

**INACSL 2020 Non-Research Abstract
Rating Rubric
(QI projects, Creative Innovations,
Curriculum Interventions, "How To" Projects)**



	Evaluation Categories	-1- Emerging	-2- Developing	-3- Good	-4- Very Good	-5- Exceptional
1	Introduction/Background/Rationale Provides a complete explanation of the gap in knowledge addressed by the project. The central issue addressed in the project is well identified with a clear purpose statement provided.	Explanations of how this central issue of the project was identified as important or an explanation of the purpose of the project, or the presented descriptions are unclear.	Minimally explains how the central issue of this project was identified as important or minimal background information provided.	Partly explains how the issue in this project was identified as important.	Mostly explains how the central issue of this project was identified as important but is missing one aspect (e.g., Intro/ Background etc.)	Complete and thorough explanation of how the central issue of this project is identified as important is fully presented. A gap in knowledge related to the study topic is well described. Clearly states the rationale of the project to address the identified gap.
2	Description of the project was thoroughly described to include learners experience, facilitation process, and goals/ purpose.	Description of the project is either unclear <u>or not provided</u> .	The overall project is described; however, there are minimal project details.	The overall project is partially described with a superficial description of the project's essential details.	The overall project details are mostly described, but there is a noted absence of an important detail to fully explicate the project.	Project and its details are fully described, which allows for a complete and comprehensive understanding of the project and how it was implemented.
3	Learners/Intended participants/ Setting identified. Discusses potential beneficiary of this project.	Identified learner and setting are either unclear or not identified	Minimal learner and setting information provided.	Number of learners identified but major characteristics of learners and setting are only partially provided.	Learners and setting are mostly identified but lacking additional details or descriptions.	Description of the characteristics and number of learners and setting of the project is fully and clearly provided. Clearly identified a population to whom project is applicable.

**INACSL 2020 Non-Research Abstract
Rating Rubric
(QI projects, Creative Innovations,
Curriculum Interventions, "How To" Projects)**



4	Outcomes/Evaluation of the project are consistent with project goals, implementation steps, and evaluation methods (e.g. grades, survey, focus groups, etc.).	Outcomes/ Evaluation are unclear or not provided.	Outcomes/ Evaluation are provided, but with minimal explanation of their relationship to project goals	Outcomes / Evaluation are partially explained with unclear relationships with project goals	Explanation of the Outcomes/ Evaluation is mostly provided, but lacking clarity and detail.	Outcomes/Evaluation are fully and thoroughly explained.
5	Discussion and conclusion of the relevance and implication to advancing simulation (e.g. innovation, significance, and/or cost savings	Discussion is unclear as to relationship with relevance to simulation.	Discussion minimally explains relevance to simulation.	Discussion partially explains implications with relevance to simulation.	Discussion mostly explains implications with relevance to simulation.	Discussion fully explains the implications of the relevance to simulation.
6	The writing style is scholarly and clear to the reader.	The writing style was not scholarly and was unclear to the reader.	The writing style was minimally scholarly and/or minimally clear to the reader.	The writing style was partially scholarly and/ or partially clear to the reader.	The writing style was mostly scholarly and/or mostly clear to the reader.	The writing style was fully scholarly and/or fully clear to the reader.
	Total					

5.1.19 Abstract Review Task Force (BOD Approved 6/17/19)