Reframing Pedagogical Practice and Language and Literacy Research:
Teaching to the Future

PROPOSAL RUBRIC
Conference proposal submissions will be scored using the provided rubric.
*Categories marked with an * are double in points.*

	Met (2 points)	Almost Met (1 point)	Did Not Meet (0 points)
Participant Engagement*	The proposal **clearly describes** how the audience will engage through interactive participation beyond question/answer at the end.	The proposal mentions, but **does not clearly describe** how the audience will engage through interactive participation.	The proposal **lacks** interactive audience participation beyond question/answer at the end.
Innovation and Relevancy*	The proposal represents a topic that is **relevant**, research- or practice-based, provides the audience with **innovative information**, tools or practices, and **contributes to the field** of language and literacy education.	The proposal represents a topic that is research- or practice-based and relevant to the field of language and literacy education. The topic is **not current, innovative, and/or contributive** to the field.	The proposal **does not show relevancy** to the field of language and literacy education, is not research- or practice-based, and does not contribute to the field.
Topic	Contains an overall purpose/theme that **matches** with the conference call for proposals.	Contains an overall purpose/theme, but **loosely matches** with the conference call for proposals.	Contains an overall purpose/theme, but **does not match** with the conference call for proposals.
Title	The title is **interesting and inviting**. It **clearly references** the information that will be discussed in the presentation	The title provides **general information** regarding the topic of the conference; the title is **not engaging or inviting**.	The title is general and **does not provide adequate information** about the topic of the presentation; it is **unclear or not engaging**
Description	**Well-written**, in appropriate tone for a scholarly journal. **Clear and easily identifiable purpose**, organized and easy to follow, evidence of a **consistent and strong** command of conventions.	Written, in **appropriate tone** for a scholarly journal. **Somewhat organized**, evidence of **adequate command** of conventions.	**Inappropriate** tone for a scholarly journal. **Limited or no command** of conventions.
Submission Guidelines	The submission guidelines **have been followed**: the proposal is limited to 500 words. The submission includes an abstract limited to 75 words. No identifiers are present.	The submission guidelines **have not been followed BUT no identifiers** are present.	The submission guidelines **have not been followed. Identifiers** have been included. The proposal cannot be accepted.