NCEMNA Public Policy and Diversity Leadership Summit
Theme: "Transforming Healthcare in Diverse Communities"
March 25, 2019

CALL FOR ABSTRACTS

The National Coalition of Ethnic Minority Nurse Associations (NCEMNA) is accepting poster abstracts until **December 31, 2018**, for the 2019 NCEMNA Public Policy and Diversity Leadership Summit which will be held at The California Endowment, 1000 N. Alameda Street, Los Angeles, California, 90012.

ABSTRACT CATEGORIES:

♦**Administration/Leadership Development/Professional Practice**

♦**Clinical/Evidence-Based Practice**

♦**Education**

♦**Research**

GUIDELINES FOR ABSTRACT SUBMISSION

1. All abstracts must be submitted on time and follow guidelines. See CHECKLIST below before.
2. The components of the abstract are divided into sections to help authors assure that they have included all required information based upon the scoring criteria. Authors are encouraged to write the abstract in a word processing file (e.g. MS Word).
3. The final abstract (body of abstract) **must be no more than 300 words**.
4. To ensure consistent, high-quality content, all abstracts must be organized into the required format based upon the abstract category.
5. The abstract title should clearly indicate the nature of the subject. Acronyms should not be used in the title and should be written out on first mention. A quantifiable objective must be submitted and the body of the abstract should be in paragraph form, using complete sentences, and avoiding special characters. Abstracts should have all funding sources written out completely if applicable.
6. For abstracts with more than one author, the presenting author will be considered the contact person.
7. Abstracts MUST be submitted on or before **DECEMBER 31, 2018** to Dr. Lillian Tom-Orme at Lillian.Tomorme@gmail.com.

Submission Checklist:
- [ ] Full name and credentials of presenting author
- [ ] Institutional affiliation / organization of presenting author
- [ ] City, State or Province, Country of presenting author
- [ ] Email of presenting author
- [ ] Names and credentials of co-authors
- [ ] Institutional affiliation / organization of co-authors
- [ ] Title of abstract

☐ Poster Abstract Category (select one)
☐ Must agree to statement of intent to attend conference, if selected
☐ 2 learning objectives (for continuing education application)
☐ Attach 1-2 paragraphs of biographical sketch for presenting author
☐ Abstract (not to exceed 300 words)

ABSTRACT HEADINGS and SCORING CRITERIA

For Categories: Administration / Leadership Development/Clinical / Evidence-Based Practice/ Education

Abstract Title
- 4   Abstract title includes key words from study purpose and abstract text.
- 3   Abstract title shows congruency with abstract content and purpose of the study/project.
- 2   Abstract title appears congruent with abstract content and includes some key words in the study purpose.
- 1   Abstract title does not align closely with content of abstract.
- 0   Title appears unrelated to abstract content.

Significance and Background
- 4   Significance to nursing practice and/or NCEMNA Mission is clearly expressed and well-articulated with other components of the abstract. Rationale given to support that the study addresses an important problem.
- 3   Significance to nursing practice is mostly clear and fits the NCEMNA Mission.
- 2   Significance to nursing practice clearly appears in abstract but lacks strong congruency with rest of abstract.
- 1   Significance to nursing practice is inferred. Shows minimal alignment with rest of abstract and may lack clarity.
- 0   Significance to nursing practice is unclear or not well articulated.

Objectives
- 4   Objectives (or purpose/aims) are clear, concise, and consistent with purpose.
- 3   Objectives (or purpose/aims) are justified but lack clarity and conciseness.
- 2   Objectives (or purpose/aims) are present but not clear, concise or completely justified.
- 1   Objectives (or purpose/aims) are not clear, concise or justified.
- 0   Objectives (or purpose/aims) are not described.

Intervention
- 4   Intervention selected is clear. Strong introduction. Background explains the interest in the intervention and what has been done or has changed in the history of the practice/ intervention.
- 3   Intervention selected is clear. Introduction limitedly compelling. Background explains the interest in the intervention and the history.
- 2   Intervention selected is initially unclear or difficult to identify quickly. Introduction is not well organized or not compelling. Background is limited.
- 1   Intervention selected is unclear. Introduction is poorly organized and not enough information is given to explain the background.
- 0   Intervention is not described.

Discussion
- 4   Current research articles are discussed in cohesive manner, and well organized to present the findings supporting the discussion.

3	Research articles are presented but lack organization to synthesize the information well.
2	Research articles are limitedly presented and not well synthesized. Articles do not completely relate to discussion.
1	Research articles were not synthesized and/or did not specifically relate to policy or discussion.
0	There was no discussion section.

Research Category

Abstract Title

4	Abstract title includes key words from study purpose and abstract text.
3	Abstract title shows congruency with abstract content and purpose of the study/project.
2	Abstract title appears congruent with abstract content and includes some key words in the study purpose.
1	Abstract title does not align closely with content of abstract.
0	Title appears unrelated to abstract content.

Significance and Background

4	Significance to nursing practice and/or NCEMNA Mission is clearly expressed and well-articulated with other components of the abstract. Rationale given to support that the study addresses an important problem.
3	Significance to nursing practice is mostly clear and fits the NCEMNA Mission.
2	Significance to nursing practice clearly appears in abstract but lacks strong congruency with rest of abstract.
1	Significance to nursing practice is inferred. Shows minimal alignment with rest of abstract and may lack clarity.
0	Significance to nursing practice is unclear or not well articulated.

Objectives

4	Objectives (or purpose/aims) are clear, concise, and consistent with purpose.
3	Objectives (or purpose/aims) are justified but lack clarity and conciseness.
2	Objectives (or purpose/aims) are present but not clear, concise or completely justified.
1	Objectives (or purpose/aims) are not clear, concise or justified.
0	Objectives (or purpose/aims) are not described.

Conceptual Model / Theoretical Framework

4	Model or framework informs the study and provides rationale. The concepts of the model or framework relate to the topic and serve as basis for interpreting findings.
3	Model or framework is appropriate but not woven through the entire study.
2	Model or framework is appropriate but not clear or concise.
1	Model or framework is not appropriate.
0	Model or framework is not described.

Methods and Analysis

4	Methods include sufficient detail to provide evidence of a logical consistency between the study's purpose and methods.
3	Methods include most of the details to provide evidence of a logical consistency between the study's purpose and methods, but is lacking in either cohesiveness or just a few elements required.

2   Methods do not include sufficient details to provide evidence of a logical consistency between the study's purpose and methods. Some necessary elements are missing.

1   Methods do not include sufficient details to provide evidence of a logical consistency between the study's purpose and methods. Most necessary methods elements are missing.

0   Methods do not include detail to provide evidence of a logical consistency between the study's purpose and methods. In general, it lacks necessary methods described.

Findings and Discussion

4   Results clearly presented in relationship to stated research question(s), hypothesis(es), and/or purpose with logical progression/ order. Current research articles are discussed in cohesive manner, and well organized to present the findings supporting the discussion.

3   Results mostly presented in relationship to stated research question(s), hypothesis(es), and/or purpose. Research articles are presented but lack organization to synthesize the information well.

2   Results are presented, but incomplete or not in a systematic manner following the research question(s), hypothesis(es), and/or purpose. Research articles are limitedly presented and not well synthesized. Articles do not completely relate to discussion.

1   Limited results are presented and lack relationship to stated research question(s), hypothesis(es), and/or purpose. Research articles were not synthesized and/or did not specifically relate to policy or discussion.

0   Lacks description of study results. There was no discussion section.