

# CRITERIA FOR SELECTION FOR POSTER/PRESENTATION Yorkshire and Humber School of Paediatrics Meeting 2017

## CASE REPORT

Abstract Number: \_\_\_\_\_

**Please use the full range of scores available in order to spread the scores i.e. 0,1,2,3,4 and 5. The marks below are examples.**

1. Clear description of case
  - Explanation of case's presentation and progression, highlighting relevant positive and negative findings.
  - Main conclusion clearly stated

0	Completely disorganised. Difficult to comprehend.
1	Messy and poorly explained.
3	Adequate presentation. Fairly clear. Main conclusion not stated.
5	Excellent presentation. Clear, ordered and concise. Includes all important information.

### 2. Originality

0	Well reported case. "Nothing new"
1	Commonly reported event. Of local interest only.
3	Some originality. Previously reported but some unique features.
5	Very interesting. Never been/ rarely reported

### 3. Relevance to clinical practice

- Is it relevant to audience?
- Does it advance understanding of the disease/aetiology?
- Does it have any effect on clinical practice

0	No relevance to audience or clinical practice.
1	Poor relevance to audience with minimal benefit to clinical practice
3	Relevant to audience. Can help shape clinical practice. Doesn't advance understanding of disease
5	Highly relevant to audience. Highly beneficial to clinical practice. Advances understanding of disease

\* Need to achieve a score  $\geq 4$  in each domain to be considered for presentation.

**Total Score (out of 15) \_\_\_\_\_**

# CRITERIA FOR SELECTION FOR POSTER/PRESENTATION

## Personal Experience

Abstract Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Please use the full range of scores available in order to spread the scores i.e. 0,1,2,3,4 and 5. The marks below are examples.

### 1. Clear overview

- clear explanation
- evidence of reflection and learning opportunities

0	Difficult to follow explanation. No reflection
1	Clear explanation but no reflection
3	Good explanation. Some reflection. Learning opportunities touched upon but not in detail
5	Excellent explanation with good reflection. Evidence of learning opportunities that can help change trainee's practice

### 2. Interest

- Is it innovative?
- Is it inspiring?

0	Uninteresting
1	Mild interest
3	Interesting. Some innovation involved. May inspire other trainees
5	Highly interesting and innovative. Inspiring to other trainees as well as consultants

### 3. Relevance

0	No relevance to practice
1	Some relevance to other trainees
3	Relevant to trainees. Audience may learn from this. May influence practice
5	Highly relevant to trainees and consultants with lots of learning points. Will influence/change practice.

\* Need to achieve a score  $\geq 4$  in each domain to be considered for presentation.

**Total Score (out of 15)** \_\_\_\_\_

# CRITERIA FOR SELECTION FOR POSTER/PRESENTATION

## Out of Programme Experience (OOPE)

Abstract Number: \_\_\_\_\_

**Please use the full range of scores available in order to spread the scores i.e. 0,1,2,3,4 and 5. The marks below are examples.**

### 1. Clear overview

- describes expected learning objectives
- describes how OOPE was achieved

0	Messy description with no learning objectives. Unclear how OOPE done
1	Moderate explanation but no learning objectives
3	Good explanation. Learning objectives clearly described. Some idea how OOPE was achieved
5	Excellent explanation with learning objectives clearly stated. Very clear how OOPE was achieved

### 2. Originality/Interest/Relevance

- Is it interesting and original
- Is it relevant to trainees?

0	Uninteresting. Not relevant to trainees
1	Mild interest. Unoriginal. Some relevance to trainees
3	Interesting. Relevant to trainees. Some originality
5	Highly interesting and original. Inspiring to other trainees and consultants.

### 3. Reflection and Achievements during OOPE

- Evidence of reflection
- Achievement during OOPE stated
- Were learning objectives achieved?

0	No reflection. Learning objectives not achieved
1	Minimal reflection. Some learning objectives achieved
3	Good reflection with learning objectives achieved. Some changes to practice done during OOPE
5	Excellent reflection. Made substantial improvements to practice during OOPE and clear explanation of importance of this provided

\* Need to achieve a score  $\geq 4$  in each domain to be considered for presentation.

**Total Score (out of 15)** \_\_\_\_\_

# CRITERIA FOR SELECTION FOR POSTER/PRESENTATION

## Research/Audit

Please use the full range of scores available in order to spread the scores i.e. 0,1,2,3,4 and 5. The marks below are examples.

**Abstract Number:** \_\_\_\_\_

### 1. Introduction and Aims

- Explanation of why study/audit undertaken
- Clearly defined aims
- Originality/Interest

0	Messy and poorly explained. Aims not clearly defined
1	Adequate explanation. Some defined aims. Minimal interest
3	Good explanation of reason study/audit undertaken and aims. Most information included. Of mild interest
5	Excellent explanation. Includes all important information. Original and interesting

### 2. Methodology

- Is study design stated
- Is it sensible
- Can it be replicated

0	Study design poorly explained with many flaws
1	Study design adequately explained. Some flaws noted
3	Good explanation of study design. Sensible and can be replicated
5	Excellent explanation of study design. Original and innovative. Can be replicated

### 3. Conclusion

- Results reflected and conclusion stated
- Advances understanding of study subject / relevant to practice

0	Results and conclusion not stated. Irrelevant and doesn't advance understanding
1	Adequate presentation of results and conclusion. No relevance to practice
3	Good explanation. Results may advance understanding of subject/ change practice
5	Excellent explanation. Interesting results. Very relevant to practice and increases understanding of subject.

\* Need to achieve a score  $\geq 4$  in each domain to be considered for presentation.

**Total Score (out of 15)** \_\_\_\_\_