

American Psychiatric Association Annual Meeting Rubric for the General Sessions

Key:

- 5: Outstanding
- 4: Very good
- 3: Good/satisfactory
- 2: Marginal/unclear
- 1: Poor

Do you have a conflict of interest with this abstract? E.g., a co-author, author is from your institution

Yes No

DOMAIN	5	4	3	2	1
<p>Quality of Abstract Structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing quality • Organization of abstract • Quality references based on current evidence • Session Agenda 	<p>OUTSTANDING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceptionally well-written, clarity of writing is excellent, well-organized, grammatically correct, detailed without being excessively lengthy • Clear, logical presentation of ideas • 3 or more excellent references published within the past 5 years, or considered seminal articles • Clear well-structured agenda aligned with abstract 	<p>VERY GOOD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity of writing is very good, structured, minimal grammatical errors, Sufficiently detailed without being excessively lengthy • 3 or more pertinent references published within the past 5 years • Very good session agenda 	<p>GOOD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity of writing is satisfactory, organized, occasional grammatical errors, adequate level of detail • 3 references published within the past 5 years • Satisfactory session agenda 	<p>FAIR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity of writing is lacking, suboptimal organization, some grammatical errors, either excessive or insufficient detail • 3 references, poor quality, non-peer reviewed (e.g., website links) or older than 5 years • Rudimentary session agenda 	<p>POOR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing is poor, disorganized, multiple grammatical errors present, contains either excessive or insufficient detail • Unable to understand meaning • Fewer than three, inadequate and/or no references, non-peer reviewed (e.g., website links) or older than 5 years, questionable relevance to abstract • Poor or missing session agenda
<p>Quality of Submission Content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing clarity and professionalism 	<p>OUTSTANDING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission contains clear learning objectives, a 	<p>VERY GOOD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission contains clear learning objectives, a thorough 	<p>GOOD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission contains learning objectives, review of 	<p>FAIR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission may or may not contain learning 	<p>POOR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission lacks learning objectives, its review of

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logical organization and flow • Clear alignment with session agenda • Consistency with stated learning objectives • Appropriate use of Bloom's Taxonomy 	<p>thorough and well-considered review of existing data/evidence and understandable rationale.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall submission content plainly helps to expand existing knowledge and/or promote new viewpoints. • When relevant, it involves well-designed and well-executed research, whose findings and significance to the field are fully explained. • Adherence to Bloom's taxonomy. 	<p>review of existing evidence/ data and understandable rationale.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall submission content should help to expand existing knowledge or promote new viewpoints. • When relevant, it entails well-planned and executed research, whose findings and significance to the field are shared. 	<p>existing data/evidence, as well as understandable rationale.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall submission may help to expand existing knowledge or less likely, new viewpoints. • When relevant, it involves the presentation of research that includes some discussion of its findings and relevance to the field. 	<p>objectives, review of existing data/evidence seems to be limited, and underlying rationale is not fully clear.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall submission might help to expand existing knowledge but is lacking in its ability to promote new viewpoints. • When relevant, it involves presentation of research that has some weaknesses in design or execution, and discussion of findings lacks clarity about their relevance to the field. • When relevant, the submission lacks novelty and uncertain whether it adds to 	<p>relevant evidence/data is superficial, and underlying rationale is weak.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall submission content does not expand existing knowledge nor foster new viewpoints. • When relevant, involves presentation of research that is inadequately designed and executed, and discussion of findings fails to address their relevance to the field • Fails to add to existing approaches, treatments, or concepts.
--	---	---	---	--	--

				current approaches, treatments, or concepts.	
<p>Quality / Creativity of Teaching Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion and clarity of proposed teaching methods • Degree of active learning (e.g., breakout groups, polling, case-based learning) • Creativity or use of innovative/novel approaches • Allocation of time for audience engagement and discussion • Likelihood that teaching methods and faculty will achieve stated learning objectives 	<p>OUTSTANDING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed teaching methods are included in the submission and may involve a limited amount of lecture-based, passive learning, but the majority of time will involve active learning, such as breakout groups, role-playing, audience polling, peer teaching, or problem/case-based learning, or cutting-edge/novel approaches. • Adequate time has been set aside during and at the end to allow for audience questions and discussion, efforts are made to foster audience engagement. • Appears highly likely that proposed teaching methods and faculty will achieve stated learning objectives. 	<p>VERY GOOD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed teaching methods are included in the submission and may involve a limited amount of lecture-based, passive learning but a significant proportion of time will use active learning, such as breakout groups, role-playing, audience polling, peer teaching, or problem/case-based learning. • Adequate time has been set aside during and at the end to allow for audience questions and discussion. 	<p>GOOD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed teaching methods are included in the submission and partly involve traditional lecture-based, passive learning but also involve some active learning, such as audience polling, breakout groups, role-playing, peer teaching, or problem/case-based learning. • An adequate amount of time is being set aside at the end to permit audience questions and discussion. • Appears likely that the proposed teaching methods and faculty will meet the stated learning objectives. 	<p>FAIR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed teaching methods may or may not be included in the submission. Mostly relies on traditionally structured, lecture-based, passive learning approaches. • A limited amount of time has been set aside at the end to permit audience questions and discussion. • Overall appears questionable as to whether the teaching methods and faculty will meet stated learning objectives. 	<p>POOR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed teaching methods are lacking in the submission and only appear to involve traditionally structured, lecture-based, passive learning approaches. • Minimal time has been set aside at the end to permit audience questions and discussion. • Appears very unlikely that the teaching methods and faculty will meet stated learning objectives.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appears very likely that proposed teaching methods and faculty will achieve stated learning objectives. 			
<p>Relevance to psychiatric practice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribution to knowledge • Contribution to practice of psychiatry • Novelty and/or value added (impact / innovation) 	<p>OUTSTANDING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceptional, highly original contribution that significantly advances thinking or practice • Submission introduces highly original insights or a compelling, integrative contribution that significantly advances thinking or practice within the field 	<p>VERY GOOD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear originality or meaningful extension, reframing, or application of existing ideas that adds substantial value to the field 	<p>GOOD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some original thinking or thoughtful synthesis that modestly enhances the thinking, understanding, or practice within the field 	<p>FAIR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic engagement with existing work but offers minimal new insight, perspective, or extension of thinking or practice within the field 	<p>POOR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reiterates existing ideas with little evidence of originality, synthesis, or added value to the thinking or practice within the field
<p>Timeliness & Strategic Relevance of topic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment with emerging research and scientific advances • Responsiveness to regulatory changes (e.g., new CMS codes, FDA approvals) • Contextual stressors (environmental, conflict, displacement) • Practice landscape 	<p>OUTSTANDING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Topic is extremely timely and anticipates near-term shifts in the field • Clearly aligned with emerging research, recent scientific advances, and evolving clinical frameworks • Demonstrates awareness of new regulatory developments (e.g., CMS codes, FDA approvals) and 	<p>VERY GOOD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Topic is timely and well aligned with recent scientific literature and clinical developments. • References relevant regulatory or policy changes where applicable • Demonstrates awareness of broader contextual 	<p>GOOD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Topic is relevant to current practice but may not fully reflect the most recent research, regulatory updates, or emerging contextual factors • Some linkage to practice landscape is present but not fully developed 	<p>FAIR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Topic addresses established or ongoing issues but lacks clear connection to recent scientific advances, regulatory changes or evolving contextual stressors • Limited demonstration of contemporary relevance 	<p>POOR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Topic appears outdated, disconnected from emerging research or regulatory developments • Does not reflect current contextual stressors or the evolving practice landscape • Limited relevance to present-day clinical care

	<p>integrates relevant contextual stressors into the discussion. Directly applicable to the current and future landscape</p>	<p>stressors influencing patient care.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly relevant to contemporary practice 		<p>to the current practice environment</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

Do you have conflicts of interest? (e.g., personal/professional relationship with an author; shared institutional affiliation)

Yes No

If you answered yes, please explain in the comments below
