

The Society for the Advancement of Biology Education (SABER) Abstract Review Rubrics

CONSIDERATIONS SPECIFIC TO EACH PRESENTATION FORMAT
<p>Long talks are 40-minute presentations intended for journal-quality projects that have been completed and are nearing publication. They likely integrate multiple smaller projects and will be of general interest. Abstracts submitted for long talks may be recommended for short talks, roundtables, or poster presentations.</p>
<p>Short talks are 20-minute presentations intended to showcase results that are being prepared for publication. Emphasis is on communicating robust findings (i.e., appropriate and thorough, triangulation of diverse data streams), tried and tested instruments and protocols, and other developed work. Abstracts submitted for short talks may be recommended for roundtables or poster presentations.</p>
<p>Roundtables are one-hour, small-group presentations and discussions on similar research projects. Each presenter has ~10 minutes to present their work, with the remaining time for feedback, suggestions, and larger group discussion from all presenters and non-presenting participants. The short presentations are used as a springboard for interaction, discussion, and critique. Presenters are encouraged to prepare a one-page summary, including focused discussion questions, to share with session attendees. Abstracts submitted for roundtables may be recommended for poster presentations.</p>
<p>Poster presentations are ideal for sharing a new or developing project or gaining specific advice on a particular set of data. Projects that are still early in development are encouraged, including studies with promising, yet minimal, outcomes data; or studies with inconclusive results.</p>

**The Society for the Advancement of Biology Education (SABER) Abstract Review Rubric
SHORT TALKS, POSTERS, & ROUNDTABLES**

Each abstract is evaluated according to the following four main categories. Within each main category, the abstract is given three sub-scores using this guideline: this component is not present/clear at all (**score 0**), this component is only present/clear in passing (**score 1**), this component is present/clear but not complete (**score 2**), or this component is present/clear and complete (**score 3**). This rubric is applicable to mixed methods, qualitative, quantitative, and theoretical studies. Note that space for written comments within each category is provided in the online system.

CATEGORY	QUESTIONS	Not present/clear at all	Only present/clear in passing	Present/clear but not complete	Present/clear and Complete
Research Question or Problem	Is a clear research question and/or educational problem in biology education described?	0	1	2	3
	Is there a sound rationale for the project?	0	1	2	3
	Is a model, theoretical framework, or philosophy of the study adequately described?	0	1	2	3
Research Design	Is the study context and/or literature base clearly described?	0	1	2	3
	Are the research design and methods clearly described?	0	1	2	3
	Are the design and methods appropriate and well-aligned with the research question or problem?	0	1	2	3
Analyses and Interpretations	Are the analyses clearly described?	0	1	2	3
	Are claims supported by evidence and appropriate given the focus of the study and the methods?	0	1	2	3
	Are the analyses at an appropriate level of completeness given the desired presentation format?	0	1	2	3

Contribution	Does the study <i>add to, refine, or refute</i> the literature base in biology education?	0	1	2	3
	Is the study likely to be of <i>general interest</i> to SABER attendees?	0	1	2	3
	Does the study provide <i>clear implications for teaching, learning, or research</i> in biology?	0	1	2	3

**The Society for the Advancement of Biology Education (SABER) Abstract Review Rubric
LONG TALKS**

Each abstract is evaluated according to the following four main categories. Within each main category, the abstract is given three sub-scores using this guideline: this component is not present/clear at all (**score 0**), this component is only present/clear in passing (**score 1**), this component is present/clear but not complete (**score 2**), or this component is present/clear and complete (**score 3**). This rubric is applicable to mixed methods, qualitative, quantitative, and theoretical studies. Note that space for written comments within each category is provided in the online system.

CATEGORY	QUESTIONS	Not present/ clear at all	Only present/ clear in passing	Present/ clear but not complete	Present/ clear and Complete
Scope	Does the project <i>integrate multiple smaller projects</i> ?	0	1	2	3
	Is the research <i>journal-quality</i> and <i>published or close to publication</i> ?	0	1	2	3
	Is the research of <i>broad enough interest</i> to warrant a 40-minute presentation to the entire community?	0	1	2	3
Research Question or Problem	Is a clear <i>research question and/or educational problem</i> in biology education described?	0	1	2	3
	Is there a sound <i>rationale</i> for the project?	0	1	2	3
	Is a <i>model, theoretical framework, or philosophy</i> of the study adequately described?	0	1	2	3
Research Design	Is the study <i>context and/or literature base</i> clearly described?	0	1	2	3
	Are the <i>research design and methods</i> clearly described?	0	1	2	3
	Are the design and methods <i>appropriate and well-aligned</i> with the research question or problem?	0	1	2	3

Analyses and Interpretations	Are the analyses clearly described?	0	1	2	3
	Are claims supported by evidence and appropriate given the focus of the study and the methods?	0	1	2	3
	Are the analyses at an appropriate level of completeness given the desired presentation format?	0	1	2	3
Contribution	Does the study add to, refine, or refute the literature base in biology education?	0	1	2	3
	Is the study likely to be of general interest to SABER attendees?	0	1	2	3
	Does the study provide clear implications for teaching, learning, or research in biology?	0	1	2	3

**The Society for the Advancement of Biology Education (SABER) Abstract Review Rubric
WORKSHOPS**

CATEGORY	QUESTIONS	Not present/ clear at all	Only present/ clear in passing	Present/ clear but not complete	Present/ clear and Complete
Authors/Presenters and qualification statements	Does it include clear statements of the <i>qualifications</i> of the presenters?	0	1	2	3
	Do the presenters have <i>expertise</i> in the area of their presentation?	0	1	2	3
	Is there <i>evidence</i> provided of their expertise (e.g., peer-reviewed publications, presentations at other organizations, Department of University appointments, grants, certificates or licenses, etc.)	0	1	2	3
Abstract	Does the topic have <i>broad appeal</i> to the SABER community?	0	1	2	3
	Does the workshop aim to teach or share usable information and/or tools that are <i>directly applicable to DBER research</i> ?	0	1	2	3
Expected Learning Outcomes	Did they <i>clearly state</i> learning objectives?	0	1	2	3
	Do their activities <i>align</i> with these objectives?	0	1	2	3
	Are their learning objectives written in terms of <i>higher-order thinking skills</i> ?	0	1	2	3
Description of activities with Participant engagement techniques	Does it have a <i>well-articulated description</i> that seems plausible and appropriate to the topic being taught?	0	1	2	3
	Does it incorporate <i>elements of interactivity</i> and use approaches that would facilitate learning?	0	1	2	3
	Does it explicitly communicate ways in which the design will <i>engage participants</i> ?	0	1	2	3