Criteria	Possible Points			SCORE
	Poor (0-3)	**Marginal (4-6)**	**Proficient (7-10)**	
To what extent did the content address the background and literature gaps?	Minimally addresses the background and literature review on the issue. The gaps in the literature are unclear.	At times, background information and/or literature review is unclear. Partially explains gaps in literature.	Presents a sound scientific background. Gaps are clearly identified.	
To what extent did the content address simulation topics that are important, innovative and/or creative?	Topic is minimally important or lacking in evidence and/or does not appear to be innovative or creative.	Partially explains why the issue is important with some supporting evidence; somewhat innovative and/or creative.	Presents a solid explanation of rationale as to the importance of the topic with supporting evidence; topic is clearly innovative and/or creative.	
To what extent were the methods/design/objective of the project relevant to the vision and mission of INACSL?	Does not align with the vision and mission of INACSL and/or does not address the significance to the vision and mission.	Does not clearly articulate how the methods/design/objectives of the project are relevant to the vision and mission of INACSL.	Explicitly and clearly addresses how the methods/design/objectives of the project relate to advancing the vision and mission of INACSL.	
To what extent was the writing style scholarly, data driven and clear to the reader?	Poor writing style exhibited. The write up is not data driven. Does not adhere to APA and/or AMA.	Writing is mostly clear. Occasional errors present. Uses APA or AMA format and cites references. Results refer to data and analysis, but lacks raw data and/or synthesis.	Strong and clear style of writing demonstrated throughout. Uses APA or AMA format and cites references. Raw data is shared, analysis is explained and conclusions/discussion loop to gap in needs.	
To what extent were the authors knowledgeable about the subject matter presented as it relates to INACSL Standards of Best Practice: Simulation[SM]?	Does not identify/state/address appropriate INACSL Standards of Best Practice: Simulation[SM] as relates to the project	Alludes to INACSL Standards of Best Practice: Simulation[SM] but does not address them specifically in the presentation/abstract and/or chosen standards do not seem to be the appropriate ones.	Clearly connects the subject matter and results to the INACSL Standards of Best Practice: Simulation[SM] as relates to the project. ***-Simulation Design, Outcomes and Objectives, -Facilitation, -Debriefing, -Participant Evaluation, -Professional Integrity, -Sim-IPE. (Please circle the Standard(s) this project addresses).**	
TOTAL SCORE				**_____points out of 50**

* Rubric developed by Greenawalt and Anderson (2016) and used content from the following publications: *Cheng, A., Kessler, D., Mackinnon, R., Change, T.P., Nadkarni, V.M, Hunt, E.A., et al., (2016) Reporting guidelines for health care simulation research.

Extensions to the CONSORT and STROBE statements. *Clinical Simulation in Nursing*, 12, A3-A13.; Fey, M. K., Gloe, D., & Mariani, B. (2015, December). Assessing the quality of simulation-based research articles: A rating rubric. *Clinical Simulation in Nursing,* 11(12), 496-504. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1016/j.ecns.2015.10.005.