

## RN Well-Being Project Grant Review Rubric

Page 1

				Proposal #	
CRITERIA	Excellent = 4	Good = 3	Fair = 2	Poor = 1	Inadequate = 0
Clarity of writing (grammar, spelling, format)	Very well written. Almost entirely free of spelling, grammar, and punctuation errors.	Well written. May have a few spelling, grammar, and punctuation errors but does not impede flow or understanding.	Somewhat well-written. Several spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors distract flow but not understanding.	Somewhat poorly written. Contains many spelling, grammar, or punctuation errors that interfere with flow and understanding, but not significantly.	Poorly written - many typos and/or grammatical errors that significantly interfere with flow and understanding.
Purpose of project	Well-being challenge is clearly defined, audience is specific, and alignment with grant aim is exemplary.	Well-being challenge, audience, and alignment with grant aim are described effectively.	Well-being challenge, audience, and alignment with grant aim are mentioned but somewhat unclear or vague.	Well-being challenge, audience, and alignment with grant aim are present but not fully described, unclear, or not significantly aligned with grant aim.	Requirements for well-being challenge, audience, or alignment with grant aim are not included or not aligned with grant aim.
Background and evidence	Issue is clearly defined with <b>strong</b> supporting evidence and literature citations that align with grant aim.	Issue is clearly defined with some supporting evidence and literature citations that align with grant aim.	Issue is vaguely defined, has little supporting evidence, or literature citations that align with grant aim.	Issue is unclear, undefined, or weakly supported with evidence, or literature citations that align with grant aim.	Issue is not stated, not supported with evidence, literature citations, or is not aligned with grant aim.
Description of the change/implementation plan	The proposed intervention, anticipated impact, and implementation strategy logically address issue, are <b>well</b> aligned with grant aim, and are thorough, specific, and convincing.	The proposed intervention, anticipated impact, and implementation strategy address the issue, are aligned with grant aim and are adequately defined.	The proposed intervention, anticipated impact, and implementation strategy address the issue, and are aligned with the grant aim, but are vaguely defined.	The proposed intervention, anticipated impact, or implementation strategy is vaguely related to the issue, weakly aligned with grant aim, or unclearly defined.	The proposed intervention, anticipated impact, or implementation strategy are not related to the issue, are not aligned with grant aims, or are not included.
Evaluation of outcomes	Very specific evaluation process, outcome metrics, collection/analysis procedures, and tools identified with evidence that the project can be sustained locally beyond grant period if results warrant.	Exhibited good understanding of evaluation process, outcome metrics, & collection/analysis procedures with possible tools identified. Strong potential that the project can be sustained locally beyond grant period if results warrant.	Unclear or vague description of evaluation process, outcome metrics, collection/analysis procedures, or tools. Sustainability lacking details. Uncertain if the project ends with the grant.	The evaluation process, outcome metrics, & collection/analysis procedures, or tools provided were flawed or lacked specificity. Plans for sustainability were not supported.	The evaluation process, outcome metrics, collection/analysis procedures, tools, or plans for sustainability were not included.

**Proposal #**

CRITERIA	Excellent = 4	Good = 3	Fair = 2	Poor = 1	Inadequate = 0
Project timeline	Timeline includes major activities with specific deadlines that meet/exceed grant aims.	Timeline includes major activities with general deadlines that meet grant aims.	Timeline includes a few activities with vague deadlines that meet grant aims.	Timeline is ambiguous, lacks activities, and may not be aligned with grant aims.	Timeline is missing or not aligned with grant aims.
Budget and justification	Description, cost, and justification are very clear with detailed expenses.	Description, cost, and justification are itemized but lack detail.	Description, cost, or justification are vague or may have errors that don't significantly impact project feasibility.	Description, cost, or justification are unclear or with critical errors impacting project feasibility.	Description, cost, or justification are not included, not feasible, or not aligned with grant aims.
<b>Letters of recommendation indicate:</b>					
1. Support for the proposed project and project team	Strong organizational support and clear understanding of project intent exhibiting long-term well-being commitment.	Adequate organizational support with an understanding of project intent and a mention of long-term well-being commitment.	Vague organizational support with an idea of project intent and a vague long-term commitment.	Unclear if there is organizational support, understanding of the project intent, or any long-term commitment.	Organizational support, project intent, or long-term commitment is not included or not aligned with grant aims.
2. Anticipated impacts on well-being	Demonstrates strong rationale and significance of proposed work. Addresses specific need(s).	Adequate demonstration of knowledge of proposed work addressing specific need(s) and potential impact.	Demonstrates an overall knowledge of proposed work but lacks connection to significant impact or specific need(s).	Unconvincing or no demonstration of knowledge of proposed work addressing specific need(s) or potential impact.	Not included/not aligned with grant aims.
					Total: /36

**Grant Scope**

CRITERIA	Excellent = 10	Good = 8	Fair = 6	Poor = 4	Inadequate = 0
The proposal is consistent with the RN Well-Being project aims and goals	Exemplary to the goals of specific system-level, environmental interventions for sustainable well-being.	Aligned with the goals of specific system-level, environmental interventions for sustainable well-being.	Is vaguely aligned with the goals of specific system-level interventions but sustainability and impact are questionable.	Specific system-level, environmental interventions for sustainable well-being is unlikely and the proposal may provide outcomes contrary to grant scope.	Not at all aligned with the goals. <b>DO NOT FUND</b>
Potential to address root causes impacting RN well-being	Significant potential to address, prevent, or correct the cause of an underlying stressor.	Likely potential to address, prevent, or correct the cause of an underlying stressor.	Possible potential to address, prevent, or correct the cause of an underlying stressor.	Unconvincing potential to address, prevent, or correct the cause of an underlying stressor.	No Potential. Proposal does not have a root cause focus. <b>DO NOT FUND</b>

<b>Overall comments, i.e. strengths and weaknesses:</b>	Total: /56
---	------------

