

SAHM 2027 Annual Meeting

Educational Session Proposal Review Rubric

Proposals will be evaluated by a pool of SAHM volunteer reviewers using the scoring criteria outlined below:

Scoring Criteria	Points Awarded			
1. Innovative session content that can change and/or challenge how attendees conduct clinical practice, education, research, and/or programming.	4 Strongly Agree	3 Agree	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree
2. Topic proposals is timely and relevant to the particular focus with the field of adolescent health and medicine.	4 Strongly Agree	3 Agree	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree
3. Well-described interactive and/or engaging teaching methods within the proposal.	4 Strongly Agree	3 Agree	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree
4. Clear, appropriately scoped, and achievable learning-based objectives (<i>see Bloom's taxonomy</i>).	4 Strongly Agree	3 Agree	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree
5. Proposal includes three peer-reviewed references that are within the past five years.	4 = 3 or more references; 3 = 2 references 2 = 1 reference; 1 = no references or are not within the past 5 years			
6. Proposal demonstrates a clear effort to support SAHM's organizational values of community impact, accessibility and social determinants of health and does not intentionally exclude specific populations.	4 Strongly Agree	3 Agree	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree
7. Diverse representation of presenters based on background, nationality, country, geographic region, size of clinical program, perspective, and/or discipline (e.g. across disciplines and/or across specialties.) (<i>if deemed applicable based on the proposal content focus; exceptions may apply</i>)	4 Strongly Agree	3 Agree	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree
8. Anticipated roles of presenters are clearly defined.	4 Strongly Agree	3 Agree	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree
9. Proposal covers one of the Program Committee's suggested topics for this year's Annual Meeting.	Yes or No (no points assigned)			
10. Submitted by a SAHM Committee?	Yes or No (no points assigned)			
11. Willing to provide MOC Part II credits?	Yes or No (no points assigned)			

*** Reviewers will be given the option to provide anonymous feedback to authors to be shared directly with submitters as written.**

Proposals that include youth presenter(s): Reviewers will be asked to score proposals that include youth presenter(s) using the criteria below. These scores will be analyzed separately from the primary review criteria and will serve as a complementary data point for the final decision-making process.

Scoring Criteria	Points Awarded			
1. The proposal demonstrates meaningful youth involvement in the planning and/or delivery of the session.	4 Strongly Agree	3 Agree	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree
2. The proposal demonstrates an equitable and collaborative youth-adult partnership that values youth perspectives and expertise.	4 Strongly Agree	3 Agree	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree
3. The proposal demonstrates adequate planning and support to ensure youth participants can contribute successfully and have a positive experience.	4 Strongly Agree	3 Agree	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree