RESEARCH POSTERS:

1. Topic: Is the topic significant to wound, ostomy, continence and/or professional practice?
2. Purpose: Is the purpose/objective clearly stated?
3. Methodology / Clarity: Are the methods described, appropriate and clearly stated?
4. Statistics: Appropriate statistical methods been used.
5. Results / Conclusion: Are the results and conclusion presented in sufficient detail to address the research questions or aim?

PRACTICE INNOVATION POSTERS:

1. Topic: Is the topic significant to wound, ostomy, continence and/or professional practice?
2. Purpose: Is the purpose clearly stated? Is a description included that identifies the need for the practice innovation?
3. Objective: Is the objective clearly stated? Is a summary of the purpose and objectives for the practice innovation included?
4. Outcomes: Are the outcomes included that relate to the problem and objective(s)? Key measures or indicators are used to evaluate the outcomes described.
5. Clarity: The abstract is well written, and ideas are clearly communicated?

CASE STUDY POSTERS:

1. This category requires at least 3 cases, but could include more. It would be considered RARE to submit a one case scenario unless the condition or research is especially unique, which indicates that the condition is so very rare, or the solution so groundbreaking, that it has not been discussed before.
2. Statement of Clinical Problem: Is the clinical problem/challenge, clearly articulated and relevant to WOC nursing practice? Are relevant clinical data included (age, gender, primary related diagnosis and relevant co-morbidities)?
3. Description of Past Management: Is the duration of the clinical problem stated? Are past management approaches and patient responses described?
4. Current Clinical Approach: Are the management plan and any changes made to it described along with rationale?
5. Patient Outcomes: Is the patient response described, including time frame for response, objective and subjective data?
6. Conclusions: Are clinical implications identified along with limitations? Has the author limited conclusions to this case only, without generalization to general population?