



NACADA Annual Conference Proposal Rating Rubric Reader Evaluation

INSTRUCTIONS:

Comments: Provide specific, positive and relevant suggestions and comments for all proposals. Stay focused on the proposal itself and use moderate, temperate and clear language to provide feedback for how the proposal could be improved.

Format: Would you recommend a different format for the presentation, e.g. preconference workshop, poster session, etc.

Guidelines: Well written, includes complete description with background information, overview of the presentation and description of format.

If research: Description of methods, findings and recommendations, emphasis on research results and collected data

Also include: Learning outcomes, relationship of program to the conference theme, methods of audience involvement and familiarity and background of the presenters with the subject matter

Effective descriptions:
Mentions relevant theories and research
Includes an outline of the presentation
Describes intended learning outcomes for participants
Describes the institution and /or presenters

Ask yourself:

1. Are the objectives and learning outcomes clearly stated?
2. Is the subject matter "timely?"
3. Does the topic contribute to the advancement of the field of advising
4. Does the presenter offer a creative approach?
5. How adaptable are the presenter's ideas to various settings? Does the framework seem limited to the researcher's own institutional context?
6. Would you be interested in attending this session? Why or why not?
7. Who is the audience for this session? Think in terms of the novice vs. more seasoned advisor. Is it geared towards advising in a specific area, institution, or interest group?

NACADA Annual Conference Proposal Rating Rubric Reader Evaluation

8. Does the writer convince you that s/he has the knowledge/expertise to present on such a topic?
9. Would you recommend a different format for the presentation, e.g. preconference workshop, poster session, etc.?
10. While this topic may have been covered many times before ("fatigue" factor), does this presentation offer a novel approach?
11. Are the proposal and abstract well written with no grammatical or typographical errors?
12. For Preconference Workshops - is there a clear take away? Would your boss be willing to pay extra for you to attend this session? Is there an active component - or is it simply a "long concurrent" session?

SEE PROPOSAL RUBRIC ON FOLLOWING PAGES

NACADA Annual Conference Proposal Rating Rubric Reader Evaluation

Proposals must be well written with no (citation), grammatical, or typographical errors. Proposals should include complete descriptions with information on institution and/or presenters, background information, relevant theories and research, overview of the presentation (including an outline of the presentation) and description of the format. Proposals can include intended audience for their session. Proposals should also include participants' intended learning outcomes, relationship of program to the conference theme, methods of audience involvement and familiarity and background of the presenters with the subject matter.

Criteria	1 Does not meet Expectations	2 Below Expectations	3 Satisfactory	4 Good	5 Excellent	Not Applicable
Interest: Would there be a high level of interest in this session?	This session would not be of interest / cannot identify an audience for this session.	Although an audience is identified, it is not clear why attendees would want to attend this session.	This session has a clear audience and general rationale why attendees would attend.	This session sounds as though it would prove interesting to clearly identifiable groups of attendees.	This session would be highly interesting. There would be a good audience for this session.	
Application: Would these ideas be adaptable to other institutions?	The framework for this session seems limited to the institutional context.	This session could apply to certain institutions.	This session could be adapted to a number of institutions.	This session has the potential of being applicable to other institutions.	The session clearly is highly adaptable to various settings	
Clarity: Are the abstract and purpose of the proposed session well articulated?	The goals and objectives of the session are not clear at all.	The goals of the session are clear, but it is not clear how the objectives will be met.	The goals and objectives of the session are mentioned.	The goals and objectives of the session are stated and explained.	The goals and objectives of the session are made abundantly clear and explained well.	

NACADA Annual Conference Proposal Rating Rubric Reader Evaluation

Criteria	1 Does not meet expectations	2 Below Expectations	3 Satisfactory	4 Good	5 Excellent	Not Applicable
Creativity: Would this introduce new ideas, approaches, and concepts?	The session presents a topic that is often repeated and presents a fatigue factor	This session presents one or two new ideas that could be helpful.	This session offers a number of new ideas, approaches or concepts.	This session offers a new perspective along with new ideas, approaches or concepts.	This session (is transformative) and offers a novel approach	
Relevance: Is this topic relevant to current advising issues?	The subject matter is dated.	The subject matter contains a few ideas that are current.	The subject matter involves topics of current interest.	The subject matter is timely.	The subject matter is timely and offers advancement to the field of advising.	
IF APPLICABLE:	Note: Not all proposals are based on the criteria below. These scores are intended to provide an appropriate rating score where applicable. Proposals should not be adversely evaluated if they are not based on the criteria below.					
Research: Grounded in research (description of methods, findings, and recommendations, as well as emphasis on research results and collected data, where applicable?)	None of the research information is included	Some research information is included, but it seems incomplete	Research information is complete	All recommended research information is included.	Research information is written clearly and provides insight into the research process.	Proposal is not a research-based proposal

NACADA Annual Conference Proposal Rating Rubric Reader Evaluation

<p>Diversity: Does this proposal include issues of equity and/or inclusion and/or diversity, if appropriate?</p>	<p>This session mentions issues in these areas, but does not explain how it is relevant to these issues.</p>	<p>This sessions covers and explains relevant ideas in these areas</p>	<p>This session offers insights and new ideas, approaches, concepts having to do with equity, inclusion and diversity.</p>	<p>This session provides a number of well-articulated insights and new ideas, approaches, concepts having to do with equity, inclusion and diversity.</p>	<p>This session would provide a significant addition to the field in the areas of equity, inclusion and diversity.</p>	<p>Proposal does not deal with issues of diversity</p>
<p>For Preconference Sessions only: Is there a clear take away? Would your boss be willing to pay extra for you to attend this session? Is there an active component - or is it simply a "long concurrent" session?</p>					<p>The session would be valuable and relevant for attendees. There is a clear take-away for the session. The session is interactive and should be a preconference session.</p>	<p>Proposal is not suitable as a preconference workshop session</p>