

<b>Center on Aging Pilot Grant Evaluation Rubric 2024-2025</b>		
<b>Objective</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Scoring Scale (1-5)</b>
Aligns with Center on Aging themes of interest described in RFA -	Does the focus of the proposal align with one or more of the 5 key themes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. quality of life of older Vermonters</li> <li>2. aging in rural areas</li> <li>3. innovations in healthcare communication with older adults</li> <li>4. caregiving and aging</li> <li>5. resilience and longevity in Vermonters</li> </ol>	5- The proposal clearly is aligned with at least one of the key themes  1-The proposal does not align with any of the key Center themes
Demonstrate feasibility in project design	Is this project feasible? Is it likely that the project will be completed in 1-2 years? Is there a timeline with clear delineation of aims/subaims to be accomplished? Are alternatives suggested in case of roadblocks?	5- The proposal has a very high likelihood of being accomplished in the grant period.  1- The proposal does not clearly articulate the aims, specific tasks or roles of investigators, or timing of when tasks will be completed
Centers older adults in research focus	Are older adults the key focus of the study, intervention, recipients of knowledge generated by this grant? Are geriatric syndromes such as frailty, cognitive dysfunction, polypharmacy, hearing impairment, falls etc. considered as key variables either as risk factors or outcomes? Are geriatric syndromes considered as potential barriers to conducting the research? Were older adults engaged in developing the research question?	5- The proposal clearly centers on older adults, their needs and unique circumstances, their perspectives/voice.  1- The proposal fails to center older adults, account for their unique perspectives, or their voice.
Demonstrates clear path for future extramural funding	What are the anticipated outcomes of the grant? What are the next steps – specific funding mechanism to be pursued next? What is the submission deadline for the next funding mechanism? Does the proposal show significant potential for growth in funding, activity or participation beyond the Center on Aging funding?	5- The proposal clearly states the outcomes of the grant, and what organization will be solicited for funding next e.g. NIH, PCORI, foundation grants, and when.  1- The proposal does not provide clear information on outcomes expected, or

		intended next funding opportunity and timeline.
Appropriate match of project and investigator	<p>Does the investigator (faculty member) have potential to conduct this research, recruit participants if applicable- or laboratory facilities if applicable?</p> <p>Does the investigator (or the senior mentor) have prior experience with the stated methodology (qualitative interviewing skills, statistical analysis, imaging technique etc)?</p>	<p>5- The proposal clearly states the investigator's qualifications to conduct this research in the proposal and biosketch, or the mentor letter states how they will support the early career investigator to acquire these skills and complete the research within the funding period.</p> <p>1- The investigator and mentor if applicable do not have the expertise or have failed to document their expertise to conduct this research.</p>