CAEP EDUCATION INNOVATION REVIEWER CRITERIA

	1 – Unacceptable	2 – Poor	3 – Good	4 – Very Good	5 - Excellent
Clear Goals: Problem, goals & objectives outlined, with feasible (realistic, achievable) intended outcomes identified	No stated problem, goals or objectives, or intended outcomes.	Problem or objectives are vague, unclear, or poorly aligned; intended outcomes are unclear or unrealistic.	Problem and goals/objectives are adequately stated and feasible; intended outcomes are identifiable.	Problem, objectives, and intended outcomes are clear, feasible, and well aligned.	A compelling educational problem is clearly articulated, with focused, feasible objectives and meaningful, well-aligned intended outcomes.
Adequate Preparation: Describes how the innovation is related to previous literature (research or educational theory) or, rarely, personal experience	Poor linkage to previous literature/work.	Minimally linked to previous literature/work.	Linkage to previous literature/work/theory is clearly stated.	Clearly connected to a gap or need that is based on previous literature or work and informed by educational theory or conceptual frameworks, as appropriate.	Compelling educational gap or need for the innovation is clearly identified and situated within relevant literature, prior work, and/or educational theory or conceptual frameworks, as appropriate. The rationale for the innovation is strong and clearly articulated.
Appropriate Methods: Contextually sound methods for innovation implementation and evaluation that are linked to stated goals, objectives and outcomes	Implementation and/or evaluation methods are inappropriate or insufficiently described to assess the innovation.	Methods have substantial limitations or are poorly aligned with the stated objectives, context, or outcomes.	Methods are generally appropriate and sufficiently aligned with the objectives and intended outcomes.	Implementation and evaluation methods are clearly described, appropriate to the context, and well aligned with the objectives and outcomes.	Implementation and evaluation methods are exceptionally well conceived, contextually appropriate, and coherently aligned with the problem, objectives, and intended outcomes.
Evaluation & Results: Presents evaluation results for discussion. Ideally, rigorous and educationally meaningful evaluation findings, which may include positive, negative, or unexpected outcomes. Evaluation should use an approach appropriate to the innovation, its objectives, intended outcomes, and stage of development (e.g., Kirkpatrick, CIPP, logic model, or another recognized program evaluation framework). Higher outcome levels are not required for a high score.	No outcomes or evaluation results are reported.	Poorly reported or vague outcomes/evaluation results. Few will want to adapt this innovation based on these results.	Results of evaluation are clearly reported and meaningful to educators. Others may want to adapt this innovation based on these results.	Well-stated outcomes and/or evaluation results that are interesting and impactful for educators broadly. Others will want to adapt this innovation based on these results.	Evaluation is rigorous and well aligned with the objectives, producing compelling and educationally meaningful findings that advance understanding of the innovation, including positive, negative, or unexpected outcomes.
Reflective Critique: Presents a clear reflection about lessons learned from implementing and evaluating this innovation. May go on to suggest future directions and/or link to existing literature.	No meaningful reflection on the innovation, its implementation, evaluation, or limitations.	Superficial or nonspecific acknowledgement of limitations or lessons learned, with little critical reflection.	Identifies relevant limitations and lessons learned, with some consideration of their implications for the innovation.	Provides thoughtful critical reflection on implementation and evaluation, including meaningful limitations, lessons learned, and implications for future use or	Provides insightful and balanced critical reflection demonstrating how implementation experience and evaluation findings informed understanding of the innovation, its limitations, and opportunities for

				adaptation.	refinement, adaptation, or future work.
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.	Exceptionally clear, concise, coherent, and engaging abstract that communicates the innovation effectively to the emergency medicine community.
Overall Contribution	Disorganized, plagiarized*, or provides little identifiable educational contribution (e.g., everyone already does it), or is inadequately developed to support meaningful application.	Limited contribution beyond the immediate context, with substantial barriers to adaptation or application elsewhere.	Provides a meaningful educational contribution with potential relevance or adaptability to other learners, settings, or contexts.	Makes a strong and innovative contribution to education and offers insights or approaches that could be meaningfully adapted across other settings or learner groups.	Makes an exceptional educational contribution, substantially advancing current practice or thinking, with strong potential to inform, inspire, or be adapted within emergency medicine education more broadly.

*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.