

International Surgery Desk Scholarship: Reviewer's Rubric

Applicant: _____

Section	Point Range	Excellent-Very Good	Good-Fair	Poor Inadequate
Learning Objectives	0-5	Objectives are succinct, well written and clearly understood. They detail who will be involved, what the project will look like, and how this opportunity will add to their post graduate training. Points: 5 or 4	Objectives include most of the required details but not all. They are well to adequately written. Points: 3 or 2	Objectives are poorly written or missing. They include few of the required details. Points: 1 or 0
Partnership/ Local Engagement	0-10	Includes the partners, geographic areas to be served, and priority area addressed (if applicable). There is clear local engagement and support for the project. It is well written, detailed, and clearly understood. Points: 10-8	Includes partners, geographic areas to be served, and priority area addressed (if applicable), and description of local engagement is vague. Can be understood. Points: 7-5	Does not include partners, local engagement and/or geographic areas; or is missing altogether. Difficult to comprehend. Points: 4-0
Rationale/Applicability to ISD Vision	0-10	The proposal presents a very compelling case for why the ISD grant is needed. Good details current evidence from the literature are included. The section is well written and clearly understood. Points: 10-8	The proposal provides a good to fair picture of why an ISD grant is needed. It includes some literature. The section is written well to fair. Points: 7-5	Little or no rationale is included which help to explain why an ISD grant is needed. Few details from the literature are included. The section is poorly written. Points: 4-0
Proposal	0-15	The goals of the proposal are clear, appropriate, and match the identified need. The description is detailed and clear; the research question addresses the identified needs The research methods are clearly stated and appropriate (if applicable). There is evidence that the proposal will be a quality experience and the applicant will have opportunities for their continued growth as a resident during this experience. Points: 15-11	The goals of the proposal are clear and connected to the need. The research question is complete; it is clear as to what will happen and how. The research methods/question are described and appear appropriate (if applicable). There is some description of how this experience will benefit the applicant. Points: 10-5	The goals of the proposal are vague or missing; they do not connect to the stated need. It's unclear as to what will happen and how. The research methods/question are described, but they do not appear appropriate or understood. Points: 4-0
Intentional Clinical Learning	0-10	The proposal states clear clinical learning objectives and identified clinical supervisor. The explanation is detailed, appropriate, well thought out, and valid. Points: 10-8	The proposal partially states clinical learning objectives and identifies a clinical supervisor. The explanation somewhat valid but not fully convincing. Points: 7-5	The proposal does not really state clinical learning objectives or clinical supervisor. The explanation is vague and not convincing. Points: 4-0
Budget & Timeline	0-5	Budget and timeline includes clear explanations of line items, milestones and other funding sources. Amounts and timeline are reasonable. Points 5 or 4	Budget includes some explanations of line items and some form of timeline. Other funding sources are revealed. Points 3 or 2	Budget and timeline are missing explanations of line items and/or milestones. Points 1 or 0
TOTAL	/55	COMMENTS FOR AUTHORS:		COMMENTS FOR REVIEWERS: