**Sigma Abstract Rubric**

| | Excellent-5 | Good-4 | Fair-3 | Poor-2 | Unacceptable-1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Relevancy to Conference Theme** | YES – Abstract is relevant to conference theme. | N/A | N/A | N/A | NO – Abstract is NOT relevant to conference theme. |
| **Abstract Title** | Completed title; includes clear keywords found in the abstract text, provides accurate and clear insight into the content of the abstract. | Completed title; includes keywords found in the abstract text. | Title is fair with some keywords found in the abstract text. | Poorly developed title; includes some keywords found in the abstract text that provide poor insight into the content of the abstract. | Title appears unrelated to abstract text. |
| **Actual Abstract Text** | Abstract demonstrates an understanding of the relationship among material obtained from all sources. The purpose statement is clear and aligns with all other content within the abstract. The abstract provides a logical discussion with substantial details supporting the overall topic. | Writing demonstrates an understanding of some of the relationships among material obtained from all sources. The purpose statement demonstrates some cohesiveness of the content within the abstract. The abstract provides a logical discussion with adequate details supporting the overall topic. | The abstract presents work that is noted to be fair with minimal development. There is some understanding of the relationship among the material obtained from all sources. The purpose statement is fair with some alignment to the content in the abstract. Overall, the text is logical with minimal details supporting the overall topic. | Abstract does not demonstrate an understanding of the relationship among material obtained from all sources. The purpose statement is unclear or does not align with other content within the abstract. Overall arrangement is logical but is occasionally difficult to follow. | Noticeable portions of the abstract fail to convey the writer's point. There is no purpose statement. Does not tie together information in a cohesive manner. |
| | *Oral presentation abstracts need to be completed work.* *PechaKucha, rapid presentation rounds, and poster presentation abstracts do not have to be completed work.* | | | | |
| **Implications to Nursing and Evaluation Process** | The evaluation process reflects valid and reliable methods, outcome measures, and is clearly defined. Findings are clearly outlined and articulated within the abstract text with distinct implications for nursing and midwifery science, patient outcomes, nursing practice, education, administration, leadership, and/or policy making. | The evaluation process generally reflects reliable methods and outcome measures. Findings are mostly outlined and articulated within the abstract text with good correlation to nursing and midwifery science, patient outcomes, nursing practice, education, administration, leadership, and/or policy making. | The evaluation process fairly reflects methods and outcome measures. Findings are loosely outlined and articulated within the abstract text with correlation to nursing and midwifery science, patient outcomes, nursing practice, education, administration, leadership, and/or policy making. | There are gaps in the discussion of methods and outcomes measures and these criteria are not clearly defined. Findings minimally are defined in the text for implications for nursing and midwifery science, patient outcomes, nursing practice, education, administration, leadership, and/or policy making. | The evaluation process is missing or lacks sound and reliable methods and outcome statements. No clear implications identified for nursing and midwifery science, patient outcomes, nursing practice, education, administration, leadership, and/or policy making. |

**Sigma Abstract Rubric**

| | Excellent-5 | Good-4 | Fair-3 | Poor-2 | Unacceptable-1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Abstract Submission Guidelines for De-Identification Followed** | YES – Removed all references to the title and author information on the abstract before completing the submission. | N/A | N/A | N/A | NO – Did not remove all references to the title and author information on the abstract before completing the submission. |
| **References** | Includes at least five scholarly references (e.g., science journal articles, books). Clear, consistent format (i.e., APA, Harvard, MLA, etc.) with less than one error. <u>All</u> references are appropriate and/or recent for the abstract (no older than 5-7 years, unless a seminal work). | Includes at least four scholarly references (e.g., science journal articles, books). Clear, consistent format (i.e., APA, Harvard, MLA, etc.) with few errors. <u>Most</u> references are appropriate and/or recent for the abstract (no older than 5-7 years, unless a seminal work). | Provides 3 to 4 scholarly references (e.g., science journal articles, books). Consistent format (i.e., APA, Harvard, MLA, etc.) with some errors. Some references are appropriate and/or recent for the abstract (no older than 5-7 years, unless a seminal work). | Includes at least three scholarly references (e.g., science journal articles, books). Consistent format (i.e., APA, Harvard, MLA, etc.) with errors. <u>Few</u> references are appropriate and/or recent for the abstract (no older than 5-7 years, unless a seminal work). | Absent or fewer than three references. The majority are not scholarly references. Absent or the majority are not appropriate for the abstract. |
| **Writing Style and Mechanics** | Abstract flows from one issue to the next. Word choice, sentence structure, and tone are successful at communicating the writer's intentions. Sentences are clear, effective, and coherent. No grammar or spelling errors noted. | Abstract generally ties information together from all sources. Word choice, sentence structure, and tone are mostly successful at communicating the writer's intentions. Sentences mostly clear, effective, and coherent with a few grammar issues. No spelling errors noted. | Abstract is understandable with some concern for word choice for audience and topic. Abstract flows fairly. Minimal grammar and spelling errors noted. | Abstract is understandable but is marred by confusing, inappropriate sentences. Word choice is inappropriate for the audience and topic. Abstract does not flow. Some grammar and spelling errors noted. | Abstract does not flow. The abstract does not provide a logical discussion of the overall topic. Multiple grammar and spelling errors noted throughout. |