

Research Award: Contributed Paper Evaluation Form

Date: _____ Evaluator _____
 Paper Title/Number: _____
 Author: _____ Presenter (if different): _____
 Type of Research Author-identified: _____ Evaluator-identified: _____

Circle the number that best describes the degree to which each criterion is met. The rating scale ranges from 5 to 1. (5=very good, 4=good, 3=average, 2=passable, 1=poor) Give only one rating to each criterion. Include remarks about the strengths or limitations of the paper, the overall quality of the paper and the presentation points covered.

Category A: Content (from Written Abstract and Presentation) (55 points) **Very Good** \longleftrightarrow **Poor**

1	Is there a clear hypothesis, research question or study purpose?	5	4	3	2	1
2	Are the environment/setting and population (participants/resources) clearly defined?	5	4	3	2	1
3	Is the abstract clear, logical and well-written?	5	4	3	2	1
4	Is the methodology valid for this type of research question?	5	4	3	2	1
5	Is the research thorough and systematic?	5	4	3	2	1
6	Did the research methods/description as reported test the hypothesis or address the research question?	5	4	3	2	1
7	Do the results accurately reflect the evidence? (appropriate analysis of data)	5	4	3	2	1
8	Can the results be replicated? (reliability)	5	4	3	2	1
9	Does the author draw accurate conclusions? (supported by data, avoiding biases)	5	4	3	2	1
10	Do the conclusions answer the research hypothesis/question?	5	4	3	2	1
11	Does the research respond to an identified gap in the health science information/librarianship body of knowledge?	5	4	3	2	1

After evaluating the abstract, write questions, observations, notes, or additional data that need clarification when attending the paper session.

Category B: Presentation (25 points) **Very Good** \longleftrightarrow **Poor**

12	Is the paper presented in an organized, easily understood manner with a logical flow?	5	4	3	2	1
13	Does the presenter communicate significant knowledge of the research, including being responsive to questions?	5	4	3	2	1
14	How usefully is data represented with visuals (graphs, charts, tables, etc.)?	5	4	3	2	1
15	Does the paper accurately reflect what was summarized in the abstract?	5	4	3	2	1
16	How well did the presenter provide for interested people to get more information? e.g. putting up an e-mail or URL for a long enough time for the audience to write it down.	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

Category C: Implications and Summary (20 points) **Very Good** \longleftrightarrow **Poor**

17	Rate the potential impact of this paper in terms of practical or theoretical application.	5	4	3	2	1
18	Does the presenter reflect upon the results? (expected/unexpected implications)	5	4	3	2	1
19	Does the presenter explain how the results can be generalized to other settings?	5	4	3	2	1
20	Does the presenter plan/recommend future activities?	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

Suggestions for the author: