|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criterion | 1 - Novice | 2 - Acceptable | 3 - Good | 4 - Exemplary | Rating |
| 1 – Introduction | Background is not properly stated | Background is stated but the link is very obscure | Background is stated, but some references can be remotely far from the subject | Background is stated and its link to the objective are completely clear and support the subject |  |
| 1 – Project purpose | The central purpose or goal is unclear | The central purpose becomes clear, but the reader has to work to find it | The central purpose is clear from the start of the abstract, but some sentences can wander off topic | The central purpose of the project is immediately clear and the message remains throughout the abstract |  |
| 1 – Relevance for your session | The summary has no application or immediate interest in the discipline | The abstract suggests an indirect link to the discipline | The abstract describes a direct link to the discipline but the reader has to infer what it is | The abstract describes a direct link to the discipline and clearly describes the relationships |  |
| 2 – Materials and method(s) | Critical terms and method are not defined | Critical terms are not defined and method is not described clearly enough | Method is described but terms are used without being defined | The method is very well described using well-defined critical terms |  |
| 3 – Results | Results are not clear or described | Results are present but few and without quality (analysis, small sample size not taking into account) | Results are present, clear and supported with quantitative quality | Results are present, clear and supported with creativity, good experimental design and clear explanation |  |
| 4 – Discussion | Conclusions are unclear or unsupported by previous results. The project is incomplete or incorrect | Conclusions are present but some are not answering the issue and objectives stated in the introduction | Conclusions are present, clear and supported by previous results. They answer the objectives of the study but are not discussed in the context of existing knowledge | Conclusions and discussion are clear and supported. They are perfectly linked with the objectives of the study and properly insert into existing knowledge |  |
| 5 – Organization | The different parts of the abstract are not written in a logical order | The main idea is understandable but there is a sense of disorder in the flow of the ideas | The abstract is written in a logical way, but occasional detours are made and/or all parts are not presented | The abstract is written logically, the flow of ideas proceeds with smooth transitions |  |
| 6 – Mechanics | English writing lacks practice and quality and prevents a good reading of the abstract | English writing issues occur occasionally and may disrupt the reading | English writing issues may be apparent but only disrupt the reading in a minor way | If English writing issues exist, they are not noticeable and do not distract from reading |  |
| 7 – Overall depth | The project is rudimentary, scattered, incomplete, or does not address complexity or the real world. | The project represents a good amount of work but the abstract is uneven and few connections to published work are made, and / or the analysis is incomplete | The project represents a good amount of work and it is presented in detail. A reasonable number of connections to published work are made but more connections would strengthen the presentation. | The project represents a huge investment of physical and mental work. Connections between the project and published work are rich and deep, and the project represents a true contribution to the field. |  |
| 8 - Comments |  | | | | |
|  |  |  |  | TOTAL POINTS: |  |
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