

# GLACUHO Program Proposal Evaluation Rubric

This rubric outlines the review and scoring process that will be utilized by the Programming & Development Committee and designated program reviewers to evaluate the quality of program proposals. All preliminary program reviews will be conducted without personally identifiable information provided to the reviewers.

## Criterion 1: Content

The content of the proposal contains thorough, reliable information about the subject area and demonstrates clarity in communication of information.

4: Above Average	3: Average	2: Below Average	1: Needs Improvement
The proposal uses accurate and thorough information. It is detailed with no questions left unanswered. Program is clearly explained and can be easily understood.	The proposal uses information that is generally accurate and researched. Some minor clarity for program content is needed.	The proposal lacks a foundation of researched information. Clarity for program content needs work.	The proposal is significantly lacking in information and/or information included is not accurate and/or the proposal is not easily understood.

**Evaluator Comments:**

## Criterion 2: Learning Outcomes

The program proposal includes well-developed learning outcomes and explains how the learning outcomes will be met.

4: Above Average	3: Average	2: Below Average	1: Needs Improvement
The proposal has well-developed learning outcomes and it is clear how the learning outcomes will be met during the program.	The proposal has well-developed learning outcomes but more detail is needed about how these will be met in the program.	Clarity of learning outcomes could be improved and/or outcomes have only loose connections to program content.	Learning outcomes are not well-developed and there is no explanation of how the learning outcomes would be met.

**Evaluator Comments:**

### Criterion 3: Practical Competencies Related to the Field

The program proposal articulates a clear connection to one of the [ACUHO-I competencies](#) and knowledge domains.

4: Above Average	3: Average	2: Below Average	1: Needs Improvement
The program proposal contains relevant information and clearly connects content to one or more ACUHO-I competencies.	The program proposal contains information relevant to one or more ACUHO-I competencies but lacks some clarity in how these competencies are addressed within the session.	The program proposal contains information relevant to one or more ACUHO-I competencies but presenters do not make connections to these competencies in the proposal.	Proposal lacks information related to ACUHO-I competencies and knowledge domains.

**Evaluator Comments:**

### Criterion 4: Innovative Approach

The program proposal represents innovative or creative approaches to professional practices, theory, or research.

4: Above Average	3: Average	2: Below Average	1: Needs Improvement
The proposal indicates that the presenter has taken a very creative and innovative approach in the program's theory, topic, or research.	The proposal has shown some creativity or innovation in its approach to the program's theory, topic, or research.	The proposal shows little innovation or creativity in its implementation and approaches to practices, theory, or research.	The proposal does not incorporate any creative or innovative approaches to theory, topic, or research.

**Evaluator Comments:**

### Criterion 5: Theoretical and/or Practical Foundation

The program proposal is grounded in a theoretical approach or practical experiences.

4: Above Average	3: Average	2: Below Average	1: Needs Improvement
The proposal demonstrates a strong theoretical and/or practical foundation based on the presenter's experiences or well-researched theoretical information.	The proposal demonstrates a foundation in theory and/or practice but greater detail in how it these connect to the topic would improve the proposal.	The proposal demonstrates a vague theoretical and/or practical foundation.	The proposal does not clearly describe a theoretical and/or a practical foundation.

**Evaluator Comments:**

### Criterion 6: Organization

The program proposal is detailed and organized, providing an accurate description of the presentation flow.

4: Above Average	3: Average	2: Below Average	1: Needs Improvement
The proposal indicates that the presentation is well-planned, logically organized, and detailed. It is easy to understand the presentation flow.	The proposal indicates that the presentation is well-planned and detailed but organization needs minor adjustments to fully understand the presentation flow.	The proposal lacks some detail in content and organization. It is difficult to tell the presentation flow.	The proposal outline is very vague and/or disorganized.

Evaluator Comments:

### Criterion 7: Engagement

The program proposal is engages attendees across multiple learning styles/presentation styles.

4: Above Average	3: Average	2: Below Average	1: Needs Improvement
The proposal indicates that the presentation will be engaging to attendees across multiple learning styles/presentation styles. Includes multiple elements such as discussion, Q&A, social media, or hands-on activities.	The proposal indicates that engagement is well-planned and detailed but needs minor adjustment in order to accommodate multiple learning/presentation styles. Includes 2-3 elements such as discussion, Q&A, social media, or hands-on activities.	The proposal outline is low in approaches that promote attendee engagement, focusing mostly on discussion or Q&A.	The proposal outline does not include engagement approaches, making attendee engagement seem unpredictable, unclear, or anticipated to be very low.

Evaluator Comments:

### Criterion 8: Inclusion & Equity

Inclusion and equity are central to the role of a Student Affairs professional and should inform our practice. The content of the proposal tangibly engages the audience in thinking about inclusive excellence pertaining to how social identities are represented in your content and presentation style as well as how your program acknowledges different types of implicit bias, stereotypes, and microaggressions.

4: Above Average	3: Average	2: Below Average	1: Needs Improvement
The program proposal addresses <b>more than two</b> social identities and/or types of implicit bias, stereotypes, or microaggressions.	The program proposal addresses <b>two</b> identities and/or implicit bias, stereotypes, or microaggressions.	The program proposal addresses <b>one</b> social identity and/or implicit bias, stereotypes, or microaggressions.	The program proposal does not address social identity or implicit bias, stereotypes, or microaggressions.

Evaluator Comments:

## General Feedback:

### General Evaluation Points

The abstract provides an adequate description of the program (4 point Likert scale).

At least two strengths of the program proposal (Open-ended response).

At least two improvements that could be made to the program proposal (Open-ended response).