## 2021 NAGC Session Selection Rubric

Section I: Overall Quality and Alignment with NAGC Mission. The items below are designed to 1) ensure that selected sessions are appropriate to NAGC's mission, and 2) represent quality contributions worthy of presentation on a national stage.

1. The proposal is well organized and clearly written....

Very Poorly Writte /Organized	en			Exceptionally well Written/Organized	
1	2	3	4	5	

2. The proposal *specifies knowledge, skills, and/or ideas the presenter will impart* to session participant (i.e., includes clear objectives).

No mention of knowledge, skills, and/or ideas		Vague or indirect reference to knowledge, skills and/or ideas		Clear articulation of knowledge, skills, and/or ideas
1	2	3	4	5

3. The proposed session reflects application, practice, or theory related *specifically to gifted children and youth* (as opposed to typically developing or general education students).

No evident connection to gifted children and youth		Vague, indirect, or secondary connection to gifted children and youth		Clear, direct connection to the needs of gifted children and youth
1	2	3	4	5

4. The concepts to be presented represent *high-quality best practice, theory, or research* related to gifted children and youth.

No support demonstrating high quality best practice, theory or research		Vague, indirect, or secondary connection to high quality, best practice, theory or research		Clear support that ideas reflect high quality, best practice, theory or research
1	2	3	4	5

5. The proposed session will *convey substantial content, related to gifted children and youth, representative of the most informative ideas in the field* and include classic or cutting-edge ideas.

No connection between topic and gifted children and youth		ome connection between ppic and gifted children and youth		Strong connection between topic and gifted children and youth
1	2	3	4	5

## 6. (Network-specific question, TOTAL 5 POINTS)

(five point scale)

### **Required Comments:**

## TOTAL: \_\_\_\_\_/ 30 Network Specific Questions #6

Section II: Quality Content Related to One or More NAGC Network. Each NAGC network views the items below from the perspective of its distinct emphasis and current priorities.

### <u>Arts</u>

6. The proposal presents ideas which will help in the understanding of the artistically gifted individual, or aid in knowing how to work with the artistically gifted.

Will be of little help	Will be of some help			Will be a great deal of help
1	2	3	4	5

### Computers and Technology

6. The proposal emphasizes the purposeful integration of technology in order to deepen and enhance the learning process (i.e. active engagement, participation in groups, frequent interaction and feedback, and connection to real-world experts).

No or little purposeful Som integration of technology		me purposeful integration of technology		Strong purposeful integration of technology
1	2	3	4	5

### **Conceptual Foundations**

6. The proposed session will inspire and challenge participants to re-examine and/or move beyond their current thoughts and perspectives about theory; concepts of giftedness; philosophical foundations; trends, issues, and future directions for the field; historical perspectives; and/or perspectives from outside the field.

No or little re-examination of theory or concepts		Some re-examination of theory or concepts		Strong re-examination of theory or concepts
1	2	3	4	5

<u>Creativity</u>

## 6. Integration of creativity and high level content (i.e. STEAM, 21st century skills) based on sound pedagogical theory or research.

No or little integration of creativity and high level content		Some integration of creativity and high level content		Strong integration of creativity and high level content
1	2	3	4	5

## **Curriculum Studies**

6. The proposed session focuses on curricular and instructional strategies, issues, and/or areas of research that are a direct response to the learning needs of gifted learners.

No evident focus on the goals outlined		Some focus on the goals outlined		Clear and evident focus on the goals outlined		
1	2	3	4	5		

### Early Childhood

## 6. The proposal supports information of early childhood (Preschool- 3<sup>rd</sup> grade) in the areas of identification, assessment, curricula, programs, research and parenting.

No evidence that the proposal will provide information related to Early Childhood mission.	Unclear if the Early Childhoo	proposal supports od mission.	Directly impacts the abo areas and mission within early childhood age spar grade).	the
1	2	3	4	5

### Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender, and Questioning

## 6. The proposal provides strong evidence that the presented knowledge, practices, and policies can lead to significant improvements in the lives of gifted GLBTQ youth and their supporters.

No or little evidence		Some evidence		Strong evidence	
1	2	3	4	5	

## Gifted Coordinators

6. The proposal promotes collaboration among gifted coordinators and shares resources, ideas, and/or research that support the design and implementation of effective and equitable gifted programs and services.

No or little evidence of		Some evidence of relevant		Strong evidence of	
relevant resources, ideas,		resources, ideas, and/or		relevant resources, ideas	
and/or research that		research that support the	and/or research that		
support the Gifted		Gifted Coordinator Network support th			
Coordinator Network		Goals	Coordinator Networ		
Goals				Goals	
1	2	3	4	5	

Global Awareness

6. The proposed session contributes relevant ideas and best practices that promote an awareness of Self that allows gifted students to understand global perspectives and global issues to assist them in

finding a meaningful way to positively develop and influence our global society.

No or little connection between gifted children and global awareness		Some connection indicating how gifted children can influence a global society and/or become more aware of global issues		Strong connection to encouraging global awareness among gifted children and/or gifted children positively impacting our global society
1	2	3	4	5

## Research & Evaluation

Empirical Proposals Only (Scale of 1-10)
Please rate the research design and methodology
Please rate the quality of the data analysis (qualitative or quantitative)
Please rate the interpretations and conclusions made in light of the findings
Non-empirical Proposals Only (Scale of 1-5)

Please rate the applicability of topic to researchers and/or practitioners in the field Please rate the proposed style of presentation for the intended audience

## Parent & Community

6. The proposal contributes relevant ideas, best practices, and resources for parents that address advocacy and awareness, supporting families, diversity (i.e., under-served populations, families of twice-exceptional children, families using alternative schooling), building home/school/community partnerships, or the development of local and state organizations to support gifted education.

No or little evidence of relevant ideas, best practices, and resources for parents		Some evidence of relevant ideas, best practices, and resources for parents		ideas, best practices, and		Strong evidence of relevant ideas, best practices, and resources for parents
1	2	3	4	5		

### Professional Development

# 6. The proposal provides standards-based professional development with content and/or pedagogical strategies that impact the Gifted Education community.

No or little evidence of content and/or pedagogical strategies		Some evidence of content and/or pedagogical strategies		Strong evidence of content and/or pedagogical strategies
1	2	3	4	5

### Social & Emotional

6. The proposed session provides information and strategies that enable teachers, counselors, and parents to serve the affective, social, and psychological needs of gifted and talented children and youth in a variety of settings.

Not at all		To some degree	To a great degree			
1	2	3	4	5		

### **Special Populations**

6. The proposal clearly focuses on a special population of gifted children (i.e., historically underrepresented racial minority groups or underserved groups) in advanced programs.

No or little focus Some focus Strong focus	5
--------------------------------------------	---

1	2	3	4	5	

#### Special Schools & Programs

# 6. This proposal aligns with the Special Schools and Programs mission focusing on alternative, experimental, innovative ideas and practices beyond the scope of traditional public school settings.

No or little connection to the Special Schools and Programs mission		Some connection indicating alignment to the Special Schools and Programs Mission		Strong alignment to the SSP mission
1	2	3	4	5

## <u>STEM</u>

## 6. Will this information be practical, engaging, and based on best practices for STEM stakeholders?

No evidence that the proposer(s) considered practicality, engagement, or best practice when developing the proposal		Evidence that the proposer(s) considered practicality, engagement, <u>or</u> best practice when developing the proposal		Evidence that the proposer(s) considered practicality, engagement, <u>and</u> best practice when developing the proposal
1	2	3	4	5