

APTA Research Traveling Fellows Review checklist and scoring

Checklist: Application packet should include:

- **2 page proposal from (available on APTA Research website)**
 - Significance
 - Aims/Hypotheses
 - Innovation
 - Methods
 - Anticipated Outcomes
 - Timeline
 - Expertise of investigators:
 - Proposed use of funds (briefly covered here and detailed in Budget justification):
 - Travel Dates (if known)
- NIH Biosketch of applicant
- NIH Biosketch of mentor (if applicable)
- Budget and justification (proposed use of funds) (1-page)
- Letters of support from:
 - Host institution (sponsor)
 - Department Chair or Supervisor of the applicant

Scoring System: Each criterion is scored on a 1-10 point scale, where 10 is the best and 1 is the worst. Scores for all criteria are summed to produce a composite score for each grant review.

| Score | Descriptor | Additional Guidance on Strengths/Weaknesses |
|-------|--------------|---|
| 1 | Exceptional | Exceptionally strong with essentially no weaknesses |
| 2 | Outstanding | Extremely strong with negligible weaknesses |
| 3 | Excellent | Very strong with only some minor weaknesses |
| 4 | Very Good | Strong but with numerous minor weaknesses |
| 5 | Good | Strong but with at least one moderate weakness |
| 6 | Satisfactory | Some strengths but also some moderate weaknesses |
| 7 | Fair | Some strengths but with at least one major weakness |
| 8 | Marginal | A few strengths and a few major weaknesses |
| 9 | Poor | Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses |

Minor weakness: Easily addressable, does not lessen overall impact

Moderate weakness: Lessens overall impact

Major weakness: Severely limits impact

Review Criteria: Applications are scored on the following criteria. Composite scores can range from 0 to 40.

Application Form: Is the purpose and expected outcome clearly stated? Is there a high likelihood that the project will be completed successfully and will contribute to clinically relevant scientific knowledge? Is the proposed budget reasonable, well justified and consistent with APTA Clinical Research Agenda? Are other sources of budgetary support identified (e.g. in-kind contributions)?

Applicant: Is the applicant well-suited to carry out the project? Is the proposed training or career development of high benefit to the applicant who has a high potential for developing into a productive, independent researcher?

Mentor(s): Is the mentor well-suited for the project? Is the mentor able to provide the necessary training and resources to assist with the success of the fellowship plan?

Environment and Institutional Support: Do the letters of support indicate that the applicant will have the needed support and resources such as access to facilities, equipment, potential study participants, collaborators, support personnel, release time, other budgetary support, statisticians, medical library services, an institutional review board, and other research related resources.