

INACSL 2025 “How To.....” Abstract Rubric
**(Intended for topics like policy or manuscript development,
grant writing, moulage, or innovative
simulation-based learning design)**



	Evaluation Categories	-1- Emerging	-2- Developing	-3- Good	-4- Very Good	-5- Exceptional
1	Introduction/Background/ Rationale: Provides an overview of how presentation is applicable to context of healthcare simulation. Include an explanation of the need for the innovation and rationale of how presentation addresses the need.	Description of need for innovation and context in healthcare simulation is unclear. Rationale is unclear.	Minimally explains the description of need for innovation and context in healthcare simulation; minimal background information or rationale provided.	Partly explains how innovation was identified as a need. Rationale is partially- explained.	Mostly explains description of need for innovation and context in healthcare simulation. Rationale includes impact on one campus or group of learners.	Complete and thorough description of how innovation was identified as a need. Clearly states the rationale and impact on multiple campuses, groups of learners, or larger scale.
2	Topic was thoroughly described to include goals/ purpose, step-by-step instructions, resources needed (e.g., time, physical resources, personnel, budget, approval processes)	Topic is either unclear or not provided	The overall topic is described; however, there are minimal project details that limit implementation or replication.	Topic is partially described with a superficial description mostly of step-by-step instructions.	Topic is mostly described, and there is mention of step-by-step instructions, time, and budget needed)	Details are fully described, which allows for a complete and comprehensive understanding of the project and how it was implemented. Includes step-by-step instructions, time, physical resources, personnel, budget, and approval process)
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.

	Evaluation Categories	-1- Emerging	-2- Developing	-3- Good	-4- Very Good	-5- Exceptional
4	Discussion and conclusion of the impact of innovation/topic and implication to advancing simulation (e.g., innovation, significance, and/or cost savings)	Discussion is unclear as to impact of innovation/project and implications to advancing simulation on one campus.	Discussion minimally explains impact and implications to advancing simulation in a system (e.g., multiple campuses)	Discussion partially explains impact and implications to advancing simulation at the level of a professional organization.	Discussion mostly explains impact and implications to advancing simulation at a national level.	Discussion fully explains the impact and implications to advancing simulation at a global level.
5	Anticipating how innovation/topic will be evaluated (e.g., scoring of a grant, stakeholder feedback for learning activity, responding to peer reviewers' or learners' comments)	Outcomes/ Evaluation plan is unclear or not provided. No evidence of evaluation data, which reveals evaluation plans are hypothetical or innovation/project has not been evaluated previously.	Outcomes/ Evaluation plan is provided, but with minimal explanation or evaluation data. No recommendations on how to respond to evaluation data.	Outcomes / Evaluation are partially explained with examples provided of response to evaluation data.	Explanation of the Outcomes/ Evaluation is mostly provided, and comments include longitudinal evaluation.	Outcomes/Evaluation are fully and thoroughly explained. Includes longitudinal evaluation and clear recommendations for translating project to new environment.
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					