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| **Scoring rubric for Individualized Research Plan submitted to the Pathways-RRT program. The goal of scoring is two-fold: (1) to evaluate quality of the individualized research plan and likelihood of success (e.g., be in a position to pursue NIH funding or a post-doctoral fellowship at the end of residency); and, (2) to provide constructive and actionable feedback to the resident and mentor.****Resident: Reviewer:** |
| 1. **Commitment to a research career (0-4).**
 |
| **0****Minimal interest in including research as a career goal** | **1****Considering research: plan in formative stages** | **2****Plans on participating in but not leading research programs** | **3****Moderate interest in and some planning toward an independent research career** | **4****Strong interest in and strong plans towards an independent research career** |
| 1. **Candidate qualifications (0-4)**
 |
| **0****No Research Experience** | **1****Advanced studies relevant to research** **e.g., masters degrees, summer or other short term research experiences, publications in non-peer reviewed journals.** | **2****Some research experience.****e.g., third or lower co-author on publications, co-author on abstracts to scientific meeting, longer term experiences in data collection within a mentor’s lab.**  | **3****Moderate research experiences.****e.g., first author national abstracts, one or more second author publications, longer term research experiences both collecting data but also planning new projects.** | **4****Broad research experiences.****e.g., prior first authored publications, PhD, prior grant awards, has run prior small data collection projects, demonstrated research skills.** |
| 1. **Mentor qualifications (0-4)**

**Please consider both the mentor’s research background and track record of mentoring** |
| **0****No history of research or mentorship** **No research background****No publications with residents** | **1****Fair research and mentorship history****Limited research background****Prior publications with residents as co-authors (also consider mentoring successes with non-physician mentees).** | **2****Mentor has several strengths** **Active research lab with some available resources, some current funding and research opportunities moderate productivity****Mentor has record of mentorship, prior publications with residents as first author (also consider mentoring successes with non-physician mentees).** | **3****Good research and mentorship history****Active research lab with current grant funding, and strong track record of publication****Mentor has worked with multiple prior residents with some proceeding to a post-doc, or conducting research (also consider mentoring successes with non-physician mentees).** | **4****Excellent research and mentorship history****Excellent research background and available resources****Mentor Has background of successfully mentoring residents to independence and strong history of publication, NIH funding… (also consider mentoring successes with non-physician mentees)** |
| 1. **Quality, clarity and feasibility of proposed project (0-4)**
 |
| **0****Poor quality, clarity, feasibility or significance** | **1****Fair or better quality, significant but some questions as to feasibility** | **2****Fair quality, feasibility and significant** | **3****Good quality, feasibility and significance** | **4****Highly significant, outstanding quality and strong feasibility** |
| **5. Promise for development of an area of expertise/fundable area of focus (0-4)** |
| **0****Poor****Proposed area of focus does not align at all with NIH priorities, is unlikely to be a fundable area of focus, does not include a biological/intervention focus or other high priority area for physician scientists** | **1****Fair****May have some overlap with NIH priorities areas of significant clinical problems but area of focus is diffuse and relevance is to NIH priorities is less clear.** | **2****Good****Moderate likelihood that the area of focus will overlap with NIH program priorities – research focus is somewhat diffuse and less clear that approaches are innovative/significant** | **3****Very good****Area of focus aligns in many ways with NIH priorities and approaches are appropriate to physician scientist.**  | **4****Excellent****Proposed area of focus aligns well with NIH program priorities and is highly likely to be a fundable area of focus. Approaches are significant and innovative.** |
| 1. **Overall Rating (0-4)**
 |
| **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| **Application Strengths:****Application Weaknesses:** **Concrete recommendations for the resident:** |