# LibLearnX -- Proposal Review Guidelines Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Excellent = 4</th>
<th>Good = 3</th>
<th>Fair = 2</th>
<th>Poor=1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **PROPOSAL TITLE:** Does the program title clearly describe the program as proposed?  
Weight: 1 | Title is strong, clear, and matches the program proposed. Audience can rely on the title for an accurate idea of the topic. | Title is clear and generally relevant to the program as proposed. | Title is difficult to understand and/or is an inaccurate description of the program as proposed. | Title is unrelated to the proposed program. |
| **PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION:** Does the program description clearly, with sufficient detail, outline the proposed presentation?  
Weight: 2 | Description is clear, concise, and easy to understand. | Description is clear and generally easy to understand. | Description is unnecessarily verbose and/or difficult to understand. | It is unclear what is being proposed. |
| **TARGET AUDIENCE/RELEVANCE:** Who is the target audience and why would this session be relevant to them?  
Weight: 2 | Target audience is clearly defined & significance of the topic to that audience is clearly described. | Target audience is specified and the relevance of the topic to that audience is loosely described. | Target audience is generally stated, and the relevance of the topic to that audience is not described. | Target audience and relevance are not described or are described only in vague terms. |
| **TIMELINESS/DEMAND:** Is the topic timely, new and/or in-demand?  
Weight: 3 | The topic is an emerging “hot” topic and/or a topic for which there is demonstrated high demand. | While this topic has been explored, it remains an in-demand topic. | This topic has been presented often/recently, and interest may be declining. | This topic has been presented often. There is little demand. |
| **INNOVATION:** Does the content offer fresh, innovative ideas, methods, or resources?  
Weight: 4 | The proposal content is original and innovative. | The proposal content is a new take on a familiar topic. | The proposal content is a popular approach on a popular topic. | The proposal content is weak and lacks originality. |
| **LEARNING OBJECTIVES:** Are learning objectives clear, specific, observable, and actionable?  
Weight: 4 | Learning objectives are clear and specific. There are at least two measurable goals. | Learning objectives are generally clear and specific. There is at least one learning outcome specified. | Learning objectives are vague and will be difficult to assess. | Learning objectives are not specified. |
| **PRESENTATION/ENGAGEMENT STYLE:** Is the proposed presentation likely to engage participants actively in discussion, thought, or active learning?  
Weight: 3 | The proposal clearly describes multiple strategies for active engagement and/or interaction of the attendees. | The proposal clearly describes at least one strategy for active engagement and/or interaction. | The proposal suggests active engagement and/or interaction, but the description of the strategy is unclear. | The proposal does not suggest any strategies for active engagement and/or interaction. |
| **Advocacy; Equity, Diversity & Inclusion; Information Policy; Professional and Leadership Development: Does the proposal support one or more of these broad ALA strategic directions and/or ALA Core Values?  
Weight: 3 | The proposal clearly articulates a relationship to one (or more) of these strategic directions or core values, with a learning objective clearly articulated. | The proposal indicates a relationship to one (or more) of these strategic directions or core values, but the learning objective is not clearly articulated. | The proposal suggests a relationship to one (or more) of these strategic directions or core values, but it is not clearly articulated and there is no related learning objective. | The proposal does not suggest any relationship to these strategic directions or core values. |
| **PERSPECTIVES:** Does the proposal demonstrate how multiple perspectives will be addressed — and how diversity of viewpoints will be represented?  
Weight: 3 | The session will integrate multiple perspectives and a cohesive theme will be readily apparent to audience. This rating may include presentation of a viewpoint that is underrepresented. | Interaction between multiple perspectives is indicated and some cohesion is likely; the range of perspectives is broad. | The range of perspectives will be narrow. | The presentation of multiple perspectives, if any, is unclear, and there is no diversity of viewpoints. |