**2024 MIRA Scholarship Program Evaluation Rubric**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reviewer initials:** | **Applicant name:** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1. Relevance to call and alignment with MIRA mandate** (5 point maximum) | |
| Projects should meet MIRA's mandate to promote excellent potential for scientific impact and the potential to improve the experience of aging, while growing internal capacity for aging research and promoting new and existing collaborations. Are there other collaborators that would further enhance the project? | |
| * **5** – Project addresses a compelling problem in aging, demonstrates potential benefits for older adults, and this is central to the project. Strong potential for scientific impact. Selected mentors are well suited to the project. Mentors have complementary and integrated expertise; their leadership approach, governance, and organizational structure are appropriate for the project. * **3** – Project provides adequate description of aging aspects under consideration and is focused on a topic that is connected to aging with some potential for impact and benefits for older adults. Mentors are adequate. Clear identification of expertise provided by each mentor. * **1** – Project inadequately describes aging/mobility context of research or connection to aging is unclear and/or tangential, limiting potential project impact. Potential benefits for older adults are included, but not central to the study. More detail would be helpful. Identification of expertise provided by each mentor needs further clarification. | |
| **Score: /5** | **Reviewer comments and feedback:** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **2. Overall impression of the research project, writing quality, comprehension** (5 point maximum) | |
| Is the project novel, or innovative and does the research have potential for impact within the discipline and in the broader world? Is the writing and background clear, concise, and complete? | |
| * **5** – Project is novel, innovative and exciting. Research has potential for great impact both within the discipline and in the broader world. The background information is clear, concise, and complete. Project is clear in presenting research gap and candidate demonstrates excellent understanding of literature and methods. Writing is excellent – no gaps in the project. * **3** – Project has some novel or innovative elements that have potential for strong impact within discipline but may not have broader implications. Background information is adequate, clear, and free of jargon. Project adequately presents research gap and candidate demonstrates good understanding of related literature and methods. Writing is good – some elements may have been missed. * **1** – Project has limited ability to contribute new knowledge and potential impact within discipline is modest, and broader implications are minimal or absent. Background information uses jargon or is unclear and candidate demonstrates a poor understanding of the literature and/or methods. Writing is weak, major elements were not explained. | |
| **Score: /5** | **Reviewer comments and feedback:** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **3. Quality of project design and research methods** (5 point maximum) | |
| Is the research question well defined and supported by literature? | |
| * **5** – Research question is well defined and supported by literature. Methods described are valid, thorough, rigorous, and may be novel. Sample size is adequate. If applicable, power analyses were calculated, and recruitment method have been clearly outlined. Analyses are well-designed, clearly communicated, and thorough. Selected statistical tests are appropriate. * **3** – Research question is clearly stated and connection to literature is adequate. Methods described are valid, thorough, and rigorous. Sample size is adequate – power analyses were calculated, and recruitment method (if applicable) seem feasible. Analyses could be further developed or refined. Selected statistical tests are appropriate. * **1** – Research question is vague, ill defined, or unsupported by literature. Methods described are unclear or lack scientific rigor. Sample size is inadequate. Power analyses were not calculated, or adequacy of sample size is not discussed. Recruitment method (if applicable) or does not seem feasible. Analyses are incomplete or undefined. Selected statistical tests are inappropriate. | |
| **Score: /5** | **Reviewer comments and feedback:** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4. Merit of research findings: Anticipated outcomes and novel contributions** (3 point maximum) | |
| Will anticipated results inform the literature and are implications and next steps well defined? | |
| * **3** – Results or expected results will inform the literature and satisfy research question in a novel or innovative way. Conclusions, implications, and next steps are clearly defined and insightful. * **2** – Results or expected results will inform the literature and satisfy research question in a satisfactory and valid way. Conclusions, implications, and next steps are addressed and thoughtfully considered. * **1** – Results or expected results will inform the literature and satisfy research question in a modest or minimal manner. Conclusions, and implications are not valid or ill considered. Next steps are not addressed in a meaningful way. | |
| **Score: /3** | **Reviewer comments and feedback:** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5. Incorporation of stakeholder or end–user population** (3 point maximum) | |
| Are appropriate stakeholders or end–users identified (such as industry partners, clinicians, policy makers, older adults, caregivers, other academic fields)? Does the project have plans to interact with them to ensure uptake, knowledge translation and/or implementation are likely and feasible? | |
| * **3** – Carefully considered description of how stakeholders/end–users’ perspectives will be included in the project. * **2** – Consideration is given to stakeholders/end–users, and their perspectives collaterally rather than centrally. * **1** – Little or no consideration or inadequate description of stakeholder/end–users or their perspectives. | |
| **Score: /3** | **Reviewer comments and feedback:** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **6. Candidate suitability, incorporation of equity, diversity, inclusion** (3 point maximum) | |
| Does the applicant demonstrate competence, motivation, or leadership ability? Is there a consideration of **Equity, diversity, inclusion (EDI)** in the project (if applicable) and career path? Cover letter and letters of support will provide insights. | |
| * **3** – Student is well suited to the project, and demonstrates high degree of competence, motivation, or leadership ability with strong research potential and excellent past productivity. Demonstrated interests and achievement in aging research. EDI considerations for project and/or career path are clear. * **2** – Student is competent and capable of completing the project. Candidate has good research potential, and good past productivity. Some evidence of experience and interest in aging research. EDI considerations for project and/or career path are ambiguous. * **1** – Student may not be capable of completing project without a large degree of support. Candidate has weak research potential and low academic output. Little to no evidence of previous experience with aging research. EDI considerations are altogether missing. | |
| **Score: /3** | **Reviewer comments and feedback:** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **STRENGTHS** | **WEAKNESSES** |
|  |  |