

**Excellence in Research Award Application Scoring Rubric**  
***Seymour and Elizabeth Katz Memorial Award***

**Submissions MUST be for Completed Research**

Awarded to health-system practitioners conducting original research, which fosters interprofessional relationships and improves patient care through jointly conceived and implemented services.

	<b>EXEMPLARY (10 PTS)</b>	<b>ADEQUATE (6 PTS)</b>	<b>Will not be considered for this award if the project is scored either of the below</b>		<b>SCORE</b>
<b>Katz Criteria</b>  <b>Must meet exemplary or adequate criteria to be considered</b>	Innovative project that involves collaboration with at least one additional professional discipline. Demonstrates improved patient outcomes through optimization of the medication use process, medication safety or pharmacy practice. Potential for generalizability to outside health-systems.	Well executed but concept is not unique. Collaboration is evident but roles are vague or not completely described. The concept has potential to benefit patient care but improved outcomes are not demonstrated due to sample size or other methodologic issues. May contribute to the overall body of knowledge or practice at institution where research performed	Collaboration is evident but the project provides incomplete or limited contribution to the medication use process, medication safety or pharmacy practice. Impact on patient outcomes is not evaluated or fails to demonstrate benefit.	Collaboration is questionable and/or there is no appreciable contribution to the medication use process, medication safety or pharmacy practice. Impact on patient outcomes is not evaluated or fails to demonstrate benefit.	
	<b>EXEMPLARY (3 PTS)</b>	<b>ADEQUATE (2 PTS)</b>	<b>NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (1 PT)</b>	<b>MISSING (0 PTS)</b>	<b>SCORE</b>
<b>Introduction &amp; Literature Review</b>	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.	
<b>Comments</b>					
<b>Purpose and Objectives</b>	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	
<b>Comments</b>					

	EXEMPLARY (3 PTS)	ADEQUATE (2 PTS)	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (1 PT)	MISSING (0 PTS)	SCORE
<b>Methodology (Max points = 9)</b>	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.	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.	The statistical analysis plan is 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 <b>any secondary endpoint</b> AND/ OR missing/ not explained for more than 2 secondary endpoints	Statistical analysis plan is inappropriate AND/ OR missing/not explained for the <b>primary endpoint</b>	
<b>Comments</b>					
<b>Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) Considerations</b>	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	
<b>Comments</b>					

	EXEMPLARY (3 PTS)	ADEQUATE (2 PTS)	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (1 PT)	MISSING (0 PTS)	SCORE
<b>Results and Discussion</b>	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.	
<b>Comments</b>					
<b>Point deductions</b> for spelling and grammatical errors: 2 – 4 minus 2 points; 5 or more minus 3 points					<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>
ID Number _____					
Brief Title: _____					
Reviewer: _____					
<b>TOTAL SCORE (MAX SCORE = 31)</b>					Rev 12-2023