**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.  |