

Marking sheet for UKCPA awards and conference abstracts (quality improvement / improvement science)

Notes

Scoring

Please score each section of the paper using the scales given to indicate the strength of each section (where the lowest score signifies a very weak section and the highest score signifies a very strong section). Then compile an overall score for each abstract (a sum of all scores). As the overall score is based on the strength of each section, this makes it objectively easier to order the papers at the end.

Award submissions

To streamline abstract submission processes and encourage award submissions, authors are asked to indicate within their submission whether they would also like their abstract to be considered for an appropriate award. Abstract adjudicators do not need to mark these award submissions differently to those submitted for conferences, but the Chair of Adjudicators will identify the award winner from the highest mark given.

Minimum scores for acceptance

For ABSTRACT SUBMISSIONS for CONFERENCES, a minimum score of 21 (out of 35) is required for acceptance.

FOR AWARD SUBMISSIONS, a minimum score of 23 (out of 35) is required in order for a submission to be considered for the award.

Abstract number and title	Context	Problem	Assessment of problem and analysis of causes	Intervention	Strategy for change	Measurement of improvement	Effects of changes	Conclusions	Contribution to field	Writing style & adherence to guidelines	Recommend for oral presentation (if applicable)?	Total score
	Is the setting clearly described? Are the target team and/or the client/patient group that is the focus clearly described?	Is the specific problem or system dysfunction clearly outlined? Is the impact of the problem clearly described?	Is it clear how the cause and extent of the problem was assessed and how staff groups were involved at this stage of initial assessment?	Are the proposed changes to practice needed to make improvements clearly described?	Is the process and timeline for implementing change described?	Is the approach to measuring the effect of change described? Is it clear what analytical methods were used?	Is the impact of changes clearly described? Is it clear if/how this resolved the problem and what benefits have been seen?	Is it clear what lessons were learnt and what could have been done differently? If still in progress, are anticipated challenges clearly noted? Is there a clear take-home message from the experience?	Does the work strengthen the existing evidence base or bring new evidence to the topic? Does the work have an impact on patient safety, care and efficiencies?	Is the language and grammar of an appropriate standard? Is the abstract clear and coherent? Does it conform to the abstract requirements, including anonymity?		
Scoring range ➡		(0-2)	(0-2)	(0-3)	(0-3)	(0-2)	(0-3)	(0-5)	(0-5)	(0-5)	Yes/No	(0-35)

Please provide constructive comments to authors for each abstract. If an abstract is borderline for acceptance, please comment on how you think it may be improved for resubmission.

Abstract number	Abstract title	Comments