

# Reviewer's Rubric for Event Proposals



All event proposals go through a double-blind peer-review process. Reviewers are asked to score the proposals based on the following criteria. All applicants receive the scores and may also receive qualitative comments from the reviewers and editors.

	<b>1. Unsatisfactory</b>	<b>2. Fair</b>	<b>3. Good</b>	<b>4. Very Good</b>	<b>5. Excellent</b>
<b>Criteria A. Content</b>	1. Proposal does not contain information supporting the purpose of the presentation and is not related to the conference theme or current issues in education law. There is no clear plan to address the topic.	2. Information provided in the proposal generally does not address either the conference theme, current issues in education law, or the purpose of the presentation. It is difficult to discern a plan to address the topic.	3. Information provided in the proposal is relevant to the conference theme and/or current issues in education law and generally supports the purpose of the presentation. However, the plan to address the topic lacks clarity.	4. The information provided in the proposal is relevant to the conference theme and/or current issues in education law and generally supports the purpose of the presentation. There is a clear plan to address a significant topic.	5. The information provided is relevant to the conference theme and/or current issues in education law, is detailed, and clearly supports the purpose of the presentation. There is a clear plan to address a significant topic.
<b>Criteria B. Organization</b>	1. Proposal or description is very vague or not well-organized. Ideas fail to make sense.	2. Proposal is generally arranged logically but fails to make complete sense. Writing concerns are viewed as potentially impacting the presentation.	3. Proposal is well-written, well-researched or well-organized regarding contemplated research. Ideas are arranged logically, but there are some gaps.	4. Proposal is well-written, well-researched or well-organized regarding contemplated research. Ideas are arranged to generally support the central purpose of the proposal.	5. Proposal is very well-written, well-researched and detailed, or very well-organized regarding contemplated research. Ideas are arranged logically with a smooth flow.
<b>Criteria C. Impact</b>	1. The proposal is not viewed as consistent with the theme of the conference or sharing information about current issues in education law.	2. The proposal has some connection to current issues in education law but is not viewed as making a strong contribution to the conference.	3. The proposal would contribute to the theme of the conference or to sharing valuable information about current issues in education law.	4. The proposal would make an excellent contribution to the theme of the conference or to sharing valuable information about current issues in education law.	5. The proposal would be extremely impactful in either contributing to the theme of the conference or sharing valuable information about current issues in education law.
<b>Criteria D. Audience</b>	1. The proposal is not viewed as appealing to any group within the diversity of conference participants.	2. The proposal is focused so completely on the needs of a specific group as to make the session one that many could not see themselves attending.	3. The proposal's message is generally inclusive but may be focused primarily on the needs of a specific group of conference participants.	4. The proposal's message is clear and inclusive but could do more to appeal to the diversity of conference participants.	5. The proposal sends a clear and inclusive message that considers the diverse needs of conference participants.