

## AACOM Annual Research Grants Proposal Rubric 2025-26

## Total Possible Points: 105

|  | Needs Improvement   | Adequate   | Exemplary  |
|--|---|--|--|
|  | (0-5 pts)   | (6-8 pts)  | (9-10 pts)   |
| Proposal Quality and<br>Presentation                       | Proposal is poorly organized, unclear, or contains frequent grammar, formatting, or citation errors that affect readability.  | Generally clear, with minor grammar, formatting, or citation issues that do not impede comprehension.  | Proposal is clearly written, logically structured, free of errors, and follows consistent formatting/citation style. Professional and compelling presentation.   |
|  | (0-11 pts)  | (12-16 pts)  | (17-20 pts)  |
| Background &<br>Rationale                                  | Background is weak, unfocused, or lacks clear relevance; rationale is vague or poorly justified.                              | Background is relevant and somewhat compelling; rationale is present but not fully developed or supported with evidence.                           | Provides a compelling, well-supported rationale for<br>the project with strong alignment to osteopathic<br>medical education. Identifies a clear problem or gap,<br>supported by literature/data.  |
|  | (0-5 pts)   | (6-8 pts)  | (9-10 pts)   |
| Research Questions/<br>Objectives                          | Objectives are vague, missing, or not aligned with the project's rationale.   | Research questions/objectives are stated but may lack precision, measurability, or alignment.  | Clearly stated, measurable, and aligned with rationale. Hypotheses included if appropriate.  |
|  | (0-14 pts)  | (15-21 pts)  | (22-25 pts)  |
| Methods & Project<br>Design                                | Methods are incomplete, inappropriate, or not clearly linked to objectives.   | Methods address objectives but lack full<br>detail, innovation, or clarity. Some<br>feasibility concerns may remain.                               | Methods are rigorous, novel (if appropriate), and fully aligned with objectives. Includes sufficient detail for replication (design, setting, participants, measures, analytic plan). Feasibility and ethical considerations are addressed.          |
|  | (0-11 pts)  | (12-16 pts)  | (17-20 pts)  |
| Significance &<br>Impact                                   | Significance and broader implications are vague, missing, or unconvincing. Little to no connection to AACOM's Strategic Plan. | Addresses significance but with modest impact; some implications described. Proposal aligns with AACOM's Strategic Plan but is not well developed. | Demonstrates strong potential to advance osteopathic medical education, research, or practice. Clearly describes implications for future research, practice, and/or policy. Explicitly articulates alignment with AACOM's Strategic Plan priorities. |
| Innovation &<br>Potential to Scale                         | (0-5 pts)   | (6-8 pts)  | (9-10 pts)   |
|  | Approach is routine, derivative, or unlikely to influence broader practice.   | Some innovation is present, but approach is moderately original or only somewhat adaptable elsewhere.  | Proposal introduces novel ideas, methods, or applications with potential for replication or scaling across institutions.   |
|  | (0-5 pts)   | (6-8 pts)  | (9-10 pts)   |
| Dissemination,<br>Sustainability &<br>Budget Justification | Dissemination, sustainability, or budget plans are vague, missing, or misaligned with project aims.                           | Includes some plans for dissemination and budget justification, but they lack depth or precision, sustainability plans are limited.                | Provides clear, realistic plans for dissemination (e.g., publications, presentations), sustainability, and budget use. All costs are appropriate and well justified.   |