

Proposal Rating Rubric

Type of Session SIG	70-minute Workshop		70-minute Panel	35-minute Paper Presentation		20-minute Teaching Tip		Poster Presentation		
	Adult Education	Applied Linguistics	Bilingual Education	Elementary Education	Higher Education	Secondary Education	Special Education	Teacher Education	Teaching English International	
Evaluation Criteria	Excellent 5	Good 4	Satisfactory 3	Fair 2	Poor 1	Comments				
1. Proposal Summary	The summary succinctly describes the session. Learning outcomes for participants are clearly articulated. Participants will greatly benefit from attending this session. The summary adheres to word limits.	The summary clearly describes the session and learning outcomes are articulated. Participants will benefit from attending this session. The summary adheres to word limits.	The summary generally describes what the session will be about and learning outcomes are articulated to some degree. Some participants may benefit from attending this session. The summary adheres to word limits.	The summary cursorily indicates what the session will be about, however learning outcomes are unclear. This session may not be well-attended and/or participants may not benefit. The summary is either too short or too long.	The summary indicates little about what the session might entail and there are no references to learning outcomes. This session will not attract sufficient attendance. The summary is either too short or too long.					
2. Timeliness and Appropriateness of Topic (Applies to Conference Theme)	The proposal represents issues of immediate relevance and importance to the conference theme.	The proposal is timely and appropriate to the theme.	The proposal focuses on issues appropriate to the field, but is not aligned to the conference theme.	The proposal focuses on out-of-date materials and/or practice.	The proposal's focus is irrelevant and of no importance to the field.					
3. Significance of Content (Research-based and relevant to current context)	The proposal is solidly based on current research, knowledge, and/or practice (praxis) in the field.	The proposal is based on current research and practice in the field.	The proposal alludes to current research and practice in the field.	The proposal refers only to historically established and/or extraneous issues or practices in the field.	The proposal refers to some research and practices or contributions in the field.					
4. Clarity of Proposal Title and Abstract	The proposal title and abstract are succinctly written. They are well-aligned to and reflect proposal summary. Both adhere to word limits.	The proposal title and abstract are clearly written. They reflect the proposal summary. Both adhere to word limits.	The proposal title and/or abstract are adequately written. One or both may not reflect the proposal summary. Both adhere to word limits.	The proposal title and/or abstract need some additional work. They do not reflect the proposal summary. One or both do not adhere to word limits.	The proposal title and abstract need significant work. There is no alignment to the proposal summary. They do not adhere to word limits.					
5. Contribution to the Conference and/or to the Field	The session will make significant, memorable contributions to the conference and effective educational practices.	The session will positively contribute to the conference and to effective educational practices.	The session will offer minimal contribution to the conference and to effective educational practices.	Conference attendees may question the validity of the inclusion of this session.	Conference attendees will most likely regret their decision to attend this session.					
Recommendation: Accept Reject	Please explain why this proposal should be accepted or rejected:				TOTAL SCORE / 25					