AOTA INSPIRE 2025 Reviewer Instructions & Scoring Guide

Deadline: July 23, 2024

Instructions for Review
Reviewers are assigned proposals based on the Category selected on the Reviewer Sign-Up form. The review period will be June 25 – July 23, 2024.

Follow the steps to login to the review site from your welcome email, which will be sent when the review period opens. All emails come from noreply-ai@communitybrands.com. To ensure you receive all communication, please be sure to add this email to your approved senders list or have your IT department add it.

If you have any technical issues with the submission site, please email conference@aota.org.

Duplicate Proposals
Please score ALL proposals assigned to you. Some submissions may appear to be duplicates but are submitted with differing session types or formats. Pay close attention to session type and format as you are scoring proposals. If you are assigned a duplicate proposal with identical session type and format, please score and let us know by emailing conference@aota.org with the control numbers and title.

Feedback
Providing feedback is VERY important to submitters. This is the #1 complaint that we receive when a submitter does not meet the cutoff score. Submitters WANT your feedback. They want to know how they can improve their submission. Your work is critical to ensure that we schedule only the best. Please provide constructive feedback that is free of personal bias.

Conflict of Interest
If you have a conflict of interest or do not feel qualified to review a proposal, please answer the Conflict of Interest question as "yes" and then submit the review.

Cut Off Scores
Reviewer scores for each proposal are totaled and all proposals that score at or above the cutoff are considered for scheduling in the Conference program. Program selection will be conducted by a committee comprised of specifically identified volunteers with expertise in the topic areas. Final selection and scheduling of conference proposals is based on a number of factors that help to establish a diverse and balanced program.

- Note: Each proposal is considered based on its own merit, not in comparison to other submissions.

Type	Min. no of reviews	Cutoff Score	Max. Score
General	4	37	45
Research	2	33	45
Technology	2	37	45
CAPs	2	TBD*	55

*CAPs cutoff will be determined based on number of submissions and score range.

Proposal Content
Session Type

- **General –** advance occupational therapy practice, education, or program development.
- **Research –** supports occupational therapy as science-driven and evidence-based, and therefore <u>must include data</u>.
- **Technology –** advanced-level hands on tech labs that highlight service delivery skills featuring actionable technology content for OT practitioners in the field.
- **Critically Acclaimed Paper (CAPs) –** at-a-glance summaries of the findings and methods of individual articles. Accepted CAPs will be presented as posters.

Session Formats
Format varies based on Session Type and requirements differ for each format.

Format	Type			
	General	Research	Technology	CAP
Pre-Conference Institute	✓	✓		
Workshop	✓			
Short Course	✓			
Student	✓			
Tech Lab			✓	
Clinical Application of Research		✓		
Poster	✓	✓		✓

- **Pre-Conference Institute**: 6-hour session held April 2, 2025. A reflective period must be included. NOTE: If you need to cap the attendance at your proposed Institute, please make a note in the abstract. The only Institutes that will be considered for capping are those that have a clearly defined experiential component as a significant piece of the session overall.
- **Workshop**: 3-hour session with reflective period for attendees with comprehensive understanding of subject matter. **Intermediate and Advanced-level content only.**
- **Short Course**: 1-hour session with reflective time for attendees.
- **Student:** 50-minute session geared towards a student-only audience.
- **Tech Lab**: 1-hour session. Tech Lab sessions are a hands-on interactive exploration of high- and low-technology products to enhance client participation in occupations across the lifespan. Each presenter will be provided with one monitor on Floor Stand with Shelf, and HDMI input, and one laptop computer connected to a dedicated wireless network. There will be up to 4 stations where presentations/demonstrations will be occurring <u>simultaneously and continuously</u> during the 60-minute session. Tech Lab sessions are meant to be interactive. Presenters should NOT prepare a lecture component. Attendees will circulate through various stations within the 60-minutes.
- **Clinical Application of Research**: *Research submissions will be grouped together as a Clinical Application of Research panel. Total session length is 60 minutes. Each participant will present for 15 minutes, with 15 additional minutes for facilitated discussion.
- **Poster**: Displayed on an 8' wide x 4' tall bulletin board. Posters will be on display during a designated 2-hour period. Presenters are required to be with their poster for the entire 2-hour block of time.

*AOTA will create all panels. Proposals are submitted as a paper only.

Level of Material

- **Introductory** level is geared to practitioners with little or no knowledge of the subject matter. Focus is on providing general introductory information.

- **Intermediate** level is geared to practitioners with a general working knowledge of current practice trends and literature related to the subject matter. Focus is on increasing knowledge and competent application of the subject matter.
- **Advanced** level is geared to practitioners with a comprehensive understanding of the subject matter based on current theories and standards of practice as well as current literature and research. Focus is on recent advances and trends, and/or research applications. It is expected that a high-level of participation by attendees is encouraged during this session.

Learning Objectives

Learning objectives should be specific and complete the statement: "At the conclusion of this session, participants will be able to...":

Submitters could identify 1 or 2 learning objectives. Pre-Conference Institutes could provide up to 3 objectives.

Abstract Synopsis

A summary of the major points of the abstract and describes how the topic will advance either the practice, professional development of the participant or the field of occupational therapy. If the proposal is accepted, this information will be published in the AOTA Annual Conference & Expo mobile app and MUST be submitted ready for publication.

References

Please consider that references many be formatted incorrectly due to a technical issues with the site. For scoring, purposes, we would like to make sure that submissions include at least two references.

AOTA INSPIRE 2025 Scoring Guidelines for Proposal Reviewers

This document is a sample template and is not intended for proposal review submission. You must complete the online review form in order for your assigned proposals to be properly scored.

Reviewing General Proposals

General Proposals are in the areas of occupational therapy practice, education, or program development. The learning objectives should be clearly stated and relate to improved understanding or application of knowledge relevant to practice and education. The plan of presentation and the synopsis of the content should indicate how the learning objectives will be fulfilled.

<u>Note</u>: Each proposal is considered based on its own merit, not in comparison to other submissions.

Score	Descriptor	Additional Guidance for Scoring
5	Exemplary	Exceptionally strong with few or no weaknesses
4	Good	Strong but with some minor weaknesses
3	Sufficient/Adequate	Strong but with at least one moderate weakness
2	Fair	Some strengths but with some moderate weaknesses
1	Poor	Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses

Scoring Criteria for General Proposals	1	2	3	4	5
1. Topic is timely.					
2. Topic demonstrates relevance to occupation-based practice or occupational therapy.					
3. Topic demonstrates consistency with available literature and evidence.					
4. A clear, reflective component is identified. » *Poster submissions should all score 5/5 as their format allows for reflection.*					
5. Learning objectives are appropriate and clearly stated.					
6. Abstract synopsis articulates purpose and content of presentation.					
7. Level of material is appropriate for the identified target audience					
8. References are current and relevant.					
9. Proposal is coherent.					
Feedback:					

Reviewer comments are important and valued by submitters. Please provide constructive feedback so the submitter may improve the proposal for future submissions.

Reviewing Scientific Research Proposals

Scientific Research proposals support occupational therapy as being science driven and evidence based. Proposals must focus on research projects that will contribute to the occupational therapy body of knowledge, articulate and promote the distinct value of occupational therapy, and demonstrate rigor in design. Priority will be given to the following identified research priorities (AOTF, 2016):

- Health behaviors to prevent and manage chronic conditions
- Functional cognition
- Safety and injury prevention in home, clinical, and community settings
- Technology and environmental supports in home and community
- Development and transitions for individuals and families
- Emotional and physiological influences
- Family and caregiver needs
- Health care experience: Access, care coordination, and utilization

Note: Only completed research will be considered. Research work that is in progress must have preliminary data and preliminary analysis.

Score	Descriptor	Additional Guidance for Scoring
5	Exemplary	Exceptionally strong with few or no weaknesses
4	Good	Strong but with some minor weaknesses
3	Sufficient/Adequate	Strong but with at least one moderate weakness
2	Fair	Some strengths but with some moderate weaknesses
1	Poor	Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses

Scoring for Scientific Research Proposal Scoring Criteria	1	2	3	4	5
1. PURPOSE: Clearly state the purpose of the study and research question(s) and provide the rationale/background. Explain why your research is needed and how your research addresses an important problem or issue in occupational therapy.					
2. DESIGN: Describe the study design (e.g., experimental, quasi-experimental, descriptive, ethnographic, narrative, phenomenological) and the criteria and method(s) used to recruit and select participants or data sources for study (e.g., condition, age, severity level, studies).					
3. METHOD: Describe the instruments or methods used to collect data (e.g., measurement tools, qualitative methods [interview, approach, etc.]) and the analytical methods/analysis procedure.					
4. RESULTS: Summarize findings, and link findings to your research question and analysis.					
5. CONCLUSION: Explain the conclusions you have drawn from your findings, clearly linking them to the research question(s). Include knowledge translation or implementation strategies, if relevant.					
6. Impact Statement: (Maybe stated in Conclusion section) Explain: (1) How is the proposal important to practice, policy, and/or science? OR (2) How likely will it exert a powerful influence on occupational therapy?					
7. Level of material is appropriate for the identified target audience					
8. Supports occupational therapy as being science driven and evidence based by reflecting one or more of the current research priorities.					
9. Proposal is coherent.					
Feedback:					

Reviewer comments are important and valued by submitters. Please provide constructive feedback so the submitter may improve the proposal for future submissions.

Reviewing Technology Proposals

Technology Proposals are advanced-level sessions that highlight science and service delivery skills featuring actionable technology content for OT practitioners in the field. The learning objectives should be clearly stated and relate to improved understanding or application of knowledge relevant to practice and education. The plan of presentation and the synopsis of the content should indicate how the learning objectives will be fulfilled.

Note: Each proposal is considered based on its own merit, not in comparison to other submissions.

Score	Descriptor	Additional Guidance for Scoring
5	Exemplary	Exceptionally strong with few or no weaknesses
4	Good	Strong but with some minor weaknesses
3	Sufficient/Adequate	Strong but with at least one moderate weakness
2	Fair	Some strengths but with some moderate weaknesses
1	Poor	Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses

Scoring Criteria for Technology Proposals	1	2	3	4	5
1. Topic is timely.					
2. Topic demonstrates relevance to occupation-based practice or occupational therapy.					
3. Topic demonstrates consistency with available literature and evidence.					
4. A clear, reflective component is identified. » *Tech Lab submissions should all score 5/5 as their format allows for reflection.*					
5. Learning objectives are appropriate and clearly stated.					
6. Abstract synopsis articulates purpose and content of presentation.					
7. Level of material is appropriate for the identified target audience					
8. References are current and relevant.					
9. Proposal is coherent.					
Feedback:					

Reviewer comments are important and valued by submitters. Please provide constructive feedback so the submitter may improve the proposal for future submissions.

Reviewing Evidence Exchange Critically Appraised Papers

If accepted Critically Appraised Paper (CAP) authors will be invited to present their CAP at a poster session at AOTA INSPIRE. CAP posters will allow opportunities for meaningful dialogue between the CAP authors and conference attendees that can apply the evidence to practice.

- Please reference the CAP Guidelines during your review. Content should directly follow the CAP Guidelines and address the questions posted in the Guidelines. All sources must be appropriately paraphrased and cited. Direct quotes should be avoided. If needed, proper APA format must be used. If you identify plagiarism, make it clear in your feedback. Due to the limitation of a poster layout, please be mindful that there is a predetermined limit on the number of characters in each section. CAP authors are asked to write succinctly and yet without omitting any crucial information from the original article.
- Each CAP will be scored by three reviewers and is considered based on its own merit, not in comparison to other submissions. The Evidence Exchange Administrators will take into consideration reviewer commentary, the average score from reviewers, and the relevancy to occupation-based practice and occupational therapy when making the final decision to accept or reject a proposal. Please provide constructive feedback on each proposal, and keep in mind that submitters will be sent your commentary. CAP authors of the accepted proposal are expected to revise their CAPs based on the feedback from the reviewers prior to printing their posters.
- Please use the following scoring rubric to grade each of the 11 criteria.

Score	Descriptor	Additional Guidance for Scoring
5	Exemplary	Exceptionally strong with few or no weaknesses or inaccuracies
4	Good	Strong but with some minor weaknesses or inaccuracies
3	Sufficient/Adequate	Strong but with at least one moderate weakness or inaccuracies
2	Fair	Some strengths but with some moderate weaknesses or inaccuracies
1	Poor	Very few strengths and numerous major weaknesses or inaccuracies

Scoring Criteria for CAPs Proposals	1	2	3	4	5
1. CLINICAL BOTTOM LINE: Discuss how the evidence can be used to inform and guide occupational therapy practice (i.e., within the scope of traditional or emerging practice) and how practitioners can use the evidence relative to the target population and practice setting.					
2. CLINICAL BOTTOM LINE: Discuss implications in consideration of the strength of the evidence (i.e., type of study design, level of evidence, identified study limitations, internal validity rating).					
3. RESEARCH OBJECTIVE(S), DESIGN TYPE, AND LEVEL OF EVIDENCE (see CAP Guidelines for details)					
4. PARTICIPANT SELECTION: Explain how participants were recruited and selected to participate. List inclusion and exclusion criteria.					
5. INTERVENTION(S) AND CONTROL GROUP(S): List each group (i.e., Group 1, Group 2, etc.). Include brief description of the intervention.					
6. OUTCOME MEASURES: List only measures used in the study that are relevant to occupational therapy. Include the outcome measured and whether it is reliable and valid as well as when the measure is used.					
7. RESULTS: List key findings based on study objectives.					
8. LIMITATIONS: List measurement bias, intervention bias, and other limitations					
9. CONCLUSIONS: State the authors' conclusions related to the research objectives. Provide consistency with Clinical Bottom Line.					
10. Topic demonstrates relevance to occupation-based practice or occupational therapy.					
11. Proposal is coherent and follows APA format.					
Feedback:					

Reviewer comments are important and valued by submitters. Please provide constructive feedback so the submitter may improve the proposal for future submissions.