GRANT-IN-AID (GIA) COMPETENCY BASED SCORING

Applicant Name: _____ **Reviewer #:** _____ **Date:** _____

RESEARCH PROPOSAL

Criteria	(0)	Fair (1)	Good (2)	Excellent (3)	Exceptional (4)	Score	Weight	Total
Background and significance of the research		Fair presentation of societal (why it's important)[1] **or** cognitive (what is known[2] and not known[3]) or technical (methods used[2] and limitations[3]) issues and their significance but there is **no depth**. **Several** references are missing or references are **not current**.[4]	**Good** presentation of societal (why it's important)[1] **or** cognitive (what is known[2] and not known[3]) or technical (methods used[2] and limitations[3]) issues and their significance. Most references are pertinent but **a few** are missing.[4]	**Excellent** presentation of societal (why it's important)[1] **and/or** cognitive (what is known[2] and not known[3]) or technical (methods used[2] and limitations[3]) issues and their significance. References are **pertinent**.[4]	**Exceptionally well** presented societal (why it's important)[1] **and** cognitive (what is known[2] and not known[3]) or technical (methods used[2] and limitations[3]) issues and their significance. References are not only pertinent but also **varied**.[4]	7.5		/ 30
Specific aims and hypotheses to be examined		Specific aims are **not** clearly stated or **redundant**.[1] Hypotheses are **not** clearly stated or **redundant**.[2]	Specific aims are **clearly** stated but **do not** follow logically from the background and significance.[1] Hypotheses are **clearly** stated but are **not** phrased as hypotheses.[2]	Specific aims are **clearly** stated and **follow** logically from the background and significance.[1] Hypotheses are **clearly** stated and **phrased** as hypotheses.[2]	Specific aims are **clearly** stated, **follow** logically from the background and significance and are **innovative**.[1] Hypotheses are **clearly** stated, **phrased** as hypotheses and **testable**.[2]	3.75		/ 15
Overview of the methods to be employed		Participants (or model parameters)[1], procedures[2], variables and measuring instruments (or model input and output variables)[3], data analysis[4] **or** expected results[5] presentation is fair but **several** may not be appropriate or questions remain. **No** sample size calculation.[6] **Several** references are missing or references are **not current**.[7]	Participants (or model parameters)[1], procedures[2], variables and measuring instruments (or model input and output variables)[3], data analysis[4] **or** expected results[5] presentation is good but **a few** may not be appropriate or questions remain. **No** sample size calculation.[6] Most references are pertinent but **several** are missing.[7]	Participants (or model parameters)[1], procedures[2], variables and measuring instruments (or model input and output variables)[3], data analysis[4] **and/or** expected results[5] presentation and appropriateness is **excellent**. A sample size calculation is also **presented**.[6] Most references are pertinent but **a few** are missing.[7]	Participants (or model parameters)[1], procedures[2], variables and measuring instruments (or model input and output variables)[3], data analysis[4] **and** expected results[5] are **exceptionally well** presented and appropriate. A sample size calculation **and** preliminary results are also **presented**.[6] References are **pertinent**.[7]	7.5		/ 30
Itemized budget and justification		Budget is **not** clear[1], contains **illegal** expenses[2] and/or is **not** justified[3].	Budget is **clear**[1], contains **no** illegal expenses[2] but is **not** well justified (ex: how additional expenses will be funded)[3].	Budget is **clear**[1], contains **no** illegal expenses[2] and is well **justified**[3].	Budget is **clear**[1], contains **no** illegal expenses[2] and is well **justified**[3], including a demonstration of **need**[4].	1.25		/ 5
Relevance of the proposal to biomechanics		Fair justification of relevance to biomechanics but **could be better**[1], and **no** impact of results on the field or society[2].	**Good** justification of relevance to biomechanics[1], but **no** impact of results on the field or society[2].	**Excellent** justification of relevance to biomechanics[1], including the impact of results on the field **or** society[2].	**Exceptionally well** justified relevance to biomechanics[1], including the impact of results on the field **and** society[2].	1.25		/ 5

TOTAL = _____ / 85

APPLICANT

Criteria	(0)	Fair (1)	Good (2)	Excellent (3)	Exceptional (4)	Score	Weight	Total
Curriculum vita of the applicant		**Fair** GPA or GPA not provided.[1] **No** awards or scholarships.[2] **Fair** clinical, industry, research, supervisory **or** teaching experience.[3] **No** institutional or professional affiliations.[4] **No** published conference abstracts and/or journal articles.[5]	**Good** GPA.[1] **Small local** award(s) or scholarship(s).[2] **Good** clinical, industry, research, supervisory **or** teaching experience.[3] **A few** institutional or professional affiliations.[4] **A few** published conference abstracts and/or journal articles.[5]	**Excellent** GPA.[1] **Moderate state level** award(s) or scholarship(s).[2] **Diversified** clinical, industry, research, supervisory **and/or** teaching experience.[3] **Several** institutional or professional affiliations.[4] **A few** published conference abstracts and/or journal articles as **first author**.[5]	**Exceptional** GPA.[1] **Large national** award(s) or scholarship(s).[2] **Exceptionally diversified** clinical, industry, research, supervisory **and/or** teaching experience.[3] Several institutional or professional affiliations including significant **ASB involvement**.[4] **Several** published conference abstracts and journal articles as **first author**.[5]		2.5	/ 10
Letter of recommendation from the academic advisor		**Fair** letter of recommendation from advisor[1].	**Good** letter of recommendation from advisor[1].	**Strong** letter of recommendation from advisor[1], including a statement of **support** for the project (significance and resources)[2].	**Glowing** letter of recommendation from advisor[1], including a statement of **support** for the project (significance and resources)[2] and additional **pertinent information** on the applicant[3].		1.25	/ 5

TOTAL = _____ / 15

GRAND TOTAL = _____ / 100

Is there a reason why this proposal should NOT be funded? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please justify (ex: plagiarism, major flaw, infringement of guidelines, etc…):

Brief comments about notable strengths or weaknesses of the application:

Notes: If the content is acceptable but the form is poor (ex: typos, grammatical errors, poor formatting, etc…), a decreased score is warranted.
Scores should be adjusted according to the level of the student, i.e., we should expect more from a Ph.D. student than from a Master's student.