

HCC 2026 Abstract Grading Rubric

Criterion	Score 6	Score 5	Score 4	Score 3	Score 2	Score 1
1. Originality of the Research/Management Effort	Highly novel research question, or management application: significant advancement of knowledge or practice.	Strongly innovative: new method or unique application of existing ideas.	Some originality: incremental advancement or moderate innovation.	Minimally original: standard methods or approaches.	Little originality: mostly repeated work.	No originality: work does not advance the field significantly
2. Direct Connection to Native Species & Ecosystems	Abstract clearly demonstrates direct work with native species and/or ecosystems in Hawai'i or the Pacific: strong ecological relevance.	Clear connection to native species or ecosystems: project relevance evident.	Moderate connection: native species/ecosystem relevance mentioned but limited.	Weak connection: native species/ecosystem involvement unclear or partial.	Minimal mention of native species/ecosystems: relevance vague.	No connection to native species or ecosystems.
3. Relevance to Conservation Practice/Outcomes	Direct, high-impact link: research/management project informs or provides actionable conservation practices.	Strong connection: outcomes clearly support management or policy.	Moderate link: conservation implications present but indirect or partial.	Limited connection: relevance is vague or theoretical.	Superficial mention: minimal relevance to practice.	No relevance: research unrelated to conservation practice.
4. Integrated or Transdisciplinary Approaches	Highly integrated or transdisciplinary: Clearly identify disciplines and stakeholders; clear connection to management and practical outcomes.	Strong integration: some collaboration beyond academia; applied relevance clear.	Moderate integration: limited collaboration; partial management relevance.	Limited integration: minimal collaboration or applied connection.	Minimal integration: weak discipline focus; weak relevance.	No integration or collaboration: No collaboration across any disciplines
5. Solutions with Community and Cultural Involvement	Co-developed collaboration: culturally grounded; integrates local/Indigenous knowledge	Strong collaboration: local knowledge included outcomes that are culturally relevant.	Moderate engagement: cultural context considered but not central.	Limited involvement: community/cultural aspects weakly integrated.	Superficial mention: minimal meaningful engagement.	No community or cultural involvement.
6. Project & Abstract Quality	Clearly presents purpose, goals, methods, evaluation, results, outcomes, conclusions, and lessons learned. Research design is well-developed and	Most elements are clearly presented; research design is appropriate. Symposium/Forum : Overview is generally coherent.	Adequately presents most elements; some lack detail or clarity. Symposium/Forum: Overview is mostly coherent.	Some elements are missing or unclear; research design may be limited. Symposium/Forum : Overview lacks coherence.	Many elements are missing or insufficiently described; research design is weak.	Abstract fails to present purpose, methods, outcomes, or lessons; research design is absent.

HCC 2026 Abstract Grading Rubric

Criterion	Score 6	Score 5	Score 4	Score 3	Score 2	Score 1
	appropriate. Symposium/Forum: Overview is coherent and of high quality.				Symposium/Forum: Overview poorly structured or unclear.	Symposium/Forum: Overview is incoherent or missing.
7. Writing Quality <i>Does the abstract meet the following qualifications?</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Title brief and clear, title case, no period, not all caps. Author names/bios in correct fields; affiliations fully written out. Scientific names italicized; Hawaiian diacritics correct. Acronyms are spelled out for first use. Correct spelling, grammar, and punctuation. 	Meets all requirements: exceptionally clear, concise, well-structured, error-free.	Meets most requirements: clear and well-structured; minor errors do not impede understanding.	Meets some requirements: generally clear; some minor errors or inconsistencies.	Partially meets requirements: clarity or formatting issues interfere with readability.	Few requirements met: errors or formatting significantly reduce clarity.	Does not meet requirements: confusing, poorly formatted, pervasive errors.
8. Agenda (<i>ONLY for Symposium, Workshop, Forum, 'Aha, Training</i>)	Complete, detailed timeline: presentations/speakers clearly relevant; outcomes explicitly stated and aligned.	Mostly complete timeline: presentations /speakers relevant; outcomes stated.	Basic timeline: most relevant presentations /speakers; outcomes mentioned.	Limited timeline: some presentations /speakers not aligned; outcomes vague.	Incomplete or poorly structured agenda: few relevant presentations; outcomes unclear.	No meaningful agenda: irrelevant or missing presentations; outcomes not stated.
9. Audience Participation (<i>ONLY for Symposium, Workshop, Forum, 'Aha, Training</i>)	Techniques for engaging the audience fully described: innovative approaches; attendee learning objectives and experience clearly stated.	Audience engagement described: some innovative techniques noted; attendee learning objectives clear.	Basic audience participation described: some clarity on attendee learning; limited innovation.	Minimal description of engagement or attendee experience: unclear learning objectives.	Audience participation briefly mentioned: few details; unclear what attendees gain.	No audience engagement described: learning objectives not stated.