



INACSL 2020 Research Abstract Rating Rubric

	Evaluation Categories	-1- Emerging	-2- Developing	-3- Good	-4- Very Good	-5- Exceptional
1	The content addresses gaps or makes the case using current literature to further the state of the science of healthcare simulation.	The content does not address gaps, or the case using current literature to further the science of healthcare education made was unclear.	The content minimally address gaps or minimally makes the case using current literature to further the science of healthcare education.	The content partly addresses gaps or partly makes the case using current literature to further the science of healthcare education.	The content mostly addresses gaps or mostly makes the case using current literature to further the science of healthcare education.	The content fully addresses gaps or fully makes the case using current literature to further the science of healthcare education. Includes description of innovation and significance.
2	There is a clear research question or purpose statement.	The research question or purpose statement was unclear.	There is a minimally clear research question or purpose statement.	There is a partially clear research question or purpose statement.	There is a mostly clear research question or purpose statement.	There is a fully clear research question or purpose statement.
3	Concepts/theoretical framework under review explain links to the research question or purpose statement and methods.	Concepts/theoretical framework are unclear, or the author's explanation of links to the research question or purpose statement and methods is unclear.	Concepts/theoretical framework are minimally identified, or the author(s) minimally explain links to the research question or purpose statement and methods.	Concepts/theoretical framework are partially identified, or the author(s) partially explain links to the research question or purpose statement and methods.	Concepts/theoretical framework are mostly identified, or the author(s) mostly explain links to the research question or purpose statement and methods.	Concepts are fully identified and integrated into a theoretical framework, or the author(s) fully explain links to the research question or purpose statement and methods.
4	The methods are clearly stated and match the research question or purpose statement. Clearly states the methodology used.	The stated methods are unclear or do not match the research question or purpose statement. The statement of the methodology used is unclear.*	The methods are stated minimally or minimally match the research question or purpose statement. The methodology used is minimally stated.*	The methods are stated partially or partially match the research question or purpose statement. The methodology used is partially stated.*	The methods stated mostly match the research question or purpose statement. The methodology used is mostly stated.*	The methods are stated fully and fully match the research question or purpose statement. The methodology used is fully stated.*

	Evaluation Categories	-1- Emerging	-2- Developing	-3- Good	-4- Very Good	-5- Exceptional
5	Results: Summarizes salient findings and realistically interprets the data.	The results or the summary of salient findings are unclear, or the author(s) interpretation of the data is unclear, or results are not reported.	The results or the summary of salient findings are minimally summarized, or the author(s) interpretation of the data is minimally presented.	The results or the salient findings are partially summarized, or the author(s) interpretation of the data is partially presented.	The results or the salient findings are mostly summarized, or the author(s) interpretation of the data is mostly presented.	The results or the salient findings are fully summarized, or the author(s) interpretation of the data is fully presented.
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					

*When scoring (Category 4) Methods, consider the sample setting, whether there was brief description of the intervention (if applicable), the appropriateness and caveats of the data collection methods and instruments(s), the study design (If qualitative, was a methodological approach explicitly stated? Were data coding/trustworthiness/audit trail explained?), the appropriateness of the statistical methodology explained (including analytic software used, if mentioned).(Microsoft Excel is not appropriate for qualitative or quantitative analysis of data.)

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