UKMi Conference abstract and poster marking	

Definitions to guide marking

Research	**Research is a systematic activity, which uses scientific methods that are appropriate for discovering valid and generalisable knowledge about a particular thing.** Research is carried out for the purpose of contributing to scientific knowledge about the subject.
Evaluation	**Evaluation is a type of research** but is different from pure scientific research by its practical nature. It is the systematic assessment of **the implementation and impact of a project, programme or initiative.** It can be seen as judging the value of something by gathering information about it in a rigorous way for the purposes of making a better-informed decision. The results of evaluation activities can often be useful to others who are considering making the same changes.
Audit	**Audit is an investigation into whether an activity meets explicit standards**, as defined in advance, for the purposes of checking and improving that activity. The knowledge produced is specific to that audit and cannot normally be generalised.
Quality improvement	**Quality improvement** involves the systematic use of methods and tools to try to **continuously improve quality of care and outcomes for patients**. The primary intent is to bring about measurable improvement to a specific aspect of healthcare delivery, often with evidence or theory of what might work but requiring local iterative testing to find the best solution. Many different QI methodologies are available; commonly cited methodologies include the Model for Improvement, Lean, Six Sigma, and Experience-based Co-design. **NHS Scotland's Quality Improvement Hub** has a glossary of commonly used tools in QI. QI work should engage staff and patients by providing them with the opportunity and skills to contribute to improvement work and use data to drive improvement.

Date of First Issue: December 2025
Original version by: UKMi WDWG
This version updated/reviewed by: N/A
Date: December 2025
Page 1 of 7

1. Research including (service) evaluation research

Abstract	Abstract score
General adherence to abstract requirements	
• Word count, font correct, grammatically correct, free from errors. • Authors and organisations named. • Rules around tables and images followed. • Appropriate headings used. • The abstract title should convey the research question being asked.	**/10**
Background	
• How original is the research question? • How significant is the research question? • Does it add to the existing body of knowledge? • Is it applicable to other medicines advice units and/or the wider network?	**/10**
Methodology	
• The aim(s) and objectives are clear and logical. • The methodology is presented clearly. • The methodology is presented in enough detail. • The methodology is appropriate for the research question being asked.	**/10**
Results	
• The results presented address the aim(s) and objectives. • The results are presented clearly. • The results are presented in enough detail. • Appropriate analysis of the results is undertaken.	**/10**
Discussion/conclusions	
• Discussion/conclusions are presented clearly. • Discussion/conclusions relate to the aim(s) and objectives. • Discussion/conclusions reflect the results. • Results discussed in the context of other evidence. • Significance/impact of results are discussed. • Limitations of the research are identified and described. • Recommendations for further research and/or action(s) required are described.	**/10**
Total abstract score	**/50**
Accept abstract for presentation at conference?	**Y/N**

Date of First Issue: December 2025
Original version by: UKMi WDWG
This version updated/reviewed by: N/A
Date: December 2025
Page 2 of 7

Feedback to applicants	
Poster	**Poster score**
Presentation	
• Uses a variety of methods to present information (e.g. text/tables/images/graphs). • Has visual impact (e.g. appropriate use of colour, creative design, not using multiple fonts). • The poster flows logically and is easy for the reader to navigate (e.g. use of headings/subheadings/bullet points, captions under tables/graphs, not cluttered etc.).	**/10**
Content	
• The poster is not a large version of the abstract: additional relevant information is presented. • The content of the poster reflects the content of the abstract. • Enough text for the reader to understand the work that has been done clearly whilst avoiding information overload. • Grammatically correct, free from errors.	**/10**
Total poster score	**/20**
Abstract score + poster score	**/70**

Date of First Issue: December 2025
Original version by: UKMi WDWG
This version updated/reviewed by: N/A
Date: December 2025
Page 3 of 7

2. Audit

Abstract	Abstract score
General adherence to abstract requirements	
• Word count, font correct, grammatically correct, free from errors. • Authors and organisations named. • Rules around tables and images followed. • Appropriate headings used. • The abstract title should convey the audit question being asked.	**/10**
Background	
• How original is the audit question? • How significant is the audit question? • The audit standard(s) is clearly stated.	**/10**
Methodology	
• The aim(s) and objectives are clear and logical. • The methodology is presented clearly. • The methodology is presented in enough detail. • The methodology is appropriate for the audit being undertaken.	**/10**
Results	
• The results presented address the aim(s), objectives and audit standard(s). • The results are presented clearly. • The results are presented in enough detail. • Appropriate analysis of the results is undertaken.	**/10**
Discussion/conclusions	
• Discussion/conclusions are presented clearly. • Discussion/conclusions relate to the aim(s) and objectives. • Discussion/conclusions reflect the results. • Results discussed in the context of other evidence. • Significance/impact of results are discussed. • Limitations of the audit are identified and described. • Recommendations for further research, audit and/or action(s) required are described.	**/10**
Total abstract score	**/50**
Accept abstract for presentation at conference?	**Y/N**

Date of First Issue: December 2025
Original version by: UKMi WDWG
This version updated/reviewed by: N/A
Date: December 2025
Page 4 of 7

Feedback to applicants	
Poster	**Poster score**
Presentation	
• Uses a variety of methods to present information (e.g. text/tables/images/graphs). • Has visual impact (e.g. appropriate use of colour, creative design, not using multiple fonts). • The poster flows logically and is easy for the reader to navigate (e.g. use of headings/subheadings/bullet points, captions under tables/graphs, not cluttered etc.).	**/10**
Content	
• The poster is not a large version of the abstract: additional relevant information is presented. • The content of the poster reflects the content of the abstract. • Enough text for the reader to understand the work that has been done clearly whilst avoiding information overload. • Grammatically correct, free from errors.	**/10**
Total poster score	**/20**
Abstract score + poster score	**/70**

3. Innovation including quality improvement

Abstract	Abstract score
General adherence to abstract requirements	
• Word count, font correct, grammatically correct, free from errors. • Authors and organisations named. • Rules around tables and images followed. • Appropriate headings used. • The abstract title should convey the problem being addressed.	**/10**
Identifying and understanding the problem	
• The problem is clearly outlined and fully understood. • How original is the problem? • How significant is the problem to the organisation/wider healthcare network? • Have relevant stakeholders/experts been involved/engaged in the project?	**/10**
Design and delivery	

• SMART aim(s) for the improvement is included that is;
 	
   o specific (setting, type of organisation(s), target group, what is being improved)
   o measurable (appropriate outcome measure chosen to know whether the change implemented has led to improvement. Might also include process and balancing measures).
   o attainable (feasible, avoiding excess ambition)
   o relevant and a rational solution to the problem
   o time-bound
 	
• The proposed improvement(s) is described clearly.
• The proposed improvement(s) is described in enough detail.
• For QI projects - consistent use of an agreed QI methodology
• Data collection methods are appropriate.
• The results of the proposed improvement(s) are described clearly.
• The results of the proposed improvement(s) are presented in enough detail.
• Appropriate analysis of the results is performed.
	/20

Discussion/conclusions	
1. Discussion/conclusions are presented clearly. 2. Discussion/conclusions relate to the aim(s). 3. Discussion/conclusions reflect the results. 4. Has the proposed improvement(s) been successful? Are adaptations needed? What action is needed going forward? 5. Significance/impact of results are discussed. If successful, can the improvement(s) be applied to other settings? 6. Sustainability of the improvement(s) is discussed. If successful, what steps have been taken to ensure the improvement(s) will continue to be delivered? 7. Limitations of the project are identified, and any challenges described (e.g. staff adherence to new way of working).	**/10**

Date of First Issue: December 2025
Original version by: UKMi WDWG
This version updated/reviewed by: N/A
Date: December 2025
Page 6 of 7

Total abstract score	**/50**
Accept abstract for presentation at conference?	**Y/N**
Feedback to applicants	
Poster	**Poster score**
Presentation	
1. Uses a variety of methods to present information (e.g. text/tables/images/graphs). 2. Has visual impact (e.g. appropriate use of colour, creative design, not using multiple fonts). **3.** The poster flows logically and is easy for the reader to navigate (e.g. use of headings/subheadings/bullet points, captions under tables/graphs, not cluttered etc.).	**/10**
Content	
1. The poster is not a large version of the abstract: additional relevant information is presented. 2. The content of the poster reflects the content of the abstract. 3. Enough text for the reader to understand the work that has been done clearly whilst avoiding information overload. **4.** Grammatically correct, free from errors.	**/10**
Total poster score	**/20**
Abstract score + poster score	**/70**

Date of First Issue: December 2025
Original version by: UKMi WDWG
This version updated/reviewed by: N/A
Date: December 2025
Page 7 of 7