

**APBS Annual Conference
Proposal Rating Rubric**



APBS Annual Conference Proposal Ratings

INSTRUCTIONS

- Comments:** Provide specific, positive, and relevant suggestions and comments for all proposals. Stay focused on the proposal itself and use moderate, constructive, and clear language to provide feedback for how the proposal could be improved.
- Guidelines:** Well-written, includes a complete description with background information, an overview of the presentation, and a description of the format.
- Include:** Learning outcomes, relationship of the presentation to the conference theme, methods of audience involvement, familiarity and background of the presenters with the subject matter
- If research, also include:** Description of methods, findings, and recommendations; emphasis on research results and collected data
- Effective descriptions:**
- Mention relevant theories, research, and practical applications
 - Include an outline of the presentation
 - Describe intended learning outcomes for participants
- Ask yourself?**
1. Are the objectives and learning outcomes clearly stated?
 2. Is the subject matter timely and relevant?
 3. Does the topic contribute to the advancement of the field of positive behavior support?
 4. Though the topic may have been covered many times before (“fatigue” factor), does the presenter offer a novel approach?
 5. How adaptable are the presenter’s ideas to various settings or populations? Do the ideas seem limited to the presenter’s own institutional context?

**APBS Annual Conference
Proposal Rating Rubric**

6. Who is the audience for this session? Think in terms of new vs. veteran implementers, practitioners vs. researchers, etc. Is it geared toward a specific area or interest group?
7. Does the presenter convince you that they have the knowledge/expertise to present on the topic?
8. Is the proposal well-written with no grammatical or typographical errors?
9. Would you be interested in attending this session? Why or why not?
10. Would you recommend a different format for the presentation? (e.g., preconference workshop, poster session, etc.)
11. For preconference workshops: Is there a clear take away? Would you or your organization be willing to pay extra for you to attend this session? Is there an active component, or is it simply a long session?

SEE PROPOSAL RUBRIC ON FOLLOWING PAGES

**APBS Annual Conference
Proposal Rating Rubric**

Proposals should include complete descriptions with background information on the topic; relevant theories, research, and practical applications; relationship of the presentation to the conference theme; overview of the presentation (including an outline of the presentation and description of the presentation format); intended learning outcomes; intended audience for the presentation; and presenter expertise/familiarity with the subject matter. Proposals must be well-written with no grammatical or typographical errors.

Criteria	Does Not Meet Expectations (1)	Below Expectations (2)	Approaching Expectations (3)	Meets Expectations (4)	Exceeds Expectations (5)
Related to Theme: Does the topic connect to and support the conference theme?	The proposal makes no references to the conference theme, directly or indirectly.	The proposal makes indirect reference to the conference theme, but the relationship is unclear.	The proposal makes direct reference to the conference theme, and the relationship is clear.	The proposal makes direct reference to the conference theme and explains the relationship.	The proposal intentionally and specifically names the conference theme and explains the relationship in detail.
Relevance: Is this topic relevant to current issues in positive behavior support?	The topic is dated.	The topic contains a few ideas that are current.	The topic involves ideas of current interest.	The topic is timely.	The topic is timely and offers advancement to the field of PBS.
Support: Is the topic grounded in relevant theory and research, and does it have relevant practical applications?	The relevant theory, research, and practical applications are not clear.	The relevant theory and research are clear, but practical applications are not clear.	The relevant theory, research, and practical applications are mentioned.	The relevant theory, research, and practical applications are stated and explained.	The relevant theory, research, and practical applications are abundantly clear and explained in detail.
Creativity: Would this presentation introduce new ideas, approaches, and/or concepts?	The presentation focuses on a topic that is often repeated and presents a fatigue factor.	The presentation includes one or two new ideas that could be helpful.	The presentation offers several new ideas, approaches, or concepts.	The presentation offers a new perspective along with new ideas, approaches, or concepts.	The session is transformative and offers a novel approach.

**APBS Annual Conference
Proposal Rating Rubric**

Clarity: Is the purpose of the proposed presentation well-articulated?	The goals and objectives of the presentation are not clear.	The goals of the presentation are clear, but how the objectives will be met is not clear.	The goals and objectives of the session are mentioned.	The goals and objectives are stated and explained.	The goals and objectives of the session are made abundantly clear and explained in detail.
Application: Is the topic adaptable to other settings or populations?	The applied context for the presentation is unclear.	The presentation applies to one context.	The presentation has the potential to be adapted to multiple contexts.	The presentation is applicable to multiple contexts.	The presentation is clearly highly adaptable and applicable to multiple settings and/or populations.
Interest: Would there be a high level of interest in this presentation?	The presentation would not be of interest; or, cannot identify an audience for the presentation.	Although an audience is identified, it is not clear why attendees would want to attend the presentation.	The presentation has a clear audience and general rationale for why attendees would attend.	The presentation would be interesting to clearly identifiable groups of attendees.	The presentation would be highly interesting; there would be a large/wide audience for the presentation.

NOTE: Not all proposals are based on the criteria below. These scores are intended to provide an appropriate rating where applicable. Proposals should not be adversely evaluated if they are not based on the criteria below.

Criteria	Does Not Meet Expectations (1)	Below Expectations (2)	Approaching Expectations (3)	Meets Expectations (4)	Exceeds Expectations (5)	Not Applicable
Research: Description of methods, findings, and recommendations, as well as an emphasis on results and collected data.	No research information is included.	Some research information is included, but it is incomplete.	Some research information is included and complete.	All recommended research information is included and complete.	Research information is written clearly and provides insight into the research process.	Not a research-based proposal.

**APBS Annual Conference
Proposal Rating Rubric**

<p>Diversity: Does the proposal include issues of equity, inclusions, and/or diversity, if appropriate?</p>	<p>The proposal mentions issues in these areas, but it does not explain how it is relevant to these issues.</p>	<p>The presentation covers and explains relevant ideas in these areas.</p>	<p>The presentation offers insights and new ideas, approaches, and concepts having to do with equity, inclusion, and/or diversity.</p>	<p>The presentation provides multiple well-articulated insights and new ideas, approaches, and concepts having to do with equity, inclusion, and/or diversity.</p>	<p>The presentation would provide a significant addition to the field of PBS in the areas of equity, inclusion, and/or diversity.</p>	<p>Presentation does not deal with issues of diversity.</p>
<p>Preconference Workshops: Is there a clear take away? Would you or your organization be willing to pay extra for you to attend? Is there an active component, or is it simply a long session?</p>	<p>Presentation is not suitable as a preconference workshop.</p>		<p>Presentation has some, but limited value as a preconference workshop.</p>		<p>The presentation would be valuable and relevant for attendees; there is a clear take-away for the presentation; the presentation is interactive and should be a preconference workshop.</p>	<p>Not a preconference workshop proposal.</p>