**Use this rubric as a tool to complete the Reviewer Rating Form, which is the only document you need to submit.**

*Start all scoring from a 3 and add or subtract points as you deem the proposal merits. Note that a “5” should only be awarded only if* ***all*** *criteria are met.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1 (minimal)** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5 (maximum)***(Meets all criteria of 3 and additionally…)* |
| **Quality/****Clarity of *Title*** | The title does not provide a clear description of the project or is poorly written. |  | The title is well-written and clearly describes the project. |  | The title concisely describes the project while generating interest in the topic. |
| **Quality/****Clarity of *Abstract*** | The abstract is insufficient, rambling, and/or requires multiple readings to be understood. |  | The abstract is well-written and provides a clear description of the work. |  | The abstract explains the project’s purpose, methods, and (if available) any results/conclusions.For case reports: The abstract clearly and concisely describes a rare or unusual clinical case, describes what was learned from the case, and suggests how this learning can be applied to clinical practice.  |
| **Quality/****Clarity of *Learning Objectives*** | Objectives are vague or presenter-oriented. |  | Objectives are learner-oriented and written in behavioral language. |  | Objectives are also specific, measurable, and written using action verbs (such as “describe” or “explain” rather than “know” or “understand”).  |
| **Importance** | It is not apparent that this project would bring value to other individuals or practices; it may not be relevant to other settings.  |  | The results or methods are relevant to Family Medicine as a discipline and likely to be of interest to other individuals or practices. |  | The project will definitely contribute value to other individuals or practices who attend the presentation. The proposal describes the relevance and importance. |
| **Overall Quality** | The overall quality of the proposal is weaker than other proposals reviewed. |  | The proposal’s format is appropriate; the topic is original and appropriate for a resident research forum; it is relevant to clinical care or residency education. |  | The overall quality of the proposal is stronger than other proposals reviewed. The authors demonstrate a substantial level of expertise and there is a description of efforts to evaluate the project (including methods and results, if applicable). |

**Comments:** After rating a proposal, make comments that provide constructive feedback to the author about how s/he could improve the proposal or presentation. Remember that your comments be shared verbatim with the presenter.