



WNRCSN Awards Assessment of Proposal

EVALUATION CRITERIA:	Excellent (5pts)	Very Good (4pts)	Good (3pts)	Fair (2pts)	Poor (1pt)	N/A (0pts)
Scientific Merit & Significance						
a) Clarity of purpose/objectives						
b) Review of literature						
c) Conceptual framework or philosophical underpinnings of research approach						
d) Data analysis / synthesis plan						
e) Dissemination plan						
f) Time frame and feasibility						
g) Significance						
h) Relevance / Fit to aim and goals of this grant						
Research and Graduate Awards Only						
i) Appropriateness of research methods						
(i) Research design						
(ii) Sample selection						
(iii) Data collection procedures						
Educational Innovation Award Only						
j) Innovation in nursing education						
(i) Degree of innovation						
(ii) Impact on student teaching and learning						
(iii) Potential for model for nursing educators						
(iv) Sustainability of innovation						
Rationale/comments:						



WNRCSN Awards Assessment of Proposal

Overall Assessment

Please note that your comments below will be shared with applicants so please ensure that your assessment, including strengths and weaknesses, is provided in a constructive manner.

_____ Tally Point Score from above rubric.

Research Award Total Possible Points: 55

_____ Out of a possible total of:
(see total possible points to the right)

Graduate Student Award Total Possible Points: 55

Educational Innovation Award Total Possible Points: 60

What were the strengths of this proposal related to the scientific merit and significance of the research?

What were the weaknesses of this proposal related to the scientific merit and significance of the research?

Innovation, creativity, and supporting new areas of research and new researchers is a key consideration for WNRCSN awards. Aside from the scientific merit of this proposal, do you believe that this proposal, with revisions and guidance, should be considered for funding?

_____ Yes _____ Yes with revisions _____ No

If yes, with revisions, indicate which revisions are required prior to funding.

If no, recommended level of support and rationale for reduction.