

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 a negligible 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 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. |