

# AMH COVID-19 Seed Grant: Evaluation Rubric

## General Information

Applicant Name	
Project Title:	
Reviewer Name:	

## Rubric

**\*Using the category and descriptions on the following pages, assign each category a score between 0 (weak) and 5 (outstanding) in 0.5 increments.**

Reviewer Ranking	Score (0-5)
Applicant	
Addressing addiction and mental health (AMH) COVID-19 issues, and importance of the work	
Methodology	
Anticipated outcomes	
Future impact, implications for practice, and project opportunity	
Budget	
Timeline and feasibility	
Organization & clarity	
<b>Reviewer comments</b> (Comments are encouraged & may be used by applicants to strengthen their projects):	

## For AMH Research Hub use only:

AMH Research Hub Ranking	Score (0-5)
Collaboration	
Knowledge Translation (KT)	
Implications for practice	
Completion or current status of previous AMH Strategic Clinical Network™ (SCN) and AMH Research Hub grants	

<b>Total Score</b> (Out of 60)	
--------------------------------	--

## Rubric for Reviewer Ranking

Category	Weak (0.0 – 1.0)	Fair (1.5, 2.0)	Good (2.5, 3.0)	Very Good (3.5, 4.0)	Outstanding (4.5, 5.0)
<b>Applicant</b>	Principle Investigator (PI) lacks expertise in research generally.	PI has some experience in research but lacks expertise in most project-related areas.	PI demonstrates expertise in most, but not all, project-related areas and does not demonstrate history of working with the groups of interest.	PI possesses a high level of project-related experience, including experience with the groups of interest.	PI possess a high level of project-related experience, is an expert with a proven track record in this field and has successfully completing related projects with this population.
<b>Addressing AMH COVID-19 issues, and importance of the work</b>	There is no discussion of how the AMH topic relates to COVID-19.	While the AMH topic may be important, the topic is unlikely to be affected by COVID-19.	The AMH topic is important, and may be affected by COVID-19. However, it is not an urgent part of the pandemic response.	The AMH topic is important and affected by COVID-19. Addressing this topic may help in the pandemic response.	The AMH topic is important and the proposal clearly shows how it is affected by COVID-19. Addressing this topic will be a key component in effective short- and long-term pandemic responses.
<b>Methodology</b>	No description of proposed methodology.	Preliminary thoughts outlining how they would answer the research question but lacks detail.	Clear direction on how they would attempt to answer the research question.	Excellent detail on the proposed methodology and sufficient explanation on appropriateness.	Exceeds expectations around proposed methodology and explanation.
<b>Anticipated outcomes</b>	Outcomes are not defined or do not address the research question presented.	Outcomes are poorly defined or likely unattainable.	Outcomes are defined and may or may not be achievable.	Outcomes are well defined and likely to be achieved.	High-impact outcomes are well defined, likely to be achieved, and answer the research question presented in the proposal.
<b>Future impact, implications for practice, and project opportunity</b>	No impact is provided and future projects resulting from this work are not discussed.	Impact or implications for practice are mentioned, but it is unclear how this project can move onto the next stage.	Impact or implications for practice are mentioned, and future project stages are provided.	Impact or implications for practice are clearly provided, and these will improve healthcare responses. The future stages of the project are laid out.	Impact or implications for practice are clear and important. Future work is clearly described, builds from this project, and is of priority to Albertans. There is a clear link between the next step in the project and future short- and long-term pandemic responses.
<b>Budget</b>	The budget is not complete.	The budget is complete, but is not cost efficient or reasonable.	The budget is complete, cost efficient, and reasonable.	The budget is complete, cost effective, and reasonable. The budget is over \$15,000, but additional funds are discussed and already available.	The budget is specific, complete, cost efficient, and reasonable. The budget is within \$15,000 and no additional funds are required.

<b>Timeline and feasibility</b>	The timeline is not complete.	The timeline may not be appropriate for the proposed research.	The timeline is appropriate for the proposed research.	The timeline is feasible and the work has a high likelihood of being completed in the timeframe.	The timeline is feasible and the work has a high likelihood of being completed in the timeframe. Potential barriers or facilitators are discussed.
<b>Organization &amp; clarity</b>	Very poor quality; significant typos, grammatical errors, etc.	Minor issues, such as typos, grammatical errors, etc.	Overall well written. No major typos, grammatical errors.	Strong, well written, no issues noted with typos, grammatical errors.	Exceeds expectations with organization, flow, and quality of writing. Entire proposal is well thought out, logical, and stands out.

## Rubric for AMH Research Hub Ranking

Category	Weak (0.0 – 1.0)	Fair (1.5, 2.0)	Good (2.5, 3.0)	Very Good (3.5, 4.0)	Outstanding (4.5, 5.0)
<b>Collaboration</b>	No team list provided	A team list is provided, but is not adequate (missing important stakeholder groups).	An adequate team is provided, but they may or may not be engaged yet.	The team is well suited for the project, but not all members have been engaged.	Team is well suited to the project, and all team members have already been engaged.
<b>Knowledge Translation (knowledge users, dissemination plans, integrated KT, consultation with operations, etc. )</b>	No KT components are mentioned.	Some KT components are mentioned.	KT components are mentioned throughout.	KT components are incorporated into the grant and used effectively.	KT components are incorporated into the grant and used effectively. The proposal shows how the project is strengthened by this KT work.
<b>Implications for practice or policy</b>	No implications for practice or policy are provided.	Implications for practice or policy are mentioned.	The proposal clearly states the potential implications for practice or policy, but findings are not feasible for incorporation at AHS.	The proposal clearly states the potential implications for practice or policy. It is unclear if they are feasible for incorporation at AHS.	The proposal clearly states the potential implications for practice or policy. There is potential to impact practice or policy at AHS.

Category	No (0.0)	Yes (5.0)
<b>Completion or current status of previous AMH SCN and AMH Research Hub grants</b>	The PI does not have a proved track record for timely grant completion. The PI holds a grant or has held a grant from the AMH SCN or AMH Research Hub and failed to complete it within the allotted time.	The PI has successfully completed any previously held AMH SCN and AMH Research Hub grants in a timely manner. Alternatively, the PI has never received funds from the AMH SCN or AMH Research Hub.