SPPCP VC PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Title of Submission: _____

Answer the following questions:

Which of the following areas of practice is this proposal relevant for? *Select all that apply*.

   a. Hospice
   b. Pain management
   c. Palliative care

On which areas of practice does the proposal focus?

   a. Hospice
   b. Pain management
   c. Palliative care.
   d. Hospice and palliative care (equally)
   e. Hospice, pain management, and palliative care (equally)

Rank the proposal and rate components of the proposal using the rubric below:

Overall ranking			
What is your overall ranking of this proposal?	Top 3rd of all proposals	Middle 3rd of all proposals	Bottom 3rd of all proposals
Interest			
Would prospective conference attendees (pharmacists and healthcare professionals specializing or wishing to specialize in pain, hospice, or palliative care) have a high level of interest in this session?	2 The proposal addresses a highly relevant issue or problem for pharmacists in the field(s) of pain, hospice, &/or palliative care.	1 The proposal addresses a moderately relevant issue/problem or addresses an issue/problem that is highly relevant to more limited or niche settings in pain, hospice, &/or palliative care.	0 The proposal does not address a relevant issue or problem of interest for pharmacists specializing in pain, palliative care, or hospice.
Learning objectives			
Are the learning objectives clear, measurable, and realistic for the time and resources of the session?	2 All learning objectives are clearly written, include measurable action verbs, and are achievable given the session length and format.	1 ≥ 1 learning objectives can be modified with minimal edits to be clearly written, include measurable action verbs, and be achievable for the session length and format.	0 Most learning objectives are vague, incomplete, or not achievable for the session length and format. They would need to be rewritten or significantly revised.
Alignment			
Are the description and learning objectives in alignment with each other?	2 The description strongly aligns with the learning objectives and provides a clear picture of how the learning objectives can be achieved.	1 Some misalignment between the description and the learning objectives compromises clarity of the session's purpose or outcomes.	0 The description provides inadequate details to evaluate alignment or does not align with the learning objectives.
Scientific rigor			
To what degree does the proposal minimize the impact of cognitive biases and promote scientific inquiry and rigor?	2 Proposal incorporates evidence, avoids one-sided viewpoints, and conveys thoughtfulness. (e.g., conveys nuance and complexity, addresses bias if applicable, includes analysis of evidence, or looks at issue from multiple viewpoints)	1 Proposal does not convey inclusion of available evidence, is not inclusive of differing perspectives, or overstates available evidence.	0 Proposal does not convey inclusion of available evidence, is not inclusive of differing perspectives, and overstates available evidence.

AJEDI			
Does the proposal promote **A**ccessibility, **J**ustice, **E**quity, **D**iversity, and **I**nclusion? (See considerations for inclusive language below.)	2 Use of inclusive language is maximized; If applicable: proposal addresses relevant issues of injustice or inequity; proposal includes or cites relevant experts on DEI topics. Proposal authorship reflects SPPCP values of DEI and mentorship.	1 Editable, avoidable jargon or stigmatizing language compromises accessibility & inclusion; additional relevant experts should be invited as co-presenters or cited; or proposal authorship could be enhanced to further reflect SPPCP values of DEI and mentorship.	0 Major revisions needed to avoid compromising AJEDI.
Faculty			
Does the proposal faculty (as a group if ≥ 1) convey relevant expertise and experience for the session proposal and advance SPPCP's mission? Faculty's titles and practice sites listed in submission.	2 Faculty group has relevant experience in proposal topic and ≥ 1 faculty member is a member of SPPCP.	1 Faculty group has relevant experience in proposal topic but none of the proposal faculty are SPPCP members.	0 Faculty group has some, but not yet sufficient, experience in the proposal/topic area; proposal could benefit from additional coauthors with expertise in this proposal topic/area. Possible opportunity to connect with other faculty.
SPPCP Membership of Faculty			
		1 SPPCP Member(s)	0 Non-Member(s)
Additional Comments			
Total Points:			

When evaluating a proposal for inclusive language, please consider the following:

- Does the information include unacceptable jargon or acronyms?
- Are there phrases that suggest victimhood?
- Are gender neutral terms used?
- Does the session information contain any stigmatizing language? Does the session information contain language that could be interpreted as normalization or homogenization?
  - Using the word "normal" when comparing groups can stigmatize marginalized people's experiences.
  - Statements such as "we've all been there," might incorrectly assume the audience has the same abilities and experiences.
  - Information should be specific when discussing communities of people.
- Does the session information contain person-first language or labels? (i.e. patient is labeled as "cancer patient" instead of "person with cancer")
- Does the session information include ableist phrases or language?

Resources on inclusive language:

- https://www.nih.gov/nih-style-guide/person-first-destigmatizing-language
- https://www.cdc.gov/healthcommunication/Health_Equity.html
- https://www.mypcnow.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/FF-429-Destigmatizing-addiction-language.pdf
- https://www.drugabuse.gov/nidamed-medical-health-professionals/health-professions-education/words-matter-terms-to-use-avoid-when-talking-about-addiction
- http://deareverybody.hollandbloorview.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/DearEverybodyTipsonAbleistLanguage2018-19.pdf