**SCNESA Abstract Review Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Possible points** | | | **Score** |
| **Excellent (7-10)** | **Good (4-6)** | **Poor (0-3)** |
| **Abstract Title** | Compete, provides clear insight into the content of the abstract. | Satisfactory, relates to the content of the abstract. | Title relates poorly to the content of the abstract. |  |
| **Abstract Text** | Clear, readable, demonstrates understanding of the topic. | Writing is fairly clear, logical discussion with minimal spelling/grammatical errors. | Confusing, does not flow, poor writing style. |  |
| **Relevance of topic** | Presents solid explanation of relevance of topic to simulation issues. Topic is highly relevant to simulation education. | Partially explains relevance of topic to the audience. Topic is somewhat relevant. | Poor explanation of relevance of topic to simulation or topic is minimally important. |  |
| **Extent to which the abstract is scholarly. (for research based abstracts)** | Research design explained clearly with appropriate methodology for the subject. | Design explained poorly, methodology unclear or questionable. | No explanation of design, methodology not appropriate to subject. |  |
| **Extent to which the abstract presents innovative ideas (for non-research abstracts)** | Project is summarized clearly with sufficient detail to evaluate feasibility of replication. | Significance not well explained with few details included. | Poor explanation of steps of project. Too little information to determine feasibility of replication. |
| **References** | Includes appropriate number of references from peer-reviewed journals that are recent or appropriate. | Too few references for the topic, some references are recent and appropriate. | Very few or no references. References are out of date or not relevant to the topic. |  |
| **Total Score (50 possible)** |  |  |  |  |