

2020 Global English Education China Assembly - Proposal Rating Rubric

Evaluation Criteria	Poor (1 Point)	Fair (2 Points)	Good (3 Points)	Excellent (4 Points)
1. Currency, importance, and appropriateness of topic to the field and audience	Topic is not current and/or lacks importance or appropriateness to the field and/or to the potential audience.	Topic is only tangentially related to the field, not completely current or important to the field and/or to the potential audience.	Topic is current, important, and appropriate to the field and potential audience.	Topic is extremely current, significant, and appropriate to the field and potential audience.
2. Pedagogy, research, theory, and policy rationale	The proposal does not mention a need or rationale, or it is unclear how the need or rationale is connected to the field or content of the session.	The proposal refers loosely or tangentially to a need or rationale, but the citations and/or terminology are not specific, recent, or relevant to the field or the content of the session.	The proposal presents a need or rationale for the session content via recent citations and/or terminology relevant to the field.	The proposal establishes a strong need or rationale for the session content through a cogent and coherent synthesis of recent citations and/or terminology relevant to the field.
3. Description of session content and plan	The proposal makes claims with no description of the method, procedure, or plan of action of the session.	The proposal lacks coherence and/or loosely describes the method, procedure, and plan of action of the session.	The proposal provides a coherent description of the method, procedure, and plan of action of the session.	The proposal provides a very detailed and coherent description of the method, procedure, and plan of action of the session.
4. Outcomes and implications for educational settings	The participant outcomes and practical implications for TESOL professionals are not provided.	The participant outcomes and practical implications for TESOL professionals are unclear and/or too broad.	The participant outcomes and practical implications for TESOL professionals are mostly clear and specific.	The participant outcomes and practical implications for TESOL professionals are very clear, specific, and highly relevant.
5. Appropriateness in terms of length, content and delivery methods	The proposal is inappropriate for the session type in terms of length, content, and delivery methods.	The proposal is somewhat inappropriate for the session type in terms of length, content, and/or delivery methods.	The proposal is mostly appropriate for the session type in terms of length content, and/or delivery methods.	The proposal is clearly appropriate for the session type in terms of length, content, and delivery methods.
6. Overall clarity of proposal as indicator of presentation quality	The proposal is vague and/or poorly edited, suggesting that the presentation may be of poor quality.	The proposal is somewhat clear but suggests that the presentation may be of weak quality.	The proposal is clear and suggests that the presentation will be of good quality.	The proposal is very clear and well-written, suggesting that the presentation will be of professional quality.