**TED 2021 Proposal Rubric** 

O it is a second of the second							
Criteria	5 Excellent	4 Good	3 Satisfactory	2 Below	1 Unacceptable		
	LXCellellt	Good	Satisfactory	Expectations	Onacceptable		
Research or Policy Base Proposal is a research-based practice, with evidence of positive learner outcomes OR describes policy with positive outcomes for special education teacher preparation	Proposal clearly describes the methodology of the study, provides multiple instances of evidence in the literature review, and the study itself provides positive outcomes for teacher education or learners. Project has external review by a reputable organization, such as What Works Clearinghouse, IES or, has been conducted. OR Policy describes clear effect on outcomes for special education teacher preparation and development.	Proposal describes methodology for the study, provides evidence in the literature review, and the study itself provides positive outcomes for teacher education or learners. OR Policy describes effects on outcomes for special education teacher preparation or development.	Proposal describes a promising practice OR policy topic. Promising practice shows positive outcomes for students, but research design does not support evidence of those outcomes. Policy describes achievable outcomes which are measurable.	Proposal is an emerging practice OR literature review. Emerging practice gives anecdotal evidence of effectiveness, but no research has been conducted.	Proposal is to present a product or service.		
Topic relevance and significance	Clearly addresses the conference	Addresses the conference theme	Addresses the conference theme	Superficially addresses the	Does not address the conference		
Applicability,	theme and current	and current issues	and/or current	conference theme	theme and/or		
meaningfulness,	issues in the field in	in the field in	issues in the field in	and/or current	current issues in the		
and value of the	significant ways that	important ways that	a way that can	issues in the field in	field in a way that		
theoretical,	will contribute to	contributes to	contribute to	a way that can	seems likely to		
empirical, and/or	research and/or	research, practice.	research, practice,	contribute to	contribute to		
practical	practice. Will be a	Likely to be a	or policy. Might be a	research, practice,	research or		

Adapted from: <a href="https://conference.viu.edu/cllc/content/Proposal-Review-Rubric">https://conference.viu.edu/cllc/content/Proposal-Review-Rubric</a> (retrieved 2/21/18)

## **TED 2021 Proposal Rubric**

			Toposai Rubiic		
contribution in relation to the conference theme Clear application to personnel preparation, induction and mentoring, or professional development.	worthwhile session across interest groups.	worthwhile session, possibly across interest groups.	worthwhile session for researchers and/or practitioners.	or policy. Its value might be limited to a narrow group of researchers and/or practitioners.	practice. Value to researchers and/or practitioners not evident.
Presentation Description/ Problem/Issue description Current, with innovative research questions, practical applications	Descriptions include current and practical applications, thought-provoking, and innovative for most conference participants. Attendees across disciplines will gain new knowledge and insights.	Descriptions include current and practical, innovative for most participants. Attendees across disciplines are likely to gain new knowledge and insights.	Descriptions include current and somewhat practical information, but do not present thought-provoking evidence. Attendees from specific disciplines may gain new knowledge and insights.	Descriptions are current, but not innovative or practical. Attendees from specific disciplines may gain limited knowledge.	Descriptions are not current, practical or innovative. Few attendees would gain new knowledge or insights.
Literature review and references Clear research-based support, with explicit citations in APA format.	Supports specific practice and/or research in ways that demonstrate current, in-depth knowledge and provide direct justification for the presentation content. Includes multiple examples of positive outcomes for students. Citations	Supports specific practice and/or research in ways that demonstrate concrete knowledge and provide justification for the presentation content. Includes an example of positive outcomes for students. Citations are current and included.	Refers to practice, and/or research in ways that demonstrate knowledge and provide some justification for the presentation content. Supporting examples of positive outcomes for students are not clear Citations are included.	Mentions or implies practice, and/or research, but does not support with current citations.	Does not support practice or research in ways that relate to the presentation content. Citations are not included, out of date or invalid.

Adapted from: <a href="https://conference.viu.edu/cllc/content/Proposal-Review-Rubric">https://conference.viu.edu/cllc/content/Proposal-Review-Rubric</a> (retrieved 2/21/18)

## **TED 2021 Proposal Rubric**

		T.		1	1
	are current and included.				
Specific and achievable presentation outcomes Intended outcomes and audience participation are stated in explicit terms and can be achieved in the proposed format	Participant outcomes are explicitly stated and can be achieved in the proposed presentation format.	Participant outcomes are stated and can be achieved in the proposed format.	Participant outcomes are not stated, but can be inferred, and might be achieved in the proposed format.	Participant outcomes are not stated, take effort to infer, and/or might not be achievable in the proposed format.	Participant outcomes are not stated, cannot be inferred, and/or are not achievable in the proposed format.
Clarity of proposal Level of detail, organization, and focus, resulting in a professional, accessible presentation. Grammar, usage, mechanics, and APA format create professional proposal	The proposal is very well-written, with clear, detailed, organized and relevant descriptions. Research methodology is cited. No errors in grammar, usage, mechanics or APA format.	The proposal is written with detailed, organized and relevant descriptions. No errors in grammar, usage, mechanics or APA format.	The proposal is written with organization and relevant descriptions, but lacks detail. There are no more than two errors in grammar, usage, mechanics or APA format.	The proposal is written with relevant descriptions, but shows disorganization and lack of detail. There no more than four errors in grammar, usage, mechanics or APA format.	The proposal lacks detail, organization, and/or relevant descriptions. There are five or more errors in grammar, usage, mechanics or APA format.

Resources to develop rubric:

https://conference.viu.edu/cllc/content/Proposal-Review-Rubric (retrieved 2/21/18) The IRIS Center. (2014). Evidence-Based Practices (Part 1): Identifying and Selecting a Practice or Program. Retrieved from <a href="https://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu/module/ebp\_01/">https://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu/module/ebp\_01/</a> (retrieved 10/6/18)

Adapted from: <a href="https://conference.viu.edu/cllc/content/Proposal-Review-Rubric">https://conference.viu.edu/cllc/content/Proposal-Review-Rubric</a> (retrieved 2/21/18)