

ATENK 2020 Proposal Rating Rubric

Proposals are rated in four categories on a scale of 1 (poor) to 4 (excellent). For more information about the rubric, please see the Checklist for Proposal Writers.

Evaluation Criteria	Poor (1 Point)	Fair (2 Points)	Good (3 Points)	Excellent (4 Points)
1. Currency, importance, and appropriateness of topic to the field and audience	Topic is not current and/or lacks importance or appropriateness to the field and/or to the potential audience.	Topic is only tangentially related to the field, not completely current or important to the field and/or to the potential audience.	Topic is current, important, and appropriate to the field and potential audience.	Topic is cutting-edge, groundbreaking, and significant to the field and potential audience.
2. Theory, practice, and/or research basis	The proposal does not mention a pedagogical, research, theoretical, and/or policy rationale, or it is unclear how the rationale is connected to the field or content of the presentation.	The proposal refers loosely or tangentially to a pedagogical, research, theoretical, and/or policy rationale, but the citations and/or terminology are not specific, recent, or relevant to the field or content of the presentation.	The proposal presents the pedagogical, research, theoretical, and/or policy rationale for the presentation content via citations and/or terminology related to the field or content of the presentation.	The proposal fully incorporates the pedagogical, research, theoretical, and/or policy rationale for the presentation content into the description via citations and/or terminology related to the field or content of the presentation.
3. Overview of session content.	The proposal makes claims with no description of the method, procedure, or plan of action to achieve the goals and objectives of the session.	The proposal lacks coherence and/or loosely describes the method, procedure, and plan of action to achieve the goals and objectives of the session	The proposal provides a clear and coherent description of the method, procedure, and plan of action to achieve the goals and objectives of the session.	The proposal provides a very clear, detailed, and coherent description of the method, procedure, and plan of action to achieve the goals and objectives of the session.
4. Outcomes and implications for educational settings	The participant outcomes and practical implications for ATENK professionals	The participant outcomes and practical implications for ATENK professionals	The participant outcomes and practical implications for ATENK professionals	The participant outcomes and practical implications for

	are not provided.	are unclear and/or too broad.	are mostly clear and specific.	ATENK professionals are very clear, specific, and highly relevant.
5. Appropriateness in terms of length, content and delivery methods	The proposal is inappropriate for the session type in terms of length, content, and delivery methods.	The proposal is somewhat inappropriate for the session type in terms of length, content, and/or delivery methods.	The proposal is mostly appropriate for the session type in terms of length content, and/or delivery methods.	The proposal is clearly appropriate for the session type in terms of length, content, and delivery methods.
6. Overall clarity of proposal as indicator of presentation quality	The proposal is vague and/or poorly edited, suggesting that the presentation may be of poor quality. I do not recommend this session.	The proposal is somewhat clear but suggests that the presentation may be of weak quality. I might recommend this session.	The proposal is clear and suggests that the presentation will be of good quality. I recommend this session.	The proposal is very clear and well-written, suggesting that the presentation will be of professional quality. I strongly recommend this session.