Education Innovations / Work in Progress

Abstract Review Rubric

	0 - Unacceptable	1 - Good	2 – Very Good
Clear Goals: Problem, goals & objectives outlined, feasible (realistic, achievable) outcomes for success identified.	No stated problem, goals or objectives. No definitions of success.	Stated problem or goal/objective that is feasible, realistic, and achievable.	Clear problem goal, objective that is feasible, realistic, and achievable.
Adequate Preparation: Describes how project is related to previous literature (research or theory) or, rarely, personal experience.	Poor linkage to previous literature/work.	Linkage to previous literature/work is clearly stated.	Clearly connected to a gap or need that is based on previous literature or work.
Appropriate Methods: Contextually sound methods that are linked to stated goals, objectives and outcomes.	Method/innovation is completely inappropriate for the particular problem/ goal/ objective.	Method/innovation is a potentially useful way to tackle the particular problem/ goal/ objective.	Method/innovation would be a novel and much-preferred way to tackle the address the problem/ goal/ objective.
Significant Results: Presents results of interest for discussion. Ideally, significant, highly impactful or novel results. Suggested framework = Kirkpatrick program evaluation or another similar evaluator framework.	No outcomes or results for reported. OR No one will want to replicate this innovation based on these results.	Acceptability stated outcomes/results reported. Results are meaningful to educators. Others may want to adapt this innovation based on these results.	Well-stated outcomes and/or results that are interesting and impactful for educators broadly. Others may want to replicate this innovation based on these results.
Reflective Critique: Presents a clear reflection about lessons learned from this project. May go on to suggest future directions and/or link to existing literature.	Shows no reflective capacity or insight into limitations or problems.	Identifies a limitation that provides other insights.	Displays some reflection about implementation problems or limitations, providing other insights into the project.
Effective Presentation: Abstract is written in a way that clearly explains innovation for the general health/medical education community.	Abstract is awkward, incomplete, or poorly written.	Adequately written. May have some missing info.	Well-constructed abstract.

	0 - Unacceptable	1 - Good	2 – Very Good
Overall Quality	Disorganized, plagiarized*, or not innovative or novel (i.e. everyone already does it!).	Interesting and potentially will be implementable in certain educational contexts. May be very context specific, and reviewer anticipates barriers to widespread implementation.	Novel and expands upon current practice in a considerable way. Likely broadly applicable with some slight modifications

*Exact word-for-word copying. We don't mean that they haven't already submitted elsewhere or is innovating off of others' work (e.g. external validation of project), that is possibly acceptable.

Adapted from CAEP 2022 Education Innovations Abstract Review Criteria.