



CANADIAN HOSPICE PALLIATIVE CARE ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE

Abstract Review and Scoring Criteria

Section 1: Stream and Sub-Theme Alignment		
Does the abstract align with the most appropriate conference streams and sub-themes? REVELVANCE (10 points total)		
Questions	Scoring Criteria	Point Value
Please select the learning stream(s) most suitable for your abstract. You may have a maximum of two learning streams.	Is/Are the selected stream(s) the most appropriate for this abstract? (The primary stream accurately reflects the content of the abstract. If additional streams are selected, they are relevant and appropriate to the topic.) <input type="radio"/> 1 (Poor) <input type="radio"/> 2 (Fair) <input type="radio"/> 3 (Good) <input type="radio"/> 4 (Very Good) <input type="radio"/> 5 (Excellent)	Maximum 5 points
Please select the sub-themes most suitable for your abstract. You may have up to two sub-themes for each stream.	Alignment with selected conference sub-theme(s). (The abstract demonstrates clear relevance to the selected sub-themes within the chosen stream(s).) <input type="radio"/> 1 (Poor) <input type="radio"/> 2 (Fair) <input type="radio"/> 3 (Good) <input type="radio"/> 4 (Very Good) <input type="radio"/> 5 (Excellent)	Maximum 5 points
Section 2: Abstract Quality and Learning Criteria		
Does the abstract clearly define its focus, structure, and approach? QUALITY (30 points total)		
Please provide a description of your abstract that includes the following components. If submitting a panel presentation, describe the overall theme of the panel and how each panelist's contribution will address the topic. Include		Maximum 25 points

<p>panel structure and any shared outcomes or lessons. Description of your abstract must include:</p> <p>Aim / Research Question(s) / Focus – Clearly define the focus of your abstract.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If your abstract falls under Research and Evidence-Based, specify your research question(s) and objectives. • If your abstract falls under Quality Improvement, Innovation, and Lived Experience, describe the purpose, key theme, or challenge your work addresses. • If this is a panel presentation, describe the unifying theme and how each panelist contributes to the topic. <p>Background / Context – Provide relevant background information.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Research and Evidence-Based abstracts, describe the background and rationale for your study. • For Quality Improvement, Innovation, and Lived Experience abstracts, explain the setting, influences, and relevance of your work to practice or community-based initiatives. • For panel presentations, provide background on the 	<p>Clarity & Definition of Aim / Research Question(s) / Focus – Is the purpose of the abstract clearly stated?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Research and Evidence-Based, does it specify a research question? • If Quality Improvement, Innovation, and Lived Experience, does it articulate the purpose, a key theme, or challenge? • If this is a panel presentation, is the unifying theme clear and are individual contributions identified? <p>○ 1 (Poor) ○ 2 (Fair) ○ 3 (Good) ○ 4 (Very Good) ○ 5 (Excellent)</p> <p>Background / Context – Does the abstract provide sufficient background and context?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Research and Evidence-Based, does it explain the study rationale? • If Quality Improvement, Innovation, and Lived Experience, does it describe the setting, influences, and practical relevance? • If this is a panel presentation, does it provide background and explain why the topic benefits from a multi-presenter format? 	
---	---	--

<p>topic and the importance of presenting it through multiple perspectives.</p>	<p>○ 1 (Poor) ○ 2 (Fair) ○ 3 (Good) ○ 4 (Very Good) ○ 5 (Excellent)</p>	
<p>Main Content / Approach – Explain how the work was conducted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Research and Evidence-Based abstracts, describe your methodology (e.g., qualitative, quantitative, mixed methods, etc.). • For Quality Improvement, Innovation, and Lived Experience abstracts, summarize your initiative, experience, or case study, including the process or strategies used. • For panel presentations, explain how the session will be structured (e.g., individual presentations, moderator-led questions, audience Q&A throughout or at the end) and how each speaker will contribute. 	<p>Main Content / Approach – Does the abstract explain how the work was conducted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Research and Evidence-Based, is the methodology clearly explained? • If Quality Improvement, Innovation, and Lived Experience, does the abstract clearly summarize the initiative, experience, or case study, including the process or strategies used? Is the content well-structured and informative? • If this is a panel presentation, is the session structure clearly explained and is each speaker's role clear? <p>○ 1 (Poor) ○ 2 (Fair) ○ 3 (Good) ○ 4 (Very Good) ○ 5 (Excellent)</p>	
<p>Key Findings / Outcomes / Lessons Learned – Summarize the impact of your work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Research and Evidence-Based abstracts, present your results and conclusions (if applicable). • For Quality Improvement, Innovation, and Lived Experience abstracts, 	<p>Key Findings / Outcomes / Lessons Learned</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Research and Evidence-Based abstracts are the results and conclusions (if applicable) clearly presented? • For Quality Improvement, Innovation, and Lived Experience abstracts are the key takeaways, reflections, and impacts on practice, policy, or 	

<p>highlight key takeaways, reflections, and how your work has influenced practice, policy, or community engagement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For panel presentations, describe the expected outcomes of the session or key messages for the audience. 	<p>community engagement clearly described?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For panel presentations: Are the intended session outcomes or key audience messages well-articulated? <p>○ 1 (Poor) ○ 2 (Fair) ○ 3 (Good) ○ 4 (Very Good) ○ 5 (Excellent)</p> <p>Overall Relevance & Impact on Palliative Care – Does the abstract demonstrate relevance to palliative care? Does it contribute to research, quality improvement, innovation, or community engagement?</p> <p>For panel presentations, does the panel format meaningfully enhance the topic’s relevance and engagement?</p> <p>○ 1 (Poor) ○ 2 (Fair) ○ 3 (Good) ○ 4 (Very Good) ○ 5 (Excellent)</p>	
<p>Learning Objectives: What will participants learn from your session?</p> <p>List 2-5 specific and actionable learning objectives that describe what participants will gain. Learning objectives should be clear, measurable, and participant-focused (e.g., “Participants will be able to identify three strategies for improving advance care planning conversations”).</p>	<p>Clearly Defined Learning Objectives – Does the abstract list 2-5 specific and actionable learning objectives? Are they clear, measurable, and relevant to participants?</p> <p>○ 1 (Poor) ○ 2 (Fair) ○ 3 (Good) ○ 4 (Very Good) ○ 5 (Excellent)</p>	Maximum 5 points
<p>Does the abstract contribute meaningfully to hospice palliative care?</p> <p>SIGNIFICANCE (10 points total)</p>		

<p>How does your work contribute to policy, practice, or community engagement?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If your abstract falls under Research and Evidence-Based, describe how your findings can inform policy, future research, or evidence-based practices. • If your abstract falls under Quality Improvement, Innovation, and Lived Experience, explain how your work contributes to quality improvement, clinical or community-based practices, innovation, or lived experiences—even at a local, emerging, or early stage of development. • If submitting a panel presentation, describe how the combined perspectives or planned discussion will contribute to research, practice, or community engagement. 	<p>Significance & Real-World Application</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Research and Evidence-Based abstracts does the abstract explain how the findings can inform policy, future research, or evidence-based practice? • For Quality Improvement, Innovation, and Lived Experience abstracts does it describe how the initiative contributes to clinical or community-based practice, innovation, or lived experience—even at a local or early stage? • For panel presentations does it explain how the combined perspectives or planned discussion will meaningfully contribute to research, practice, or community engagement? <p> <input type="radio"/> 1 (Poor) <input type="radio"/> 2 (Fair) <input type="radio"/> 3 (Good) <input type="radio"/> 4 (Very Good) <input type="radio"/> 5 (Excellent) </p>	<p>Maximum 5 points</p>
<p>Contribution to the Field: Describe how this abstract adds to or reinforces existing knowledge or practice in hospice palliative care.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If your abstract falls under Research and Evidence-Based, explain how your work expands on current research, introduces new findings, or confirms existing best practices. • If your abstract falls under Quality Improvement, Innovation, and Lived Experience, describe how 	<p>Demonstrates a Contribution to the Field</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Research and Evidence-Based abstracts does the work expand on current research, introduce new findings, or reinforce existing best practices in hospice palliative care? • For Quality Improvement, Innovation, and Lived Experience abstracts does the work enhance, innovate, or validate existing approaches in 	<p>Maximum 5 points</p>

<p>your work enhances, innovates, or validates existing approaches in clinical or community-based practice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If submitting a panel presentation, describe how the session as a whole contributes to the field — through diverse perspectives, knowledge sharing, or emerging trends. 	<p>clinical or community-based practice?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For panel presentations does the session contribute to the field through diverse perspectives, knowledge sharing, or emerging trends? <p> <input type="radio"/> 1 (Poor) <input type="radio"/> 2 (Fair) <input type="radio"/> 3 (Good) <input type="radio"/> 4 (Very Good) <input type="radio"/> 5 (Excellent) </p>	
Section 3: Workshop Engagement		
Does the workshop format effectively support participant learning and interdisciplinary collaboration? WORKSHOP-SPECIFIC CRITERIA (10 additional points for workshops only, otherwise N/A)		
<p>For Workshops Only</p> <p>Interdisciplinary, Patient/Family-Centred, and Community Collaboration: Explain how your workshop session will support interdisciplinary collaboration, patient/family-centred care, and/or broader community engagement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This may include team-based approaches, collaborative care models, advocacy efforts, education, professional development, or communication strategies that contribute to hospice palliative care. If your workshop focuses on other key aspects of palliative care (e.g., provider wellness, educational tools, fund development), describe its intended impact. 	<p>Supports Interdisciplinary Collaboration, Patient/Family-Centred Care, or Community Engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the workshop clearly demonstrate how it supports interdisciplinary collaboration, patient/family-centred care, and/or broader community engagement? Does it include team-based models, advocacy, education, professional development, or communication strategies that contribute to hospice palliative care? If focused on other key areas (e.g., provider wellness, educational tools, or fund development), is the intended impact clearly described? <p> <input type="radio"/> 1 (Poor) <input type="radio"/> 2 (Fair) <input type="radio"/> 3 (Good) </p>	<p>Maximum 5 points</p>

	<input type="radio"/> 4 (Very Good) <input type="radio"/> 5 (Excellent) <input type="radio"/> N/A (Not a workshop)	
For Workshops Only Interactive Elements & Audience Engagement: Describe how you will actively engage participants and facilitate meaningful interaction throughout the workshop. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider how you will use discussion, group activities, technology, case studies, role-playing, or other interactive methods to enhance learning. Workshops should integrate adult learning principles, ensuring that engagement happens throughout the session, rather than only at the end. 	Demonstrates a Thoughtful Plan for Audience Engagement & Interaction – Does the workshop incorporate active learning strategies, meaningful participation, and interactive methods (e.g., group activities, technology, case studies, role-playing)? <input type="radio"/> 1 (Poor) <input type="radio"/> 2 (Fair) <input type="radio"/> 3 (Good) <input type="radio"/> 4 (Very Good) <input type="radio"/> 5 (Excellent) <input type="radio"/> N/A (Not a workshop)	Maximum 5 points
Total Possible Score: Oral Presentations: 50 points Posters: 50 points Panels: 50 points Workshops: 60 points		

Cultural Perspectives and Ethical Considerations Review

Knowledge Sharing & Permissions (Not Scored but Must Pass Criteria Review for Acceptance)		
Questions	Scoring Criteria	Point Value
Will your presentation include Indigenous Knowledge, cultural perspectives, or insights from other diverse cultural groups? If yes, the following questions and reviewing criteria apply.	Will the presenter(s) be sharing Indigenous Knowledge, cultural perspectives, or insights from other diverse cultural groups? <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No (If "No," the following scoring questions are not required.)	Not applicable but required for abstract acceptance.

<p>We recognize the importance of including voices with lived experience in discussions that impact them. Does your lived experience, cultural background, or personal identity — or that of your co-presenter(s) — inform your presentation?</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Prefer not to say </p> <p>If applicable, please describe how lived experience, cultural background, or personal identity informs the presentation. (Optional) (300 characters max).</p>	<p>Does the presenter(s) indicate that their lived experience, cultural background, or personal identity informs their presentation?</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Did not specify </p>	<p>Not applicable but required for abstract acceptance.</p>
<p>If your presentation includes insights from Indigenous communities or diverse cultural groups, have you or your co-presenter(s) obtained permission to share this knowledge?</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No (You may be asked to seek permission before acceptance into the conference.) <input type="radio"/> N/A (Select if you or a co-presenter are a member of the Indigenous community or cultural group whose insights are being shared and are speaking from personal lived experience.) </p>	<p>If the abstract involves working with Indigenous communities, has consent or permission been obtained?</p> <p> <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No (Requires follow-up before acceptance.) <input type="radio"/> N/A (Select if presenter(s) are a member of the Indigenous community or cultural group whose insights are being shared and are speaking from personal lived experience.) </p>	<p>Not applicable but required for abstract acceptance.</p>
<p>If yes to the above question, please describe how consent or permission was obtained.</p>	<p>Does the response demonstrate appropriate ethical considerations, including community consultation, consent processes, cultural protocols, and voluntary knowledge-sharing (e.g.,</p>	<p>Not applicable but required for abstract acceptance.</p>

	consultation with Elders, engagement with governance bodies, obtaining written or verbal consent, obtaining institutional ethics approval)? <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Needs clarification (Select if the response is unclear, missing key details, or does not satisfactorily explain how permission was obtained.)	
Ethical Research Compliance: If your abstract involves research, what ethical protocols or guidelines were followed (e.g., TCPS 2 – Chapter 9, OCAP® Principles, institutional ethics board, community-based research processes)? For panel presentations, please describe any ethical processes followed by you or your co-presenter(s) whose content includes research.	Ethical Research Compliance – For research-based abstracts, does the abstract adhere to established ethical research frameworks (e.g., TCPS 2, OCAP® Principles, institutional review board approval)? <input type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Needs clarification (if unclear or missing key information) <input type="radio"/> N/A (if the abstract does not include research)	Not applicable but required for abstract acceptance.
	Reviewer Comments on Knowledge Sharing & Permissions (if applicable) (Optional):	

