



2021 WE Local Call for Participation (CFP) Scoring Rubric

Purpose: The purpose of this document is to provide details on each call for participation (CFP) review question that you, as a reviewer, will need to assess. Below is a breakdown of each question and scoring options.

TITLE	5 POINTS
DESCRIPTION – FOCUSED & CONCISE	5 POINTS
DESCRIPTION – RELEVANT & APPEALING	5 POINTS
LEARNING OUTCOMES	5 POINTS
SPEAKER QUALIFICATIONS	5 POINTS
OVERALL CLARITY & GRAMMAR	3 POINTS
UNIQUE PERSPECTIVE	4 POINTS
RELEVANT TO SWE'S MISSION	3 POINTS
TOTAL AVAILABLE POINTS	35 POINTS

	Outstanding	Well-done	Sufficient	Needs improvement	Poor	Should not be considered
TITLE	5	4	3	2	1	0
DESCRIPTION: focused & concise	5	4	3	2	1	0
DESCRIPTION: relevant & appealing	5	4	3	2	1	0
LEARNING OUTCOMES	5	4	3	2	1	0
SPEAKER QUALIFICATIONS	5	4	3	2	1	0
CLARITY & GRAMMAR	3	na	2	na	1	0
UNIQUE PERSPECTIVE	4	3	2	na	1	0
RELEVANT TO SWE'S MISSION	3	na	2	na	1	0
TOTAL	35					

TIPS & BEST PRACTICES

- Use the Call for Participation Guidelines and this scoring rubric for each of your assigned sessions.
- Schedule time to complete your reviews. Rushing to complete the review can have unintended consequences on scores.
- Selecting a top score (**OUTSTANDING**) indicates that the content provided is nearly perfect when considered against the scoring rubric and other submitted proposals.
- Selecting NEEDS IMPROVEMENT/POOR/SHOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED requires that you type the reasoning behind your score. This will be sent to the speaker.

Directions: review each submitted session based on the following questions.

1. **CONFLICT OF INTEREST.** Do you have a potential conflict of interest, bias, or proprietary interest relating to this submission? A conflict of interest exists when self-interest and professional interest intersect.
 - If yes, do not review this session. Simply click the 'Save' button and select the next assignment in your list.

Directions, continued: review each submitted session based on the following questions.

2. **TITLE** (5 available points). Please rate based on the title being concise AND captures interest.

5	Outstanding title: especially concise and very focused; especially relevant and of great interest to the majority of attendees and/or intended target audience.
4	Well-done title: concise, relevant, and will capture interest for most attendees.
3	Sufficient title: somewhat concise and relevant, may capture interest of attendees.
2	Title needs improvement: not concise but may be relevant or capture the interest of some attendees.
1	Poor title: not concise and will not capture interest of attendees.
0	Should not be considered.

3. **SESSION DESCRIPTION – FOCUSED AND CONCISE** (5 available points). Please rate based on the description being focused and concise (limit 140 words).

5	Outstanding description: especially concise and very focused.
4	Well-done description: concise and focused on the identified session content.
3	Sufficient description: somewhat concise and mostly focused on the identified session content.
2	Description needs improvement: not concise and may have issues staying focused on the identified content.
1	Poor description: lengthy and does a poor job of focusing on the identified session content.
0	Should not be considered.

4. **SESSION DESCRIPTION – RELEVANT AND INTERESTING** (5 available points). Please rate based on the session description is relevant and interesting.

5	Outstanding description: especially relevant and of great interest to the majority of attendees and/or intended target audience; subject matter is extremely compelling.
4	Well-done description: relevant and of interest to a large percentage of attendees and/or target audience; subject matter is compelling.
3	Sufficient description: somewhat relevant and may be of interest to many attendees and/or target audience; subject matter is compelling to most.
2	Description needs improvement: likely not of interest to many attendees and/or target audience; not especially compelling.
1	Poor description: not relevant, or of interest to any attendees; not compelling at all.
0	Should not be considered.

5. **LEARNING OUTCOMES** (5 available points). Please rate based on the learning outcomes being clearly stated and achievable with instruction.

5	Outstanding learning outcomes: very clearly stated and illustrate realistic actions attendees will be able to do after attending the session.
4	Well-done learning outcomes: it is clear and realistic that attendees will be able to do the stated learning outcomes after attending the session.
3	Sufficient learning outcomes: mostly clear and attendees will likely be able to do the stated learning outcomes after attending the session.
2	Learning outcomes need improvement: not clear, but attendees may be able to do the outcomes after attending the session.
1	Poor learning outcomes: not clear, and it is not realistic that attendees will be able to do the stated outcomes after attending.
0	Should not be considered.

Directions, continued: review each submitted session based on the following questions.

6. **TRACK** (0 available points). The track selected is the most appropriate based on the session description and learning outcomes. Tracks are core content areas.
- Yes
 - No
7. **SPECIALIZED AREA OF FOCUS** (0 available points). If applicable, the specialized area of focus are intended for specific audiences or areas of expertise. Please note that the majority of sessions will not have a specialized area of focus; these sessions should indicate this with a NA.
- Yes
 - No
8. **LEARNING LEVEL** (0 available points). The selected targeted learning level(s) are most applicable to the session proposal. If no levels are selected, this indicates the session is applicable to more than two career levels.
- Yes
 - No

9. **SPEAKER QUALIFICATIONS** (5 available points). Please rate based on the speaker(s) credentials indicating subject matter expertise on the submitted topic and is recognized as an expert in his or her field.

5	Outstanding speaker qualifications (formal or informal, i.e. organization or club involvement): speaker is very clearly an expert on the subject matter, with incredibly relevant credentials and/or experience.
4	Well-done speaker qualifications: speakers appears to be an expert on the subject matter, with relevant credentials and/or experience.
3	Sufficient speaker qualifications: speaker is very well-versed on the subject matter but lacks outstanding credentials or experience.
2	Speaker qualifications need improvement: speaker does not appear to be well-versed on the subject matter.
1	Poor speaker qualifications: speaker has unrelated or no credentials; is not well-versed on the subject.
0	Should not be considered.

10. **SESSION FORMAT** (0 available points). Is the selected format appropriate for the content with lectures being 30-60 minutes and lightning talks being 15?
- Yes
 - No

11. **CLARITY AND GRAMMAR** (3 available points). Please rate based on all elements of the submission being well-written, easy to understand and free of grammatical errors.

3	Well-done clarity and grammar: all elements of submission are written in a way that is very clear and understandable; completely free of grammatical errors; it is clear the submitter proof-read the abstract.
2	Sufficient clarity and grammar: submission is well-written enough to be understandable; mostly free of grammatical errors.
1	Poor clarity and grammar: many elements of the submission are poorly written, difficult to understand and contain grammatical errors.
0	Should not be considered.

Directions, continued: review each submitted session based on the following questions.

- 12. RELEVANT TO SWE'S MISSION** (3 available points). Please rate based on the session content advancing SWE's mission (empower women to achieve full potential in careers as engineers and leaders, expand the image of the engineering and technology professions as a positive force in improving the quality of life, and demonstrate the value of diversity and inclusion).

3	Well-done mission-relevancy: subject matter does an excellent job of advancing SWE's mission, keeping mind a diverse audience.
2	Sufficiently mission-relevant: subject matter is aligned with SWE's mission.
1	Poor title: subject matter may not align with SWE's mission.
0	Should not be considered.

- 13. UNIQUE PERSPECTIVE** (3 available point). The session offers a one-of-a-kind/innovative/diverse viewpoint.

3	The session has an outstanding and unique point of view (one-of-a-kind, innovative, diverse viewpoint). The content is one that is rarely seen at a WE conference.
2	The session's perspective is somewhat unique to WE Conferences.
1	The session's perspective is not unique to WE Conferences.
0	Should not be considered