

## Scoring Rubric for AAIDD Conference Proposals

**Abstracts are limited to 600 total words submitted in four fields as described below.** While the system will allow a word or two over this limit, it will not accept notably longer abstracts.

The four sections of the 600-word abstract are:

1. **Background & Purpose/Aims** (150 words)
2. **Description/Design** (250 words)
3. **Outcomes/Findings** (100 words)
4. **Implications & Impact** (100 words)

The desired content for each section and the rubric used to score proposals is presented below. The maximum score for each section is 5 points and in total possible score is 20 points. AAIDD does not provide authors with scores or feedback on their proposals.

### 1. **Background & Purpose/Aims** (150 words, maximum score 5 points)

Explain why the proposed content is significant/important to the field. Describe the purpose or aims of the project, program, policy, or research. Describe the contribution that the project, program, or policy is expected make to the field.

Scoring for this section:

| 5<br>(Exemplary)  | 4<br>(Good) | 3<br>(Sufficient /Adequate)   | 2<br>(Fair) | 1<br>(Poor)   |
|---|-------------|---|-------------|---|
| Clear, succinct, strong, statement about the importance of this policy, practice, or research project/program. Focused, clearly described purpose/aims. |             | Provides sufficient and relevant information to support this policy, practice, or research project/program. Generally described purpose/aims. |             | Unclear why this policy, practice, or research project/program is important. Contains irrelevant information. Lacks clear purpose/aims, or stated purpose is not connected to the background information. |

## 2. Description/Design (250 words, maximum score 5 points)

Provide a clear description of the following:

- For **policy** or advocacy proposals, the issue, actions taken/proposed, stakeholders involved, and other relevant information. If applicable, data driven policy papers should include the data used and analytical procedures.
- For **practice**, program, or project proposals, the program activities, intended recipients, program development (if applicable), and other relevant information.
- For **research** proposals, the study design, participants, procedures, analysis, and other relevant information.

Scoring for this section:

|  | 5<br>(Exemplary)   | 4<br>(Good) | 3<br>(Sufficient /Adequate)  | 2<br>(Fair) | 1<br>(Poor)   |
|--|--|-------------|--|-------------|---|
| <b>Policy</b> or advocacy proposals              | Policy/advocacy described in detail and clearly supports desired outcomes; (if applicable) analysis of data is sophisticated.  |             | Policy/advocacy sufficiently described and would likely support desired outcomes; (if applicable) data analysis is appropriate.  |             | Insufficient description of policy/advocacy; would not logically lead to desired outcomes; (if applicable) data analysis is inappropriate.                                    |
| <b>Practice</b> , program, or project proposals, | Project/ program is grounded in evidence-based best practices; activities described in detail and clearly support desired outcomes.  |             | Project/ program primarily uses evidence – based practices; activities logically connect to desired outcomes.  |             | Project/ program is not evidence based or uses out of date practices; description of activities is insufficient; activities would not logically lead to the desired outcomes. |
| <b>Research</b> proposals                        | Design strongly controls for threats to validity; clearly described sample appropriate given research question; Clear description of steps and methods; analysis is sophisticated. |             | Design somewhat controls for threats to validity; adequately described sample appropriate for question; Sufficient description of steps and methods; analysis is appropriate for research question and data. |             | Design has insufficient controls for threats to validity; insufficient sample or not well described; inadequate description of steps; inappropriate analysis.                 |

### 3. Outcomes/Findings (100 words, maximum score 5 points)

Provide a clear description of the following:

- For **policy** or advocacy proposals, the outcomes of the advocacy effort or policy implementation/change. If applicable, data driven papers should describe the results of the analysis (or hypothesized results) and indicate if results are final, preliminary, or forthcoming.
- For **practice**, program, or project proposals, the outcomes experienced by participants and other relevant stakeholders.
- For **research** proposals, describe study results (or hypothesized results). Indicate if results are final, preliminary, or forthcoming.

Scoring for this section:

|  | 5<br>(Exemplary)   | 4<br>(Good) | 3<br>(Sufficient /Adequate)   | 2<br>(Fair) | 1<br>(Poor)   |
|--|--|-------------|---|-------------|---|
| <b>Policy</b> or advocacy proposals              | Concise and clear presentation which includes specific key outcomes; (if applicable) data results include key statistics/themes. |             | General summary of outcomes; (if applicable) general summary of analytical results without specific (e.g., no statistics reported).                                 |             | Outcomes are not clearly described; (if applicable) data results do not match analysis or aims. |
| <b>Practice</b> , program, or project proposals, | Outcomes/key themes are clearly described using specific assessments and/or evaluation results when applicable.                  |             | General summary of outcomes without specifics (e.g, no assessment or other evaluation results). Preliminary outcomes are promising.                                 |             | The outcomes are not described or are not logically connected to the program activities.        |
| <b>Research</b> proposals                        | Reports final results including specific key descriptive/inferential statistics/ or themes/relationships between themes.         |             | General summary of results without specifics (e.g., no statistics reported, no quotes provided); Preliminary results suggest positive outcomes/ promising findings. |             | The provided results do not match analysis or aims.   |

#### 4. Implications & Impact (100 words, maximum score 5 points)

Describe the potential impact of the outcomes/finding for the field and/or the lives of people with IDD. Identify implications for future research, policy, and/or practice within and/or across multiple contexts (e.g. across systems, cultures, countries). If applicable, convey any linkage to the conference theme (linkage to theme is for information and is not scored).

Scoring for this section:

| 5<br>(Exemplary)   | 4<br>(Good) | 3<br>(Sufficient /Adequate)   | 2<br>(Fair) | 1<br>(Poor)  |
|--|-------------|---|-------------|--|
| Clearly articulates the impact on the field and/or the lives of people with IDD. Explains how work is important or influential and likely to change practice, research, or policy. |             | Statements about the impact on the field is general/vague. Conclusions illustrate how the work has the potential to impact practice, research, or policy, although some linkages are less explicit. |             | Statements about the impact on the field are inappropriate given the outcomes/findings. Impact to research, policy, and practice is not addressed. |