**Global English Education China Assembly - Proposal Rating Rubric** @ TESOL International Association

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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. |