

# **NCHEP Presentation Proposals – Review Rubric**

The following rubric will be used by reviewers for 2020 NCHEP submission. Because we are a small community, all reviews will be double-masked (all reviews and feedback will be provided without any identifying information for the reviewer or the submitter).

## **Presentation Essentials**

Did the lead presenter tend to honor the proposal/submission directions and word limits? (Y/N)

Is the selected track appropriate for the proposals? (Y/N)

Would the proposed presentation be more suited as a poster for the Exhibit and Resource Hall?

If this is a submission by an Emerging Scholar<sup>1</sup>, in what ways do you think the presentation will benefit from support in advance of the conference?

- Structuring the presentation format
- Strengthening the content of the presentation
- Enhanced audience interaction
- Strategies to accomplish desired learning outcomes
- Building and developing research and/or argument
- Other
- If other, please explain

## **Presentation Rubric**

Please use the scoring mechanism below when answering the following questions:

0 - did not complete

2 - limited

4 - weak

6 - ordinary

8 - strong

10 - excellent

Note: Scores will be weighted with the following percentages:

Q1: 30%; Q2: 30%; Q3: 15%; Q4: 15%; Q5: 10%

1. The content of this proposal is compelling and original: 0 – 10
2. The content of this proposal is higher quality and intellectually rigorous: 0 – 10
3. This proposal outlines clear and compelling ideas for how the audience will be engaged (or offers a good explanation for why they will not be) during the presentation: 0 – 10

---

<sup>1</sup> Emerging Scholars are, for example, undergraduate or graduate students (formerly incarcerated or not) starting their scholarly careers or scholars who have little experience with conference presentations. This community may also include those new to the NCHEP conference. The intention of this designation is to ensure that the conference experiences provide effective learning opportunities for all participants and that the presentation review process is equitable. If this designation is selected, the Emerging Scholars will present with other Emerging Scholars whenever possible, and scholars accepted under the Emerging Scholars designation can receive support from the Conference Planning Committee to prepare their presentations.

4. The proposed 3-5 take-aways are informative, well-reasoned, and in the best interest of audience members: 0 – 10
5. This proposed presentation would advance the conference theme of "Amplifying Access": 0 – 10

## **Reviewer Notes**

In an effort to continue to provide professional development and support to our community of stakeholders we encourage you to provide some feedback to the submitter/s. We will return this feedback to submitter/s without identifying reviewers.

1. Do you recommend this presentation for acceptance to the NCHEP 2020?

0 - Reject (poor quality)	6 - Lean Toward Accepting (borderline quality)
2 - Probably Reject (minor quality)	8 - Probably Accept (good quality)
4 - Lean Toward Rejecting (low quality)	10 - Definitely Accept (high quality)
2. Please provide any additional feedback about the proposal that you would like to share with the review committee (submitter/s will not see this).
3. Please provide any additional feedback about the proposal that you would like to share with the submitter/s (submitter/s will see this).