

Urgent Care College of Physicians Research Grants Program – Scoring Rubric

Criteria	Insufficient 0 points	Emerging 1 points	Acceptable 3 points	Excellent 5 points
Advancing Urgent Care medicine as a specialty	Did not address impact on advancing specialty of Urgent Care medicine.	Addressed, but vague. Shared possible impacts on Urgent Care medicine, but does not create a strong sense of purpose.	Addressed, and logically presented with some support. Included discussion about possible impacts on advancing Urgent Care medicine.	Thoroughly addressed, clearly and concisely. Presented with supporting references.
Impact to Patient Care	Did not address impact on patient care.	Addressed, but vague. Shared possible impacts on patients, but lacking supporting information.	Addressed, and included some discussion.	Clearly addressed with supporting evidence of impact.
Target Audience	No clear identification of target audience(s).	Vague identification of target audience(s).	Clearly identified target audience(s).	Strongly defined target audience(s), with explanation of selection significance.
Project Design and Methodology	Plan lacks sufficient detail to judge how it will accomplish work. Methodology not addressed.	Plan lacks depth of detail or appeared to be missing steps. Methodology vaguely addressed. For multi-year projects, vague description of how each year will build upon the work.	Plan included description of the major steps. Includes some specificity about the methodology. For multi-year projects, outlined how each year will build upon the work.	Plan includes detailed description of major and minor steps; description of strengths, weaknesses, and critical attributes. High level of specificity about the methodology. For multi-year projects, clearly described how each year will build upon the work.
Evaluation and Outcomes	Evaluation missing or unusable.	Evaluation flawed by untestable outcomes, inappropriate metrics, or lack of useful data collection.	Evaluation addressed anticipated results, but lacks some detail about data or metrics.	Evaluation is clear how data is to be collected and used to demonstrate success.
Sustainability	Did not address sustainability or future impact of project.	Vague reference to sustainability. Future impact of project is assumed, no supporting argument provided.	Clearly stated sustainability with project designed to end with grants, or addressed some effort to secure commitment beyond grant.	Sustainability supported with evidence presented that project or its impact can be sustained beyond grant period, if results warrant.

Urgent Care College of Physicians Research Grants Program – Scoring Rubric

Dissemination of Results	Did not address dissemination of results.	Dissemination of results vaguely outlined. Did not include discussion of how the project could contribute to the field or possibility for the future.	Clearly stated plan for dissemination of results. Included limited discussion about how the project could contribute to the field and some possibility for the future.	Thoroughly addressed plan for dissemination of results, making a clear connection to future contributions; thoughtfully addressed significance of project.
Project Timeline	Insufficient information about project activities timeline.	Vague or unrealistic timeline, with project unlikely to be achieved in current form.	Clear timeline of activities. Outcomes appear achievable despite gaps or leaps.	Thoughtful timeline that is congruent with project description and outcomes.
Budget	Insufficient information expenditures to gauge feasibility.	Outlined budget, but does not appear sufficient or realistic for project needs in current form.	Budget clearly presented and appears sufficient for project.	Detailed budget that clearly matches stated needs and thoughtful approach to expenditures, with justification as needed.