

WA Branch presents

THE RURAL EDUCATION WEEKEND

Emerging Technologies

The Sebel, Mandurah
24 - 25 October 2020



Abstract Marking Matrix (Non-Scientific Paper)

Criteria	Not Acceptable	Below Average	Average	Excellent	Outstanding
Relevance of topic to the medical radiation profession Max. 3 marks	Abstract topic is not relevant to the medical radiation profession and is not relevant to the attending audience. Title does not reflect abstract content. (0)	Difficult to determine relevance of abstract topic to the medical radiation profession and relevance to the attending audience. Title partly reflects abstract content. (1)	Abstract topic is broadly relevant to the medical radiation profession and will be of interest to a small number of audience members. Title reflects abstract content. (1.5)	Abstract topic is considerably relevant to the medical radiation profession and will be of interest to audience members. Title reflects abstract content. (2)	Abstract topic is highly relevant to the medical radiation profession and will be of great interest to a wide audience. Title reflects abstract content. (3)
Background Max. 4 marks	It is unclear what the case study/non-scientific review or commentary involved. (0)	Basic description of what the case study/non-scientific review or commentary involved. (1)	Good description of what the case study/non-scientific review or commentary involved. (2)	Excellent description of what the case study/non-scientific review or commentary involved. (3)	Outstanding description of what the case study/non-scientific review or commentary involved. (4)
Critical Appraisal Max. 6 marks	Abstract content does not support the purpose or aims of the case study/non-scientific review or commentary. (0)	It is difficult to determine if the abstract content supports the purpose or aims of the case study/non-scientific review or commentary. (1.5)	The content in the abstract supports the purpose or aims of the case study/non-scientific review or commentary. (3)	Excellent description of content, which supports the purpose of aims of the case study/non-scientific review or commentary. (4.5)	The content in the abstract outstandingly supports the purpose or aims of the case study/non-scientific review or commentary. (6)

WA Branch presents

THE RURAL EDUCATION WEEKEND

Emerging Technologies

The Sebel, Mandurah
24 - 25 October 2020



Abstract Marking Matrix (Non-Scientific Paper)

Clarity of Abstract Max. 4 marks	The reviewer is unable to read and follow the abstract submission. Abstract contains too many personal feelings/views on subject without reasoning or supporting evidence. Numerous spelling and grammatical errors exist. (0)	Abstract contains some personal feelings/views without reasoning or supporting evidence. It is difficult to follow what the author is saying. Some spelling and grammatical errors exist. (1)	Abstract is clear with views/recommendations on subject supported with some reasoning or supportive evidence. Some spelling and grammatical errors exist. (2)	Abstract is clear with views/recommendations on subject supported with good reasoning or supportive evidence. No spelling or grammatical errors. (3)	The author's views/recommendations are based on supportive evidence and excellent reasoning. Abstract is clear and easy to follow with no spelling or grammatical errors. (4)
Novelty of Abstract Max. 4 marks	The abstract details information which is not new and has already been thoroughly presented. (0)	It is difficult to determine if the topic presented provides new or original information. (1)	The topic presented is current. It provides new, original information which will be of interest to a small number of audience members. (1.5)	The topic presented is current. It provides new, original information which will be of interest to audience members. (2)	The topic presented is current. It provides new, original information which will be of great interest to the audience. (3)