Texas Medical Association - Medical Student Section Resolution Scoring Rubric

Feasibility and Scope (2 points):

- Feasible = actionable. Actionable entails that the word choice/word usage is not
 inflammatory <u>and</u> that the "asks" are within reach for the TMA to act upon. "Asks" should
 utilize words such as "support of, research, etc," and have less of a fiscal or monetary
 commitment from the TMA for the execution of the resolution.
- Appropriate = supported by existing TMA policy and falls within the scope of TMA.
 Generally, TMA addresses topics related to the practice of medicine, including financial and organizational affairs, medical education, socioeconomic issues, and science and public health.
 - The resolution is feasible and appropriate for the TMA (Assign 2 points)
- If it is an ask that would be more readily actionable by the AMA or a specialty society or
 is clearly not supported by existing TMA policy, the scope and feasibility would be
 uncertain.
- If it is an ask that would be readily actionable by the TMA but would require a monetary investment or would involve the passage of laws/legislation on the state level, the immediate feasibility would be more difficult to implement.
 - The ask is feasible/actionable but not within the immediate scope of the TMA, or the immediate feasibility is uncertain or may be more difficult to implement (Assign 1 point)
 - The ask is not feasible/actionable nor is it within the scope of the <u>TMA's goals or</u> mission (Assign 0 points)

Timeliness (1 point):

- A non-exhaustive list of reasons a topic might be considered "urgent" includes policy related to the current social/political environment and relevance to current events. Use discretion here: any resolution suggesting a consequence to the status quo may be deemed "timely."
 - This resolution addresses a topic/issue that is time-sensitive, urgent, or especially relevant to the upcoming HOD assembly (Assign 1 point)
 - This resolution does not require immediate address over the short term or does not have substantial consequences if not acted upon (Assign 0 points)

Novelty (1 point):

Does this resolution address a subject matter largely neglected by current policy or add

in a valuable way to existing policy? Does existing policy already cover this resolution's asks? Is it in line with or in opposition to the current TMA policy? You can check the TMA Policy Compendium and AMA Policy Finder for existing policies.

- The ask is completely novel. If a resolution seeks to amend existing policy, but provides a novel amendment, the ask could be considered novel overall. (Assign 1 point)
- The ask covers some existing policy but is not identical (Assign 0.5 points)
- The ask is covered by or directly conflicts with existing policy (Assign 0 points)

Structure (2 points):

- Each Resolved clause is appropriately supported by the Whereas clauses (i.e., there is sufficient support for each ask of the policy). There are no unnecessary Whereas clauses. (Assign 2 points)
- The Resolved clauses are mostly supported by the Whereas clauses, but further support
 is needed OR there are unnecessary Whereas clauses that do not provide any useful
 addition to the resolution. (Assign 1 point)
- There is minimal to no support for the Resolved clauses (Assign 0 points)

Flow (1 point):

- The flow of the Whereas clauses followed a logical progression that was easy to follow and transitioned appropriately into the Resolved clauses. (Assign 1 point)
- The flow of the Whereas clauses was difficult to follow and did not follow a logical progression. (Assign 0 points)

Clarity (1 point):

- Everything in the resolution was clear and easy to understand, with no jargon. Any
 specific terminology was appropriately defined. All acronyms were written out fully before
 using them. (Assign 1 point)
- At least half of the statements were clear and easy to understand. There was minimal
 jargon that was not defined appropriately, or acronyms were not fully written out.
 (Assign 0.5 points)
- Less than half of the statements were clear, and there was extensive jargon that was not defined appropriately. (Assign 0 points)

Research (2 points):

• Every reference (AMA format) is from trustworthy, high-quality, evidence-based sources (e.g., peer-reviewed journals, respected news sources) (+0.5 points)

 All sources are published within the last 5 years, or any sources older than 5 years are foundational to the point being made (+0.5 points)

The resolution is well-researched and demonstrates high-quality work. All Whereas
clauses are supported by a citation, and the points being made are fairly representative
of the source cited. (+1 point)

Do NOT assign points if each Whereas clause is not accompanied by a citation

Response to Feedback (1 point):

- The authors addressed any specific feedback and/or concerns raised during the prior round of reviews or appropriately explained why they did not incorporate suggestions from reviewers (Assign 1 point)
- There are minimal changes from the previous version of the policy and the authors did not make an effort to incorporate feedback and address concerns that were brought up by reviewers (Assign 0 points)

Additional Points:

- -1 point for wrong formatting. References should be in AMA format. Reference the MSS
 Resolution Submission Packet for proper formatting
- +0.5 points for attending the Resolution Writing Workshop

Total Score: ___/11

Initial grading

- First Draft Grading: Only resolutions scoring greater than 6 out of 10 points following the
 1st deadline review will move forward to the next round of reviews
- Second Draft Grading: Only Resolutions scoring greater than 8.5 out of 10 points following the 2nd deadline review will move forward for consideration for this year's TexMed.

Final grading:

- Only resolutions finalized by the final deadline will be passed on for recommendation to the TMA-MSS.
- Only resolutions approved by the TMA-MSS will be sent to the TMA House of Delegates.