

SCHOLARLY WRITING ASSESSMENT FORM

Resident Name:	Preceptor Name:	Date:
Type of manuscript: <input type="checkbox"/> Case report / Case series <input type="checkbox"/> Pharmacokinetic study <input type="checkbox"/> Observational study/pilot study <input type="checkbox"/> Randomized, controlled interventional study <input type="checkbox"/> Therapeutic review/meta-analysis <input type="checkbox"/> Guidelines/clinical recommendations <input type="checkbox"/> Other	Target Publication: <input type="checkbox"/> Pharmacy journal <input type="checkbox"/> Pharmacology journal <input type="checkbox"/> Medical journal - HIV <input type="checkbox"/> Medical journal - general <input type="checkbox"/> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 st scholarly writing activity <input type="checkbox"/> 2 nd scholarly writing activity <input type="checkbox"/> _____ scholarly writing activity *PLEASE ATTACH A COPY OF THE DRAFT/ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT TO THIS EVALUATION.

ACTIVITY OUTCOMES:

The resident will develop skills and gain experience in preparing a manuscript(s) for submission to a pharmacy or medical journal for publication.

The resident will complete at least one manuscript during the residency year for publication (apart from the residency project).

Expectation: proficient with 1st scholarly writing activity. If the resident does not perform at the proficient level or above, the resident will be given another opportunity to demonstrate scholarly writing through a different project (i.e., bulletin, drug information request, etc).

	Advanced Beginner (1)	Competent (2)	Proficient (3)	Expert (4)	Not Applicable
MANUSCRIPT CONTENT					
1.1 Abstract	<input type="checkbox"/> The abstract is incomplete, unfocused and is not an accurate representation of the manuscript findings.	<input type="checkbox"/> Abstract includes required components but is written in an unfocused manner, does not clearly represent main findings from manuscript, or exceeds the specified word limit.	<input type="checkbox"/> Abstract includes required components (, appropriately reflects findings in paper, and is within the specified word limit.	<input type="checkbox"/> Abstract is clearly and concisely written, includes required components (, appropriately reflects findings in paper, and is within the specified word limit.	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2 Introduction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Advanced Beginner (1)	Competent (2)	Proficient (3)	Expert (4)	Not Applicable
	Introduction does not provide adequate background information or rationale for study / publication.	Introduction includes some background information, and/or basic rationale for study / publication.	Introduction includes summary of pertinent literature, and appropriately frames the rationale for the study / publication.	Introduction includes a well-written and comprehensive summary and critical analysis of pertinent literature, and appropriately frames the rationale for the study / publication. Describes how the manuscript will add to existing literature.	
1.3 Study / manuscript goals/objectives	<input type="checkbox"/> Research question or goal of publication is poorly formulated, and/or objectives and endpoints are missing/incomplete.	<input type="checkbox"/> Research question or goal of publication is defined. Main objectives and/or endpoints are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Research question or goal of publication is clearly defined. Objectives and endpoints are appropriate .	<input type="checkbox"/> Research question or goal of publication is clearly and concisely defined. Objectives and endpoints are appropriate and feasible.	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4 Methodology (study design, population, and outcomes; ethical considerations)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unable to describe the study/project methodology. Information is imprecise or inaccurate. Choice of methodology is inappropriate..	<input type="checkbox"/> Most aspects of the methodology are described, but with insufficient detail to replicate the study/project. The selected methodology is appropriate for the research question/project	<input type="checkbox"/> All aspects of the methodology are described, allowing replication of the study/project by others if needed. The methodology is the most appropriate strategy for the research question/project.	<input type="checkbox"/> All aspects of the methodology are clearly and concisely described, allowing replication of the study/project by others if needed. The methodology is the most appropriate strategy for the research question/project. Justifies why methodology was chosen and identifies limitations.	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.5 Data collection/ analysis plan / statistical analysis	<input type="checkbox"/> Unable to identify appropriate data collection and analysis plan (statistical tests) needed to analyse/report data.	<input type="checkbox"/> Plan for data collection and analysis (statistical analysis) is present but not clearly articulated or incomplete.	<input type="checkbox"/> Plan for data collection and analysis (statistical analysis) is appropriate and clearly described.	<input type="checkbox"/> Plan for data collection and analysis (statistical analysis) is appropriate and clearly and thoroughly described. Plan of analysis demonstrates understanding of limitations of approach used.	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.6 Results	<input type="checkbox"/> Results provided are incomplete, inaccurately presented, or do not	<input type="checkbox"/> Results provided align with defined primary and secondary endpoints. Information is	<input type="checkbox"/> Results provided align with defined primary and secondary endpoints. Results are presented	<input type="checkbox"/> Results provided align with defined primary and secondary endpoints. Results are presented clearly,	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Advanced Beginner (1)	Competent (2)	Proficient (3)	Expert (4)	Not Applicable
	align with defined primary and secondary endpoints.	sometimes vague or incomplete.	clearly and completely in a format consistent with accepted standards of reporting.	completely and consisely in a format consistent with accepted standards of reporting. Results which are notable are highlighted.	
1.7 Discussion/ conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Superficial or incomplete discussion. Conclusions overstate or do not adequately reflect research results.	<input type="checkbox"/> Discussion/Conclusions adequately reflect main findings of paper. Some insight into interpretation / implication of findings is lacking.	<input type="checkbox"/> Discussion/Conclusions adequately interpret main findings of paper; includes discussion on relevance of findings to field of study, and implications of study findings for readers.	<input type="checkbox"/> Results appropriately interpreted, including limitations, relevance of findings to field of study, how results compare to other similar studies, implications of study findings for readers, and suggestions for future research.	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.8 Tables/ Figures, Appendices	<input type="checkbox"/> Tables/Figures are incomplete, difficult to understand or results presented are inaccurate; and/or there is an inappropriate number of figures/tables according to journal requirements. r	<input type="checkbox"/> Tables/Figures contain relevant information which is clearly presented. There is some duplication / overlap of information with text in the manuscript.	<input type="checkbox"/> There is an appropriate number of tables/figures according to journal requirements. Results are relevant, clearly presented and complement the information in the text.	<input type="checkbox"/> There is an appropriate number of tables/figures according to journal requirements. Results are clearly presented, complement the information in the text, and enhance readers' understanding of the study. Legends and titles are clear and complement the tables/figures. Discriminates which tables/figures should be in main article vs supplementary material (if applicable).	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.9 References	<input type="checkbox"/> References are incomplete/missing. Only secondary/tertiary sources used.	<input type="checkbox"/> References are complete and appear in order of citation. Primary and secondary sources used.	<input type="checkbox"/> References are complete and formatted according to journal specifications. Key primary and secondary sources used.	<input type="checkbox"/> References are complete, relevant, up-to-date, reflect current practices/key research data and are formatted according to journal specifications.	<input type="checkbox"/>
2 ETHICS					
2.1 Ethics approval (case	<input type="checkbox"/> The patient(s) were	<input type="checkbox"/> The patient(s) provided	<input type="checkbox"/> The patient(s) provided	<input type="checkbox"/> The patient provided consent	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Advanced Beginner (1)	Competent (2)	Proficient (3)	Expert (4)	Not Applicable
reports/case series)	not approached/did not provide consent for publication and a waiver of consent was not provided by the ethics committee.	consent (or a waiver of consent was obtained by the ethics committee), but this was not noted in the manuscript or letter of submission.	consent (or a waiver of consent was obtained by the ethics committee); information noted in manuscript or letter of submission. Resident contributed to preparing consent form / obtaining consent / obtaining waiver of consent.	(or a waiver of consent was obtained by the ethics committee); information noted in manuscript or letter of submission. Resident had significant role in preparing consent form/obtaining patient consent / obtaining waiver of consent.	
2.2 Original work and contribution	<input type="checkbox"/> Portions of the manuscript (including text, results, images, tables, graphs) appear to be manipulated or plagiarized from another source. Any plagiarism will be considered a critical incident. Plagiarism must be reported to the program coordinators and the disciplinary action policy and procedure will apply.	<input type="checkbox"/> Portions of the manuscript appear very similar to other published sources without sufficient originality / insight but all information presented is referenced.	<input type="checkbox"/> All portions of the manuscript written by the resident (including text, images, tables/figures) are original and the authors' own work. The resident contributed significantly to at least one section of the manuscript (e.g., for a review article).	<input type="checkbox"/> All portions of the manuscript (including text, images, tables/figures) are original and the authors' own work. The resident contributed significantly to most sections of the manuscript.	
3 PROFESSIONALISM, COLLABORATION					
3.1 Professionalism, Sense of responsibility	<input type="checkbox"/> Needed repeated reminders to complete manuscript within required time frame. Did not request assistance. Manuscript was incomplete or poorly done.	<input type="checkbox"/> Completed manuscript within required time frame with some assistance. Significant revisions to the content was needed after the first draft. Manuscript was clearly written with few typos or grammatical errors.	<input type="checkbox"/> Completed manuscript within required time frame with minimal assistance. Few revisions to the content was needed after the first draft. Manuscript was clearly written in professional language with minimal typos or grammatical errors.	<input type="checkbox"/> Completed manuscript in required time frame with no assistance or revisions required. Review was clearly written, using appropriate terminology and respectful language (e.g., people-first terminology, appropriate and culturally accepted terms for race, gender, etc).	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Advanced Beginner (1)	Competent (2)	Proficient (3)	Expert (4)	Not Applicable
3.2 Authorship	<input type="checkbox"/> Unclear of conventions regarding authorship order, unable to appropriately identify significance of own contributions. Did not fulfill requirements for authorship.	<input type="checkbox"/> General understanding of conventions regarding authorship order; able to appropriately identify significance of own contributions. Fulfilled requirements for authorship.	<input type="checkbox"/> Understands conventions regarding authorship order; able to appropriately identify significance of own contributions as well as those of co-authors. Able to negotiate appropriate order of authorship with assistance. Fulfilled requirements for authorship.	<input type="checkbox"/> Appropriately identifies significance of own contributions as well as those of co-authors. Able to negotiate appropriate order of authorship without assistance. Fulfilled requirements for authorship.	<input type="checkbox"/>
3.3 Acknowledgements, disclosures	<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgements or disclosures not included.	<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgements or disclosures included, but not complete.	<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgements or disclosures included and complete, with some assistance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Independently prepares acknowledgements and disclosures, with no assistance.	<input type="checkbox"/>
4 JOURNAL SUBMISSION PROCESS					
4.1 Selection of journal	<input type="checkbox"/> Unable to identify appropriate journals for manuscript submission.	<input type="checkbox"/> Able to identify some journals appropriate for manuscript submission, based on target audience and readership.	<input type="checkbox"/> Identifies journals appropriate for manuscript submission, based on target audience, readership, indexing, and impact factor.	<input type="checkbox"/> Identifies journals appropriate for manuscript submission, based on target audience, readership, indexing, and impact factor. Identifies journal(s) most closely aligned with focus of and length of manuscript.	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.2 Adherence to journal requirements (incl. font size, line spacing, margins, word limit, table/figure formatting, reference style)	<input type="checkbox"/> Requires significant revisions/support to meet criteria.	<input type="checkbox"/> Requires some assistance in formatting manuscript to meet most of journal's requirements.	<input type="checkbox"/> Prepares manuscript to meet journal requirements with little assistance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Independently prepares manuscript adhering to all of the specified journal's requirements for submission.	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.3 Cover letter to editor	<input type="checkbox"/> Cover letter is incomplete or poorly written.	<input type="checkbox"/> Cover letter includes attestation that submission is original, not under consideration for publication by	<input type="checkbox"/> Cover letter includes attestation that submission is original, not under consideration for publication by another journal, and that	<input type="checkbox"/> Cover letter includes attestation of original work, not under consideration for publication by another journal, and that all authors have	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Advanced Beginner (1)	Competent (2)	Proficient (3)	Expert (4)	Not Applicable
		another journal, and that all authors have contributed to the manuscript.	all authors have contributed to the manuscript. Letter provides short background information on importance of submitted work to the published body of literature.	contributed to the manuscript. Includes summary on importance of submitted work to the published body of literature, including highlight of existing gaps in knowledge or therapeutic controversies which manuscript helps to address. Specifies if data was presented elsewhere prior to submission (i.e., oral abstract, poster presentations). Suggested reviewers are provided (if necessary).	
4.4 Response to reviewers	<input type="checkbox"/> Requires significant assistance in addressing reviewers' comments in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/> Requires some assistance in addressing reviewers' comments in a timely manner. Response to reviewers letter is generally complete.	<input type="checkbox"/> Able to independently address most of the reviewers' comments in a timely manner. Response to reviewers letter is clearly written.	<input type="checkbox"/> Able to independently address all of the reviewers' comments in a timely manner. Response to reviewers letter is clearly written. Rebuttals are clearly articulated with appropriate justification.	<input type="checkbox"/>
4.5 Author proofs	<input type="checkbox"/> Requires significant assistance in addressing Author queries in a timely manner. Proof errors are not identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Requires some assistance in addressing Author queries in a timely manner. Identifies most typos/errors in proof.	<input type="checkbox"/> Able to independently address most of the Author queries in a timely manner. Identifies typos/errors in proof. Tables and Figures are proofread for accuracy.	<input type="checkbox"/> Able to independently address all of the Author queries in a timely manner. Identifies all typos/errors in proof. Tables and Figures are proofread for accuracy. Key significant updates are added to the manuscript if applicable.	<input type="checkbox"/>

RESIDENT'S PERSONAL LEARNING OBJECTIVES FOR SCHOLARLY WRITING ACTIVITIES

Please assess whether the resident's personal learning objectives were met:

ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE	Unmet	Partially Met	Met	Not Applicable
List personal learning objectives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Advanced Beginner (1)	Competent (2)	Proficient (3)	Expert (4)
OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE	<input type="checkbox"/> Requires significant guidance to prepare manuscript at the proficient level.	<input type="checkbox"/> Competently prepares manuscript with some guidance. Some gaps identified that require further focused development.	<input type="checkbox"/> Proficiently prepares manuscript with minimal guidance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Prepares manuscript at an expert level, with little to no guidance.

Resident Comments:	Preceptor Comments:
Resident Signature	Preceptor Signature
Date	Date

Adapted from:

- The University of Vermont College of Nursing and Health Sciences, Doctoral Program of Study in Human Functioning and Rehabilitation Sciences. Criteria for Assessment of Research Article. https://www.uvm.edu/sites/default/files/media/Criteria_for_Assessment_of_Research_Article.pdf
- Swygart-Hobaugh AJ. Rubric for original research project. Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa, USA. <https://www.cornellcollege.edu/LIBRARY/faculty/focusing-on-assignments/tools-for-assessment/original-research-rubric.pdf>
- Research paper rubric (Figure 1). Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa, USA. <https://www.cornellcollege.edu/LIBRARY/faculty/focusing-on-assignments/tools-for-assessment/ResearchPaperRubric.pdf>

Last updated August 2020