Conference Proposal Rubric: Upskilling Session

Directions

Provide your name and the proposal number/title, assign points for each criterion, and total the points at the bottom of the sheet. Please add the score and any additional comments on the spreadsheet.

Proposal Name: _____
Proposal Presenter: _____ Reviewer: _____

Criteria Table

CRITERIA (POINTS POSSIBLE)	MEETS OR EXCEEDS CRITERIA (12 POINTS)	ACCEPTABLE (8 POINTS)	NOT ACCEPTABLE (6 OR 0 POINTS)	POINTS
Relevance to the conference mission: Is the skill or topic proposed here relevant to the work of student success professionals?	This presentation is directly targeted to address a specific skill or topic relevant to the work of student success professionals.	This presentation addresses a relevant skill generally, though its connection to how it might be relevant to the work of student success professionals may be somewhat ambiguous.	This presentation does not directly address any skill or topic that would be of relevance to the work of student success professionals.	
Relevance to the audience: Will this content be relevant to the majority of the audience, which consists of professionals across student success offices and faculty.	This presentation would be useful for all audience members, including practitioners across Student Affairs, Undergraduate Education, Enrollment Management, and faculty.	This presentation would be relevant for a large percentage of practitioners across at least two divisions.	This presentation would only be relevant to a limited audience, which does not make up a large percentage of the conference attendees.	
CRITERIA (POINTS POSSIBLE)	**MEETS OR EXCEEDS CRITERIA (9 POINTS)**	**ACCEPTABLE (6 POINTS)**	**NOT ACCEPTABLE (1 OR 0 POINTS)**	**POINTS**

Audience Take-aways: Are there clearly defined tools, practices, or resources shared that can be implemented by audience members?	Audience Take-aways for participants are clear and practical.	Audience Take-aways participants are somewhat clear.	Audience Take-aways for participants are not clear.	
Foundation & expertise: Is the proposal grounded in established theory, known best practices, and/or sound research methods?	The knowledge of the presenter(s) about this topic is extensive and proposed ideas and/or results are well-founded.	The knowledge of the presenter(s) about this topic seems limited.	The knowledge of the presenter(s) about this topic is not apparent.	
CRITERIA (POINTS POSSIBLE)	**MEETS OR EXCEEDS CRITERIA (4 POINTS)**	**ACCEPTABLE (2 POINTS)**	**NOT ACCEPTABLE (0 POINTS)**	**POINTS**
Organization of ideas: The proposal is well-organized, with a structure that will be easy for participants to follow and grasp. The content fits well within the proposed format.	The presentation description is well organized. The content meets the time requirements for a presentation.	The presentation description is somewhat organized though some connections may be unclear. The timing of the presentation or the amount of visual content for a poster may be unclear or seem overly dense or not dense enough.	The presentation description is not organized. The proposal does not seem to fit the proposed form adequately.	
			TOTAL (46 POSSIBLE POINTS)	

Reviewer Responses

1. Describe any concerns, reservations, or questions you have regarding this proposal.
2. Your overall review for this proposal (choose one):
   - ○ Accept as is
   - ○ Accept conditionally
   - ○ Do not accept
3. Additional comments for the proposer: