

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Poor (1)</b>	<b>Fair (2)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (3)</b>	<b>Good (4)</b>	<b>Excellent (5)</b>
<b>1. Relevance to the Field and Audience</b>	The topic lacks importance or is not appropriate to the field and/or audience. It is not a session worth attending	The topic is tangentially related to the field, or minimally important to the audience. It is probably not a session worth attending.	The topic may not be current or groundbreaking, but it is relevant to the field and audience. It may be worth attending.	The topic is current, important and appropriate to the field and audience. It is probably a session worth attending.	The topic is cutting-edge - immediately relevant, or highly significant to the field and audience. It is definitely a session worth attending.
<b>2. Purpose &amp; Participant Outcomes</b>	The purpose and participant outcomes are not stated, implied, or clear.	The session purpose and participant outcomes are too general or broad to be achievable, or too narrow to be useful.	The session purpose and participant outcomes are stated or implied, but not sufficiently focused to aid in audience's session selection.	The session purpose and participant outcomes are clear in the session title and description, and it is clear how they will guide the audience's session selection.	The session purpose and participant outcomes are clear in the session title and description. Readers can envision what will be learned and the information provided makes the reader want to learn more.
<b>3. Motivated by Original research, Synthesis of research, or Practice Application</b>	It is unclear from the proposal how this session is connected to practice or research from the field.	The proposal refers tangentially to practice or research from the field; but it is neither specific nor related to the content of the presentation.	The proposal refers minimally to the practice and/or research on which the presentation is based.	The proposal refers clearly to the practice and/or research on which the presentation is based, and is directly related to the presentation content.	The proposal refers specifically to the appropriate practice or research on which the presentation is based, is thorough and comprehensible, and relates directly to presentation content.
<b>4. Clarity of Proposal as Indicator of Presentation Quality</b>	The proposal is poorly written, lacks clarity, demonstrates APA writing/style errors, and does not use people-first language suggesting that the delivery of the presentation may be poor and not matched to participant needs.	The proposal lacks clarity, demonstrates APA errors, and does not use people-first suggesting that the delivery of the presentation may be weak and inadequately matched to participants' needs.	The proposal is adequately written using people-first language; it demonstrates minimal match/understanding of participants' needs, suggesting a mediocre presentation.	The proposal is clearly written using people-first language and no APA referencing errors, and suggests that the quality of the presentation is matched to participants needs and be good.	The proposal is well written using people-first language, with no APA or referencing errors, and appears matched to audience needs suggesting that the presentation will be highest professional quality.
<b>5. References</b>	Insufficient recent references and none that were peer reviewed	Has over 10 references but all were over 5 years old and less than half were peer reviewed	Has over 10 references with 10% published within the last 5 years and 50% were peer reviewed	Has over 10 references with 25% published within the last 5 years and 75% were peer reviewed	Has over 10 references that were peer reviewed with 50% published within the last 5 years