

Abstract Scoring Rubric

I. Purpose/Aim <i>(covers Overview, Aim, Metric(s) to be used to determine impact)</i>
1. Project's alignment with organizational goals is identified and clear (Business Case) <i>(Score reflects knowledge of organization's goals written clearly for the audience. This includes making the business case for the project)</i>
2. Aim statement is provided and complete <i>(Points given for the aim statement, and making sure it is a complete one. No aim statement would result in a score of 0 for this question)</i>
3. Metric identified is clearly defined and appropriate for aim statement <i>(Specify actual metric to be tracked: i.e., average wait time, % reduction in waste, etc.)</i>
4. Project timeframe is provided
5. Key stakeholders are identified <i>(Instead of key stakeholders being identified in intervention, they should be identified here)</i>
II. Tools and Measurement
1. Appropriate tools were used for measuring and identifying current conditions <i>(Pareto charts, cause-and-effect diagrams (fishbone), process maps, control charts, etc.)</i>
2. All tools were used correctly <i>(full points given if tools identified are used correctly – even if they are NOT the correct tools).</i>
3. Interpretation of results for current conditions is complete and correct <i>(an interpretation of results should be given and be correct; points can be deducted if, for example, the team does not interpret a Pareto chart correctly.)</i>
4. Possible (competing) interventions are detailed with chosen intervention identified <i>(Provide some discussion of all various solutions considered and why the final intervention was identified as the one to use)</i>
5. Presentation of results are clear, well-annotated, and free from significant errors <i>(Credit is given for how well results are presented in the abstract; graphs and figures are well annotated; discussion is clear; "free from error" means only minor (and very few) errors are present; that is, errors do not disrupt reading and comprehension of what is being presented)</i>
III. Intervention and Improvement
1. Strategy for implementation of intervention is clearly stated and appropriate for given aim statement (stated purpose) <i>(Discuss the how, who, why, when, what; who will be involved? How will the intervention be implemented, etc.)</i>
2. The intervention was piloted <i>(Provide evidence that the improvement was implemented as a test basis and was correct. Correct piloting would include piloting to people who represent the population of interest, piloting in the correct location(s), impacting the right people)</i>
3. A specific action plan is provided and detailed <i>(As a result of testing and feedback, a specific plan of action for implementing the improvement plan is presented and clear)</i>
4. Plan for communication of intervention plan to key stakeholders is present and reasonable <i>(How will dissemination of the improvement plan be carried out? Is this a good plan and why was it chosen?)</i>
5. Timeline for proposed changes is provided <i>(Why is this time frame is appropriate? Ex. Because of upcoming changes in software – might cause a delay? etc.)</i>
IV. Intervention Results
1. The results are measureable and tied to aim statement <i>(Data should back up stated results; the data should also tie back to the aim statement given. Even if aim not achieved, substantial progress made in achieving aim)</i>
2. Appropriate tools were used to analyze the data collected <i>(Appropriate graphical displays used, if testing is done (hypothesis testing, confidence interval estimation) it is the appropriate test)</i>
3. Results are valid and interpreted correctly <i>(Valid may mean enough data has been collected to be able to make their claim; interpretation of results (graphs, analysis) is correct for the type of tool used.)</i>
4. Plan for continued monitoring and control of improvement is well documented and appropriate <i>(Control charts or other methods for monitoring the process should be given; this may include scheduled evaluation of people, methods)</i>
5. Presentation of results is clear, well-annotated, and free from significant errors <i>(Credit is given for how results are presented in the abstract/poster; graphs, figures are well annotated; discussion is clear; "free from error" means only minor (and very few) errors are present; that is, errors do not disrupt reading and comprehension of what is being presented)</i>
V. Revenue Enhancement/Cost Avoidance/Generalizability
1. Metrics are clearly identified and appropriate <i>(What metric is be used? Dollars saved, cost avoidance, revenue generated; the metric should align with the aim statement given)</i>
2. Data used to demonstrate impact are provided and complete <i>(Data collected from sources to calculate values for the stated metrics (from Finance, for example))</i>
3. Generalization of results is present, clear, and appropriate <i>(Were the results of this intervention implemented in multiple sites? If not, discuss why; points are given for either actually implementing the change in multiple areas, or discuss the plan for implementation in multiple areas. The plan or actual implementation should be appropriate – the populations are identical or similar enough that the intervention makes sense)</i>
4. Discussion of lessons learned is provided <i>(Discuss what worked well, what did not, what would you do differently, for example)</i>
5. Recommendations for future work are clearly identified <i>(Plans for further work should be discussed; this can be very specific or general, but a plan is needed; what other projects? Revision of intervention for new application, etc.)</i>