AACTE 2025 Annual Meeting - Proposal Scorecard Rubric   Proposal submissions will be graded based on the rubric outlined below. Reviewers will rate the proposal on a scale from 1 through 5, for each of the following evaluation criteria.

Evaluation Criteria	Level "5" – Very Strong	Level 4	Level "3" – Average	Level 2	Level "1" – Very Weak
FORMAT Proposal follows the format described in the Call for Proposals, follows standard conventions of written language, and supports the selected Session Type.	The proposal follows the format as described in the Call for Proposals, is well written, and is designed to support the selected Session Type. Though a specific citation style is not required, the proposal is written with conventional research citations when needed.	The proposal follows the format as described in the Call for Proposals and supports the selected Session Type. Although a specific citation style is not required, the proposal is written with conventional research citations when needed.	The proposal follows the format as described in the Call for Proposals and partially supports the selected Session Type. Grammatical or syntax errors impede meaning in one or two sections (I-IV).	The proposal follows the format as described in the Call for Proposals, but it minimally aligns with the selected Session Type. Grammatical and syntax errors impede meaning in one or two sections (I-IV).	Proposal does not follow the requested format as described in the Call for Proposals AND includes multiple grammatical and syntax errors that impede meaning in three or more sections (I-IV). Format of proposal does not align with selected Session Type. Citations, when needed, are not included.
ORGANIZATION Proposal provides a clear description of the conference presentation and is structured cohesively with substantial connections between ideas.	The proposal provides a detailed description of the conference presentation. Proposal includes sufficient detail for each part of the presentation and to all four sections (I-IV) on the submission form in the Call for Proposals. Ideas are connected seamlessly and cohesively to provide structure and meaning.	The proposal describes what will occur during the presentation. Proposal includes responses to all four sections (I-IV) on the submission form as described in the Call for Proposals. Ideas are connected in a way that provides structure or meaning.	The proposal describes what will occur during the presentation, but 2 or 3 ideas are minimally connected, or the description lacks clarity in one area.	The proposal lacks sufficient detail in order to understand what will occur during more than one section of the presentation. Three or more sections (I-IV) are minimally addressed.	The proposal lacks enough detail to understand all sections of the presentation. Ideas are not connected. Structure and meaning are absent.

AACTE 2025 Annual Meeting - Proposal Scorecard Rubric Proposal submissions will be graded based on the rubric outlined below. Reviewers will rate the proposal on a scale from 1 through 5, for each of the following evaluation criteria.

Evaluation Criteria	Level "5" – Very Strong	Level 4	Level "3" – Average	Level 2	Level "1" – Very Weak
Proposed Title --NEW--	Title follows the recommended format, conveys the session's content in an interesting way while providing enough information to indicate what the session is about.	Title follows the recommended format and conveys the session's content.	Title minimally describes what the session will be about.	Title does not describe the session's content and/or is confusing or unrelated to the proposal.	Title is not included or is too brief to support the presentation's purpose.
Abstract --NEW--	Abstract follows all guidelines provided in the submission form, is written for the conference attendee and identifies the intended audience, provides expectations for attendees to know what to expect and gain from this session, highlights the topic and main points, and is publication-worthy (free of errors).	Abstract is written for the conference attendee, provides expectations for attendees to know what to expect from this session, highlights the topic or main points, and is publication-worthy.	Abstract provides expectations for attendees to know what the session is about OR provides details of what the audience will gain.	Abstract reads more like a summary instead of written for the intended audience. Abstract does not address what attendees might gain or what they can expect from this session.	Abstract is too brief to be beneficial to the attendee; not publication-worthy. Abstract is minimally related to the session topic.

AACTE 2025 Annual Meeting - Proposal Scorecard Rubric   Proposal submissions will be graded based on the rubric outlined below. Reviewers will rate the proposal on a scale from 1 through 5, for each of the following evaluation criteria.

Evaluation Criteria	Level "5" – Very Strong	Level 4	Level "3" – Average	Level 2	Level "1" – Very Weak
TIMELINESS Proposal is timely; addresses a critical issue in educator preparation and the field and/or directly addresses how the topic aligns with the conference theme and the AACTE Strategic Priorities.	The proposal demonstrates this topic as one of the most critical or problematic current issues for educator preparation and/or PK-12 education and discusses emerging and/or high-demand content, and/or the proposal aligns with the conference theme or more than one of the AACTE's strategic priorities.	The proposal demonstrates this topic or content as important and in high demand, though not emerging. or, the proposal provides evidence that demonstrates new insight or a new way to explore current issues for educator preparation and/or PK-12 education. Or the proposal explores an issue that is relevant to the conference theme or relevant to one of the AACTE's strategic priorities.	The topic presented is a significant current issue for educator preparation or PK-12 education. The proposal provides clear evidence of the need to further explore the current issue or explores an issue or dilemma relevant to one of the strategic priorities.	The topic has been presented often. The proposal does not provide clear evidence of the need to further explore or revisit this tired topic. The topic may be related to the theme, but the proposal does not address the theme or any of the strategic priorities.	The proposal does not appear to address a significant current issue for educator preparation or PK-12 education. The topic or content is not related to the theme and does not explore any of the strategic priorities.
Proposal Rationale: Literature Review, Contribution, Relevance, Implication for Action	The rationale provides a clear analysis and synthesis of the proposed topic or content within current research, is relevant, and explains a detailed contribution to the field while applying research knowledge to practice, if applicable, or describes plans for the application of knowledge.\n\nThe literature review is well organized and concisely situates the topic within current research.	The rationale provides analysis OR synthesis of the proposed idea within current research and contributes to the field while applying research knowledge to practice, if applicable, or describes plans for applying knowledge.\n\nThe literature review situates the topic within current research.	The rationale is thorough in one or more areas and demonstrates how it contributes to the field, but a significant application of knowledge to practice is not developed.\n\nThe literature review partially situates the topic within current research	The rationale is limited to one or more areas and demonstrates how it contributes to the field or applies it to knowledge to practice but neither idea is fully developed.\n\nThe literature review is unorganized or brief and fails to situate the topic within current research.	The rationale is brief and/or does not apply knowledge to practice.\n\nThe literature review does not provide evidence-based research or is unrelated to the topic.

AACTE 2025 Annual Meeting - Proposal Scorecard Rubric   Proposal submissions will be graded based on the rubric outlined below. Reviewers will rate the proposal on a scale from 1 through 5, for each of the following evaluation criteria.

Evaluation Criteria	Level "5" – Very Strong	Level 4	Level "3" – Average	Level 2	Level "1" – Very Weak
SIGNIFICANCE Proposal provides conclusions about the focus of the work and the issue in the broader context of educator preparation.	Overall, the proposal raises significant issues, questions, and/or dilemmas about work and its place within the larger context of educator preparation and/or PK-12 education. The proposal considers multiple and/or underrepresented perspectives and communities.	Overall, the proposal raises an issue, question, or dilemma about work and its place within the larger context of educator preparation and/or PK-12 education.	The proposal discusses one or more conclusions about the work's focus and its place in the larger context of educator preparation or PK-12 education.	The proposal lacks a contribution toward significant issues, questions, or dilemmas about work, or the context for the proposal's issue is minimally connected to educator preparation and/or PK-12 education.	The proposal fails to draw conclusions about the focus of the work or its place in the larger context of educator preparation or PK-12 education.
PARTICIPANT OUTCOMES (LEARNING OBJECTIVES) The proposal includes a clear description of participant outcomes.	All learning objectives describe realistic participant outcomes to this proposal and session type. All learning objectives are specific, measurable, and actionable.	Two or more learning objectives describe realistic participant outcomes to this proposal and session type. All learning objectives are specific, but one may include verbs that are not actionable.	Learning objectives are related to the session proposal but may lack description or are non-specific in terms of what participants will be able to do after attending the session.	Learning objectives are unrealistic and inappropriate to the time allotted in the proposal. Two or more learning objectives are not specific, not measurable, or not actionable.	Learning objectives are not provided, unrelated to the proposed presentation, and not written in terms of participant outcomes.

AACTE 2025 Annual Meeting - Proposal Scorecard Rubric   Proposal submissions will be graded based on the rubric outlined below. Reviewers will rate the proposal on a scale from 1 through 5, for each of the following evaluation criteria.

Evaluation Criteria	Level "5" – Very Strong	Level 4	Level "3" – Average	Level 2	Level "1" – Very Weak
SESSION TYPE SELECTION & AUDIENCE ENGAGEMENT Proposal describes an appropriate level of audience interaction in the selected session type to meet learning outcomes.	Proposal provides multiple opportunities for audience engagement, incorporates creative and meaningful opportunities for the audience to meet all of the learning outcomes, and the outcomes are doable with the selected session type.	Proposal provides audience interaction; the learning outcomes are doable with the selected session type and provides an opportunity for the audience to meet two learning outcomes.	Proposal provides opportunities to appropriately engage the audience to meet one or more learning outcomes, but one or two learning outcomes may not be doable with the selected session type.	Proposal provides limited audience interaction to meet learning outcomes or interaction does not align with the selected session type.	Proposal does not provide any evidence of audience interaction and little to no attention to meeting the learning outcomes.

SESSION TYPES
Research to Action (60 minutes): Encourages the audience to consider and discuss practical applications in everyday settings in an interactive way; engages the audience in robust small group discussion.

Scenario Planning (60 minutes): Engages audience to explore possibilities with peer-to-peer discussion and plan their own strategies and tactics in response to the information received; allows time to explore potential or certain changes to implement in own settings.

Case Stories (60 minutes):
Proposal engages the audience with vivid pictures, storyboards, and visuals to bring stories to life; and engages the audience with small or large group discussions about what participants have learned and how they can apply the lessons to their practices.

Roundtable Discussions (30 minutes):
Proposal seeks to discuss the author's work and engage the audience to explore the work specifically and in a larger context. The proposal engages the audience in a way that generates audience feedback and allows the audience to provide critical input to inform the author's next step of development. A significant majority of the time is devoted to interaction with the audience.

Scholarly Papers (30 minutes):
Proposal generates minimal, if any, audience feedback. The audience will engage with the content as the speaker presents the research/ paper. As proposed, the audience will meet the learning objectives, but a Q&A segment is not appropriate for this session type.

Posters (60 minutes):
Proposal engages the audience with vivid pictures, storyboards, and visuals to bring stories to life, and engages the audience in small or large group discussions on what they learned and how to apply the lessons to their practices.