

DONOR-INSPIRED STUDY SCORING RUBRIC

<p>Scientific Merit</p>	<p>Weak hypotheses and objectives, experimental design & methods, data analysis and/or preliminary data (if applicable), with significant flaws.</p> <p>The project does not address the stated problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field.</p>	<p>Adequate hypotheses and objectives, experimental design & methods, data analysis and preliminary data (if applicable), with minor flaws.</p> <p>The project may directly or indirectly address the stated problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field.</p>	<p>Excellent hypotheses and objectives, experimental design & methods, data analysis and preliminary data (if applicable) with no significant flaws.</p> <p>The project directly addresses the stated problem or a critical barrier to progress in the field, with a strong interventional component if that is appropriate for the topic being considered.</p>
	<p>0-1</p>	<p>2-3</p>	<p>4-5</p>
	<p>Impact</p>	<p>Unclear and unlinked impact plan goals, objectives and activities that are not attainable and lack engagement with appropriate beneficiaries.</p> <p>The impact plan and proposal do not inform each other and do not result in outcomes that scientifically advance the field.</p> <p>There is no clear pathway for findings from the proposed work to be utilized by owners, breeders, veterinarians, or other stakeholders.</p>	<p>Mostly clear and linked impact plan goals, objectives and activities that may be attainable and engage somewhat with appropriate beneficiaries.</p> <p>The impact plan and proposal somewhat inform each other and may result in outcomes that scientifically advance the field.</p> <p>There is a described and moderately credible pathway for findings from the proposed work to be utilized by owners, breeders, veterinarians or other stakeholders.</p>
<p>0-1</p>		<p>2-3</p>	<p>4-5</p>

Significance	<p>The study does not specifically address the topic.</p> <p>Ability to generate new information on the topic is not well-described.</p>	<p>The study somewhat addresses the topic.</p> <p>Ability to generate new information on the topic is somewhat described.</p>	<p>The study clearly addresses the topic.</p> <p>Ability to generate new information on the topic is clearly described.</p>
	0	1	2

Attainability of Objectives	<p>Objectives are unlikely to be completed in the given timeline, objectives are dependent, potential pitfalls are not addressed, and/or expertise, facilities and equipment are inadequate.</p> <p>The research team does not have sufficient expertise and there is no clear evidence of useful connection with stakeholder groups.</p>	<p>Objectives may be completed in the given timeline, some objectives are dependent, some potential pitfalls are addressed, and/or expertise, facilities and equipment are adequate.</p> <p>The research team has expertise and some evidence of credibility and connection with stakeholder groups.</p>	<p>Objectives are likely to be completed in the given timeline, objectives are independent, potential pitfalls are addressed, and facilities and equipment are excellent.</p> <p>The research team has significant expertise and well-documented credibility and connection with stakeholder groups.</p>
	0	1-2	3

Grantsmanship & Budget	<p>Writing is unclear and disorganized. Proposal does not adhere to one or more guidelines.</p> <p>Budget is not appropriate and not properly justified, particularly with regard to salary.</p>	<p>Writing is not completely clear or organized. Proposal does not completely adhere to guidelines.</p> <p>Budget is mostly appropriate and properly justified, particularly with regard to salary.</p>	<p>Writing is clear and organized. Proposal adheres to guidelines.</p> <p>Budget is appropriate and properly justified, particularly with regard to salary.</p>
	0	1	2