

MIRA | Dixon Hall Centre Community-Engaged Research Graduate Scholarship

Evaluation Rubric

<p>1. Alignment with MIRA Dixon Hall Centre’s priorities in research on aging: Projects should meet MIRA's mandate to promote excellent potential for scientific impact and the potential to improve the experience of aging.</p>	<p>5 Project addresses a compelling problem in aging, demonstrates potential benefits for older adults, and this is central to the project.</p>	<p>3 Project provides adequate description of aging aspects under consideration and is connected to aging.</p>	<p>1 Connection of research to aging/mobility is unclear and/or tangential.</p>
<p>2. Incorporation of stakeholder or end-user population: Are appropriate stakeholders or end-users identified (such as older adults, caregivers, or policy makers)? Does the project have plans to interact with them to ensure uptake, knowledge translation and/or implementation are likely and feasible?</p>	<p>5 Carefully considered description of how stakeholders/end-users’ perspectives will be included in the project.</p>	<p>3 Consideration is given to stakeholders/end-users, and their perspectives collaterally rather than centrally.</p>	<p>1 Little or inadequate description of stakeholder/end-users or their perspectives.</p>
<p>3. Incorporation of equity, diversity, inclusion: Is there a consideration of equity, diversity, inclusion (EDI) in the project (if applicable) and training/career path?</p>	<p>5 EDI considerations for project and/or career path are clear and well-articulated.</p>	<p>3 EDI considerations for project and/or career path are ambiguous.</p>	<p>1 EDI considerations are altogether missing.</p>
<p>4. Research potential and experience, academic excellence: Does the applicant demonstrate competence, motivation, research productivity, or leadership ability? Do they have a strong academic record?</p>	<p>5 Student is well suited to the project, and demonstrates high degree of competence, motivation, or leadership ability with strong research potential.</p>	<p>3 Student is competent and capable of completing the project. Candidate has good research potential.</p>	<p>1 Student will require a large degree of support to complete project.</p>

<p>5. Background and research methods: Is the research question well defined and supported by literature?</p>	<p>5 Clear articulation of the research gap with strong command of relevant literature and methods. Writing is excellent and cohesive. Methods are valid, rigorous, and potentially novel. Sample size is appropriate, with power analyses and recruitment strategies clearly outlined. Analyses are well-designed, thorough, and use appropriate statistical tests.</p>	<p>3 Background is clear and jargon-free, with a well-defined research question and adequate connection to literature. Methods are sound and feasible, with appropriate sample size and power analysis. Recruitment strategy is reasonable. Analyses are generally appropriate but could be more refined.</p>	<p>1 Background is unclear or overly technical, showing limited understanding of literature or methods. Research question is vague or unsupported. Methods lack clarity or rigor. Sample size is insufficient or unjustified. Recruitment strategy is weak or absent. Analyses are incomplete or use inappropriate statistical tests.</p>
<p>6. Anticipated outcomes and novel contributions: Is the project novel, or innovative and does the research have potential for impact within the discipline and in the broader world? Will anticipated results inform the literature and are implications and next steps well defined, including a plan for knowledge mobilization?</p>	<p>5 Project is novel and impactful, advancing both the discipline and broader societal understanding. Findings will offer original insights, clearly address the research question, and contribute meaningfully to the literature. Conclusions and next steps, including knowledge mobilization strategy, are well-defined, insightful and actionable.</p>	<p>3 Project has limited impact and adequately addresses the research question and contributes to the literature. Conclusions and next steps are thoughtfully considered but knowledge mobilization strategy is ambiguous.</p>	<p>1 Project offers limited contribution to the literature and weakly addresses the research question. Conclusions and next steps lack clarity or depth. Knowledge mobilization strategy is altogether missing.</p>