

Excellence in Pharmacy Practice 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 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 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 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/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					
Health Inequity Considerations	The impact of health inequities on the proposed research question is identified and addressed in the study design or a detailed explanation is provided as to why health inequities are not relevant.	---	---	---	
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					TOTAL SCORE
ID Number _____					
Brief Title: _____					
Reviewer: _____					
TOTAL SCORE (MAX SCORE = 31)					Rev 11-2024