

# CHIME24 Fall Forum Track Session Evaluation Rubric

Evaluation Criteria	Poor (0-2 Point)	Fair (3-4 Points)	Good (5-6 Points)	Very Good (7-8 Points)	Excellent (9-10 Points)	Score (Points)
1. Current & relevant to CHIME members and Fall Forum program in terms of topic and experience	Topic is not current or lacks importance or appropriateness CHIME members	Topic is only tangentially related to the profession, or not important to CHIME member audience	While not groundbreaking, topic is relevant to CHIME members	Topic is current, appropriate, and essential to CHIME members	Topic is innovative, relevant, and/or groundbreaking making it essential to CHIME members	
2. Innovation & Fresh Insights	Solution concepts are unlikely to be realistically implemented by CHIME members	Concept already exists in the industry – lacking innovation or new perspective	Interesting but not overly distinctive from existing approaches; or may have implementation (“how”) gaps in proposal	An improvement upon existing approaches, demonstrates ability to be impactful	Fundamentally distinct from status quo approaches with demonstrated ability to create an improvement	
3. Speaker Knowledge & Expertise	No information available to assess speaker(s)’ knowledge/ expertise	Limited/ insufficient information available to assess	Proposal indicates speaker(s) possess adequate knowledge/ expertise in content	Proposal indicates speaker(s) have in-depth knowledge and expertise of content	Proposal indicates speaker(s) possess full knowledge and expertise in content/topic	
4. Interactive event and audience engagement	No information is provided on how speaker(s) intend to engage the audience	Session is mainly lecturing format with little to no opportunities for audience engagement beyond Q&A.	Proposal relies on lecture format with limited engagement or learning reinforcement activities	Proposal includes several engagement and learning reinforcement activities in addition to lecture presentation	Proposal includes multiple engagement and learning activities including experiential learning to maximize audience participation and learning retention	
5. Proposal Clarity & Learning Outcomes	Lack of defined learning objectives and/or structure that is consistent with proposal description	Concepts are cohesive and defined and align with objectives, but overall presentation lacks clear description of learner outcomes and concepts are not fully developed	Demonstrates a targeted structure aligned with learning objectives and proposed outcomes with fully developed concepts and ideas	Well written with defined learning objectives and outcomes that are supported by fully developed and/or innovative concepts with supporting case studies and examples	Proposal is clear, well written, and exciting, suggesting the presentation will be of high professional quality, and objectives are clear, support the proposal and realistic experience goals for the time allotted	
<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>Maximum Score: 50</b> 41-50 Strong Proposal 31-40 Strong proposal for acceptance depending on program space or requested changes 21-30 Proposal could be included or combined or further developed 11-20 Further clarification and development needed for consideration 1-10 Should not be considered					
<b>Inclusivity Deductions / Adjustments</b>	<b>If a <u>panel</u> (defined as 3 or more people on stage, including any moderator) is proposed that has no female panelist, a deduction of 10 points will be taken from the TOTAL SCORE (above). Additionally, evidence of moderator/speakers from historically under-represented groups such as people of color, LGBTQ+, etc., is strongly encouraged.</b>					