



**NAGC26 Annual Convention Call for Proposals Rubric**

The purpose of this review process is to ensure that sessions selected for the NAGC Convention (a) are appropriate to NAGC’s mission and (b) represent quality contributions worthy of presentation on a national stage. Please keep the following guidelines in mind as you conduct your review:

- Please consider *all aspects* of the proposal provided, including the short and long description, the objectives, and details including intended audience and presentation format.
- Please rate the proposal on its overall quality **in section 1** of the rubric, *even if you do not feel the proposal is a precise match for the selected network*. You will have an opportunity to indicate whether the proposal is a match for the network, but we are interested in your evaluation of the proposal quality *overall*.
- Descriptors are provided for scores of 1, 3, and 5 for each criterion. Scores of 2 and 4 may be offered if in your evaluation the proposal falls between the descriptors offered.

Section 1: Criteria for ALL proposals	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Criteria</b>					
1. The proposal provides enough information so that the attendee knows what to expect from the session.	Proposal is difficult to follow or so generic that attendees do not have enough information to know what to expect.		Proposal is reasonably clear on the topic or focus of the session. Attendees may be unsure of likely session details.		Proposal is clear and includes enough information that attendees should know what to expect from the session.
2. The session objectives convey what participants can expect to take away from the session.	Session objectives are unclear or disconnected from other aspects of the proposal.		Session objectives give a general sense of what participants will take from the session but may not be clearly connected with the		Session objectives provide clearly defined takeaways for participants aligned with the session description.

			session description.	
3. The proposal focuses on gifted children and youth and/or fostering advanced levels of learning.	Proposal demonstrates no specific connection to gifted children and youth or to an advanced learning focus.		Proposal demonstrates some connection to gifted children and youth or advanced learning but may seem more broadly applicable to general education.	Proposal clearly and directly connects to needs or experiences specific to gifted children and youth AND/OR clearly and directly demonstrates attention to fostering advanced levels of learning.
4. The proposal addresses topics likely to be of interest to NAGC audiences.	Proposal focuses on topic(s) not likely to be of interest to NAGC audiences.		Proposal focuses on topic(s) of general interest that may not have specific relevance or high levels of concern for NAGC audiences.	Proposal focuses on persistent/ongoing issues in the field OR on new topics/issues of high relevance to NAGC audiences.
5. The proposal demonstrates connections to evidence-supported practices or theory in the field.	The proposal provides no evidence of connections to high-quality sources/evidence in the field.		The proposal seems to build on high-quality sources/evidence in the field (e.g., published work in the field, NAGC standards), but the connection can be interpreted rather than evidenced.	The proposal specifies high-quality sources that underlie the proposed session (e.g., published work in the field, NAGC standards).
6. There is clear alignment across proposal elements (topic/description, presentation format, intended audience).	The proposal seems misaligned across description, format, and intended audience.		The proposed presentation format may not show good alignment with the description and/or intended audience.	The proposal shows a clear and appropriate alignment between the details in the description, the proposed format, and the intended audience.
<b>Section 2: Network-specific criteria</b>				
<b>7. NETWORK-SPECIFIC ITEM</b>	<b>PLEASE SEE BELOW FOR Network QUESTIONS</b>			

**Additional questions:**

Please answer the questions below. These items will not be calculated in the score but will provide additional information to assist Network Program Chairs and the Convention Committee with selection decisions, especially in cases in which networks have many proposals with similar overall scores.

- How well does this proposal match the network selected?
  - Strong match to the network
  - Moderate match to the network
  - Does not match the network
- Does the proposal connect to one or more elements of the NAGC Strategic Plan listed below?
  - Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion - yes/no
  - Advocacy - yes/no
  - Connecting Research and Practice - yes/no
- How well attended would you expect this session to be?
  - High attendance/high general appeal
  - Moderate attendance/moderate general appeal
  - Strong appeal to specific interest group(s)
  - Low attendance/low appeal
- Overall rating: Would you recommend this proposal for the NAGC Annual Convention?
  - Highly recommend
  - Recommend
  - Neutral
  - Do not recommend

**QUESTION 7: NETWORK SPECIFIC**

**Arts**

**7. The proposal focuses on the unique educational needs of those who are gifted in the arts, high ability in the arts, or advanced learners in the arts.**

No focus on gifted and talented in the arts		Clear focus on gifted and talented in the arts		Very clear focus on gifted and talented in the arts
1	2	3	4	5

**Computers and Technology**

**7. 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 integration of technology		Some purposeful integration of technology		Strong purposeful integration of technology
1	2	3	4	5

**Conceptual Foundations**

**7. The proposed session will inspire and challenge participants to critically reexamine—and thoughtfully extend—their understandings of the foundational ideas that shape gifted education. Participants will engage with evolving theories and practices, diverse conceptions of giftedness, philosophical and historical perspectives, and emerging trends and issues that influence the field’s future direction. By drawing from both within and beyond the field of gifted education, this session encourages renewed clarity, curiosity, and connection to the core purposes that ground our work.**

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

**Creativity**

**7. The integration of creativity and high-level content (i.e., STEAM, 21st century skills) is based on sound pedagogical theory or evidence.**

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



**Global Awareness**

**7. 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

**NEW: Growing Talent in the Gen Ed Classroom**

**7. This proposal seeks to extend the understanding of gifted education and gifted children to an audience of general classroom teachers.**

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

**Research & Evaluation**

**7. 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 1-10)**

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**

**7. The proposal offers research-based, yet practical, meaningful strategies or resources that enhance the experiences of parents and caregivers of gifted and twice-exceptional children. This may include support for advocacy and awareness, navigating diverse family needs (e.g., underserved populations, 2e families, or alternative schooling paths), strengthening home/school/community partnerships, or building family engagement within local and state gifted education organizations.**

No or little evidence of research-based practices and/or resources for parents	Some evidence of research-based practices and/or resources for parents	Strong evidence of research-based practices and/or resources for parents		
1	2	3	4	5

**Professional Development**

**7. 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**

**7. 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**

**7. The proposal clearly focuses on a special population of gifted children who have been historically underrepresented in advanced programs (e.g., race; ethnicity; twice exceptional; rural; LGBTQ+; etc.).**

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

**Special Schools & Programs**

**7. This proposal promotes the Special Schools and Programs mission by 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

**STEM**

**7. 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