CAEP QIPS ABSTRACT REVIEWER CRITERIA

	1 – Unacceptable	2 – Poor	3 – Good	4 – Very good	5 – Excellent
Problem characterization	No characterization of a relevant problem being addressed	Problem information is minimal or vague	Adequate information provided, but not specific	Well-described problem relevant to the practice of emergency medicine	Clinically important problem, stated clearly, and quantified
Project Primary Objective	No aim statement or objective provided or not relevant to quality	Vague, inappropriate, or unrealistic aim statement or objective	Reasonable aim or objective	Good aim statement that is relevant to improving practice but misses some SMART components	Well-written SMART aim statement: Specific, Measurable, Actionable, Realistic, Time-defined or project objective is well defined with relevance to local practice improvement
Measures	No measures/ outcomes tracked or not relevant to quality	Measures/outcomes are stated but inappropriate or unreliable	Measure is well-defined and relevant, but there is only one, or multiple measures but not well-defined or relevant	Well-defined and relevant measures, but missing some components of a "5"	Clearly defined, relevant, and patient-oriented set of measures tracked, including process, outcome, and balancing measures (when relevant)
Project Design	No intervention tested or implemented, or project design not described or not relevant to quality	Flawed design, inadequate for aims or objectives	Basic pre/post design, not measured as multiple points over time, or basic project design with some notable flaws	Multiple tests of change, but without clear use of QI methodology or without evidence of refinement or reflection between changes	Exemplary use of QI methodology to plan and test changes, with multiple changes tested over time
Evaluation/Results	No evaluation provided or not relevant to quality	Evaluation performed, but flawed or inadequate	Data are presented clearly but overly simplistic, as before/after or descriptive	Data are clearly presented and appropriately analyzed (run or SPC chart for QI)	Exemplary data presentation and evaluation using appropriate methods (run or SPC charts for QI)
Interpretation and Impact	No clear interpretation or meaningful impact	Vague and incomplete interpretation and description of impact	Basic interpretation with limited impact	Solid interpretation with good potential for impact and learning for other EDs	Strong interpretation with high potential for impact and relevance to other EDs

Overall impression	☐ Very weak project, no results, or not relevant to quality. Definitely reject.	☐ Weak project or unlikely to interest attendees. Probably should be rejected.	☐ Solid project of reasonable interest. Could be a poster presentation.	☐ Very good project likely to be of interest to attendees. Could be offered a *moderated* poster presentation.	☐ Excellent project and excellent example of QI methods or other relevant methods, likely to be of high interest to attendees. Could be offered an *oral* presentation.
Additional comments	Are there particular strengths or concerns about this abstract?				

Preamble

The Quality Improvement and Patient Safety track is meant for projects that have the primary purpose of improving local emergency medicine practice or optimizing patient safety.

The QIPS track is designed to foster the scholarly dissemination of projects that aim to improve or innovate on the care provided to patients, on a local or broader level. The focus of the projects can be any or all of the domains of healthcare quality (i.e. safety, timeliness, efficiency, efficacy, equitability, patient-centredness). Projects submitted within this abstract tract should utilizethe science of quality improvement (e.g., Ishikawa or process mapping analyses, PDSA cycles, repeated data sampling). Data analysis that uses techniques such as SPC or run charts will be given higher consideration. Projects that used sound design and implementation but that were not successful (i.e. 'negative' projects) will still be given just as much credit, as there is tremendous value in learning from what has not worked in other similar settings. Projects with an objective of building understanding of a local program, for the purpose of planning improvement efforts, may also be considered when the findings provide a compelling learning opportunity.