

Proposal Rating Rubric Presentation proposals are rated in five categories on a scale of **1 (fair)** to **3 (excellent)**.

Evaluation Criteria	Fair - 1 Point	Good - 2 Points	Excellent - 3 Points
1. Currency, importance, and appropriateness of the topic to the field	Topic is only tangentially related to the field, not current or important to the field and/or to the potential audience. It may not be a worthwhile session.	Topic may not be current or groundbreaking, but it is relevant to the field and potential audience. It might be a worthwhile session.	Topic is current, important, and appropriate to the field and potential audience. It appears to be a worthwhile session.
2. Purpose, participant outcomes, and session type	The proposal may be appropriate for the session type. The length and content are inappropriate for the session type, and the delivery methods and participant outcomes are too general or broad.	The length, content and delivery methods are generally appropriate for the session type. The objectives and participant outcomes are stated or implied but may lack sufficient focus.	The length and content are appropriate for the session type and delivery methods. The objectives and participant outcomes are clear.
3. Support for practices, conclusions, and/or recommendations	The proposal states or implies references to support, but it is not clear whether sufficient support will be provided for practices, conclusions, or recommendations.	The proposal gives some indication as to how practices, conclusions, or recommendations will be substantiated.	The proposal provides details indicating that the practices, conclusions, or recommendations will be substantiated.
4. Clarity of proposal as indicator of presentation quality	The writing suggests that the presentation may be weak.	The proposal is adequately written but suggests that the presentation may be uneven or of moderate quality.	The proposal is clearly written and suggests that the presentation will be of very good quality.
5. Evidence of critical engagement (places the work in the context of larger questions about equity & justice) and ethical research practice (if applicable)	Proposal does not clearly explain roles or ways of critical engagement. The proposal does not make clear their research practice or does not appear to be ethical	Proposal gives some indication of evidence of critical engagement but lacks detail. Proposal refers somewhat to evidence of ethical research practice	Proposal provides details indicating evidence of critical engagement within the work. Proposal provides full details indicating evidence of ethical research practices
Panels will be evaluated with the first 5 criteria above and these additional items			
Engagement of session participants	Proposal does not clearly state or imply the type of engagement of session participants	Proposal mentions some type of engagement of the session participants	Proposal provides detail of the planned engagement of the session participants
Proposal explains how the panelists will provide multiple perspectives on the focal topic and encourage in-depth and multifaceted views of the topic.	Proposal does not state or imply how they panelists will provide multiple perspectives	Proposal mentions some ways that the panelists will provide multiple perspectives	Proposal provides in depth detail on how the panelists will provide multiple perspectives on the focal topic

Lightning / ignite talks will only be evaluated with these criteria

Evaluation Criteria	Fair - 1 Point	Good - 2 Points	Excellent - 3 Points
Proposal appropriateness for session type	Proposal does not seem to fit the brevity of the session	Proposal somewhat indicates how it is appropriate for session type	The length (5 minutes) and content are appropriate for the session type and delivery methods.
Currency, importance, and appropriateness of the topic to the field	Topic is only tangentially related to the field, not current or important to the field and/or to the potential audience. It may not be a worthwhile session.	Topic may not be current or groundbreaking, but it is relevant to the field and potential audience. It might be a worthwhile session.	Topic is current, important, and appropriate to the field and potential audience. It appears to be a worthwhile session.
Clarity and organization of proposal	The writing suggests that the presentation may be weak.	The proposal is adequately written but suggests that the presentation may be uneven or of moderate quality.	The proposal is clearly written and suggests that the presentation will be of very good quality.

Posters will be evaluated will only be evaluated with these criteria

Evaluation Criteria	Fair - 1 Point	Good - 2 Points	Excellent - 3 Points
Proposal appropriateness for session type	Proposal does not seem to fit the brevity of the session	Proposal somewhat indicates how it is appropriate for session type	The content is appropriate for the session type and delivery methods.
Currency, importance, and appropriateness of the topic to the field	Topic is only tangentially related to the field, not current or important to the field and/or to the potential audience. It may not be a worthwhile session.	Topic may not be current or groundbreaking, but it is relevant to the field and potential audience. It might be a worthwhile session.	Topic is current, important, and appropriate to the field and potential audience. It appears to be a worthwhile session.
Clarity and organization of proposal	The writing suggests that the presentation may be weak.	The proposal is adequately written but suggests that the presentation may be uneven or of moderate quality.	The proposal is clearly written and suggests that the presentation will be of very good quality.