



**KATHARINE M. DONOHOE CLINICAL RESEARCH AWARD  
Evaluation Score Sheet and Comments**

Applicant's name:

Title of proposal:

CATEGORY	SCORE OPTIONS	SCORE	COMMENTS
<b>1. Significance of the Issue (0-4 points)</b>	<p>4 (Outstanding): The issue addresses a critical, high-priority problem that is timely and impactful. The proposal clearly outlines how the pilot project will provide preliminary data to advance the field or address an urgent gap.</p> <p>3 (Good): The issue is important and relevant, but its potential impact or urgency is less immediate or clear. It addresses a meaningful problem that could influence the field.</p> <p>2 (Fair): The issue is relevant but either not well defined, lacks urgency, or may only have moderate impact. Its contribution to the field is somewhat clear but not compelling.</p> <p>1 (Poor): The issue is marginally relevant, lacks significant impact or urgency, and has little potential to advance the field meaningfully.</p> <p>0 (Unacceptable): The issue is not relevant to the grant focus, lacks justification, or is poorly defined.</p>		
<b>2. Investigative Team (0-4 points)</b>	<p>4 (Outstanding): The investigative team or applicant is exceptionally qualified with demonstrated requisite expertise, prior success, and complementary skills. Strong collaborations are evident, and the team has a clear track record of delivering on similar projects.</p> <p>3 (Good): The team or applicant is well-qualified with relevant requisite expertise and a strong history of successful collaborations. However, minor gaps in skills or experience may exist.</p> <p>2 (Fair): The team or applicant has some relevant experience and partial requisite expertise, but lacks cohesion or has notable gaps in expertise. There is potential, but the team's ability to fully execute the project is uncertain.</p> <p>1 (Poor): The team or applicant has limited experience or requisite expertise in the project area, with unclear or weak collaboration. The team structure may be ineffective for achieving the project's goals.</p>		

<p><b>3. Likelihood for Follow-up Funding (0-4)</b></p>	<p>4 (Outstanding): The project has a strong potential to attract future funding. The proposal outlines a clear plan for how the results will support future grants or create new funding opportunities.</p> <p>3 (Good): The project has reasonable potential for follow-up funding. The proposal suggests how results could lead to future grant opportunities, but the plan lacks specific detail or guarantee.</p> <p>2 (Fair): The potential for future funding is unclear. Some effort is made to explain the path to future grants, but it lacks specificity or strength.</p> <p>1 (Poor): There is little potential for follow-up funding. The proposal does not convincingly demonstrate how this project will lead to future grant opportunities.</p> <p>0 (Unacceptable): There is no consideration of follow-up funding, or the project is unlikely to generate further funding opportunities.</p>		
<p><b>4. Budget Justification (0-4)</b></p>	<p>4 (Outstanding): The budget is thoroughly justified and directly tied to project goals and activities. Costs are reasonable, well explained, and demonstrate a clear understanding of the resources needed for success.</p> <p>3 (Good): The budget is justified with clear connections to project objectives. Most costs are reasonable, but there may be minor areas where further explanation is needed.</p> <p>2 (Fair): The budget is somewhat justified but lacks sufficient detail or rationale for some costs. There may be concerns about the appropriateness of certain expenditures.</p> <p>1 (Poor): The budget is poorly justified, with significant gaps in explanation. Some costs seem excessive or unrelated to the project's objectives.</p> <p>0 (Unacceptable): The budget is unjustified or missing key details. Costs are inappropriate, excessive, or irrelevant to the proposed project.</p>		
<p>Total Scoring Range:</p>	<p>0-16 points, with higher scores reflecting stronger LOIs that demonstrate significant impact, a capable investigative team, a solid budget rationale, and potential for ongoing funding.</p>		

\*Student-led proposals should be evaluated based on their proposed mentorship team

Recommend for funding

Do not recommend for funding

Recommend for funding with modifications

**Additional Comments**

Evaluator

Date