Review Rubric

Choose a rating for each category based on the proposal information in the email. When you have submitted your answers, click on the second link in the email to recommend whether the proposal should be accepted or rejected.

Please note that successful proposals do not need to address all outcomes.

example@website.edu Switch account

✉ Not shared

* Indicates required question

Copy and paste the title of the proposal you are reviewing. *

Your answer

Your Name: *

Your answer

General Questions (Answer for all proposals)

Proposal is clearly relevant to the goals of the conference *

○ 0 (Does Not Address)

○ 1 (Needs Improvement)

○ 2 (Addresses Slightly)

○ 3 (Addresses Adequately)

○ 4 (Addresses Substantially)

Proposal is likely to be of interest and benefit to the target audience *

○ 0 (Does Not Address)

○ 1 (Needs Improvement)

○ 2 (Addresses Slightly)

○ 3 (Addresses Adequately)

○ 4 (Addresses Substantially)

Proposal indicates that presentation will demonstrate clear and insightful thought, valuable knowledge gained from experience, or the results of research about this subject *

○ 0 (Does Not Address)

○ 1 (Needs Improvement)

○ 2 (Addresses Slightly)

○ 3 (Addresses Adequately)

○ 4 (Addresses Substantially)

Conference Key Outcomes (Answer for all proposals)

Defining Information literacy in the digital age *

○ 0 (Does Not Address)

○ 1 (Needs Improvement)

○ 2 (Addresses Slightly)

○ 3 (Addresses Adequately)

○ 4 (Addresses Substantially)

Presenting effective means of developing information literacy skills in learners *

○ 0 (Does Not Address)

○ 1 (Needs Improvement)

○ 2 (Addresses Slightly)

○ 3 (Addresses Adequately)

○ 4 (Addresses Substantially)

Identifying partnerships with librarians/classroom teaching to teach students research skills *

○ 0 (Does Not Address)

○ 1 (Needs Improvement)

○ 2 (Addresses Slightly)

○ 3 (Addresses Adequately)

○ 4 (Addresses Substantially)

Addressing information literacy across the disciplines *

○ 0 (Does Not Address)

○ 1 (Needs Improvement)

○ 2 (Addresses Slightly)

○ 3 (Addresses Adequately)

○ 4 (Addresses Substantially)

Addressing assessment of information literacy initiatives *

○ 0 (Does Not Address)

○ 1 (Needs Improvement)

○ 2 (Addresses Slightly)

○ 3 (Addresses Adequately)

○ 4 (Addresses Substantially)

Addressing intellectual property, copyright, and/or plagiarism issues in the digital age *

○ 0 (Does Not Address)

○ 1 (Needs Improvement)

○ 2 (Addresses Slightly)

○ 3 (Addresses Adequately)

○ 4 (Addresses Substantially)

Workshop Ratings (Answer for Workshop proposals ONLY)

Indicates activities for workshop participants

○ 0 (Does Not Address)

○ 1 (Needs Improvement)

○ 2 (Addresses Slightly)

○ 3 (Addresses Adequately)

○ 4 (Addresses Substantially)

Identifies learning outcomes for the workshop

○ 0 (Does Not Address)

○ 1 (Needs Improvement)

○ 2 (Addresses Slightly)

○ 3 (Addresses Adequately)

○ 4 (Addresses Substantially)

Demonstrates how learning outcomes will be achieved

○ 0 (Does Not Address)

○ 1 (Needs Improvement)

○ 2 (Addresses Slightly)

○ 3 (Addresses Adequately)

○ 4 (Addresses Substantially)

Includes a schedule for the workshop

○ 0 (Does Not Address)

○ 1 (Needs Improvement)

○ 2 (Addresses Slightly)

○ 3 (Addresses Adequately)

○ 4 (Addresses Substantially)

Recommendation to Information Literacy Program Chair... *

○ Accept this proposal.

○ Revise and resubmit this proposal.

○ Reject this proposal.

Additional comments and/or suggestions for revisions:

Your answer

Submit   Clear form