RDMLA Symposium Proposal Rating Rubric

Poster proposals are rated in four categories on a scale of 1 (fair) to 3 (excellent)

<u>Proposal Description</u>: Is the proposal clearly written, with sufficient detail, outline the proposed presentation, and is relevant to the year's theme?

Fair – 1 Point	Good – 2 Points	Excellent – 3 Points
Proposal is unclear about what is being proposed, has poor grammar and multiple typos, is not well organized and difficult to understand, and does not relate to the year's theme.	Proposal is adequately written and hints at the year's theme, but could use additional information or editing to make it more understandable and organized.	Proposal is clearly written (correct grammar, minimal typos, easy to read), concise, easy to understand, well organized, and strongly relates to the year's theme.

<u>Timeliness/Demand</u>: Is the topic timely, important, and appropriate to the field and potential audience?

Fair – 1 Point	Good – 2 Points	Excellent – 3 Points
Topic is only tangentially related to the field and/or has been presented often; there is little demand/no potential audience.	Topic has been explored and not necessarily current, but it is relevant to the field and potential audience.	Topic is an emerging, current, important topic, and is appropriate to the field and potential audience, and/or there is a demonstrated high demand.

<u>Presentation/Engagement Style</u>: Is the proposed presentation likely to engage participants in discussion, thought, and active learning?

Fair – 1 Point	Good – 2 Points	Excellent – 3 Points
Proposal does not suggest or imply any strategies for engagement of attendees.	Proposal suggests some type of active engagement, but the description is unclear.	Proposal clearly provides detail for active engagement of attendees.

<u>Evidence of Critical Engagement</u>: Does the proposal consider the larger questions of equity, justice, ethical research practice and/or demonstrate how diversity of viewpoints will be represented?

Fair – 1 Point	Good – 2 Points	Excellent – 3 Points
Proposal does not clearly explain ways of critical engagement, and there is no diversity of viewpoints.	Proposal provides some evidence of critical engagement and interaction between multiple perspectives, but lacks detail and/or range of perspectives is narrow.	Proposal provides detailed evidence of critical engagement of larger questions and will integrate multiple perspectives and a cohesive theme will be readily apparent to the audience.

Panel proposals are rated in six categories on a scale of 1 (fair) to 3 (excellent)

Proposal Description: Is the proposal clearly written, with sufficient detail, outline the proposed presentation, and is relevant to the year's theme?

Fair – 1 Point	Good – 2 Points	Excellent – 3 Points
Proposal is unclear what is being proposed, has poor grammar and multiple typos, is not well organized and difficult to understand, and does not relate to the year's theme.	Proposal is adequately written and hints at the year's theme, but could use additional information or editing to make it more understandable and organized.	Proposal is clearly written (correct grammar, minimal typos, easy to read), concise, easy to understand, well organized, and strongly relates to the year's theme.

Timeliness/Demand: Is the topic timely, important, and appropriate to the field and potential audience?

Fair – 1 Point	Good – 2 Points	Excellent – 3 Points
Topic is only tangentially related to the field and/or has been presented often; there is little demand/no potential audience.	Topic has been explored and not necessarily current, but it is relevant to the field and potential audience.	Topic is an emerging, current, important topic, and is appropriate to the field and potential audience, and/or there is a demonstrated high demand.

Presentation/Engagement Style: Is the proposed presentation likely to engage participants in discussion, thought, and active learning?

Fair – 1 Point	Good – 2 Points	Excellent – 3 Points
Proposal does not suggest or imply any strategies for engagement of attendees.	Proposal suggests some type of active engagement, but the description is unclear.	Proposal clearly provides detail for active engagement of attendees.

Learning Outcomes/Takeaways: Are learning outcomes/takeaways clear, specific, observable, and actionable?

Fair – 1 Point	Good – 2 Points	Excellent – 3 Points
Proposal does not specify learning outcomes/takeaways.	Proposal provides learning outcomes/takeaways that are vague and will be difficult to assess.	Proposal provides learning outcomes/takeaways that are clear and specific.

Evidence of Critical Engagement: Does the proposal consider the larger questions of equity, justice, ethical research practice and/or demonstrate how diversity of viewpoints will be represented?

Fair – 1 Point	Good – 2 Points	Excellent – 3 Points
Proposal does not clearly explain ways of critical engagement, and there is no diversity of viewpoints.	Proposal provides some evidence of critical engagement and interaction between multiple perspectives, but lacks detail and/or range of perspectives is narrow.	Proposal provides detailed evidence of critical engagement of larger questions and will integrate multiple perspectives and a cohesive theme will be readily apparent to the audience.

Format: Is the proposal presentation appropriate for the format of a panel?

Fair – 1 Point	Good – 2 Points	Excellent – 3 Points
Proposal does not provide enough content (or too much content) and is inappropriate for the format type.	Proposal indicates that the panel format is likely okay, but the content is lacking some details.	Proposal provides an appropriate amount of content to demonstrate it is appropriate for session type and delivery method.