



National Translational Research Collaborative: DRAFT Research Grants Committee (RGC) rubric

Instructions for use of the rubric:

This rubric is structured to address 4 overall Domains, with specific criteria within each Domain: Research design- methods and data analysis; Translation and scalability; Collaboration and diversity of research team; Timelines and Budget. Different score weightings are applied for each Domain.

DOMAIN 1: Research design- methods and data analysis (50%)							
Criteria	Poor	Fair	Borderline	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Score
Background: demonstrates research gap via reference to literature review	No evidence of appropriate literature review (0 points)	Background statement suggests literature review is limited. Doesn't instill confidence that researcher is properly aware of current research on topic (1-3 points)	Background statement suggests literature review adequate. Researcher doesn't properly draw-out research gap arising from literature review (4-5 points)	Background statement summarises current literature and demonstrates evidence of research gap. (6-7 points)	Background statement succinctly covers current research on topic and clearly highlights the research gap. (8-9 points)	Background statement demonstrates thorough understanding of current literature and clearly highlights the research gap. (10 points)	/10
Establishing the research question: Aims and objectives/ Hypothesis	None described (0 points)	Not well expressed; Aims and Objectives not clear and Hypothesis unlikely to resolve the research question. (1- 3 points)	Some merit in establishing the research question. But either Aims and Objectives not well thought out, and/or Hypothesis unlikely to resolve the research question. (4-5 points)	Research question has merit. Aims and Objectives are clear, and Hypothesis properly targets research question. (6-7 points)	Aims and Objectives are sound and will address some new and interesting concepts. Hypotheses well-constructed to resolve research question. (8- 9 points)	Novel Aims and Objectives. Well-constructed Hypothesis that will definitely resolve research question. (10 points)	/10
Research methodology	No real description and not appropriate to address aims/hypothesis. (0 points)	Basic description but with flaws in design & limited appropriateness to address aims/ hypothesis. (5-8 points)	Described but some flaws in design; only partially appropriate to address aims/ hypothesis. (9-11 points)	Described. Research methodology appropriate to address aims/ hypothesis. May need some advice/ assistance. (12-14 points)	Well described. Well structured and considered methodology to address aims/ hypothesis. (15-18 points)	Highly developed research methodology. Novel and innovative approach. Acutely aligned to address aims/ hypothesis. (19-20 points)	/20

**National Translational Research Collaborative:
DRAFT Research Grants Committee (RGC) rubric**



DOMAIN 1: Research design- methods and data analysis (continued)							
Criteria	Poor	Fair	Borderline	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Score
Analysis of data	Nil, or no clear analysis of data described to answer aim/ hypothesis. (0 points)	Basic description of data analysis but with flaws. Unlikely to be appropriate for data collected or to answer aims/ hypothesis. (1 -3 points)	Some description of data analysis. Submission shows gaps in researcher(s) ability to apply solid data analysis. (4- 5 points)	Data analysis appropriately described. Has a structured approach that will address aims/ hypothesis. May need additional guidance. (6-7 points)	Well described data analysis. Some overview of statistical evaluation provided. Solid approach that address aims/ hypothesis. (8-9 points)	Unique approach to data analysis. Sound statistical concepts and displays sound reasoning and understanding of data analysis to address aims hypothesis. (10 points)	/10

DOMAIN 2: Translation and scalability (25%)							
Criteria	Poor	Fair	Borderline	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Score
Research impact	Will have no impact or relevance to healthcare, policy or pharmacy practice. (0 points)	Insignificant impact or relevance to healthcare, policy or pharmacy practice. (1-3 points)	Marginal significance or narrow scope of impact on healthcare, policy or pharmacy practice. (4-5 points)	Some relevance to healthcare, policy or pharmacy practice, but likely limited scope. (6-7 points)	Relevant to healthcare, policy or pharmacy practice. Scope of impact more broad or has potential for significant change in a narrow practice area. (8-9 points)	Highly relevant to healthcare, policy or pharmacy practice. Broad scope of impact or potential for practice redesign or fundamental change in a narrow practice area. (10 points)	/10
Translation to practice	No translational capacity. (0 points)	Concept may eventually be translatable to policy or practice, but currently unlikely to be translatable. (1-3 points)	Some potential to translate to policy or practice but significant additional research required. (4-5 points)	Translatable to practice but will take time or will require more evidence to apply directly to policy or practice. (6-7 points)	Directly translatable to policy or practice. Will likely have immediate impact. (8-9 points)	Highly translatable. Will result in immediate policy or practice change. (10 points)	/10
Potential to 'scale-up' project	No potential. (0 points)	Research does not lend itself it further scale-up or needs significant redesign to have potential. (1 point)	Limited applicability for scale-up unless change in design. (2 points)	Some potential for scale-up. Would need some re-design. (3 points)	Directly applicable for scale-up. May need some re-design. (4 points)	Highly relevant for scale up. (5 points)	/5

**National Translational Research Collaborative:
DRAFT Research Grants Committee (RGC) rubric**



Ethical implications <free text>. Describe any evaluator concerns arising from the aims of the study or the associated research methodology (if Ethics Committee approval has not already been obtained).

DOMAIN 3: Collaboration and diversity of research team (15%)							
Criteria	Poor	Fair	Borderline	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Score
Collaborative interdisciplinary research team	Single researcher-no collaboration. (0 points)	Researchers all pharmacists from single site. (1 point)	Researchers all pharmacists across sites/hospitals. (2 points)	Multi-disciplinary team from single site. (3 points)	Multi-disciplinary team from across sites/hospitals. (4 points)	Multi-disciplinary team from across sites/hospitals with evidence of national or international collaboration. (5 points)	/5
Consumers and early career researchers¹	a. No early career researchers or consumers as part of research team. (0 points)	b. Consumer OR early career researcher as part of research team. (1 point)	c. Consumer AND early career researcher as part of research team. (2 points)	d. >1 Consumer and/or >1 early career researcher as part of research team. (3 points)	e. Evidence of early career researcher and/ or consumers taking active part in proposal development, in addition to d. (4 points)	f. Evidence of early career researcher and/or consumers taking lead role WITH SUPPORT from experienced research team in addition to d. (5 points)	/5
Research experience and track record.	No research experience. (0 points)	Research team with limited research project management experience and no publications. (1 point)	One or two researchers with track record in research/ project management. Some publications. (2 points)	One or more researchers with track record in project management and evidence of peer reviewed publications. (3 points)	Two or more researchers with good track record in research project management and significant publication record. (4 points).	Excellent with extensive project management experience or research publications. (5 points)	/5

**National Translational Research Collaborative:
DRAFT Research Grants Committee (RGC) rubric**



DOMAIN 4: Timeline and budget (10%)							
Criteria	Poor	Fair	Borderline	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	Score
Timeline and budget	Nil or poorly considered timeline and budget. (0 points)	Timeline and/or budget provided is unrealistic. (1-3 points)	Timeline and/or budget is appropriately structured but is unrealistic or has flaws (4-5 points)	Timeline and budget is appropriate. Could be more detail. (6-7 points)	Timeline and budget is detailed and provides value for the proposed expenditure. (8-9 points)	Timeline and budget is well-constructed. Proposal provides excellent value for proposed expenditure. (10 points)	/10
Total Score							/100
Comments							

1. Early career researcher <10years as a registered practitioner