human subjects and seek IRB approval mostly well described or lack thereof mostly justified	Procedures to protect human subjects and seek IRB approval fairly well described or lack thereof somewhat justified	Procedures to protect human subjects and seek IRB approval poorly described or lack thereof poorly justified	Protection of human subjects and IRB approval plan not addressed
C. Presentation (20%)					
C1. Plans for dissemination	Very appropriate and well described	Mostly appropriate and described	Fair appropriateness and description	Poor appropriateness and description	Plans for dissemination not addressed
C2. Timetable and feasibility 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	Lacks timetable
C3. Budget (not counted in proposal page limit) – N/R for Dissertation/ DNP Research Award Proposals	Budget very clear and expenses well justified	Budget mostly clear and justified	Budget fairly clear and justified	Poor budget clarity and justification	Lacks budget
C4. Cohesiveness and	Very cohesive and coherent	Mostly cohesive and coherent	Somewhat cohesive and coherent	Poor cohesiveness and coherency	Lacks cohesiveness and coherency

PROPOSAL REVIEW RUBRIC					
	<i>Excellent = 4</i>	<i>Good = 3</i>	<i>Fair = 2</i>	<i>Poor = 1</i>	<i>Missing = 0</i>
coherency					
C5. Clarity of writing	Very well written, jargon-free, no typographical and grammatical errors	Mostly well written, jargon-free, minimal typographical and grammatical errors	Fairly well written, jargon-free, multiple typographical and grammatical errors	Poorly written; many typographical and grammatical errors	Lacks clarity of writing
A. Advancing the Science of Nursing Education (30% of final score)					
B. Methodological Soundness (50% of final score)					
C. Presentation (20% of final score)					
Final Score					
OVERALL COMMENTS: Please provide overall strengths and weaknesses of the study <u>to be shared with applicant(s) and the Research Review Panel (RRP).</u>					