

## NLN Foundation Scholarship Review Rubric

The Proposal Review Rubric below is being used for the 2017 grant cycle. Components of the rubric are not weighted. Applicable components that are missing will receive a 0 and the component will be included in the percentage score.

PROPOSAL REVIEW RUBRIC 2017 Grant Cycle					
	Excellent = 4	Good = 3	Fair = 2	Poor = 1	0 or NA*
*Consistency with goal of the NLNFNE Scholarship Priority (advanced degree to become/continue to be fulltime faculty)	Highly consistent with the goals	Consistent with the goals	Some consistency with the goals	Little consistency with the goal	
One full year completed and feasible that they will complete program leading to degree	Completion very feasible	Feasible	Fairly feasible	Little feasibility	
Clear purpose of request	Very clear purpose	Clear purpose	Purpose mostly clear	Purpose not clear	
Potential for fulltime faculty position	Position secured as in advancing in tenure	Potential position	Seeking position	Not clear	
Clarity and adequacy of budget	Budget very clear /expenses well justified	Budget mostly clear and justified	Budget doesn't match narrative	Poor budget clarity and justification	
Potential for significant contribution to nursing	Significant	Somewhat significant	Small potential	No potential	
Clarity of writing ... jargon-free syntax	Very well written	Mostly well written	Fairly well written	Many typo grammatical errors	
Overall Comments strengths and weaknesses					
*0 means the component was not addressed in the application, but was applicable NA means the component was not applicable					

\*Demonstrates contribution to nursing: Candidate with some evidence of scholarship (publications, presentations) and research agenda

\*Research proposal ok but candidate should have a personal statement about goal as fulltime faculty