Sigma Theta Tau International – Abstract Rubric
Leadership Connection 2018

	Excellent-5	Good-4	Fair-3	Poor-2	Unacceptable-1
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.	Satisfactory stated title; includes some keywords found in the abstract text.	Poorly stated given the abstract text.	Title appears unrelated to abstract text.
Content Outline	Exceptionally clear, focused, engaging content with relevant and strong supporting detail. Content supports event theme and objectives.	Clear, focused ideas with appropriate detail that relate to the associated event outcomes.	Unclear ideas due to lack of supporting details/ generalizations/off-topic detail in relation to the associated event outcomes.	Purpose and main idea are unclear and cluttered by irrelevant detail. Topics to be covered are listed but not related to the associated event outcomes.	Not present. Lacks a central idea. . Content is not related to event theme or objectives.
Actual Abstract Text	Sentences are clear, effective, and coherent. Abstract flows from one issue to the next. Writing demonstrates an understanding of the relationship among material obtained from all sources. The abstract provides a logical discussion, with substantial details, supporting the overall topic. No spelling errors noted. Dates of data collection identified when appropriate.	Word choice, sentence structure, and tone are successful at communicating the writer's intentions. Content ties information together from all sources. Writing demonstrates an understanding of the relationship among material obtained from all sources. The abstract provides a logical discussion, with adequate details, supporting the overall topic. No spelling errors noted.	Abstract does not demonstrate an understanding of the relationship among material obtained from all sources. Overall arrangement is logical but is occasionally difficult to follow. The abstract provides a logical discussion, with limited details, of the overall topic. One to two 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 spelling errors noted.	Noticeable portions of the abstract fail to convey the writer's point. Does not tie together information. Abstract does not flow. The abstract does not provide a logical discussion of the overall topic. Multiple spelling errors noted throughout. Dates of data collection are not identified.

	Excellent-5	Good-4	Fair-3	Poor-2	Unacceptable-1
Evaluation Process	The evaluation process reflects valid and reliable methods and outcome measures and is clearly expressed. Findings have clear implications for nursing science, patient outcomes, nursing practice, education, administration, leadership, and/or policy making. If this is a poster presentation, rate evaluation as "Excellent" unless a process is discussed.	The evaluation process reflects reliable methods and outcome measures. Findings may have implications for nursing science, patient outcomes, nursing practice, education, administration, leadership, and/or policy making. If this is a poster presentation, rate evaluation as "Excellent" unless a process is discussed.	The evaluation process reflects some reliable methods and outcome measures; however, this is not clearly expressed. Findings have no defined implications for nursing science, patient outcomes, nursing practice, education, administration, leadership, and/or policy making. If this is a poster presentation, rate evaluation as "Excellent" unless a process is discussed.	The evaluation process does not reflect methods or outcome measures or is not clearly expressed. Findings have no defined implications for nursing science, patient outcomes, nursing practice, education, administration, leadership, and/or policy making. If this is a poster presentation, rate evaluation as "Excellent" unless a process is discussed.	The evaluation process is unclear, missing, or inappropriate. If this is a poster presentation, rate evaluation as "Excellent" unless a process is discussed.
Abstract Submission Guidelines for Deidentification 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- number/type	Includes at least six scholarly references (e.g., science journal articles, books). Clear, consistent format (i.e. APA, Harvard, MLA, etc.) with less than one error.	Includes at least five scholarly references (e.g., science journal articles, books). Clear, consistent format (i.e. APA, Harvard, MLA, etc.) with few errors.	Includes at least four scholarly references (e.g., science journal articles, books). Consistent format (i.e. APA, Harvard, MLA, etc.) with errors.	Includes at least three scholarly references (e.g., science journal articles, books). Format is inconsistent and with (i.e. APA, Harvard, MLA, etc.) significant errors.	Absent or fewer than three references. The majority are not scholarly references.
References- appropriateness /timeliness	All references are recent and/or appropriate for the abstract (references should be no older than 5 years, unless they are a seminal work).	Most references are recent and/or appropriate for the abstract (references should be no older than 5 years, unless they are a seminal work).	Some references are recent and/or appropriate for the abstract.	Few references are recent and/or appropriate for the abstract.	Absent or the majority are not appropriate for the abstract.