

SSSPA 2022 Conference POSTERS Scoring Rubric for Undergraduate Students

Instructions:

Look at the scoring rubric (10 questions – see below) and determine what the criteria is and how it is scored. Please use this scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating ‘Weak’ and 5 indicating ‘Excellent’ as follows:

5= Excellent

4= Very good

3 = Good

2= Fair – missing or inadequate information, does not qualify to present at the conference

1= Weak does not meet the expectations in any way, does not qualify to present at the conference

An abstract with a total score of 40 and above by two independent reviewers will be accepted to in the SSSPA 2022 Conference.

Below are 10 items (each worth a maximum of 5 points for a maximum score of 50 total points available):

1) Qualifications of the students’ supervisor:

Does the supervisor have expertise in the topic? Is there evidence provided of their expertise (e.g., peer-reviewed publications, presentations at other organizations, Clinical experience, grants, certificates, or licenses, etc.) The supervisor’s CV must be submitted.

5	The supervisor is an expert and a well-known professional in the presented topic, evident by his publications in the field, and his/her research and academic interests.
4	The supervisor is an expert in the presented topic, evident by his publications in the field, and his/her research and academic interests.
3	The supervisor is knowledgeable in the presented topic, but has limited publications and research and academic interests.
2	
1	

2) Relevance to SSSPA’s conference theme and objectives:

Is the title relevant to the SSSPA 2022 Conference? Does the wording in the title describe the ideas presented in the Conference? Does the title succeed in arousing the reader’s interest?

Reviewer should consider potential audience for the 2022 Conference – what would be of interest to them? Does it bring a perspective that is relevant to current practice?

5	The title and topic are highly related to the SSSPA's theme and objectives. It is outstandingly appealing and interesting to the target audience.
4	The title and topic are moderately related to the SSSPA's theme objectives. It is appealing and interesting to the target audience.
3	The title and topic are neutrally related to the SSSPA's theme and objectives. It is neutrally appealing and interesting to the target audience.
2	The title and topic are slightly related to the SSSPA's theme and objectives. It is slightly appealing and interesting to the target audience.
1	The title and topic are not related to the SSSPA's theme and objectives. It is appealing or interesting to the target audience,

3) Novelty and importance of the topic

Is the topic presented novel in some way? Is the approach or methodology new or different from known approaches? Do the results provide support for a new approach or for changing an accepted approach? Are the ideas presented provocative? Is it based on a strong scientific rationale?

5	The topic is outstandingly novel and important to the current practices, and is strongly supported by scientific evidence.
4	The topic is novel and important to the current practices, and is supported by scientific evidence.
3	The topic is important to the current practices but have been addressed before. It is supported by scientific evidence.
2	The topic is of limited importance to the current practices and have been addressed before. It is supported by limited scientific evidence.
1	The topic is neither novel nor important to the current practices. Scientific evidence is not sufficient.

4) Title

Is the title relevant to the SSSPA 2022 Conference? Does the wording in the title describe the ideas presented in the Conference? Is the title accurately succinct or too lengthy? Does the title succeed in arousing the reader's interest?

5	The title is clear and appropriate, contains necessary descriptors (subjects, independent (IV) and dependent variables (DV)), and allows readers to anticipate design
4	The title is clear and appropriate. Most descriptors are present; identifies problem and experimentation, suggests design but lacks all descriptors
3	The title is clear and appropriate. It Identifies the problem but does not allow the reader to anticipate the design
2	The title is not fully clear. It identifies one descriptor, lacks design information or is misleading.

1	The title is not clear. It is not relevant to the intended study or is missing.
---	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------

5) Clarity of learning objectives

Did they clearly state learning objectives? Do their activities poster align with these objectives?

5	The submission included clear and measurable learning objectives that targets different learning domains (e.g., knowledge, cognitive). The objectives align with the presented information.
4	The submission included clear and measurable learning objectives. It targets only one learning domains. The objectives align with the presented information.
3	The submission included clear learning objectives but some of them are not measurable, and it targets only one learning domains. The objectives align with the presented information.
2	The submission included some vague learning objectives which are not measurable, and it targets only one learning domains. Few objectives align with the presented information.
1	The submission included unclear and unmeasurable learning objectives. The objectives does not align with the presented information.

6) Abstract:

Does the abstract follow the required word count? Does it follow the scientific guidelines for writing the abstract? Does the abstract clearly summarize the aim and outcomes of the study? Does it relate to the presented study?

5	The abstract follows the required word count and is written using the scientific guidelines for abstract writing. It clearly summarizes the elements of the poster (statement of the problem, methods, results, and conclusion). It relates to the presented study, and it sparks the interest of the reader.
4	The abstract follows the required word count and is written using the scientific guidelines for abstract writing. It summarizes most of the elements of the poster (statement of the problem, methods, results, and conclusion). It

	relates to the presented study, and moderately sparks the interest of the reader.
3	The abstract exceeds the required word count and is written using the scientific guidelines for abstract writing. It summarizes most of the elements of the poster (statement of the problem, methods, results, and conclusion). It relates to the presented study, and marginally sparks the interest of the reader.
2	The abstract exceeds or drops below the required word count. It summarizes few elements of the poster (statement of the problem, methods, results, and conclusion). It relates to the presented study, but minimally sparks the interest of the reader.
1	The abstract exceeds or drops below the required word count. It is missing many elements of a scientific abstract. It marginally relates to the presented study, but does not spark the interest of the reader.

7)

8) Research Question/Hypothesis/Statement of the Problem

5	The problem statement is concise, includes descriptor variables and informs the reader of the exact purpose of the study
4	The statement of the problem includes most of the descriptor variables and informs the reader of the exact purpose of the study
3	The statement of the problem includes 1 descriptor variable and informs the reader of the purpose of the study
2	The statement of the problem is unclear and does not include any descriptor variables
1	The statement of the problem is missing or is unclear and unable to be interpreted

9) Description of participants and methods

5	The submission describes the participants number, ages, and any special characteristics. It includes the inclusion criteria, the type of the study, and a description of how their rights were protected. It clearly and thoroughly describes the methodology of conducting the study,
4	The submission specifies most of the descriptors regarding the participants characteristics, inclusion criteria and how their rights were protected. Type of the study is included. Some details are missing or unrelated.
3	The submission specifies most of the descriptors regarding the participants. It fails to identify some sources of data and/or represents information that is disorganized.
2	The submission specifies few descriptors regarding the participants. It fails to identify some sources of data and/or represents information that is disorganized.
1	The submission does not identify the participants characteristics. Information about the methodology is incomplete or unrelated.

10) Writing mechanics and referencing style:

5	The writing follows the scientific writing style, with APA style for in-text citations and referencing. The submission is clear, coherent, and cohesive with no grammatical or spelling mistakes.
4	The writing follows the scientific writing style, with APA style for in-text citations and referencing. The reference list is limited, or some resources are not cited. The submission is clear, coherent, and cohesive with no grammatical or spelling mistakes.
3	The writing follows the scientific writing style with few errors in APA style for in-text citations and referencing. Some resources are not cited, or it included irrelevant articles. The submission is clear, coherent, and cohesive with few grammatical or spelling mistakes.
2	The writing follows the scientific writing style with many errors in APA style for in-text citations and referencing. Many resources are not cited, or it included irrelevant articles. The submission includes some sections that are unclear, incoherent, and/or incohesive with many grammatical or spelling mistakes.
1	The writing does not follow the scientific writing style with major errors in APA style for in-text citations and referencing. Many resources are not cited,

	or it included irrelevant articles. The submission includes many grammatical or spelling mistakes that affects the clarity of the submission.
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Presenter Name: _____

Abstract Title: _____

Criteria	Score (from 5)	Comments
1) Qualifications of the students’ supervisors		
2) Topic and Title		
3) Abstract		
4) Methods/ Description of Activities with Participants Engagement Techniques		
5) Clarity of learning objectives		
6) Abstract		
7) TBA		
8) Research Question/Hypothesis/Statement of the Problem		
9) Description of participants and methods		

10) Writing mechanics and referencing style		
TOTAL SCORE		

Accepted

Not accepted

Reviewers' name:

Date of review: