

Submission Review Rubric

CRITERIA	EXCELLENT = 5	GOOD = 4	AVERAGE = 3	FAIR = 2	POOR = 1
PROPOSAL TITLE: Does the program title clearly describe the program as proposed?	Title is strong, clear, and matches the program proposed. Audience can rely on the title for an accurate idea of the topic.	Title is clear and generally relevant to the program as proposed.	The title is adequate and neither offensive nor inspiring.	Title is difficult to understand and/or is an inaccurate description of the program as proposed.	Title is unrelated to the proposed program.
PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION: Does the program description clearly, with sufficient detail, outline the proposed presentation?	Description is clear, concise, and easy to understand	Description is clear and generally easy to understand.	Description is acceptable.	Description is unnecessarily verbose and/or difficult to understand.	It is unclear what is being proposed.
TARGET AUDIENCE/RELEVANCE: Who is the target audience and why would this session be relevant to them?	Target audience is clearly defined & the significance of the topic to that audience is clearly described.	Target audience is specified and the relevance of the topic to that audience is loosely described.	Target audience is articulated and unambiguous but not specific.	Target audience is generally stated, and the relevance of the topic to that audience is not described.	Target audience and relevance are not described or are described only in vague terms.
CONFERENCE THEME/GOALS: Does the proposal reflect aspects of the conference goals and themes?	The conference theme/goals are a predominant factor in the session content.	The conference theme/goals are a significant factor in the session content.	The conference theme/goals are a moderate factor in the session content.		The conference theme/goals are not reflected at all in the session content.
TIMELINESS/DEMAND: Is the topic timely, new and/or in-demand?	The topic is an emerging "hot" topic and/or a topic for which there is demonstrated high demand.	While this topic has been explored, it remains an in-demand topic.	This topic is acceptable – not cutting edge or emerging.	This topic has been presented often/recently, and interest may be declining.	This topic has been presented often. There is little demand.
INNOVATION: Does the content offer fresh, innovative ideas, methods, or resources?	The proposal content is original and innovative.	The proposal content is a new take on a familiar topic	This topic is acceptable – neither hackneyed nor innovative.	The proposal content is a popular approach on a popular topic.	The proposal content is weak and lacks originality.
LEARNING OUTCOMES: Are learning outcomes clear, specific, observable, and actionable?	Learning outcomes are clear and specific. There are at least two actionable goals.	Learning outcomes are generally clear and specific. There is at least one learning outcome specified.	Learning outcomes are acceptable but not inspired.	Learning outcomes are vague and will be difficult to assess.	Learning outcomes are not specified.
TLA CORE VALUES (Value Libraries; Learning Culture; Thriving Organization): Does the proposal support one or more of these broad TLA strategic directions and/or TLA Core Values?	The proposal clearly articulates a relationship to one (or more) of these strategic directions or core values, with a learning objective clearly articulated	The proposal indicates a relationship to one (or more) of these strategic directions or core values, but the learning objective is not clearly articulated.	The proposal indicates a vague relationship to one (or more) of these strategic directions or core values, but the learning objective is not clearly articulated.	The proposal suggests a relationship to one (or more) of these strategic directions or core values, but it is not articulated and there is no related learning objective.	The proposal does not suggest any relationship to these strategic directions or core values.
PERSPECTIVES: Does the proposal demonstrate how multiple perspectives will be addressed -- and how diversity of viewpoints will be represented?	The session will integrate multiple perspectives and a cohesive theme will be readily apparent to the audience. This rating may include presentation of a viewpoint that is underrepresented.	Interaction between multiple perspectives is indicated and some cohesion is likely; the range of perspectives is broad.	Interaction between multiple perspectives is not likely; the range of perspectives is relatively narrow.	The range of perspectives will be narrow.	The presentation of multiple perspectives, if any, is unclear, and there is no diversity of viewpoints.



Submission Review Rubric