

Doctoral Research and Master's Student Forums
Evaluation Rubric

Evaluation Criteria	Poor (1 Point)	Fair (2 Points)	Good (3 Points)	Very Good (4 Points)	Excellent (5 Points)
1. Currency, importance, and appropriateness of topic to the field	Topic is not current and/or lacks importance or appropriateness to the field. It does not appear to be a worthwhile session.	Topic is only tangentially related to the field, not current or important to the field and/or to the potential audience. It may not be a worthwhile session.	Topic may not be current or groundbreaking, but it is relevant to the field and potential audience. It might be a worthwhile session.	Topic is current, important, and appropriate to the field and potential audience. It appears to be a worthwhile session.	The topic is cutting-edge, relevant, groundbreaking, or significant to the field and potential audience. It appears to be a very worthwhile session.
2. Purpose, participant outcomes, and session type	The length and content are inappropriate for the session type, and the delivery methods and/or objectives are not clearly stated or implied.	The proposal may be appropriate for the session type. The length and content are inappropriate for the session type, and the delivery methods and participant outcomes are too general or broad.	The length, content and delivery methods are generally appropriate for the session type. The objectives and participant outcomes are stated or implied but may lack sufficient focus.	The length and content are appropriate for the session type and delivery methods. The objectives and participant outcomes are clear.	The length, content, and delivery methods match the session type. The objectives and participant outcomes are very clear.
3. Theory, practice, and/or research basis	The proposal does not mention theory, practice, or research, or it is unclear how this session is connected to the field.	The proposal provides background references to theory, practice, and/or research, but the references are not specific or recent, or the proposal does not relate the theory, practice, and/or research to the content.	The proposal refers somewhat to relevant theory, practice, and/or research in an understandable way and relates it to the content.	The proposal refers clearly to the relevant theory, practice, and/or research in a thorough and comprehensible manner (i.e. current citations, terminology, and/or debates in the field) and relates it directly to the content.	The proposal refers specifically to the relevant theory, practice, and/or research in a detailed and comprehensible manner (i.e., current citations, terminology, and/or debates in the field), and relates it directly to the presentation content.
4. Support for practices, conclusions, and/or recommendations	The proposal does not indicate how it will support its claims.	The proposal states or implies references to support, but it is not clear whether sufficient support will be provided for practices, conclusions, or recommendations.	The proposal gives some indication as to how practices, conclusions, or recommendations will be substantiated.	The proposal provides details indicating that the practices, conclusions, or recommendations will be substantiated.	The proposal provides ample details indicating that the practices, conclusions, or recommendations will be clearly substantiated.
5. Clarity of proposal as indicator of presentation quality	The writing suggests that the presentation may be poor.	The writing suggests that the presentation may be weak.	The proposal is adequately written but suggests that the presentation may be uneven or of moderate quality.	The proposal is clearly written and suggests that the presentation will be of very good quality.	The proposal is very well written and suggests that the presentation will be of professional quality.