

Abstract Scoring Rubric

Reviewers will perform a peer review of all abstracts using the rubric below. Please review the rubric while preparing and before submitting your abstract. 350 words or less

Theme: <i>Collaborating to Meet the Challenges and Opportunities: The State of Maryland's Health</i>	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)	Absent (0)
<p>Relevance to theme and objectives: Explore new care models, staffing initiatives and support services that will cultivate the retention of a resilient skilled diverse nursing workforce.</p> <p>Describe collaborative partnerships for preparing faculty and students linked to progressive educational programs that will meet Maryland's future health care needs.</p> <p>Identify key legislative stakeholders and organizations that will fund and drive the implementation of long-term sustainable change within Maryland's health systems.</p> <p>Recognize the vital role of nurses in strategizing academic and practice approaches to address the current nursing crisis.</p>	<p>Strong focus on key concepts of the overall theme or objectives</p>	<p>Some focus on key concepts of the overall theme or objectives</p>	<p>Little relevance to the theme or objectives</p>	<p>Focus is generalized to the field of healthcare</p>	<p>No relevance to the theme or objectives</p>
<p>Statement of the Problem or Question</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of the gap in knowledge or the problem in practice addressed by the QI project or Research study 	<p>Clear, concise statement of gap/problem</p>	<p>Statement identifies the gap and knowledge but lacks clarity to the gap in knowledge or problem</p>	<p>Statement identifies a broad issue within healthcare</p>	<p>Unclear written statement</p>	<p>No statement of objectives</p>
<p>Methods/ Process Procedure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rigorous methods identifying the design, sample, setting, data collection and analysis • Discussion of implementation and actions for completing the project 	<p>Clear description of precisely what was done; sufficient detail to provide evidence of logical consistency between the stated objectives and the approach</p>	<p>Description contains logical consistency between the stated objectives and approach</p>	<p>Description provides vague descriptor of what was done</p>	<p>Description provides no evidence between the stated objectives</p>	<p>No description of what was done</p>
<p>Results/ Outcomes</p>	<p>Clear statement of evidence for findings or outcomes; logical relationship to problem or gap, objectives, and methods; logical interpretation of results</p>	<p>Findings or outcomes hold some relevance to the problem or gaps with brief amount of interpretation</p>	<p>Findings or outcomes hold relevance with no interpretation of results</p>	<p>Vague description of evidence for findings or outcomes</p>	<p>No evidence of the outcomes or findings</p>
<p>Significance</p>	<p>Innovative contribution to knowledge and/or practice</p>	<p>Strong contribution to knowledge and/or practice</p>	<p>Slight contribution to knowledge and/or practice</p>	<p>Contribution is questionable</p>	<p>No contribution to knowledge and/or practice</p>
<p>Quality of Abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing quality • Quality references based on current evidence 	<p>Clearly written with no spelling or grammar issues. References within past 5-7 years.</p>	<p>Clearly written with some spelling/ grammar mistakes. References within past 5-7 years.</p>	<p>Clearly written few spelling/ grammar mistakes with references over 5-7 years</p>	<p>Poorly written multiple spelling and grammar mistakes</p>	<p>So poorly written unable to understand meaning</p>