Outstanding Research Coordinator Award

The Outstanding Research Coordinator Award is intended to recognize an individual who has made exceptional contributions (could be for a single large project or over multiple projects) in primary care research in a central support role.

**Eligibility Criteria**: Nominee must be a current NAPCRG member.

The term “Research Coordinator” has many synonyms, including Project Manager, Clinical Research Professional, Research Assistant, Research Associate, and/or Practice Facilitator. The Research Coordinator is an individual who manages the day-to-day operation of a research project, group of projects, or program. These individuals are often credentialed at the Master’s level, but may also be Baccalaureate-level professionals, or in some cases, doctorally-prepared individuals. Research Coordinators perform many tasks, including managing IRB submissions, recruiting subjects, cleaning or analyzing data, hiring, training and supervising other research staff, managing budgets and grant processes, and participation in manuscript writing and editing, to name just a few. In short, the Research Coordinator helps facilitate the organization, management, and/or execution of research projects.

The nominee’s primary role must be to help facilitate the organization, management and/or execution of research projects as described in the purpose statement above.

Examples of ineligble individuals might include graduate students whose primary role was coordinating their own student-initiated projects; individuals who provide purely administrative support, without a substantive role in the direct execution of research activities; faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Achievements</th>
<th>Scoring Range/Definitions (1 is the lowest score and 5 is top score)</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did they meet the eligibility criteria?</td>
<td>Yes or No</td>
<td></td>
<td>(If no, this is a disqualification)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Did they follow instructions and submit the correct materials?                        | 0-2                                                                  |       | 0 – Did not follow instructions  
1 – One lapse (eg: CV too long)  
2 – Followed all instructions                                                                                       |
| Represents significant influence and support to researcher, research team and/or organization. | 1-5                                                                  |       | 1 – Mostly administrative support for research team, does not lead presentations, posters or new projects.  
2 – Manages administrative tasks and staff, manages budgets or other grant management, assists in the collection of data.  
3- Primarily supports one team, one project. Does minimal writing or IRB maintenance.  
4- Manages several projects. Acts as connection between research sites/patients/communities and team. Engaged in academic production.  
5 – Trusted with full leadership activities within their team. Manages and/or coordinates several projects for their group. Actively writes and/or disseminates research findings with team. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Have they been part of NAPCRG in the past (submitted with their team, present at meetings? Noted to participate in NAPCRG events such as PBRN or ICPF conferences?) | 1 – Submits with team but does not attend NAPCRG events  
2 – Active member of NAPCRG with some submissions, may or may not be primary presenter  
3 – Active member of NAPCRG with submissions, lead presenter, and takes on leadership roles within NAPCRG. |
| Personal statement and Letters of Support: Do they accurately describe philosophy and career? | 1 – Describes work, but does not go into depth on collaboration.  
2 – Describes impact on work, if they have been leaders in their organization, how they approach the team.  
3 – Focuses on their own innovation and contributions to making the team stronger. May have secondary responsibilities such as data analysis, community engagement, running advisory boards. |
| Rate the nominee based on their submission packet.                    | 1 – Moderate candidate that is supportive of their team, but does not have leadership roles, community involvement, or take work involving higher orders of complexity.  
2 – Engaged with team, involved with research from the beginning, offers ideas, helps with data and admin, and supports academic production.  
3 – Leader among the team, involved with research from the beginning, provides innovative research initiatives, manages systems, autonomous academic endeavors. |

Total Overall Score (Average of the rated metrics) / 16