ABSTRACT RUBRIC

	Excellent-5	Good-4	Poor-2	Unacceptable-1
Relevancy to Conference Theme	YES – Abstract is relevant to conference theme.	N/A	N/A	NO – Abstract is NOT relevant to conference theme.
Abstract Title	Completed title; includes clear keywords found in the abstract text, provides accurate and clear insight into the content of the abstract. Title length adheres to guidelines.	Completed title; includes keywords found in the abstract text. Title length adheres to guidelines.	Poorly developed title; includes some keywords poor insight into the content found in the abstract text. Title length adheres to guidelines.	Title appears unrelated to abstract text. Title length does not adhere to guidelines.
Actual Abstract Text	The abstract presents original work that is novel or innovation. Abstract demonstrates an understanding of the relationship among material obtained from all sources. The purpose statement is clear and aligns with all other content within the abstract. The abstract provides a logical discussion, with substantial details, supporting the overall topic.	The abstract presents original work that, with some development, could be novel or innovative. Writing demonstrates an understanding of the relationships among material obtained from all sources. The purpose statement demonstrates some cohesiveness of the content with the abstract. The abstract provides a logical discussion, with adequate details, supporting the overall topic.	The abstract presents original work that is NOT novel or innovative. Abstract does not demonstrate an understanding of the relationship among material obtained from all sources. The purpose statement is unclear or does not align with other content within the abstract. Overall arrangement is logical but is occasionally difficult to follow.	The abstract does NOT present original work. Noticeable portions of the abstract fail to convey the writer's point. There is no purpose statement. Does not tie together information in a cohesive manner.

	Excellent-5	Good-4	Poor-2	Unacceptable-1
Evaluation Process	The evaluation process reflects valid and reliable methods and outcome measures and is clearly defined. Findings have clear implications for nursing and midwifery science, patient outcomes, nursing practice, education, administration, leadership, and/or policy making. If the submission is for a poster presentation ONLY, rate evaluation as "Excellent." If the submission is for a podium presentation or podium/poster presentation, rate the evaluation process accordingly.	The evaluation process generally reflects reliable methods and outcome measures. Findings may have implications for nursing and midwifery science, patient outcomes, nursing practice, education, administration, leadership, and/or policy making. If the submission is for a poster presentation ONLY, rate evaluation as "Excellent." If the submission is for a podium presentation or podium/poster presentation, rate the evaluation process accordingly.	There are gaps in the discussion of methods and outcome measures and these criteria are not clearly defined. Findings have no clearly defined implications for nursing and midwifery science, patient outcomes, nursing practice, education, administration, leadership, and/or policy making. If the submission is for a poster presentation ONLY, rate evaluation as "Excellent." If the submission is for a podium presentation or podium/poster presentation, rate the evaluation process accordingly.	The evaluation process is missing or lacks sound and reliable methods and outcomes statements If the submission is for a poster presentation ONLY, rate evaluation as "Excellent." If the submission is for a podium presentation or podium/poster presentation, rate the evaluation process accordingly.
Abstract Submission Guidelines for Deidentification Followed	YES – Removed all references to the title and author information on the abstract before completing the submission.	N/A	N/A	NO – Did not remove all references to the title and author information on the abstract before completing the submission.
References- number/type	Includes at least six scholarly references (e.g., science journal articles, books). Clear, consistent format (i.e. APA, Harvard, MLA, etc.) with less than one error. All references are appropriate and/or recent for the abstract (no older than 5-7 years, unless a seminal work.)	Includes at least five scholarly references (e.g., science journal articles, books). Clear, consistent format (i.e. APA, Harvard, MLA, etc.) with few errors. Most references are appropriate and/or recent for the abstract (no older than 5-7 years, unless a seminal work.)	Includes at least four scholarly references (e.g., science journal articles, books). Consistent format (i.e. APA, Harvard, MLA, etc.) with errors. Some references are appropriate and/or recent for the abstract (no older than 5-7 years, unless a seminal work.)	Absent or fewer than three references. The majority are not scholarly references. Absent or the majority are not appropriate for the abstract.
Writing Style and Mechanics	Abstract flows from one issue to the next. Word choice, sentence structure, and tone are successful at communicating the writer's intentions. Sentences are clear, effective, and coherent. No grammar or spelling errors noted.	Abstract generally ties information together from all sources. Word choice, sentence structure, and tone are mostly successful at communicating the writer's intentions. Sentences mostly clear, effective, and coherent with a few grammar issues. No spelling errors noted.	Abstract is understandable but is marred by confusing, inappropriate sentences; word choice is inappropriate for the audience and topic. Abstract does not flow. Some grammar and spelling errors noted.	Abstract does not flow. The abstract does not provide a logical discussion of the overall topic. Multiple grammar and spelling errors noted throughout.