



Sigma Abstract Rubric

	Excellent-4	Good-3	Poor-2	Unacceptable-1
Relevancy to Conference Theme	Clearly and directly supports the development of a healthy work environment for healthcare professionals. Includes evidence-based strategies, innovations, or outcomes.	Generally aligned with the theme; addresses key elements such as safety, communication, leadership, or well-being.	Vague connection to the theme; lacks clear relevance to improving work environments.	Not related to healthy work environments.
Abstract Title	Clear, concise, and accurately reflects the content. Uses keywords that highlight the abstract's focus on workplace health, safety, or culture.	Title reflects most of the content and includes some relevant keywords.	Title lacks clarity or does not convey key focus areas.	Title does not reflect content or keywords.
Abstract Content	Presents research, EBP, or QI work or significant improvements in workplace culture, safety, or well-being. Strong purpose statement, logical flow, and comprehensive discussion with specific strategies or outcomes.	Purpose is mostly clear; some innovation or improvements are presented. Generally logical with adequate detail.	Limited originality or innovation; weak alignment of content and purpose. Organization is difficult to follow.	Lacks originality, purpose is unclear or missing, and the content is disorganized.
<p>Oral presentation abstracts need to be completed work. Pecha Kucha presentations do not have to be completed work.</p>				



Sigma Abstract Rubric

	Excellent-4	Good-3	Poor-2	Unacceptable-1
Interprofessional Collaboration	Highlights collaborative efforts across the healthcare team to improve the work environment. Demonstrates shared accountability and engagement.	Some evidence of collaboration across the healthcare team.	Minimal mention of collaboration across the healthcare team.	No indication of collaboration across the healthcare team.
Actionable Strategies	Includes specific, practical, and scalable strategies that can be implemented in healthcare settings to improve work environments.	Includes general or moderately useful strategies. May require adaptation to be implemented.	Strategies are vague, theoretical, or lack practical application.	No actionable strategies provided.
Evaluation and Impact	Clearly defined evaluation methods with measurable outcomes. Demonstrates significant impact on staff well-being, patient outcomes, team dynamics, or organizational culture.	Evaluation methods are mostly appropriate. Shows moderate impact or potential.	Limited or unclear evaluation methods. Impact is not well defined or minimal.	No evaluation or impact described
Abstract Submission Guidelines for De-Identification Followed	Fully de-identified; no identifying names or institutions; aligns with ethical guidelines	N/A	N/A	Identifiable; does not meet ethical standards for anonymity



Sigma Abstract Rubric

	Excellent-4	Good-3	Poor-2	Unacceptable-1
References	5 or more scholarly references, properly formatted, recent (within 5–7 years) or seminal. Directly relevant to healthy work environments.	4 scholarly references; mostly relevant and well-formatted.	3 scholarly references; formatting or relevance issues.	<3 references or sources are not scholarly/relevant.
Writing Style and Mechanics	Clear, logical flow; language is professional and audience appropriate. No spelling/grammar errors.	Mostly clear and professional; few grammar or sentence issues.	Difficult to follow; awkward wording or inconsistent tone.	Disorganized, with multiple errors that impede comprehension.