

## Vance Stevens Educational Technology Mentoring Award

The following three criteria will be used to evaluate each proposal:

- Statement of Interest (5 points)
- Organizational Experience (5 points)
- Description of the Proposed TELL Project (10 points)

CRITERIA	RATING 1	RATING 2	RATING 3	RATING 4	RATING 5
<b>Statement of Interest:</b> Clarity of statement, explanation of qualification for this award, potential involvement, and leadership in TESOL International Association’s CALL-IS and/or EVO.	Vague or off-topic, minimal explanation	Unclear or lacking in detail	Adequate	Good	Exceptionally clear and compelling
<b>Organizational Experience:</b> Involvement and achievements in professional organizations, such as an affiliate of the TESOL International Association, EVO, IATEFL’s LT SIG, or other relevant awards and honors.	No involvement or achievements	Limited involvement and few achievements	Adequate involvement and achievements	Good involvement and achievements	Highly involved and significant achievements
CRITERIA	RATING 2	RATING 4	RATING 6	RATING 8	RATING 10
<b>Description of the Proposed TELL Project:</b> Clear explanation of the TELL project (2 pts) and its implementation plan (2 pts), expected outcomes (2pts), effective use of funds (2pts), and its innovative use of technology (2pts).	Vague or off-topic, minimal explanation	Unclear and lacking in detail	Adequate	Good	Exceptionally clear and compelling

**TELL Project Proposal Rubric**

<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>Needs Improvement (0 pts)</b>	<b>Adequate (1 pt)</b>	<b>Excellent (2 pts)</b>
<b>Project Description</b>	Description is vague or not relevant to TELL.	Generally describes the project, but lacks clarity or focus.	Clearly outlines a proposed TELL project and how mentorship will support the awardee's growth in educational technology and leadership.
<b>Implementation Plan</b>	No clear plan or not feasible.	Plan is somewhat clear but lacks some detail or feasibility.	Provides a clear, realistic, and detailed implementation plan with a timeline.
<b>Expected Outcomes</b>	Outcomes are unclear or missing.	Outcomes are mentioned but are vague or not easily measured.	Outcomes are specific, measurable, and relevant to language learning.
<b>Use of Funds</b>	No explanation or inappropriate use of funds.	Use of funds is partially justified or lacks clarity.	Use of funds is logical, justified, and clearly explained.
<b>Innovation and Use of Technology</b>	No clear technology integration or relevance.	Some use of technology, but lacks innovation or clear purpose.	Demonstrates creative and meaningful integration of tech tools.

**Total Possible Points: 20**

**Scoring Guidelines (Overall Score)**

- 15-20 Points: Exceptional candidate, fully aligned with award criteria, demonstrating significant potential for contribution and leadership
- 11-14 Points: Strong candidate, good alignment with award criteria, showing promise for contribution and leadership
- 5-10 Points: Adequate candidate, moderate alignment with criteria, some potential for contribution
- 1-4 Points: Below average candidate, limited alignment with criteria, needs significant development