

The O&P Foundation Review Rubric

Microgrants

Clinical Relevance/Clinical Need (Background)

1	2	3	4	5
Inadequate	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Investigators fail to identify a clinical need. Demonstrates minimal understanding with little rationale or evidence. Does not establish relevance.	Investigators identify a general clinical need. Demonstrates a partial understanding, with an underdeveloped rationale, making relevance unclear.	Investigators identify a clinical need. Demonstrates a basic understanding of the issue but lacks depth and specificity in the rationale. The relevance is acknowledged, but evidence or justification is limited.	Investigators identify a specific clinical need. Demonstrates an understanding of the issue; offers a rationale suggesting meaningful impact, though it may be less comprehensive than required for an excellent score	Investigators clearly identify a significant, specific clinical need or gap. Demonstrates understanding of the issue and presents an evidence-backed rationale for addressing it.

Clarity of the Aim/Outcome of Activity (Aim)

1	2	3	4	5
Inadequate	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
The aim is unclear, poorly defined, or missing, with little to no explanation of how it addresses the clinical gap. The hypothesis is irrelevant or untestable -OR- if a hypothesis is not applicable, the outcome is missing or lacks meaningful connection to the project aim.	The aim is not well-defined, making it difficult to discern the project's objective. It may attempt to address too broad of a scope to address the clinical gap. The hypothesis is not directly aligned with the project's aim -OR- expected outcomes are unclear.	The aim is broadly defined, providing only a general sense of how it addresses the clinical gap. The hypothesis may only partially relate to the project aim -OR- if a hypothesis is not applicable, the outcome lacks detail.	The aim is clear and specific, indicating how the activity addresses the clinical gap. The hypothesis is testable, but lacking clarity compared to a top score -OR- the expected outcome is realistic but may lack clarity compared to a top score.	The aim provides a well-defined explanation of how the proposed activity directly addresses the clinical gap. The hypothesis is testable and directly related to the objective -OR- the expected outcome is clearly articulated and achievable.

Project/Activity Description

1	2	3	4	5
Inadequate	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
The approach contains major weaknesses that threaten the validity of the project. May be unclear, incomplete, or missing, with minimal or no connection to the aim.	The approach contains some major weaknesses. Several sections are missing or underexplained and inadequately address the aim. There is little	The approach contains moderate weaknesses. It is generally clear but is lacking details that may affect the overall validity of the project. Relevant sections are connected to	The approach is clear and well-defined with only minor weaknesses that do not threaten the overall validity of the project. Relevant sections are mostly connected to the	There are no apparent weaknesses in the approach given the intent and scope of the program. Relevant sections (e.g., methods, population, interventions, outcomes,

Key sections are poorly defined or absent, and the overall approach is poorly reasoned. There is no discussion of challenges or alternative strategies, and the project lacks sufficient planning or logic.	discussion of challenges or alternative strategies, and the overall approach may raise major concerns about the potential success of the project/activity.	the aim, but the links may be incomplete or underdeveloped. Alternative strategies, if applicable, only partially address potential challenges.	aim, but some aspects may lack clarity. If applicable, anticipated challenges and alternative strategies are addressed but may not be as thoroughly developed as in the top score.	and analysis) are thoughtfully connected to the aim. If applicable, anticipated challenges and alternative strategies are well-reasoned.
---	--	---	--	--

Project Feasibility (Training, Equipment, Skills, Timeline)

1	2	3	4	5
Inadequate	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Equipment, training, and skills are poorly defined, missing, or irrelevant to aims. The timeline is missing or unrealistic, with no clear milestones. Team expertise is inadequate, with important roles and skill sets missing from the team.	Equipment, training, and skills are only weakly connected to aims, with one or more key elements underdeveloped. The timeline is unrealistic or lacks milestones. Team expertise is limited, with roles not clearly aligned to project needs.	Equipment, training, and skills are adequate but may lack alignment with aim(s). The timeline is included but may lack detail or measurable milestones. Team expertise may be relevant, though important skills may be missing from the team.	Equipment, training, and skills mostly align with project aim(s). The timeline is feasible, with milestones that support success, though may benefit from additional clarity or measurable milestones. Team expertise and roles are mostly appropriate and/or defined.	Equipment, training, and skills are clearly connected to the project's aim(s). The timeline is realistic with clear, actionable milestones. The team's expertise is appropriate, with roles clearly defined to match the project's requirements.

Dissemination Plan

1	2	3	4	5
Inadequate	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
The plan for sharing project outcomes is missing or unclear. It fails to specify how the project's outcomes will benefit the O&P profession or reach relevant audiences. May mention dissemination but without specific methods or a clear strategy.	The dissemination plan lacks detail. It provides a general approach to sharing project outcomes but shows limited alignment with project goals or does not clearly address how it will reach or impact relevant O&P audiences. Target audiences are missing or not well described.	The dissemination plan provides a satisfactory approach to sharing project outcomes with the O&P profession. Aspects of the dissemination plan may lack detail or refinement. Strategy to reach target audiences may be missing or may have moderate weaknesses.	The dissemination plan is reasonably detailed and reflects a realistic approach to engaging with the O&P profession and specific target audiences. Minor weaknesses in the dissemination plan or description for sharing project outcomes may be present.	The investigators describe a detailed, well-thought-out plan for sharing project outcomes to benefit the O&P profession. Dissemination plan may include traditional methods (e.g., manuscripts, conference presentation or posters) or other methods to engage O&P professionals, students, or other stakeholders.

Collaboration/Mentorship

1	2	3	4	5
Inadequate	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
The project's support structure is unclear, with minimal confidence in the team's ability to complete the project successfully. If applicable, mentors do not have the skills or time to guide student/resident progress.	The investigator team's expertise may be insufficiently detailed, and roles are not clearly aligned with the project's requirements. If applicable, mentors may not be well-suited to guide student/resident progress.	The team's expertise (including that of mentors, if applicable) is generally appropriate, but roles may lack alignment with project needs and aims.	The investigator team is well-suited to the project, and if applicable, mentors for student or resident PIs have relevant expertise.	The investigator team has extensive expertise in the areas needed to successfully complete the project. If the principal investigator is a student or resident, the mentor(s) identified for the project have the expertise to help the trainee successfully complete the project.

Budget and Justifications

1		3	4	5
Inadequate		Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
There are major concerns with budget or budget justification.		There are moderate concerns with the budget or budget justification.	There are minor concerns with budget or budget justification.	Budget is appropriate, and budget justification clearly explains how each cost contributes to the project.

Letters of Support

1		3	4	5
Inadequate		Satisfactory	Good	Excellent
Letters of support are absent, vague, or fail to demonstrate institutional support or resources for the project.		Letters of support provide basic evidence of institutional support and resources, though may leave moderate concern for project success.	Letters of support clearly demonstrate institutional commitment and resources, with only minor concerns regarding support for project success.	Letters of support clearly indicate institutional support and access to resources that reinforce the string likelihood of project success.

Summary of strengths and weaknesses

- Please summarize the major strengths and weaknesses of the proposal.