NWM2026

NAIROBI , KENYA • 10-12 NOVEMBER 2026

Texas Children's Global Health Network

27th Network Meeting Judges Orientation 2026

Drs. Heather Haq & Morgan Sekou



Baylor College of Medicine | BAYLOR GLOBAL HEALTH

BAYLOR COLLEGE OF MEDICINE Children's Foundation UGANDA



Thank You!

Thank you for serving as a judge for the 27th Network Meeting. Your expertise and thoughtful evaluations play an essential role in recognizing excellence across our global health network.

This is an important peer review activity that can be listed on your CV.

Network Meeting Judging

- Scores and feedback will be shared **anonymously** with participants to support their learning and professional development. As such, scores should **accurately reflect** the quality of the abstract and presentation, and **feedback should be constructive** and actionable. The goal is to help participants improve rather than provide overly critical reviews.

- Judges should disclose any **conflicts of interest** as soon as it is recognized. This includes involvement in the research project or a personal relationship with the author(s).

Network Meeting Judging

Scoring Instructions: Rate each section from **1-10** using the criteria provided. Score what is demonstrated in the presentation; do not infer information that is not presented. Use the "Comments" section to offer feedback on overall strengths or areas for improvement.

Score	Rating	Description
9-10	Exceptional	**Criteria are exceptionally well met.** Information is accurate, complete, clearly presented, and logically connected. Key information is easy to identify and interpret. **Only a few posters overall** will likely meet these criteria.
7-8	Strong	**Criteria are very well met.** Information is clear, accurate, sufficiently detailed, and logically connected. Minor gaps or areas for improvement may be present.
5-6	Good	**Criteria are adequately met.** Essential information is present, accurate, and understandable. Work meets the criteria but may lack some depth, detail, or refinement.
3-4	Developing	**Criteria are only partially met.** Important information is missing, unclear, incomplete, or insufficiently supported. Some aspects may be difficult to understand or evaluate.
1-2	Needs Improvement	**Criteria are minimally met or not met**. Major information is missing, unclear, inaccurate, or insufficiently supported, substantially limiting understanding or evaluation.

- Scores should be assigned using the standards one would apply at a large international scientific conference. **Scores of 9 or 10 should be reserved for truly exceptional posters/presentations.** Only a small number of posters across the conference are expected to receive scores in this range. Judges should feel confident that the work meets the highest standards and could be presented at a major international conference with little to no revision required.



Judging Oral Abstract Presentations

Oral Abstract Presentations | November 10-12, 2026

The oral abstract presentations build on the 4 themes introduced during the plenary discussions, providing presenters with an opportunity to share their research, experiences, and innovations in greater detail.

- Theme 1: Advancing Self-Reliance through Sustainable and Innovative Health Systems
- Theme 2: Integrating Priority Health Services into Primary Care to Advance Outcomes
- Theme 3: Clinical and Programmatic Innovations to Drive Quality of Care
- Theme 4: Strengthening Global Health Security through Preparedness, Response, and Innovation

Oral Abstract Presentations | November 10-12, 2026

- Each presenter will have **6 minutes** to deliver their oral presentation.
- Timekeepers will display signs indicating a **2-minute warning, 1-minute warning, and time expired**.
- A **10-15-minute Q&A session** will be held at the end of the presentation session with all speakers, facilitated by the **Oral Abstract Chair**.

Oral Abstract Presentations | November 10-12, 2026

- Judges should arrive at their assigned oral abstract session **early** and will be **seated in the front row**, so that you can see both the presenter and their slides.
- You will **complete the scoring rubric in real-time during the presentations**, and will have a few minutes to finalize your comments before turning in your rubrics.

Rate each section Below by circling the Score

- **Scores of 9 or 10 should be reserved for truly exceptional posters/presentations.** Only a small number of posters across the conference are expected to receive scores in this range.

Oral Presentation Rubric – Program Description

Theme Title
Date + Time of Session
Judge:
Abstracts #
Oral Abstract Title:

Scoring Instructions: Rate each section from **1-10** using the criteria provided. Score what is demonstrated in the presentation; do not infer information that is not presented. Use the "Comments" section to offer feedback on overall strengths or areas for improvement.

Score	Rating	Description
9-10	Exceptional	**Criteria are exceptionally well met.** Information is accurate, complete, clearly presented, and logically connected. Key information is easy to identify and interpret. **Only a few posters overall** will likely meet these criteria.
7-8	Strong	**Criteria are very well met.** Information is clear, accurate, sufficiently detailed, and logically connected. Minor gaps or areas for improvement may be present.
5-6	Good	**Criteria are adequately met.** Essential information is present, accurate, and understandable. Work meets the criteria but may lack some depth, detail, or refinement.
3-4	Developing	**Criteria are only partially met.** Important information is missing, unclear, incomplete, or insufficiently supported. Some aspects may be difficult to understand or evaluate.
1-2	Needs Improvement	**Criteria are minimally met or not met.** Major information is missing, unclear, inaccurate, or insufficiently supported, substantially limiting understanding or evaluation.

Section	Guiding Questions	Circle One
Background	• Is the **problem/need/gap** clearly identified? • Is the **target population or setting** identified? • Is the program's **purpose, scope, or objective** clearly stated?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Description	• Is the **program or intervention** clearly described? • Is it clear **what was implemented, by whom, and where**? • Is the **key population** identified? • Are the **key activities or interventions** described? • Is the **implementation approach** aligned with the stated need or objective?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Lessons Learned	• Are program **results or outcomes** clearly presented? • Is **specific analysis or evaluation of lessons learned** provided? • Is it clear **what changed, was achieved, or was learned**?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Next steps	• Is the **significance of the findings and/or outcomes** towards strengthening care described? • Are implications for **practice, policy, programs or future implementation** identified?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Overall	• Were the **slides clear and easy to read** (text size, figure quality, layout)? • Did the presenter maintain a **professional tone and clear speaking style?** • Did the presenter use their **time efficiently and effectively**? • Did they respond to audience **questions thoughtfully and respectfully** (if applicable)?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Comments. Use this section to offer feedback on overall strengths or areas for improvement.

3 Oral Presentation Rubrics:

- **Program Description**
- **Quality Improvement**
- **Scientific Research**

Rate each section Below by circling the Score

- **Scores of 9 or 10 should be reserved for truly exceptional posters/presentations.** Only a small number of posters across the conference are expected to receive scores in this range.

Oral Presentation Rubric – Quality Improvement

Theme Title
Date + Time of Session
Judge:
Abstracts #
Oral Abstract Title:

Scoring Instructions: Rate each section from **1-10** using the criteria provided. Score what is demonstrated in the presentation; do not infer information that is not presented.

Score	Rating	Description
9-10	Exceptional	**Criteria are exceptionally well met.** Information is accurate, complete, clearly presented, and logically connected. Key information is easy to identify and interpret. **Only a few posters overall** will likely meet these criteria.
7-8	Strong	**Criteria are very well met.** Information is clear, accurate, sufficiently detailed, and logically connected. Minor gaps or areas for improvement may be present.
5-6	Good	**Criteria are adequately met.** Essential information is present, accurate, and understandable. Work meets the criteria but may lack some depth, detail, or refinement.
3-4	Developing	**Criteria are only partially met.** Important information is missing, unclear, incomplete, or insufficiently supported. Some aspects may be difficult to understand or evaluate.
1-2	Needs Improvement	**Criteria are minimally met or not met.** Major information is missing, unclear, inaccurate, or insufficiently supported, substantially limiting understanding or evaluation.

Section	Guiding Questions	Circle One
Purpose	• Is the **problem and current knowledge** summarized? • Is the **local problem** described? • Is the **intended improvement** stated, and does it logically fit the problem? • Is a clear **aim** stated (specific, measurable, time-bound)?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Methods	• Is the **setting** clearly described? • Are the **intervention and implementation**, including team formation, summarized? • Is it clear what **data were collected and how**? • Were the data checked for **accuracy** and **analyzed appropriately**?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Results	• Are **setting factors that could affect results** (resources, staffing, organization culture) reported? • Are the **sequences of events** and **participant numbers shown?** • Is it explained how the **intervention evolved** over time? • Are the **changes in performance or outcomes** clearly presented? • Is change shown using **appropriate data, figures, or other evidence?**	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Discussion	• Do the findings support the **stated conclusions about improvement?** • Are **strengths** and **limitations** described? • Are the **results compared** with other work? • Are **future directions or next steps** appropriate and clear?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Overall	• Were the **slides clear and easy to read** (text size, figure quality, layout)? • Did the presenter maintain a **professional tone and clear speaking style?** • Did the presenter use their **time efficiently and effectively**? • Did they respond to audience **questions thoughtfully and respectfully** (if applicable)?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Comments. Use this section to offer feedback on overall strengths or areas for improvement.

3 Oral Presentation Rubrics:

- **Program Description**
- **Quality Improvement**
- **Scientific Research**

Rate each section Below by circling the Score

- **Scores of 9 or 10 should be reserved for truly exceptional posters/presentations.** Only a small number of posters across the conference are expected to receive scores in this range.

Oral Presentation Rubric – Scientific Research

Theme Title
Date + Time of Session
Judge:
Abstracts #
Oral Abstract Title:

Scoring Instructions: Rate each section from **1-10** using the criteria provided. Score what is demonstrated in the presentation; do not infer information that is not presented. Use the "Comments" section to offer feedback on overall strengths or areas for improvement.

Score	Rating	Description
9-10	Exceptional	**Criteria are exceptionally well met.** Information is accurate, complete, clearly presented, and logically connected. Key information is easy to identify and interpret. **Only a few posters overall** will likely meet these criteria.
7-8	Strong	**Criteria are very well met.** Information is clear, accurate, sufficiently detailed, and logically connected. Minor gaps or areas for improvement may be present.
5-6	Good	**Criteria are adequately met.** Essential information is present, accurate, and understandable. Work meets the criteria but may some lack depth, detail, or refinement.
3-4	Developing	**Criteria are only partially met.** Important information is missing, unclear, incomplete, or insufficiently supported. Some aspects may be difficult to understand or evaluate.
1-2	Needs Improvement	**Criteria are minimally met or not met.** Major information is missing, unclear, inaccurate, or insufficiently supported, substantially limiting understanding or evaluation.

Section	Guiding Questions	Circle One
Background & Rationale	• Is the **purpose** of the research clearly stated? • Is the **problem/need/gap** clearly identified? • Is the **research objective, question,** or **hypothesis** clearly stated?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Methods	• Is the **population and setting** adequately described? *(e.g., location, dates, inclusion)* • Is the **study design/type** clearly identified, appropriate, and rigorous? *(e.g., cross-sectional, qualitative interview study, etc.)* • Is it clear **what data were collected and how**? • Is the **interpretation** of the data accurate? • Are the **methods and analysis appropriate** for the stated objective?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Results	• Are the main **findings** clearly presented? • Is there **specific** evidence to support the findings? *(e.g., counts, percentages, p-values, themes – not just "improved outcomes")* • Are **figures, tables, charts, or quotations** used appropriately? • Do the **results address the stated objective/question**?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Conclusion & Future Directions	• Are **conclusions directly supported** by the results? • Is the **significance or implication** of the findings explained? • Are **future directions, recommendations, or next steps** appropriate and clear?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Overall	• Were the **slides clear and easy to read** (text size, figure quality, layout)? • Did the presenter maintain a **professional tone and clear speaking style?** • Did the presenter use their **time efficiently and effectively**? • Did they respond to audience **questions thoughtfully and respectfully** (if applicable)?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Comments. Use this section to offer feedback on overall strengths or areas for improvement.

3 Oral Presentation Rubrics:

- Program Description
- Quality Improvement
- Scientific Research



Judging Poster Presentations

Poster Presentations

Poster Session 1: Wednesday November 11 11:05 - 12:00

Poster Session 2: Wednesday November 11 4:20 - 5:20

- Judges will receive a clipboard with scoring rubrics, pre-populated with the presentation details
- Judges will walk to their assigned posters using the Poster Board # in the corner of the poster board
- **Judge-led poster walkabout:** Judges will visit assigned posters during the session. Presenters will have up to **5 minutes** to present their poster, followed by **2 minutes for questions and discussion**.
- Judges will need to manage time during the poster session to ensure they have time to visit all assigned posters during the session
- Judges will complete scoring rubrics in real-time during the poster session and submit scoring rubrics at the end.

Poster Board # in the Corner of the Poster Board



Rate each section Below by circling the Score

- **Scores of 9 or 10 should be reserved for truly exceptional posters/presentations.** Only a small number of posters across the conference are expected to receive scores in this range.

Poster Presentation Rubric – Program Description

Date + Time, Poster Session
Judge Name:
Posterboard Number:
Poster Title:
Presenter Name:

Scoring Instructions: Rate each section from **1-10** using the criteria provided. Score what is demonstrated in the poster and presentation; do not infer information that is not presented. Use the "Comments" section to offer feedback on overall strengths or areas for improvement.

Score	Rating	Description
9-10	Exceptional	**Criteria are exceptionally well met.** Information is accurate, complete, clearly presented, and logically connected. Key information is easy to identify and interpret. **Only a few posters overall** will likely meet these criteria.
7-8	Strong	**Criteria are very well met.** Information is clear, accurate, sufficiently detailed, and logically connected. Minor gaps or areas for improvement may be present.
5-6	Good	**Criteria are adequately met.** Essential information is present, accurate, and understandable. Work meets the criteria but may lack some depth, detail, or refinement.
3-4	Developing	**Criteria are only partially met.** Important information is missing, unclear, incomplete, or insufficiently supported. Some aspects may be difficult to understand or evaluate.
1-2	Needs Improvement	**Criteria are minimally met or not met.** Major information is missing, unclear, inaccurate, or insufficiently supported, substantially limiting understanding or evaluation.

Section	Guiding Questions	Circle One
Background	• Is the **problem/need/gap** clearly identified? • Is the **target population or setting** identified? • Is the program's **purpose, scope, or objective** clearly stated?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Description	• Is the **program or intervention** clearly described? • Is it clear **what was implemented, by whom, and where**? • Is the **key population** identified? • Are the **key activities or interventions** described? • Is the **implementation approach** aligned with the stated need or objective?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Lessons Learned	• Are program **results or outcomes** clearly presented? • Is **specific analysis or evaluation of lessons learned** provided? • Is it clear **what changed, was achieved, or was learned**?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Next steps	• Is the **significance of the findings and/or outcomes** towards strengthening care described? • Are implications for **practice, policy, programs or future implementation** identified?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Poster Quality/ Organization	• Are the text and figures/tables readable? • Is the poster **logically organized and easy to follow?** • Is the information **concise, without unnecessary clutter?** • Are **figures, tables, and graphics** clear and relevant?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Presentation	• Did the presenter explain the poster clearly and professionally? • Was the presentation **focused and understandable?** • Did the presenter **respond thoughtfully to questions**? • Did the presenter demonstrate an **understanding of the work**?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Comments. Use this section to offer feedback on overall strengths or areas for improvement.

3 Different Poster Presentation Rubrics

- **Program Description**
- **Quality Improvement**
- **Scientific Research**


Questions?

“If you want to go fast, go alone. If you want to go far, go together.”

-African Proverb

Global Health