Scoring Rubric for 2027 Symposium on Educational Excellence Proposal Reviews (All Submission Types)

The Aim of the Symposium is: Advancing Educational Scholarship and Skills in Health Sciences

Posters = poster submissions. Sessions = workshops, snap talks, and panels. Rows marked "All submissions" apply to every proposal; rows marked "Posters only" or "Sessions only" are scored only for that format. Where wording differs by format, it is shown in separate Posters and Sessions bullets.

Categories	Ideal	Exemplary (3)	Meets (2)	Developing (1)
Audience *All submissions*	The proposed topic is geared toward health science education.	The topic is clearly centered on health science education, and the proposal makes the educational focus explicit (e.g., the learners, educators, or educational setting involved). The work would be recognizable and relevant to the health science education community.	The topic is relevant to health science education, but the educational connection is implied or only briefly stated. Reviewers can reasonably infer the fit.	The connection to health science education is unclear, tangential, or absent (e.g., the topic is primarily clinical or laboratory science with no educational angle).
Session Aim(s) *Sessions only*	The proposed submission will help participants: 1. Develop skills in conducting educational scholarship, or 2. Develop an educational skill, or 3. Engage with findings from an educational research project and/or explore implications for educational practice.	The session clearly and explicitly aligns with at least one of the three aims. It is evident what participants will gain and who the intended participants are.	The session aligns with at least one of the three aims, but the alignment must be inferred or the aim is broadly stated.	The session does not clearly align with any of the three aims (e.g., it is mainly informational or promotional, with no skill-building or engagement with scholarship).

Categories	Ideal	Exemplary (3)	Meets (2)	Developing (1)
Purpose and Aims/Objectives *All submissions*	• **Posters:** The purpose and aims are clear, specific, and realistic. • **Sessions:** The learning objectives are clear, specific, and realistic. The topic is relevant and timely.	• **Posters:** The purpose and aims are clear, specific, and realistic for the scope of the project. A specific problem or gap is stated precisely. • **Sessions:** The learning objectives are clear, specific, and realistic for the session length, and state precisely what participants will learn or be able to do. It is evident why the topic matters now.	• **Posters:** The purpose and aims are clear but stated in general terms, or somewhat ambitious for the scope of the project. A problem or gap can be identified. • **Sessions:** The learning objectives are clear but general, or somewhat ambitious for the time available. The intended learning can be identified. Relevance or timeliness is mentioned but not well supported.	• **Posters:** The purpose or aims are missing, vague, or unrealistic, or the problem or gap is unclear or confused with the methods. • **Sessions:** The objectives are missing, vague, or unrealistic, or describe what presenters will cover rather than what participants will learn. Relevance and timeliness are not evident.
Background/Context *All submissions*	The context and background literature are adequately summarized with at least two relevant citations.	The context and literature are summarized accurately and concisely with two or more relevant scholarly citations. The summary goes beyond listing sources: • **Posters:** Show how prior work and the local context lead to the gap or purpose. • **Sessions:** Establish the need for the session and supports its approach.	The context and literature are adequately summarized with at least two relevant citations. The summary is mostly descriptive, and the link to the gap, purpose, or session is implicit.	Fewer than two citations are provided, the citations are not relevant to the topic, or the context and background are missing or unclear.

Categories	Ideal	Exemplary (3)	Meets (2)	Developing (1)
Methods/Approach *All submissions*	• **Posters:** The methods/approaches are clearly described, appropriate, and well-designed for the stated purpose. • **Sessions:** The methods or learning strategies are clearly described and will lead to participants achieving the stated objectives.	The approach is described clearly enough that a reviewer understands what was or will be done. It is well matched to the purpose or objectives and shows thoughtful design. • **Posters:** It describes with whom the work was or will be done and how outcomes are assessed. • **Sessions:** It describes specific activities, discussion, or demonstrations and the time allocation. It fits the format and time, and participants are actively engaged.	The approach is appropriate for the purpose or objectives and generally understandable. • **Posters:** Some details (e.g., participants, measures, or timeline) are missing or brief. • **Sessions:** Details are limited, some objectives are less clearly supported, or engagement is mostly passive.	The approach is unclear, incomplete, or poorly matched to the purpose or objectives. • **Sessions:** It may not fit the format or may not be feasible in the time allotted. A reviewer cannot tell what was or will be done.
Results/Impact *All submissions*	• **Posters:** Results or expected impact of the project are clearly described, plausible, and directly linked to the methods/approach. They lead to sensible conclusions, and it is noted how the work fills a gap in current literature or institutional knowledge. • **Sessions:** The session topic has potential to impact educational work at OHSU or more broadly in health sciences education.	• **Posters:** Results or expected impact are specific and concrete (e.g., data, outcomes, or well-defined anticipated outcomes), plausible, tied explicitly to the methods and purpose, and lead to sensible conclusions. The proposal clearly states how the work fills a gap in the literature or institutional knowledge. • **Sessions:** The proposal clearly describes how the topic could impact educational work at OHSU or more broadly, and is specific about who would benefit and how (e.g., tools, skills, or practices participants can apply).	• **Posters:** Results or expected impact are described and plausible, with a general link to the methods. Conclusions are reasonable, and the contribution to the literature or institutional knowledge is stated but not developed. • **Sessions:** The proposal describes potential impact on educational work at OHSU or in health sciences education, but in general terms. Who benefits and how is not fully specified.	• **Posters:** Results or expected impact are vague, unsupported, implausible, or not connected to the methods, and conclusions do not follow. No contribution to the literature or institutional knowledge is noted. • **Sessions:** The potential impact is not described, is unrealistic, or has little connection to educational work at OHSU or in health sciences education.

Categories	Ideal	Exemplary (3)	Meets (2)	Developing (1)
Discussion/Conclusion *Posters only*	The potential implications, limitations (if applicable), and key takeaways of the work are clearly described. The work is critically examined in the context of existing literature or institutional culture (how it fits into the bigger picture), and future directions or next steps are identified.	Meaningful implications for education practice or scholarship are described, and the work is critically examined in the context of existing literature or institutional culture, including candid limitations (if applicable). Key takeaways follow directly from the results, and specific future directions or next steps are identified.	Implications and key takeaways are described, but the critical examination of the work in context is brief or general. Limitations (if applicable) are omitted or only briefly addressed. Future directions are mentioned but not specific.	Implications or takeaways are missing, unclear, or not supported by the results. There is little or no critical examination of the work in context, and no future directions or next steps are identified.
Diversity, Equity and Inclusion *Sessions only*	The proposal describes plans to incorporate or address DEI principles.	The proposal describes specific, concrete plans to incorporate or address DEI principles, and these are integrated into the content or design of the session (e.g., inclusive content, accessible materials, diverse perspectives, or strategies for equitable participation).	The proposal describes at least one plan to incorporate or address DEI principles, but it is general or added on rather than integrated into the session.	DEI is not addressed, or is mentioned only in a generic statement with no plan for how it will be incorporated.