

1) Teaching & Learning Scholarship and Research Abstracts Evaluation Criteria

This category considers work in teaching and learning scholarship or education research. Abstracts submitted for this category will use an intentional, pre-planned approach with well-articulated objectives, methods, results, and conclusions. Headings for this abstract submission should include title, purpose/objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

The *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)* is the systematic, evidence-based study of teaching and student learning within one's own context using sound methodology, may involve student partnership, and is conducted with the goal of improving practice and sharing results publicly. In other words, it is pragmatic, arising from the classroom and is intended to improve teaching in one's own context, and is shared to both receive feedback for further improvement/innovation and to share lessons learned.

Educational research is a broader field of systematic inquiry into teaching, learning, and educational systems. It often draws on established theories and diverse methodologies to produce findings that extend beyond a single classroom or discipline. In this category submissions may be comprised of scholarly or research questions that focus on justification (did it work?) or clarification (how or why did it work?). In other words, it is more theoretical, with larger-scale formal research design, and is shared to generate generalizable or transferable findings.

Teaching & Learning Scholarship and Research Abstract Judging Rubric (Overall score /25)

Criteria	1	2	3	4	5
Relevance and Importance	The research/ inquiry has little to no relevance to pharmacy education.		The relevance is unclear or only moderately related to pharmacy education.		The research/inquiry is highly relevant and contributes meaningfully to pharmacy education.
Objectives and Purpose	Unclear or missing.		Objectives are vague and not well-defined.		Objectives are clearly & explicitly stated and well-aligned with the focus of the research/ student learning or teaching practice inquiry.
Methods	Methods are unclear or inappropriate.		Methods are satisfactory for the aim of the research/inquiry.		Methods are clearly articulated, strong and appropriate for the aim of the research/inquiry.
Results and Presentation	Results are unclear, do not align with the methods.		Results align with the methods but need clearer presentation OR are not appropriately interpreted.		Results are consistent with the methods, appropriately interpreted, and clearly presented.

Conclusions and Advancement of Knowledge	Conclusions are weak, unsupported, or irrelevant.		Conclusions are warranted based on the results but impact on advancement of knowledge is unclear.		Conclusions are robust and the work advances current educational knowledge or contextual understanding of student learning/teaching practices.
---	---	--	---	--	--

2) Pharmacy Education Initiative Abstracts Evaluation Criteria

Abstracts submitted for this category will describe a purposeful pharmacy education initiative, which is clearly articulated and demonstrates novelty and/or refinement or enhancement of existing instructional methods. Headings for this abstract submission should include title, background, goals, description, and evidence of effectiveness/impact

Submissions are encouraged to include evidence of effectiveness, impact on student learning, or reflection on the teaching approach used (e.g., learning derived from iterative cycles of implementation). However, well-designed descriptive initiatives that are pedagogically sound and/or grounded in educational theory will also be considered. This category also encompasses submissions that report on small scale quality improvement projects or the evaluation of learning and teaching interventions.

Pharmacy Education Initiative Abstract Judging Rubric (Overall score /20)

Criteria	1	2	3	4	5
Relevance & Novelty	The initiative is neither novel nor relevant in pharmacy education.		The initiative is relevant to pharmacy education and somewhat novel or refines existing teaching methods.		The initiative is highly relevant to pharmacy education and describes a novel approach, refines or enhances existing teaching methods.
Description - Background and Goals	The background, goals, and description are unclear or missing key details.		Background and goals are provided but need more clarity.		The background and goals of the initiative are clearly articulated and well-structured.
Description - Approach Taken	The teaching method is not well described or is not pedagogically sound.		The teaching method is described but needs more clarity.		The teaching method is well articulated and is pedagogically sound and/or grounded in educational theory.
Evidence of effectiveness, impact, or reflection on learning	There is little to no information on the initiative's effectiveness or its impact on learning.		Limited information on effectiveness is provided and/or impact is not well described.		Information is clearly provided related to the effectiveness or impact of the initiative and its relationship to learning.

3) Pharmacy Practice Research Evaluation Criteria

Please grade each abstract on the criteria listed below. The scoring criteria shown below are to provide guidance for your review, however, you may wish to report scores in between those indicated below (e.g., 1 out of 4 points awarded for Introduction). Your total score (out of 20 points) will automatically calculate. Once you complete your review, include your recommendation for acceptance of the abstract.

1. INTRODUCTION:

0 = Unclear background and/or rationale for research; purpose is not stated; not cohesive with the rest of the abstract

2 = Somewhat clear background and/or rationale for research; purpose is unclear; somewhat cohesive with the rest of the abstract

4 = Clear background and/or rationale for research; clear statement of purpose; cohesive with the rest of the abstract

2. METHODS:

0 = Unclear data collection/analysis methods; methods are poorly aligned with the purpose/scope of the research

2 = Somewhat clear data collection/analysis methods; methods are satisfactory for the purpose/scope of the research

4 = Very clear data collection/analysis methods; methods are strong and appropriate for the purpose/scope of the research

3. RESULTS:

0 = Results presented do not align with methods AND are not appropriately interpreted

2 = Results align with methods presented but are not appropriately interpreted

4 = Results are fully included and appropriately interpreted; results align strongly with methods presented and are appropriately interpreted

4. INNOVATION / ORIGINALITY:

(Research is prioritized that contributes to medication management knowledge and practice within pharmacy and the health system.)

0 = No contribution to knowledge and/or practice

2 = Some contribution to knowledge and/or practice

4 = Strong or innovative contribution and relevance to knowledge and/or practice

5. OVERALL WRITING STYLE:

0 = Multiple grammatical/spelling errors poorly conveys scope and components of the research

2 = Abstract has minor grammatical/spelling errors, somewhat conveys the scope and components of the research,

4 = Free of grammatical/spelling errors, research scope and components are clearly conveyed

OVERALL SCORE: /20 (*auto-calculates total score - maximum 20*)

4) **Pharmaceutical Sciences Evaluation Criteria**

1. INTRODUCTION:

1 = Unclear background and/or rationale for research; purpose is not stated; not cohesive with the rest of the abstract

3 = Somewhat clear background and/or rationale for research; purpose is unclear; somewhat cohesive with the rest of the abstract

5 = Clear background and/or rationale for research; clear statement of purpose; cohesive with the rest of the abstract

2. METHODS:

1 = Unclear data collection/analysis methods; methods are poorly aligned with the purpose/scope of the research

3 = Somewhat clear data collection/analysis methods; methods are satisfactory for the purpose/scope of the research

5 = Very clear data collection/analysis methods; methods are strong and appropriate for the purpose/scope of the research

3. RESULTS:

1 = Results presented do not align with methods AND are not appropriately interpreted

3 = Results align with methods presented but are not appropriately interpreted

5 = Results are fully included and appropriately interpreted; results align strongly with methods presented and are appropriately interpreted

4. INNOVATION / ORIGINALITY:

(Research is prioritized that contributes to the advancement of knowledge in pharmaceutical sciences)

1 = Not relevant to pharmaceutical sciences and no novel contribution to scientific knowledge

3 = Relevant to pharmaceutical sciences, but limited novel contribution to scientific knowledge

5 = Relevant to pharmaceutical sciences and strong novel contribution to scientific knowledge

5. OVERALL WRITING STYLE:

1 = Multiple grammatical/spelling errors poorly conveys scope and components of the research

3 = Abstract has minor grammatical/spelling errors, somewhat conveys the scope and components of the research,

5 = Free of grammatical/spelling errors, research scope and components are clearly conveyed

OVERALL SCORE: /25