



## ACPA20 Program Reviewer Rubric

To shape a high-quality learning experience, the ACPA20 Program Team created the rubric below for Program Reviewers to use to evaluate educational session program proposals.

**Proposal submissions:** Individuals submitting educational session program proposals are encouraged to review this rubric to ensure that the various items are addressed in the proposal submission. As a reminder, program proposals can be modified after submission up until the proposal due date by logging into the [Educational Session Service Center](#) using the login information provided by email upon your initial submission. Proposals for Pre-Convention Workshops may be modified until the due date of August 1, 2019 and all other session types may be modified until the due date of September 6, 2019. Following those dates the ACPA20 Program Team will coordinate the review of all educational session proposals, assigning proposals to volunteer Program Reviewers to evaluate based on the rubric below. Upon the completion of the program review, a decision of the status of the proposal (accept, waitlist, or decline) along with feedback based on this rubric will be communicated to submitters by email.

**Program review:** Program Reviewers will use this rubric for evaluating educational session program proposals. The rubric below is for reference only and all program reviews must be submitted by Reviewers online through the [Reviewer Service Center](#) using the login information provided by email upon your assignment of sessions for review. Please note after the review process is complete, all text responses submitted on the online review form will be provided by email as feedback to the Coordinating Presenter.

Please contact [conventionprograms@acpa.nche.edu](mailto:conventionprograms@acpa.nche.edu) with any questions about the educational session program proposal or review process, or the Program Reviewer Rubric below.

Each criterion below, in addition to the rating a textbox is provided on the online reviewer form to provide constructive feedback for the coordinating presenter.

**Criterion: Learning Outcomes**

**Section(s) of proposal submission form to review:** Learning Outcomes

**Description:** The proposal provides specific learning outcomes clearly connected to the session.

Note learning outcomes should describe measurable ways for evaluating the knowledge, skills, abilities, or attitudes of participants as a result of attending the session.

- 3 = Includes clear, specific, and measurable learning outcomes relevant to the topic and goals of the proposed session.
- 2 = Includes clear learning outcomes relevant to the topic and goals of the proposed session, but are not specific or measurable.
- 1 = Includes learning outcomes, but not all are clear, specific, measurable, or relevant to the topic and goals of the proposed session.
- 0 = Does not include learning outcomes OR the learning outcomes included are not clear, specific, measurable, and relevant to the topic and goals of the proposed session.

**Criterion: Relevance**

**Section(s) of proposal submission form to review:** Relevant Conceptual/Theoretical Framework

**Description:** The proposal explains why the topic matters to higher education, student affairs and/or college students. Relevance to functional areas and diverse positionalities and social group memberships is articulated.

- 3 = Includes a direct explanation of session relevance to higher education, student affairs and/or college students; articulates relevance within a specific functional area or across functional areas; articulates relevance to a diverse range of positionalities, including social group memberships.
- 2 = Includes a direct explanation of session relevance to higher education, Student Affairs and/or college students; does not specify relevance within a specific functional area or across multiple functional areas; does not articulate relevance to a diverse range of positionalities, including social group memberships.
- 1 = Alludes to the field of higher education but does not make any specific connections between the session and higher education, Student Affairs and/or college students
- 0 = Contains no direct explanation of session relevance to higher education, Student Affairs and/or college students.

**Criterion: Framework**

**Section(s) of proposal submission form to review:** Relevant Conceptual/Theoretical Framework, Outline of Session Presentation

**Description:** The proposal is grounded in relevant literature and makes clear connections between literature, session content, and aligns with ACPA's Equity and Inclusion Statement. For more information about ACPA's Equity and Inclusion statement visit:

<http://www.myacpa.org/equity-and-inclusion-statement>

- 3 = Includes a review of the available knowledge with clear relevance to the session topic; establishes clear connections between the literature and all components of the Outline of Session Presentation; the framework presented aligns with ACPA's Equity and Inclusion Statement.
- 2 = Includes a review of the available knowledge with clear relevance to the session topic; establishes clear connections between the framework presented and some components of the Outline of Session Presentation; the framework presented does not align with ACPA's Equity and Inclusion Statement.
- 1 = Includes a review of literature with clear relevance to the session topic; does not establish clear connections between the framework and any component of the Outline of Session Presentation; the framework presented does not align with ACPA's Equity and Inclusion Statement.
- 0 = Does not include a review of the literature or the review provided is not relevant to the proposal.

**Criterion: Engagement**

**Section(s) of proposal submission form to review:** Outline of Session Presentation

**Description:** The proposal explains the methods used to actively engage participants and is informed by principles of universal design.

For more information about the Principles of Universal Design visit :

<https://humancentereddesign.org/index.php/inclusive-design/principles>

- 3 = Describes multiple methods (e.g., small group dialogue, instant poll, etc.) to actively engage participants during the session; explains how each method supports active engagement for the intended audience and is informed by principles of universal design.
- 2 = Describes multiple methods (e.g., small group dialogue, instant poll, etc.) to actively engage participants during the session; explains how some but not all methods support active engagement for the intended audience and are informed by principles of universal design.
- 1 = Describes one or more methods (e.g., small group dialogue, instant poll, etc.) to actively engage participants during the session; does not explain how the methods support active engagement for the intended audience and are informed by principles of universal design.

- 0 = Does not specifically describe any method to actively engage participants during the session.

**Criterion: Knowledge Synthesis and Application**

**Section(s) of proposal submission form to review:** Outline of Session Presentation

**Description:** The proposal explains the methods to promote participants' synthesis and application of knowledge.

- 3 = Describes multiple methods (e.g., reflective journaling prompt, worksheet, etc.) to promote the participants' synthesis and application of knowledge during or after the session; explains how each method supports knowledge synthesis and application and is informed by principles of universal design.
- 2 = Describes multiple methods (e.g., reflective journaling prompt, worksheet, etc.) to promote the participants' synthesis and application of knowledge during or after the session; explains how some but not all methods support knowledge synthesis and application and are informed by principles of universal design.
- 1 = Describes one or more methods (e.g., reflective journaling prompt, worksheet, etc.) to promote the participants' synthesis and application of knowledge during or after the session; does not explain how the method(s) support knowledge synthesis and application and are informed by principles of universal design.
- 0 = Does not describe any method to promote the participants' synthesis and application of knowledge during or after the session.

**Criterion: Sequence**

**Section(s) of proposal submission form to review:** Outline of Session Presentation

**Description:** The order of topics/activities is articulated and clearly explained.

- 3 = Includes a session timeline that demonstrates a logical order of clearly explained topics/activities.
- 2 = Includes a session timeline of topics/activities; explanation of one or more topics/activities is absent or unclear, thus making it difficult to assess whether the order makes sense.
- 1 = Includes a session timeline of topics/activities, none of which are clearly explained.
- 0 = Does not provide an outline of how time will be used.

### **Criterion: Time Allotment**

**Section(s) of proposal submission form to review:** Outline of Session Presentation

**Description:** The proposal includes a clear, realistic, and commensurate (e.g., not too much or too little) allotment of time for each topic/activity.

- 3 = Specific amounts of time are allotted for each topic/activity; all allocations are realistic and commensurate with the corresponding topics/activities.
- 2 = Specific amounts of time are allotted for each topic/activity; some but not all allocations are realistic and commensurate with the corresponding topics/activities.
- 1 = Specific amounts of time are allotted for each topic/activity; allocations are not realistic and commensurate with the corresponding topics/activities.
- 0 = No specific amounts of time are allotted for topics/activities.

### **Assessment Summary**

**Description:** Based on this assessment of the proposal, what is your recommendation to the Program Team regarding this proposal being accepted for the annual convention?

- Recommend
- Recommend with Reservations
- Do Not Recommend

---

In addition to the rubric following additional criteria will be used for research papers and research/practice posters.

### **Criterion: Research or Practice Methods**

**Section(s) of proposal submission form to review:** Outline of Session Presentation

**Description:** Proposal provides a clear overview of the methods, techniques, or modes of inquiry including data sources, evidence, materials, etc.

- 3 = Provides a thorough overview of the research methods used or the practice methods to be presented. Methods are clearly articulated and appropriate/relevant to the research or practice topic.
- 2 = Provides a brief overview of the research methods used or the practice methods to be presented. Methods are clearly articulated and appropriate/relevant to the research or practice topic.
- 1 = Names but does not explain the methods used. The appropriateness or relevancy of the methods to the topic are not clearly articulated.
- 0 = Does not provide an overview of the methods used or establish their relevance to the research or practice topic.

**Criterion: Findings/Results and Implications**

**Section(s) of proposal submission form to review:** Learning Outcomes

**Description:** Proposal provides a clear overview of the methods, techniques, or modes of inquiry including data sources, evidence, materials, etc.

- 3 = Provides a thorough overview of the findings/results of the research or practice to be presented; includes specific implications for practice, research, and/or policy that clearly relate to the findings/results.
- 2 = Provides a brief overview of the findings/results of the research or practice to be presented; includes specific implications for practice, research, and/or policy that clearly relate to the findings/results.
- 1 = Provides a vague overview of the findings/results of the research or practice to be presented; implications for practice, research, and/or policy are provided but do not clearly relate to the findings/results.
- 0 = Does not provide an overview of the findings/results of the research or practice to be presented; does not provide implications for practice, research, and/or policy.