

Creating and Sustaining Support Systems for Children and Families in Poverty Conference

Rubric for Peer Reviewing Conference Proposals

Please begin by checking the box for the strand and session type in the first line of the rubric below. Type the proposal title in the open space in the same first line. Scoring directions are as follows: Score each criterion between 1 and 5. While indicators are provided for odd numbers, you can score 2 and 4 as an intermediary between the odd values. Also, 0 can be assigned if the proposal has a blank/empty for that section and that information is not found in another section of the proposal. The criteria are weighted to determine the total score, with calculation directions provided on the rubric.

Strand	Trauma Informed Instruction Social Emotional Learning in the Classroom Research, Policy, & Practice on Working with Children & Families in Poverty Increasing Educational Access and Success for Low Income Students	Session Type	Research to Practice Case Studies Roundtables	Proposal Title			
Scoring Directions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Type your score into the top right box on each criterion line in the weighted score column (Example: 4). Multiple the score by the value indicated in the bottom left box (Example: 3, 3x4). Place the total weighted score in the rightmost column (Example: 12). Add the total scores in the rightmost column to calculate a total score for this proposal in the final row. 						4	12
						x3	
Criteria	5	3	1	Weighted Score			
Content Consider both Abstract & Full Proposal	Content is clearly and correctly described. Content provides important confirming or disconfirming evidence for commonly held beliefs that will greatly impact audience. Proposal offers a novel approach to the content, well-suited for creating and sustaining support systems for children and families in poverty.	Content is described, but possibly only implicitly, or there may be easily corrected in the content description. Proposal is a similar application to the content that is in district professional learning or institutes of higher education, but offers a slightly different angle based on an aspect of the content provided, strand, session type, etc.	Content is not clearly described, implicitly or explicitly; or there are significant errors in the content description. Proposal offers only a routine application of well understood procedures to a problem without much novelty.	x3			
Objectives	Objectives provide a clear and authentic description of realistic participant outcomes including understandings and skills. Written in participant-friendly language.	Objectives provide a description of participant outcomes, but they may lack authenticity or realism regarding the time allotted. May not include both understandings and skills but should include at least one. Written in participant-friendly language but may include jargon (e.g., PWBAT).	Objectives provide a limited or unrealistic or unauthentic description of participant outcomes. Objectives lack both understandings and skills. Objectives are written without the use of participant-friendly language and/or use copious jargon.	x2			

Fit with Conference Strand	Proposal clearly addresses a chosen strand conference and makes clear and relevant connections how their proposal meets the strand description.	Proposal is tangentially related to chosen conference strand; the proposal suggests some exploration of an aspect the strand but may not fully embrace all aspects of the strand description.	Proposal is not related to a chosen strand and/or attempts to make a connection to several strands without depth or relevance.		
				x3	
Engagement	Clearly describes what will occur during the presentation, with an interactive level of engagement. Proposal seems reasonable for the time available. Proposal demonstrates an appropriate level of critical reflection and analysis based on the session type selected. May include information on accessible (e.g., use a microphone rather than teacher voice, use close captions, Open Dyslexic font); and inclusive practices (e.g., use inclusive references and pictures; have a land and/or Black body acknowledgement slide)	Partially describes what will occur during the presentation, with limited amount of interactive engagement. Proposal may be reasonable for the time available. Level of engagement is somewhat interactive and may or may not be achievable (as described) in the time available. Proposal includes evidence of critical reflection and analysis; may be of limited depth based on the session type selected.	Description is unclear as to what will occur during the presentation, with a lack of evidence as to interactive engagement or to sufficient time for the indicated plan. Little evidence of critical reflection or analysis based on the session type selected.		
				x2	
References and Resources	References and/or resources appropriate for the proposal; indicate that the proposal is cutting edge, addresses new knowledge or looks at seminal knowledge with new applications.	References and/or resources are mostly appropriate for the proposal; indicate that while the proposal may not break new ground, it might reinforce current the knowledge base.	References and/or resources are not appropriate for the proposal; indicate that the proposal is redundant, outdated, or draws little from the knowledge base.		
				x1	
Cohesive Proposal	The proposal is carefully crafted, clear, and concise. Proposal is well-written and easy to follow.	The proposal is summarily presented but difficult to follow. Proposal is adequately written.	Proposal lacks a rationale or the one provided is unclear. Proposal is poorly written.		
				x1	
Proposal Total Weighted Score					
Add the total scores in the rightmost column to calculate a total score for this proposal. Do not count the example (12) in the total weighted score.					

Comments

Please provide comments for the proposal author(s):

Please provide comments for the Conference Planning Committee: