2022 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 the scoring options.

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 reviews can have unintended consequences on the score you give.

- 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 reason for your score. This will be sent to the speaker. **Remember to be kind and courteous! It is recommended to include the following:**

  o Thank them for submitting and share something positive about the response.
  o Explain why no points were given.
  o Share at least one way to improve the response for the next submission.

Example you can use: Thank you for submitting a proposal for WE21! I appreciated the opportunity to review your topic because _____. This question unfortunately did not receive points based on the following rubric scores: (*e.g., learning outcomes, speaker qualifications*) _____. In the future, you can improve the response by _____.

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

1. <u>CONFLICT OF INTEREST</u> (YES/NO). 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.

2. <u>TITLE</u> (5 available points). Please rate based on the title being concise <u>AND</u> capturing interest.

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

3. <u>SESSION DESCRIPTION</u> – (5 available points). Rate based on the description being **focused and concise** (150 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. <u>SESSION DESCRIPTION</u> – (5 available points). Rate based on the description being **relevant and interesting**.

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

5. <u>LEARNING OUTCOMES</u> (5 available points). 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.

6. <u>TRACK</u> (YES/NO) (0 points). The track selected is the <u>most appropriate</u> based on the session description and learning outcomes. Tracks are core content areas.
    ● If not, what track is best for this session? (Dropdown menu with tracks)

7. <u>LEARNING LEVEL</u> (YES/NO) (0 points). Does the learning level appropriately match the speaker's level of experience?

8. <u>KEYWORD</u> (YES/NO) (0 points). For the Technical Innovations track only, does the selected keyword(s) most appropriately reflect the technical subject matter?
    ● If not, what keyword(s) are best for this session? (Checkbox options with keywords)

9. <u>SESSION FORMAT</u> (YES/NO) (1 available point). Is the selected format appropriate for proposed session, with listen and learn lectures being 60 minutes and snap sessions being 15? If no, what is the best format (Dropdown menu with Listen and Learn Lecture, Engaged Exchange Panel Discussion, or Snap Session)?

26 August 2021   SWE Learning & Development

10. <u>SPEAKER QUALIFICATIONS</u> (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 appear 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.

11. <u>BACKGROUND</u> (YES/NO) (3 available points) – SWE prioritizes diversity in our selection process. Does the topic serve an underrepresented group on a subject that the speaker has either personal or professional experience with? Refer to the speaker bio for the speaker's experience.

12. <u>CLEAR AND UNDERSTANDABLE</u> (3 available points). Rate based on all elements of the submission being well-written, easy to understand, and written in the author's own voice.

3	Well-done: all elements of submission are written clearly and understandable; written in the author's own voice; it is clear the submitter proof-read the abstract.
2	Sufficient: submission is well-written enough to be understandable.
1	Poor clarity: many elements of the submission are poorly written, difficult to understand and contain errors.
0	Should not be considered.

13. <u>UNIQUE PERSPECTIVE</u> (3 available points). 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) that deserves to be championed at WE21 because you have not seen the topic presented elsewhere.
2	The session's point-of-view is unique, rarely seen at other conferences or events.
1	The session's perspective is somewhat unique, occasionally seen at other conferences or events.
0	The session's perspective is not unique.

14. <u>RELEVANT TO SWE'S MISSION</u> (3 available points). Rate based on the session content advancing SWE's mission to 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.

15. On a scale from 1 to 5, what is your overall recommendation for accepting this session, with 1 meaning do not accept and five meaning SWE should absolutely accept the session.