

Excellence in Research Award Application Scoring Rubric David Adelman Pharmacovigilance Award

Submissions MUST be for Completed Research

Awarded for research conducted in the areas of monitoring the safe use of medications, adverse drug event detection and reporting programs, assessing medication use risks and/or benefits, and developing programs focusing on safe medication use for healthcare providers and/or patients.

	EXEMPLARY (10 PTS)	ADEQUATE (6 PTS)	Will not be considered for this award if the project is scored either of the below		SCORE
Adelman Criteria Must meet exemplary or adequate criteria to be considered	Innovative project that describes a program or process that evaluates or monitors adverse outcomes. Demonstrated or potential improvement in patient outcomes by prevention or early identification of adverse effects. Role of the pharmacist is clearly described. Potential for generalizability to outside health-systems.	Well executed but concept is not unique. Describes a program or process that evaluates or monitors adverse outcomes. May possibly improve patient outcomes by prevention or early identification of adverse effects. Role of the pharmacist is limited or not well described. Limited potential for generalizability.	Project involves a process or program for adverse event detection or monitoring but it has limited potential to impact patient outcomes.	Project is solely a descriptive report of adverse reactions and has no potential to impact patient outcomes.	
	EXEMPLARY (3 PTS)	ADEQUATE (2 PTS)	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (1 PT)	MISSING (0 PTS)	SCORE
Introduction & Literature Review	Provides a clear and thorough background and introduction.	Provides a partial or incomplete background and introduction.	Provides a background and introduction that is not related to the project.	Introduction and/or background not provided.	
Comments					
Purpose and Objectives	The purpose of the work is clearly stated and supported by the background discussion. Presents rationale and significance of the proposed project in a well-structured, logical scientific argument.	The purpose is clearly stated but is not completely supported by the background provided. Arguments for rationale and significance of the proposed work are present but are not robust.	The purpose of the project is vague and/or confusing. Arguments made for the rationale and significance of the proposed work are in the form of a weak and unstructured scientific argument and are not completely supported	There is no clear research question that is posed. The rationale and significance of proposed work is not articulated nor is it supported	
Comments					_

	EXEMPLARY (3 PTS)	ADEQUATE (2 PTS)	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (1 PT)	MISSING (0 PTS)	SCORE
Methodology (Max points = 9)	Research objectives are clearly stated and directly related to the purpose of the project	Research objectives are clearly stated but are not entirely related to the purpose of the project	Research objectives are unclear, or not related to the purpose.	Explanation of experimental methods are missing and/or there is no clearly defined research objective	
	A primary endpoint is identified that will answer the research question. All endpoints are relevant to the project and may be measured with the proposed research process delineated in the methods.	A primary endpoint is identified that will answer the research question and is measurable. Secondary endpoints are relevant, but measurement is uncertain via the proposed research process delineated in the methods. The statistical analysis plan is	A primary endpoint is identified that will answer the research question but may not be adequately measured via the proposed research process delineated in the methods.	A primary endpoint is not identified, or it will not answer the research question proposed.	
	The statistical analysis plan is appropriate for each stated endpoint. The sample size justification and power calculations are included if applicable.	appropriate for the primary endpoint but missing/not explained for no more than 2 secondary endpoints OR No sample size justification included.	Statistical analysis plan is inappropriate for any secondary endpoint AND/ OR missing/ not explained for more than 2 secondary endpoints	Statistical analysis plan is inappropriate AND/ OR missing/not explained for the primary endpoint	
Comments					
Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Considerations	Evaluates the project from the DEI perspective and includes specific considerations for DEI into the project design and methods to ensure specific, measurable DEI outcomes are included the project	Evaluates the project from the DEI perspective, but does not, include specific, measurable, considerations into the project design and methods.	Mentions DEI, but does not evaluate the project from its perspective	DEI was not discussed	
Comments					

	EXEMPLARY (3 PTS)	ADEQUATE (2 PTS)	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (1 PT)	MISSING (0 PTS)	SCORE	
Results and Discussion	Results and interpretation of data described and presented in final format. Impact of results and external validity are described. Strengths and limitations described. Conclusions support the project results.	Some minor data collection and analysis remains to be completed; strengths, limitations, or external validity not described thoroughly. Conclusion are partially supported by the project results.	Significant data collection and analysis remains to be completed; or statistical analysis, strengths, limitations, or external validity poorly described. Conclusions are not supported by the project results	Results are incomplete or do not match project methods. Data analysis has major flaws. Conclusions are not supported by the analysis.		
Comments						
Point deductions for spelling and grammatical errors: 2 – 4 minus 2 points; 5 or more minus 3 points						
ID Number						
Brief Title:						
Reviewer: TOTAL SCORE (MAX SCORE = 31)						