



NAINA's 10th Biennial Conference Abstract Evaluation Rubric

Criteria	5 – Excellent	4 – Good	3 – Fair	1 – Poor
Title	Clear, concise, engaging; aligns with purpose	Clear but less engaging	Vague or weak alignment	Unclear or unrelated
Relevance to Track & Theme	Strong alignment	Mostly relevant	Weak or unclear connection	Not relevant
Purpose / Objectives	Clear, specific, measurable	Stated but lacks clarity	Vague or partially defined	Missing or unclear
Innovation / Originality	Highly innovative; presents new ideas, approaches, or solutions	Some innovation; adds new perspective	Limited originality; mostly known approaches	No originality; standard or common content
Background & Significance	Well-developed, relevant	Adequate but limited depth	Minimal or unclear	Missing or irrelevant
Methods / Implementation. Do not use for Research, QI and EBP abstracts)	Thorough, logical description of methods, intervention/approach.	Adequate with minor gaps	Basic or unclear	Poorly described or absent
Results / Outcomes	Clear, meaningful outcomes	Results present, limited detail	Vague or incomplete	Missing
Implications for Practice	Strong implication to clinical practice	Discusses implications but may lack depth.	Minimal or weak link to clinical practice implications.	No discussion of practice implications.
Organization & Clarity	Clear, concise, well-organized	Minor clarity issues	Some disorganization	Poorly written
Academic Quality (APA, Writing, References)	References- High-quality evidence, cited in APA (6th or 7th Edn.) format. Defines all acronyms at first use, <5 spelling/ grammatical errors. Length of the abstract 275-300 words without reference	Poor quality reference, older than 7yrs, cited in the wrong format, <5 spelling/ grammatical errors, Abstract 300-325 words	Evidence of copy-paste from sources, Reference-poor quality evidence, not in APA format, Abstract 325-350 words	Reference- not provided, not following academic writing concepts, Several spelling/ grammatical errors, Word count >350
Use for Research Projects only: Appropriate methods and feasible recommendations. (Design, sample, setting, data collection, and data analysis methods are identified and appropriate for the research purpose/question)	Methods are rigorous, clearly described, and well aligned with the research question; recommendations are evidence-based and logically derived from the results	Methods are appropriate and feasible but lack some detail or justification; recommendations are reasonable but implementation constraints	Methods are partially appropriate or unclearly described; recommendations are weakly supported	Methods are inappropriate, infeasible, or missing; recommendations are unsupported or absent
Use for Quality Improvement/Evidence-based Practice Projects only: Clear Processes & Practical Recommendations	Processes are clearly defined, and systematic; recommendations are practical, actionable, and grounded in evidence	Processes are clear but lack detail or full justification; recommendations are practical but lacks specificity	Processes are inconsistently described or unclear; recommendations lack specificity or feasibility	Processes are poorly described or absent; recommendations are impractical, unsupported, or missing

Scoring:

- **Total Possible Points:** 50
- **Scoring Guidelines:**
 - **46–50:** Exceptional – Strong candidate for acceptance and potential for oral/poster presentation
 - **40–45:** Acceptable – Consider for presentation with minor revisions
 - **30–39:** Marginal – May require substantial revisions or clarification
 - **<30:** Not suitable for acceptance