

INACSL22 Non-Research Project Abstract Rubric

(QI projects, Creative Innovations,

Curriculum Interventions, “How To" Projects)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Evaluation Categories** | **-1-****Emerging** | **-2-****Developing** | **-3-****Good** | **-4-****Very Good** | **-5-** **Exceptional** |
| 1 | Introduction/Background/RationaleProvides a complete explanation of the gap in knowledge addressed by the project. The central issue addressed in the project is well identified with a clear purpose statement provided. | Explanations of howthis central issue ofthe project was identified as important or an explanation of the purpose of the project, or the presented descriptions are unclear. | Minimally explains howthe central issue of thisproject was identified as important or minimalbackground informationprovided. | Partly explains how the issue in this project was identified as important. | Mostly explainshow the centralissue of this project was identified asimportant but ismissing one aspect (e.g., Intro/Background etc.) | Complete and thorough explanation of how the central issue of this project is identified as important is fully presented.A gap in knowledge related to the study topic is well described. Clearly states the rationale of the project to address the identified gap. |
| 2 | Description of the project was thoroughly described to include learners experience, facilitationprocess, and goals/purpose. | Description of theproject is eitherunclear or notprovided  | The overall project isdescribed; however,there are minimalproject details. | The overall project is partially describedwith a superficialdescription of theproject’s essentialdetails. | The overallproject details aremostly described,but there is anoted absence ofan importantdetail to fullyexplicate theproject. | Project and its details are fullydescribed, which allows for acomplete and comprehensiveunderstanding of the project andhow it was implemented. |
| 3 | Learners or Intended participants and setting identified. Discusses potential beneficiary of this project. | Identified learnerand setting areeither unclear ornot identified | Minimal learner andsetting informationprovided. | Number of learnersidentified but majorcharacteristics oflearners and setting are only partially provided. | Learners andsetting are mostlyidentified butlacking additionaldetails ordescriptions. | 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. |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4 | Outcomes/Evaluation of the project are consistent with project goals, implementation steps, and evaluation methods (e.g. grades, survey, focus groups, etc.). | Outcomes/ Evaluation are unclear or not provided. | Outcomes/ Evaluation are provided, but with minimal explanation of their relationship to project goals | Outcomes / Evaluation are partially explained with unclear relationships with project goals | Explanation of the Outcomes/ Evaluation is mostly provided, but lacking clarity and detail. | Outcomes/Evaluation are fully and thoroughly explained. |
| 5 | Discussion and conclusion of the relevance and implication to advancing simulation (e.g. innovation, significance, and/or costsavings | Discussion is unclear as to relationship with relevance tosimulation. | Discussion minimally explains relevance to simulation. | Discussion partially explains implications with relevance tosimulation. | Discussion mostly explains implications with relevance tosimulation. | Discussion fully explains the implications of the relevance to simulation. |
| 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 |  |  |  |  |  |
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