

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/  Rationale  Provides 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 how  this central issue of  the project was identified as important or an explanation of the purpose of the project, or the presented descriptions are unclear. | Minimally explains how  the central issue of this  project was identified as important or minimal  background information  provided. | Partly explains how the issue in this project was identified as important. | Mostly explains  how the central  issue of this project was identified as  important but is  missing 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, facilitation  process, and goals/  purpose. | Description of the  project is either  unclear or not  provided | The overall project is  described; however,  there are minimal  project details. | The overall project is partially described  with a superficial  description of the  project’s essential  details. | The overall  project details are  mostly described,  but there is a  noted absence of  an important  detail to fully  explicate the  project. | Project and its details are fully  described, which allows for a  complete and comprehensive  understanding of the project and  how it was implemented. |
| 3 | Learners or Intended participants and setting identified. Discusses potential beneficiary of this project. | Identified learner  and setting are  either unclear or  not identified | Minimal learner and  setting information  provided. | Number of learners  identified but major  characteristics of  learners and setting are only partially provided. | Learners and  setting are mostly  identified but  lacking additional  details or  descriptions. | 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 cost  savings | Discussion is unclear as to relationship with relevance to  simulation. | Discussion minimally explains relevance to simulation. | Discussion partially explains implications with relevance to  simulation. | Discussion mostly explains implications with relevance to  simulation. | 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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