

APTA Academy of Physical Therapy Education

Grant Review Criteria and Instructions

The Academy of Physical Therapy Education Research Committee (APTERC) reviews and ranks grant applications submitted in each of three categories (Research Grants, Mentored Grants, and Planning Grants). Grants are awarded based on merit and scientific contributions to physical therapy education. For a definition of education research: (<http://www.aera.net/EducationResearch/WhatisEducationResearch/tabid/13453/Default.aspx>).

Each grant application is reviewed by one primary reviewer and one secondary reviewer. All reviewers receive complete 'masked' grant applications with all identifying information removed. All reviewers score all review criteria. Composite scores, comments from each reviewer and summary statements from the primary reviewer are forwarded to the Grant Review Subcommittee Chair of the APTERC. This feedback is shared with all other reviewers of the grant. Summary feedback may be shared with the applicant after final funding decisions have been announced, if requested. After each independent review has been submitted, reviewers may discuss each grant with each other and with the APTERC. Final funding decisions are made by the Grant Review Subcommittee Chair and the Research Committee Chair.

Instructions for Primary Reviewers:

Please score each grant application on the following form, using the scoring system described. Also provide constructive, carefully worded critiques for the applicant. If you have comments that you want to share only with the Grant Review Subcommittee Chair and Research Committee Chair, please make those comments in the space indicated on the form. The rest of your review will be shared with the applicant and other reviewers.

In addition to your review, your job as primary reviewer is to create a single document for each grant application that includes the scores and feedback from both reviewers, plus summary statements that you generate. You do not need to repeat what the secondary reviewer has written, but summarize the major strengths and weaknesses, reconcile any discrepancies among comments, and calculate an average composite score. The strengths, weaknesses, and average scores for each grant should be followed by the original scores and comments from each reviewer. When creating this document, be sure to delete any confidential comments submitted by the secondary reviewer and remove reviewers' names. Compile a separate document containing confidential comments from all reviewers, for each grant application. Send it only to the Grant Review Subcommittee Chair of the APTERC.

Also compile a rank order of all grant applications that you reviewed as the primary reviewer, based on the average composite score, with the highest score at the top. Send the single document for each grant application and your rank order document to the Grant Review Subcommittee Chair of the APTERC.

Instructions for Secondary Reviewers:

Please score each grant application on the following form, using the scoring system described. Also provide constructive, carefully worded critiques for the applicant. If you have comments that you want to share only with the Primary Reviewer, Grant Review Subcommittee Chair, and Research Committee Chair, please make those comments in the space indicated on the form. The rest of your review will be shared with the applicant and other reviewers of the grant. When you have completed your review, send the form to the primary reviewer.

Research Grant

Scoring System:

Each criterion is scored on a 1-10 point scale, where 10 is the worst and 1 is the best.

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
10	Poor	Lack of information prevents assessment of strengths/weaknesses

Minor weakness: Easily addressable, does not lessen overall impact

Moderate weakness: Lessens overall impact

Major weakness: Severely limits impact

Review Criteria:

Research Grant applications are scored on the following criteria. Composite scores can range from 0 to 40.

Aims/Impact of the Research: Overall impact of the research on physical therapy education (PTs/PTs, student PTs/PTAs, clients/patients). Is there a high likelihood that the project will be completed successfully and will contribute to educationally relevant scientific knowledge?

Significance: Scientific justification for the project. Has the applicant demonstrated knowledge of relevant literature and development of well-reasoned hypotheses? Does the project address an important problem or critical barrier to education of professionals, students or clients/patients? Is the project different than previously published studies?

Approach: Justification of the research strategy, including experimental design, sample size, recruitment and retention plans, methodology, analysis and dissemination of results. Does preliminary data demonstrate feasibility? Are potential problems and alternative strategies described? Is the timeline feasible? Is IRB approval established or likely to be received?

Resources: Background and expertise of the applicant. Is he or she well-suited to carry out the project? Research/clinical environment of the applicant, including 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. Is the proposed budget reasonable, well justified? Are other sources of budgetary support identified (e.g. in-kind contributions)?

**APTA Academy of Physical Therapy Education
Research Grant Review Form**

Title: _____

Reviewer: _____ **Date:** _____

Type of Grant: (check one)

Research Grant _____

Mentored Grant _____

Planning Grant _____

Scoring:

	Score (1 – 10)
Aims / Impact of the Research	
Significance	
Approach	
Resources	
Composite (sum of all criteria scores)	

Comments: (these comments and all scores will be shared with the applicant)

Aims / Impact of the Research:

Significance:

**APTA Academy of Physical Therapy Education
Research Grant Review Form**

Approach:

Resources:

Confidential comments to be shared only with the Primary Reviewer, Grant Review Subcommittee Chair, and Research Committee Chair: (Comments below this line will not be shared with the applicant)