



Poster Abstract Review Criteria Rubric

Each criterion will be scored from 1 (criteria is not met) to 5 (criteria is exceeded). Abstracts that fail to include all required components will automatically be rejected (either for further editing/clarification/modification or outright). No re-submissions will be allowed.

	Does not adequately address criteria (1)	Addresses criteria with substantial weakness (2)	Adequately addresses criteria (3)	Strongly addresses criteria (4)	Exceeds expectations in addressing criteria (5)
Quality and Relevance	The topic is not relevant, is not current, and/or lacks importance or appropriateness to the field. It does not appear to be of value or a worthwhile poster for ASMCUE attendees.	The topic is only tangentially related to the field and is not current or important to the field and/or to the potential audience. It may not be a worthwhile poster, or its value might be limited to a narrow group.	The topic may not be current, but it is relevant to the field and potential audience. It might be a worthwhile poster for some ASMCUE attendees.	Topic is current, important, and appropriate to the field and potential audience. It appears to be a worthwhile poster. Likely to be a worthwhile poster, possibly for multiple groups.	The topic is current, relevant, groundbreaking, or significant to the field and potential audience. It appears to be a very worthwhile poster. Likely to be a very worthwhile poster for multiple groups.
Innovation and Originality	The topic is not current, innovative, original, or groundbreaking. Attendees are unlikely to gain new knowledge or insights.	The topic may be current, but not particularly original, innovative, or groundbreaking. Attendees may not be likely to gain new knowledge or insights.	The topic is current and fairly original, if not innovative or groundbreaking. Attendees may gain new knowledge and insights.	The topic is current, original, innovative, and groundbreaking for at least some participants. Attendees are likely to gain new knowledge and insights.	The topic is cutting-edge, thought-provoking, innovative, and groundbreaking for many participants. Attendees are very likely to gain new knowledge and insights.
Background	The activity is not described, or the description does not provide any relevant context, and/or the	The activity is not clearly described or lacks sufficient detail; the description provides little relevant context and/or the	The activity is adequately described; the description provides some relevant context	The activity is clearly described; the description provides relevant context and the rationale for the activity	The activity is very clearly described; the description provides all relevant context and the

	rationale for the activity cannot be inferred.	rationale for the activity takes effort to infer.	and/or rationale for the activity can be easily inferred.	is stated or clearly implied.	rationale for the activity is explicitly stated.
Hypothesis Statement	There is a lack of hypothesis statement.	There is a hypothesis statement, but it is not related to the project described and/or is not clearly defined.	The hypothesis statement is adequate.	The hypothesis statement is clearly described and follows precisely from the rationale provided in the background.	The hypothesis is clearly and concisely described. In addition, the hypothesis follows from the rationale provided in the background and is limited to one specific testing variable.
Study Design & Methods	There is a complete lack of methods.	There is a brief explanation of the methods, but not enough information is provided to test the hypothesis and/or provide context for the results.	The methods are adequately described.	The methods provide all relevant information necessary to understand how the hypothesis will be tested and how the results will confirm/reject the hypothesis.	The methods are clearly and concisely described so the reader can easily see how the author is testing their hypothesis and how the results will confirm or reject that hypothesis.
Data supporting effectiveness of strategy	There is a complete lack of data stemming from the hypothesis.	The data provided has some relevance but does not follow from the methods and/or the hypothesis.	The data generated is adequate and stems directly from the hypothesis statement.	The data generated is adequate, stems from the hypothesis, and is sufficient to provide context for a preliminary conclusion.	The data generated is solid, stems from the hypothesis, and is more than sufficient to provide context for a conclusion.
Conclusion	There is complete lack of concluding statement.	The concluding statement is not supported from the data provided and/or does not address the hypothesis.	The concluding statement is adequate – it addresses the hypothesis or stems from the data.	The concluding statement addresses the hypothesis and stems directly from the data provided.	The concluding statement is clearly and concisely written. In addition, it addresses the hypothesis and directly stems from the data provided.
Adoption	For others to adopt this project, it requires very specific equipment or resources that is likely not available or too complex that it requires to many site-specific variables.	This project can be utilized by others, but may require a significant amount of time to implement.	This project can be adapted may not be overly difficult to do so, but may require a significant amount of time to do so.	This project can be implemented right away but some minor variables may need to be adapted.	This project can be implemented right away with very little difficulty.