

## WORKSHOP PEER REVIEW RUBRIC

### To what extent are the learning objectives clearly stated and specific?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The learning objectives do not clearly define what specific skills the learner will develop during the workshop.		The learning objectives are somewhat clear and/or specific.		The learning objectives are mostly clear and/or specific.		The learning objectives clearly identify what specific skills the learner will develop during the workshop.

### To what extent does the workshop address the learning objectives?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Workshop does not effectively address stated learning objectives		Workshop addresses only some of the stated learning objectives		Workshop addresses most of the stated learning objectives		Workshop clearly addresses each of the stated learning objectives

### To what extent does the workshop use active learning methods?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Workshop utilizes mostly passive learning strategies		Workshop utilizes some active learning strategies, but remains largely passive		Workshop uses a mix of passive and active learning strategies		Workshop uses almost entirely active or interactive learning strategies

### Does the session outline make appropriate use of the time allotted?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Poorly designed outline and/or activities described are not feasible in the time allotted		Adequately designed outline; times allotted may be moderately off for the activities described		Well-designed outline for the session time; times allotted may be slightly off for the activities described		Excellent designed outline for the session time; all times allotted are accurate and appropriate for the activities described

### Is the workshop content novel and/or practice changing?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No novel content or not practice changing		Minimal novel content or potential for practice change		Moderate amount of novel content or potential for practice change		Significant amount of novel content or potential for practice change

### To what extent does the session promote practical skill building or tangible take away items (i.e.: teaching templates, deliverables, how to guides, etc) that participants can efficiently put into practice at the session's conclusion?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Unclear skill building or no take away item to be used outside of the session		Minimal skill building/take away item(s), or cannot reliably be replicated or practically used by participants		Promotes moderate skill building/ has an adequate take away item that could theoretically be put into practice		Promotes substantial skill building/ clear useful take away item that can reliably put into place at the session's conclusion

**NARRATIVE FEEDBACK TO CO-CHAIRS: OPTIONAL**

## **Workshop Peer Review Guidelines:**

- Follow the grading rubric when completing your evaluation of each submission.
- There will be multiple reviewers per abstract, whose scores will be averaged to come up with an average numeric score.
- When scoring each section, use the entire scale (1-7). Your honest evaluation is appreciated.
- Applicants will not see your numeric score evaluation or narrative feedback to the co-chairs.
- The narrative feedback to the workshop co-chairs is optional. Applicants will not have access to your specific comments. Please use this section to alert the chairs to any particularly stellar workshops, particular concerns, or any feedback that you think may be helpful in the final workshop selection process.
- You should recuse yourself from evaluating a workshop in the following situations:
  - If you are involved in the project
  - If you are a mentor/employer/supervisor of the applicant
  - If you feel that you know the project/person and this would create personal bias

If you have any questions about workshop evaluation or the workshop selection process, please contact the workshop co-chairs:

Anne Smeraglio  
SGIM 2025 Workshop Chair  
Associate Professor of Medicine  
OHSU/Portland Veterans Hospital  
[smeragli@ohsu.edu](mailto:smeragli@ohsu.edu)

Jillian Kyle  
SGIM 2025 Workshop Co-Chair  
Assistant Professor of Medicine  
University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine  
[roperj@upmc.edu](mailto:roperj@upmc.edu)