SNRS Criteria for Scholarly Project Abstract Evaluation

 Abstract Number and Title \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Unsatisfactory =****0 points** | **Fair = 1 point** | **Good = 2 points** | **Excellent = 3 points** | **Score** |
| **Introduction/ Significance** | Significance of the problem is not described  | Problem lacks relevance or connection to the literature.  | Problem statement is clear, but the description may lack data demonstrating the clinical significance.  | Provides compelling evidence of the clinical significance of the problem and makes a clear connection to previous related works. |  |
| **Literature Synthesis**  | Supporting evidence is not included. | Evidence is listed but not evaluated, or not synthesized.  | Uses an EBP framework (e.g. PICO or SPIDER) with clear appraisal of evidence. | Comprehensive evidence of an EBP framework and thorough appraisal of evidence, leading to the proposed EBP or QI solution.  |  |
| **Methodology**  | Absent or minimal description of framework, design, and data collection procedures. | Methods are described, but not optimal for addressing the problem.  | Methods are clearly described and logically consistent with the problem, literature synthesis, and methods.  | Methods are rigorous and comprehensively described, which could support replication. Logically flows from the problem and literature synthesis.  |  |
| **Results/****Outcomes**  | Lacks outcomes or results | Preliminary or limited results included. Or, the results are not logically related to the clinical problem, literature synthesis, or methods.  | Results indicate that the project is complete, and aligned with the problem, synthesis, methods.  | Complete results presented in a clear and compelling manner, in relation to the problem, synthesis, and methods.  |  |
| **Discussion/****Conclusion** | Findings or results unstated or hard to identify. No clear conclusions or key takeaways.  | Findings and conclusions are stated but lack clarity or context. Conclusions may be an over-statement of results. Unclear next steps for influencing practice.  | Conclusions support an adequate analysis of the problem and outcomes. Future recommendations are clear with a sense of next steps for influencing practice.  | Conclusions provide a mature analysis of the gap, linking results to previous work. Conclusions are clear, logical, and objective. Casts a vision for future scholarly work. Key takeaways are explicit.  |  |
| **For Reviewer: Additional Comments and Total Score** |  |

Revised May 2024