

**INACSL Research Abstract Rating Rubric**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 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 ofthe 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.)
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