

Preconference Workshop Proposal Review Process and Rubric

2027 Call for Podium and Poster Abstracts and Preconference Workshop Proposals

Preconference workshops provide focused, interactive learning opportunities that enhance the Annual Assembly experience. Held before the main conference, these sessions allow participants to deepen their knowledge, build practical skills, and engage closely with expert faculty and peers on key topics in hospice and palliative care. Each preconference should present a distinct, well-defined focus that complements, rather than duplicates, the core conference programming, offering unique value and minimizing overlap with other preconference sessions.

The Review Process

The Annual Assembly Planning Committee will review and accept preconference workshop proposals.

Scoring Criteria

The Planning Committee will assess proposals using seven criteria, each rated on Likert Scale (1-5), with a maximum score of 35 points.

1. Clarity, Organization, and Adherence to Submission Guidelines

Is the proposal clear, well-organized, and compliant with submission guidelines?

Scoring Criteria (Five Points Possible):

1. Poor: Lacks clarity, is disorganized, or does not follow submission guidelines.
2. Fair: Some components are clear, but proposal is poorly organized, vague, or has significant formatting/content omissions.
3. Average: Generally understandable and follows basic guidelines, but lacks polish, specificity, or cohesion.
4. Good: Clear, well-organized, sufficiently detailed, and mostly adheres to submission guidelines.
5. Excellent: Exceptionally clear, well-structured, detailed, and fully compliant with all submission requirements.

2. Depth and Scope

Does the proposal demonstrate sufficient content, depth, and scope to meaningfully fill the proposed workshop duration?

Scoring Criteria (Five Points Possible):

1. Poor: Content is too limited, superficial, or narrow to justify a half-day or full-day workshop.
2. Fair: Topic has potential but content appears underdeveloped or repetitive for the proposed duration.
3. Average: Adequate content for the proposed length but pacing, depth, or expansion plans are not well articulated.
4. Good: Clearly demonstrates enough high-quality content, activities, and learning progression to fill the proposed time.
5. Excellent: Robust, thoughtfully sequenced content with appropriate depth, variety, and instructional design that fully justifies and optimizes the proposed workshop length.

3. Relevance and Demand

Is the topic timely, relevant, and appealing enough to attract and sustain participant interest?

Scoring Criteria (Five Points Possible):

1. Poor: Topic has limited relevance or appeal to the target audience; low likelihood of filling seats.
2. Fair: Topic is niche or weakly connected to current learner needs; moderate concern about attendance.
3. Average: Topic is relevant but broadly framed; likely to attract a limited or specific audience.
4. Good: Topic aligns well with current challenges, priorities, or interests in hospice and palliative care and is likely to draw strong participation.
5. Excellent: Highly compelling, timely, and high-interest topic with strong potential to fill the workshop and generate sustained engagement.

4. Evidence Based Content and Educational Rigor

Are the workshop's content, methods, and recommendations grounded in current evidence, best practices, or established frameworks?

Scoring Criteria (Five Points Possible):

1. Poor: Content lacks credible evidence, rationale, or educational rigor.
2. Fair: Some evidence or best practices are referenced, but support is incomplete, dated, or unclear.

3. Average: Appropriate evidence is included, but depth, synthesis, or critical analysis is limited.
4. Good: Content is clearly informed by current evidence and best practices, with reasonable integration into learning activities.
5. Excellent: Demonstrates strong educational rigor with thoughtful, balanced use of current evidence, frameworks, and alternative perspectives.

5. Educational Design and Learner Engagement Strategy

Does the proposal outline effective adult learning strategies and opportunities for active engagement?

Scoring Criteria (Five Points Possible):

1. Poor: Relies almost entirely on lecture with minimal or no learner engagement.
2. Fair: Includes limited engagement strategies but lacks intentional instructional design.
3. Average: Incorporates some interactive elements, though alignment with learning goals is inconsistent.
4. Good: Uses multiple adult learning strategies (e.g., case-based learning, discussion, skill practice) that support stated objectives.
5. Excellent: Exceptionally well-designed interactive experience with purposeful engagement strategies that enhance learning, skill acquisition, and reflection.

6. Contribution to Learner Competence, Performance, and/or Professional Development

Does the workshop clearly articulate meaningful takeaways that can be applied to practice, leadership, or educational improvement?

Scoring Criteria (Five Points Possible):

1. Poor: Little to no clear benefit to learner competence, performance, or professional development.
2. Fair: Some potential benefit, but learning outcomes or applications are vague or weakly defined.
3. Average: Reasonable potential for learner growth, though implementation or impact is not fully articulated.
4. Good: Clear, practical contributions to learner competence, performance, or professional development.
5. Excellent: Strong, actionable outcomes with high potential to meaningfully impact practice, leadership, education, or professional growth.

7. Overall Merit Score

How strongly would you recommend this proposal be included as a preconference workshop?

This score reflects the reviewer's holistic assessment of the proposal and serves as a tiebreaker when proposals receive similar total scores.

Scoring Criteria (Five Points Possible):

1. Poor: Significant weaknesses across multiple areas; do not recommend acceptance.
2. Fair: Some strengths, but overall quality or feasibility is insufficient for a preconference workshop.
3. Average: Acceptable proposal; would consider if space allows but lacks distinction.
4. Good: Strong proposal aligned with conference goals; likely to be valuable and well-attended.
5. Excellent: Exceptional proposal with strong content, demand, and educational design; should be prioritized for inclusion.

Program Alignment Criteria Rubric

In addition to the scored review rubric, reviewers assess a set of Program Alignment Criteria that help shape the overall structure, balance, and educational flow of the Annual Assembly. While these criteria do not factor into an abstract's acceptance score, they play an important role in informing session placement, audience alignment, and integration with overarching conference priorities.

1. Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion

The abstract includes diverse representation with a focus on historically minoritized and marginalized populations and/or is anchored in principles of justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion (JEDI).

Scoring Options: Yes or No

2. Interdisciplinary Collaboration

The abstract integrates interprofessional/multidisciplinary collaboration with a meaningful impact on hospice and palliative practice, team-based care, and/or professional development.

ANNUAL
ASSEMBLY

HOSPICE & PALLIATIVE CARE
Pittsburgh, PA • March 17-20, 2027



Scoring Options: Yes or No