



Excellence in Pharmacy Practice Research Award Application Scoring Rubric
Research in Progress

	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 with sufficient supporting literature/references.	Provides a partial or incomplete background and introduction with partial supporting literature/references.	Provides a background and introduction that lacks relevance to the project and limited supporting literature/references.	Introduction and/or background not provided and no supporting literature/references.	
Comments					
Purpose	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 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					
Methodology	Research objectives/outcomes 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 vague, or not related to the purpose.	Explanation of experimental methods are missing and/or there is no clearly defined research objective	
	All of the following are well described: Study design, inclusion/exclusion criteria, definitions, and data collection	Three of the four are well described: Study design, inclusion/exclusion criteria, definitions, and data collection	Two of the four are well described: Study design, inclusion/exclusion criteria, definitions, and data collection	One to none of the following are well described: Study design, inclusion/exclusion criteria, definitions, and data collection	
	Statistical analyses are clearly described and are appropriate for the data described including the statistical analyses platform/software	Statistical analyses are partially described, but are the appropriate tests for the data described. Statistical analyses platform/software may or may not be included	Statistical analyses are described, but are the inappropriate tests for the data described. Statistical analyses platform/software may or may not be included	Statistical analyses are not provided nor are the statistical analyses platform/software.	
Comments					

	EXEMPLARY (3 PTS)	ADEQUATE (2 PTS)	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (1 PT)	MISSING (0 PTS)	SCORE
Contribution to Pharmacy Practice	Innovative project with a novel contribution to the medication use process, medication safety or pharmacy practice. Potential for generalizability to outside health-systems.	Well executed but concept has been discussed or published elsewhere; project may contribute to the overall body of knowledge or practice at the institution where research performed, but the design can limit the generalizability to other outside health systems	Concept has been discussed and executed elsewhere. Project provides an incomplete or limited contribution to the medication use process, medication safety or pharmacy practice and / or results are not generalizable to other outside health systems	No appreciable contribution to the medication use process, medication safety or pharmacy practice.	
Feasibility	The resources are available, and the plan / timeline are appropriate for conducting the project	The resources are available, but the plan/timeline is questionable for conducting the project	The resources and the plan/timeline is questionable for conducting the project	The resources and the timeline are not evaluable	
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 = 21)					
Rev 11-2025					