

ATHLETIC TRAINING STUDENT SYMPOSIUM



Abstract Review Rubric:

Critically Appraised Topic

ABSTRACT #: _____

	Basic/Beginning (1)	Emerging (2)	Developing (3)	Accomplished (4)	Exemplary (5)	Notes/ Score
Title/ Clinical Scenario/ Clinical Question	Provides minimal background. Missing two or more parts of a focused clinical question with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons (optional), and outcomes (PICO or PIO format)	Provides minimal background. Missing one part of a focused clinical question with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons (optional), and outcomes (PICO or PIO format)	Provides adequate background. Identifies a focused clinical question with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons (optional), and outcomes (PICO or PIO format)	Provides thorough background. Clearly states the focused clinical question with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons (optional), and outcomes (PICO or PIO format)	Provides thorough background. Explicitly states the focused clinical question with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons (optional), and outcomes (PICO or PIO format)	
Summary of Key Findings/ Clinical Bottom Line/ Strength of Recommendation	Provides a summary of the results and the key findings. Communicates the answer to the focused clinical question. No attempt made to relate the findings to clinical practice. No strength of recommendation identified.	Provides a summary of the results and the key findings. Unclearly communicates the answer to the focused clinical question. Attempts to relate the findings to clinical practice. No strength of recommendation identified	Provides a clear synthesis of the results and summarizes the key findings. Communicates the answer to the focused clinical question and relates the findings to clinical practice. Strength of recommendation may be present	Provides a clear, and relevant synthesis of the results and summarizes the key findings. Clearly communicates the answer to the focused clinical question and clearly relates the findings to clinical practice. Strength of recommendation clearly	Provides a clear, concise, and relevant synthesis of the results and summarizes the key findings. Clearly and concisely communicates the answer to the focused clinical question and clearly relates the findings to clinical practice. Strength of recommendation clearly identified.	
Search Strategy	Missing three or more of the key search strategy pieces: describes the search strategy of peer reviewed evidence, including criteria for inclusion/exclusion, search strategy (databases used), search terms, and number of possible pieces of evidence	Missing two of the key search strategy pieces: describes the search strategy of peer-reviewed evidence, including criteria for inclusion/exclusion, search strategy (databases used), search terms and number of possible pieces of evidence	Missing one of the key search strategy pieces: describes the search strategy of peer-reviewed evidence, including criteria for inclusion/exclusion, search strategy (databases used), search terms, and number of possible pieces of evidence	Describes the search strategy of peer-reviewed evidence including criteria for inclusion/exclusion, search strategy (databases used), search terms, and number of possible pieces of evidence but description is somewhat unclear	Clearly describes the search strategy of peer reviewed evidence including criteria for inclusion/exclusion, search strategy (databases used), search terms, and number of possible pieces of evidence	
Summary of Best Evidence	Provides an incomplete description of the methods used to appraise articles and/or used articles that were not peer reviewed	Provides adequate description of the methods used to appraise the evidence of less than 3 peer-reviewed medical/allied health journal articles	Provides adequate description of the methods used to appraise the evidence of 3-5 peer-reviewed medical/allied health journal articles	Clearly describes the methods used to appraise the evidence of 3-5 peer-reviewed medical/allied health journal articles	Clearly and concisely describes the methods used to appraise the evidence of 3-5 peer-reviewed medical/allied health journal articles.	
Implications for Practice, Education and Future Research	An attempt is made to identify the impact on AT clinical practice, education and/or research	Unclear if findings relate to current knowledge. An attempt is made to identify the impact on AT clinical practice, education and/or research is identified	Findings relate to current knowledge. The impact on AT clinical practice, education and/or research is identified	Findings challenge or build on current knowledge. The impact on AT clinical practice, education, and/or future research is identified	Findings challenge or build on current knowledge. The impact on AT clinical practice, education, and/or future research is clearly identified	
Organization (grammar, syntax, professional, terminology, etc.)	Demonstrates an incorrect understanding of grammar/syntax and fails to use appropriate professional terminology. Does not include citations	Demonstrates a basic understanding of grammar/syntax, fails to use appropriate professional terminology Includes incorrectly formatted citations	Demonstrates an adequate understanding of grammar/syntax and developing use appropriate professional terminology. Includes minimal sources/ correctly formatted citations	Demonstrates a thorough understanding of grammar/syntax and appropriate professional terminology. Includes adequate sources, correctly formatted citations	Demonstrates professional use of appropriate grammar/syntax, and appropriate professional terminology. Includes multiple sources, correctly formatted citations	

Total Score

--

Final Comments/Feedback