CAEP EDUCATION INNOVATION REVIEWER CRITERIA

	1 – Unacceptable	2 – Poor	3 – Good	4 – Very Good	5 - Excellent
Clear Goals: Problem, goals & objectives outlined, feasible (realistic, achievable) outcomes for success identified	No stated problem, goals or objectives. No definitions of success.	Some vague problem, goal or objective. Difficult to understand.	Stated problem or goal/objective that is feasible, realistic, and achievable.	Clear problem goal, objective that is feasible, realistic, and achievable.	Compelling problem. Well-written and succinct written goal or objective that is feasible, realistic, and achievable.
Adequate Preparation: Describes how project is related to previous literature (research or theory) or, rarely, personal experience	Poor linkage to previous literature/work.	Minimally linked to previous literature/work.	Linkage to previous literature/work is clearly stated.	Clearly connected to a gap or need that is based on previous literature or work.	Compelling gap or need identified and linked to previous literature or work.
Appropriate Methods: Contextually sound methods that are linked to stated goals, objectives and outcomes	Method/innovation is completely inappropriate for the particular problem/goal/objective.	Method/innovation is not a preferred way to tackle the particular problem/goal//objective.	Method/innovation is a potentially useful way to tackle the particular problem/goal//objective.	Method/innovation seems like a very good way to address the particular problem/goal//objective.	Method/innovation would be a novel and much-preferred way to tackle the address the problem/goal//objective.
Significant Results: Presents results of interest for discussion. Ideally, significant, highly impactful or novel results. Suggested framework = Kirkpatrick program evaluation or another similar evaluator framework.	No outcomes or results for reported. OR No one will want to replicate this innovation based on these results.	Poorly stated or vague outcomes/results reported. Few will want to replicate this innovation based on these results.	Acceptability stated outcomes/results reported. Results are meaningful to educators. Others may want to adapt this innovation based on these results.	Well-stated outcomes and/or results that are interesting and impactful for educators broadly. Others may want to replicate this innovation based on these results.	Compelling outcomes and/or results that are interesting and impactful for educators broadly. Others will want to replicate this innovation based on these results.
Reflective Critique: Presents a clear reflection about lessons learned from this project. May go on to suggest future directions and/or link to existing literature.	Shows no reflective capacity or insight into limitations or problems.	States vague non-specific limitations or lessons learned.	Identifies a limitation that provides other insights.	Displays some reflection about implementation problems or limitations, providing others insights into the project.	Provides a clear reflection about the process for making this innovation successful, including both limitations and advice for others.
Effective Presentation: Abstract is written in a way that clearly explains innovation for the general emergency medicine community.	Abstract is awkward, incomplete, or poorly written.	Abstract is clumsily written and has some grammatical issues.	Adequately written. May have some missing info.	Well-constructed abstract.	Compelling and interesting abstract.
Overall Quality	Disorganized, plagiarized*, or not innovative or novel (i.e. everyone already does it!)	May not be a purely novel endeavour (e.g. applies others' innovation to own context).	Interesting and potentially will be implementable in certain educational contexts. May be very context specific, and reviewer anticipates barriers to widespread implementation.	Novel and expands upon current practice in a considerable way. Likely broadly applicable with some slight modifications	Highly innovative and possibly may change the course of EM medical education In Canada. Will be easily implementable to multiple levels of learners and many learning contexts, with very little adaptation.

*Exact word-for-word copying. We don't mean that they haven't already submitted elsewhere or is innovating off of others' work (e.g. external validation of project), that is *possibly* acceptable.