

Review Rubric – Panel

Category	Does not meet requirement Rating = 1	Poor Rating = 2	Fair Rating = 3	Satisfactory Rating = 4	Excellent Rating = 5	Category Sub Score
Currency, Importance and Appropriateness of topic	Topic lacks relevancy to the needs of NAGAP members and topics identified for the conference. Topic will only appeal to a small segment of potential session participants. Topic is not current or important and will have very limited impact on the work of NAGAP members. Panel topic is not based on best practice, evidence-based research, analysis of data, and/or evaluation of policies and procedures used in GEM. Anticipated level of session participation satisfaction: Very Low	Topic might lack relevancy to the needs of NAGAP members and topics identified for the conference. Topic might only appeal to a small segment of potential session participants. Topic is not adequately current or important and will have limited impact on the work of NAGAP members. Panel topic does not appear to be based on best practice, evidence-based research, analysis of data, and/or evaluation of policies and procedures used in GEM. Anticipated level of	Topic is somewhat relevant to the needs of NAGAP members and topics identified for the conference. Topic might appeal to a segment of potential session participants. Topic might not be current, but is relevant, important and can have impact on the work of NAGAP members. Panel topic is somewhat based on best practice, evidence-based research, analysis of data, and/or evaluation of policies and procedures used in GEM. Anticipated level of session	Topic is very relevant to the needs of NAGAP members and topics identified for the conference. Topic will appeal to a variety of potential session participants. Topic is current, important and relevant and can have impact on the work of NAGAP members. Panel topic is based on best practice, evidence-based research, analysis of data, and/or evaluation of policies and procedures used in GEM. Anticipated level of session participation satisfaction: High	Topic is extremely relevant to the needs of NAGAP members and topics identified for the conference. Topic will appeal to a wide variety of potential session participants. Topic is cutting edge, immediately relevant and will have significant impact on the work of NAGAP members. Panel topic is highly based on best practice, evidence-based research, analysis of data, and/or evaluation of policies and procedures used in GEM. Anticipated level of session participation satisfaction: Very High	

Review Rubric – Panel

		session participation satisfaction: Low	participation satisfaction: Good			
Purpose Outcomes	Unclear how the panel's suggested questions and intended outcomes support conference topics. Goals and learning objectives of the session are vague and not concrete enough for NAGAP audience.	Specific outcomes and key "takeaways" are not adequately indicated. Suggested questions are not adequately focused. Session participants might not be able to envision what they will learn from the panel and how they can apply it to their work as GEM professionals. Goals and learning objectives of session do not include enough follow-up action and next steps.	Panel's suggested questions and intended outcomes satisfactorily support conference topics. Specific outcomes and key "takeaways" are indicated. Session participants can envision what they will learn from the panel and how they can apply it to their work as GEM professionals. Goals and learning objectives of session include some follow-up action(s) and next steps.	Panel's suggested questions and intended outcomes support conference topics. Specific outcomes and key "takeaways" are clearly indicated. Session participants can envision what they will learn from the panel and how they can apply it to their work as GEM professionals. Goals and learning objectives of session include follow-up action(s) and next steps.	Panel's intended suggested questions and intended outcomes highly support conference topics. Specific outcomes and key "takeaways" are very clearly indicated. Session participants can envision what they will learn from the panel and how they can apply it to their work as GEM professionals. Goals and learning objectives of session include a wide variety of concrete follow-up action(s) and next steps.	

Review Rubric – Panel

<p>Well defined topic and abstract</p>	<p>Title and description are vague or lack enough detail to evaluate. Description and relevant questions are unclear.</p>	<p>Title and description provide a limited idea of what the session will be about. Description and relevant questions may lack details and clarity about intended audience, goals and follow-up. More information would be needed to fully evaluate.</p> <p>Session description might be better aligned to goals in order to be more appealing to session participants.</p>	<p>Title and description are somewhat inviting, clear and detailed. Clarity of description and relevant questions somewhat provide participants with some information about intended audience, goals and follow-up.</p> <p>Session description might be better aligned to goals in order to be more appealing to session participants.</p>	<p>Title and description are inviting, clear and detailed. Clarity of description and relevant questions provide participants with explicit and thorough information about intended audience, goals and follow-up.</p> <p>Session format is aligned to goals and will be appealing to session participants.</p>	<p>Title and description are very inviting, clear, detailed and interesting. Clarity of description and relevant questions provide participants with explicit and thorough information about intended audience, goals and follow-up.</p> <p>Session format is aligned to goals and will be extremely appealing to session participants.</p>	
---	---	---	--	---	---	--

Review Rubric – Panel

Qualifications/ Background of panelist(s)	Panelist(s) qualification(s) cannot ensure a positive experience for session participants. Panelist(s) is not knowledgeable about the topic and does not appear to have expertise based on his/her direct or related experiences in GEM and/or personal, professional or educational background. Panelist(s) has not presented on this topic at other conferences.	Panelist(s) qualifications might not ensure a positive experience for session participants. Panelist(s) is not adequately knowledgeable about the topic and does not appear to have expertise based on his/her direct or related experiences in GEM and/or personal, professional or educational background. Panelist(s) has presented on this topic at other conferences.	Panelist(s) qualifications would ensure a somewhat positive experience for session participants. Panelist(s) is somewhat knowledgeable about the topic and appears to have expertise based on his/her direct or related experiences in GEM and/or personal, professional or educational background. Panelist(s) has presented on this topic at other highly recognized conferences.	Panelist(s) qualifications would ensure a very positive experience for session participants. Panelist(s) is knowledgeable about the topic and appears to have expertise based on his/her direct or related experiences in GEM and/or personal, professional or educational background. Panelist(s) has presented more than once on this topic at other highly recognized conferences.	Panelist(s) qualifications would ensure an extremely positive experience for session participants. Panelist(s) is very knowledgeable about the topic and appears to have a high level of expertise based on his/her direct or related experiences in GEM and/or personal, professional or educational background. Panelist(s) has presented on this topic at several other highly recognized conferences.	
TOTAL SCORE						

Review Rubric - Presentation

Category	Does not meet requirement Rating = 1	Poor Rating = 2	Fair Rating = 3	Satisfactory Rating = 4	Excellent Rating = 5	Category Sub Score
Currency, Importance and Appropriateness of topic	<p>Topic lacks relevancy to the needs of NAGAP members and topics identified for the conference. Topic will only appeal to a small segment of potential session participants. Topic is not current or important and will have very limited impact on the work of NAGAP members.</p> <p>Education session is not based on best practice, evidence-based research, analysis of data, and/or evaluation of policies and procedures used in GEM.</p> <p>Anticipated level of session participation satisfaction: Very Low</p>	<p>Topic might lack relevancy to the needs of NAGAP members and topics identified for the conference. Topic might only appeal to a small segment of potential session participants. Topic is not adequately current or important and will have limited impact on the work of NAGAP members.</p> <p>Education session does not appear to be based on best practice, evidence-based research, analysis of data, and/or evaluation of policies and procedures used in GEM.</p> <p>Anticipated level of session participation satisfaction: Low</p>	<p>Topic is somewhat relevant to the needs of NAGAP members and topics identified for the conference. Topic might appeal to a segment of potential session participants. Topic might not be current, but is relevant, important and can have impact on the work of NAGAP members.</p> <p>Education session is somewhat based on best practice, evidence-based research, analysis of data, and/or evaluation of policies and procedures used in GEM.</p> <p>Anticipated level of session participation satisfaction: Good</p>	<p>Topic is very relevant to the needs of NAGAP members and topics identified for the conference. Topic will appeal to a variety of potential session participants. Topic is current, important and relevant and can have impact on the work of NAGAP members.</p> <p>Education session is based on best practice, evidence-based research, analysis of data, and/or evaluation of policies and procedures used in GEM.</p> <p>Anticipated level of session participation satisfaction: High</p>	<p>Topic is extremely relevant to the needs of NAGAP members and topics identified for the conference. Topic will appeal to a wide variety of potential session participants. Topic is cutting edge, immediately relevant and will have significant impact on the work of NAGAP members.</p> <p>Education session is highly based on best practice, evidence-based research, analysis of data, and/or evaluation of policies and procedures used in GEM.</p> <p>Anticipated level of session participation satisfaction: Very High</p>	

Review Rubric - Presentation

<p>Purpose Outcomes</p>	<p>Unclear how the session's learning objectives and intended outcomes support conference topics. Goals and learning objectives of the session are vague and not concrete enough for NAGAP audience.</p>	<p>Specific outcomes and key "takeaways" are not adequately indicated. Session participants might not be able to envision what they will learn in the session and how they can apply it to their work as GEM professionals. Goals and learning objectives of session do not include enough follow up action and next steps.</p>	<p>Session's learning objectives and intended outcomes satisfactorily support conference topics. Specific outcomes and key "takeaways" are indicated. Session participants can envision what they will learn and how they can apply it to their work as GEM professionals. Goals and learning objectives of session include some follow-up action and next steps.</p>	<p>Session's learning objectives and intended outcomes support conference topics. Specific outcomes and key "takeaways" are clearly indicated. Session participants can envision what they will learn and how they can apply it to their work as GEM professionals. Goals and learning objectives of session include follow –up action(s) and next steps.</p>	<p>Session's intended learning objectives and intended outcomes highly support conference topics. Specific outcomes and key "takeaways" are very clearly indicated. Session participants can envision what they will learn and how they can apply it to their work as GEM professionals. Goals and learning objectives of session include a wide variety of concrete follow up action(s) and next steps.</p>
--------------------------------	--	---	---	---	--

Review Rubric - Presentation

Well defined topic and abstract	<p>Title and abstract are vague or lack enough detail to evaluate. Abstract and outline are unclear what the session is about.</p>	<p>Title and abstract provide a limited idea of what the session will be about. Abstract and outline may lack details and clarity about intended audience, goals and follow-up. More information would be needed to fully evaluate.</p> <p>Session format might be better aligned to goals in order to be more appealing to session participants.</p>	<p>Title and abstract are somewhat inviting, clear and descriptive. Clarity of abstract and outline somewhat provides participants with some information about intended audience, goals, and follow-up.</p> <p>Session format might be better aligned to goals in order to be more appealing to session participants.</p>	<p>Title and abstract are inviting, clear and descriptive. Clarity of abstract and outline provides participants with explicit and thorough information about intended audience, goals, and follow-up.</p> <p>Session format is aligned to goals and will be appealing to session participants.</p>	<p>Title and abstract are very inviting, clear, descriptive and interesting. Clarity of abstract and outline provides participants with explicit and thorough information about intended audience, goals and follow-up.</p> <p>Session format is aligned to goals and will be extremely appealing to session participants.</p>	
--	--	---	---	---	--	--

Review Rubric - Presentation

Qualifications/Background of presenter(s)	Presenter(s) qualification(s) cannot ensure a positive experience for session participants. Presenter(s) is not knowledgeable about the topic and does not appear to have expertise based on his/her direct or related experiences in GEM and/or personal, professional or educational background. Presenter(s) not has presented on this topic at other conferences.	Presenter(s) qualifications might not ensure a positive experience for session participants. Presenter(s) is not adequately knowledgeable about the topic and does not appear to have expertise based on his/her direct or related experiences in GEM and/or personal, professional or educational background. Presenter(s) has presented on this topic at other conferences.	Presenter(s) qualifications would ensure a somewhat positive experience for session participants. Presenter(s) is somewhat knowledgeable about the topic and appears to have expertise based on his/her direct or related experiences in GEM and/or personal, professional or educational background. Presenter(s) has presented on this topic at other highly recognized conferences.	Presenter(s) qualifications would ensure a very positive experience for session participants. Presenter(s) is knowledgeable about the topic and appears to have expertise based on his/her direct or related experiences in GEM and/or personal, professional or educational background. Presenter(s) has presented more than once on this topic at other highly recognized conferences.	Presenter(s) qualifications would ensure an extremely positive experience for session participants. Presenter(s) is very knowledgeable about the topic and appears to have a high level of expertise based on his/her direct or related experiences in GEM and/or personal, professional or educational background. Presenter(s) has presented on this topic at several other highly recognized conferences.	
TOTAL SCORE						

Review Rubric – Special Interest Forum

Category	Does not meet requirement Rating = 1	Poor Rating = 2	Fair Rating = 3	Satisfactory Rating = 4	Excellent Rating = 5	Category Sub Score
Currency, Importance and Appropriateness of topic	<p>Topic lacks relevancy to the needs of NAGAP members and topics identified for the conference.</p> <p>Topic will only appeal to a small segment of potential session participants.</p> <p>Topic is not current or important and will have very limited impact on the work of NAGAP members.</p> <p>Questions will not generate discussion or will not lead to sharing of best practice, evidence-based research, useful</p>	<p>Topic might lack relevancy to the needs of NAGAP members and topics identified for the conference.</p> <p>Topic might only appeal to a small segment of potential session participants.</p> <p>Topic is not adequately current or important and will have limited impact on the work of NAGAP members.</p> <p>Questions do not appear to generate discussion or lead to sharing of best practice, evidence-based research, useful</p>	<p>Topic is somewhat relevant to the needs of NAGAP members and topics identified for the conference.</p> <p>Topic might appeal to a segment of potential session participants.</p> <p>Topic might not be current, but is relevant, important and can have impact on the work of NAGAP members.</p> <p>Questions might generate some sharing of best practice, evidence-based research, useful data, and/or</p>	<p>Topic is very relevant to the needs of NAGAP members and topics identified for the conference.</p> <p>Topic will appeal to a variety of potential session participants.</p> <p>Topic is current, important and relevant and can have impact on the work of NAGAP members.</p> <p>Questions will generate sharing of best practice, evidence-based research, useful data, and/or</p>	<p>Topic is extremely relevant to the needs of NAGAP members and topics identified for the conference. Topic will appeal to a wide variety of potential session participants. Topic is cutting edge, immediately relevant and will have significant impact on the work of NAGAP members.</p> <p>Questions will generate significant sharing of best practice, evidence-based research, useful data, and/or evaluation of policies and procedures used</p>	

Review Rubric – Special Interest Forum

	data, and/or evaluation of policies and procedures used in GEM. Anticipated level of session participation satisfaction: Very Low	data, and/or evaluation of policies and procedures used in GEM. Anticipated level of session participation satisfaction: Low	evaluation of policies and procedures used in GEM. Anticipated level of session participation satisfaction: Good	evaluation of policies and procedures used in GEM. Anticipated level of session participation satisfaction: High	in GEM. Anticipated level of session participation satisfaction: Very High	
--	--	---	--	--	---	--

Review Rubric – Special Interest Forum

Purpose Outcomes	Unclear how the Session's learning objectives and intended outcomes support conference topics. Goals and learning objectives of the discussion are vague and not concrete enough for NAGAP audience.	Specific outcomes and key "takeaways" are not adequately indicated. Session participants might not be able to envision what they will learn from the discussion and how they can apply it to their work as GEM professionals. Goals and learning objectives of session do not include enough follow up action and next steps.	Session's learning objectives and intended outcomes satisfactorily support Conference topics. Specific outcomes and key "takeaways" are indicated. Participants can envision what they will learn from the discussion and how they can apply it to their work as GEM professionals. Goals and learning objectives of session include suggested follow up action and next steps.	Session's learning objectives and intended outcomes support conference topics. Specific outcomes and key "takeaways" are clearly indicated. Participants can envision what they will learn from the discussion and how they can apply it to their work as GEM professionals. Goals and learning objectives of session include suggested follow up action(s) and next steps.	Session's intended learning objectives and intended outcomes highly support conference topics. Specific outcomes and key "takeaways" are very clearly indicated. Participants can envision what they will learn from the discussion and how they can apply it to their work as GEM professionals. Goals and learning objectives of session include a wide variety of concrete follow-up action(s) and next steps.	
-------------------------	--	---	---	---	---	--

Review Rubric – Special Interest Forum

<p>Well defined topic description questions</p>	<p>Topic description is vague or lacks enough detail to evaluate. Description and discussion questions are unclear as to what the session is about.</p>	<p>Topic description provides a limited idea of what the session will be about. Description and discussion questions may lack details and clarity about intended audience, goals and evolution of discussion. More information would be needed to fully evaluate.</p> <p>Discussion questions might be better aligned to description or goals in order to be more appealing to session participants.</p>	<p>Topic description is somewhat inviting, clear and descriptive. Clarity of description and discussion questions somewhat provide participants with some information about intended audience, goals and evolution of discussion.</p> <p>Discussion questions might be better aligned to description or goals in order to be more appealing to session participants.</p>	<p>Topic description is inviting, clear and descriptive. Clarity of description and discussion questions provide participants with explicit and thorough information about intended audience, goals and evolution of discussion.</p> <p>Discussion questions are aligned to description or goals and will be appealing to session participants.</p>	<p>Topic description is very inviting, clear, descriptive and interesting. Clarity of description and discussion questions provide participants with explicit and thorough information about intended audience, goals and evolution of discussion.</p> <p>Discussion questions are aligned to description or goals and will be extremely appealing to session participants.</p>	
--	---	--	--	---	---	--

Review Rubric – Special Interest Forum

Qualifications/Background of discussion leader(s)	Leader(s) qualification(s) cannot ensure a positive experience for session participants. Leader(s) is not knowledgeable about the topic and does not appear to have expertise based on his/her direct or related experiences in GEM and/or personal, professional or educational background. Leader(s) has not led discussion on this topic at other conferences.	Leader(s) qualifications might not ensure a positive experience for session participants. Leader(s) is not adequately knowledgeable about the topic and does not appear to have expertise based on his/her direct or related experiences in GEM and/or personal, professional or educational background. Leader(s) has led discussion on this topic at other conferences.	Leader(s) qualifications would ensure a somewhat positive experience for session participants. Leader(s) is somewhat knowledgeable about the topic and appears to have expertise based on his/her direct or related experiences in GEM and/or personal, professional or educational background. Leader(s) has led discussions on this topic at other highly recognized conferences.	Leader(s) qualifications would ensure a very positive experience for session participants. Leader(s) is knowledgeable about the topic and appears to have expertise based on his/her direct or related experiences in GEM and/or personal, professional or educational background. Leader(s) has led discussion on this topic more than once at other highly recognized conferences.	Leader(s) qualifications would ensure an extremely positive experience for session participants. Leader(s) is very knowledgeable about the topic and appears to have a high level of expertise based on his/her direct or related experiences in GEM and/or personal, professional or educational background. Leader(s) has led discussion on this topic at several other highly recognized conferences.	
TOTAL SCORE						

Review Rubric – Vendor Presentation

Category	Does not meet requirement Rating = 1	Poor Rating = 2	Fair Rating = 3	Satisfactory Rating = 4	Excellent Rating = 5	Category Sub Score
Currency, Importance and relevance of product or service	Product lacks relevancy to the needs of NAGAP members and topics identified for the 2014 conference. Product will only appeal to a small segment of potential session participants. Product is not current or important and will have very limited impact on the work of NAGAP conference attendees. Product does not support best practice, evidence-based research, analysis of data,	Product might lack relevancy to the needs of NAGAP members and topics identified for the 2014 conference. Product might only appeal to a small segment of potential session participants. Product is not adequately current or important and will have limited impact on the work of NAGAP conference attendees. Product does not support best practice, evidence-based research, analysis of data, and/or development of	Product is somewhat relevant to the needs of NAGAP members and topics identified for the 2014 conference. Product might appeal to a segment of potential session participants. Product might not be current, but is relevant, important and can have impact on the work of NAGAP conference attendees. Product somewhat supports best practice, evidence-based research, analysis of data, and/or development of policies and	Product is very relevant to the needs of NAGAP members and topics identified for the 2014 conference. Product will appeal to a variety of potential session participants. Product is current, important, and relevant and can have impact on the work of NAGAP conference attendees. Product supports best practice, evidence-based research, analysis of data, and/or development of policies and procedures used in GEM. Anticipated level of	Product is extremely relevant to the needs of NAGAP members and topics identified for the 2014 conference. Product will appeal to a wide variety of potential session participants. Product is cutting edge, immediately relevant and will have significant impact on the work of NAGAP conference attendees. Product highly supports best practice, evidence-based research, analysis of data, and/or development of	

Review Rubric – Vendor Presentation

	and/or development of policies and procedures used in GEM. Anticipated level of session participation satisfaction: Very Low	policies and procedures used in GEM. Anticipated level of session participation satisfaction: Low	procedures used in GEM. Anticipated level of session participation satisfaction: Good	session participation satisfaction: High	policies and procedures used in GEM. Anticipated level of session participation satisfaction: Very High	
--	---	--	--	--	--	--

Review Rubric – Vendor Presentation

Purpose Outcomes	Unclear how the Session’s learning objectives and intended outcomes support conference topics or how the product supports GEM. Goals and learning objectives of the session are vague and not concrete enough for NAGAP audience.	Specific outcomes and key “takeaways” are not adequately indicated. Session participants might not be able to envision what they will learn in the session, how they can apply it to their work as GEM professionals or how the product supports GEM. Goals and learning objectives of session do not include enough follow-up action and next steps.	Session’s learning objectives and intended outcomes satisfactorily support conference topics. Specific outcomes and key “takeaways” are indicated. Session participants can envision what they will learn and how they can apply it to their work as GEM professionals or how the product supports GEM. Goals and learning objectives of session include some follow-up action and next steps.	Session’s learning objectives and intended outcomes support conference topics. Specific outcomes and key “takeaways” are clearly indicated. Session participants can envision what they will learn and how they can apply it to their work as GEM professionals or how the product supports GEM. Goals and learning objectives of session include follow up action(s) and next steps.	Session’s intended learning objectives and intended outcomes highly support conference topics. Specific outcomes and key “takeaways” are very clearly indicated. Session participants can envision what they will learn and how they can apply it to their work as GEM professionals or how the product supports GEM. Goals and learning objectives of session include a wide variety of concrete follow up action(s) and next steps.	
-------------------------	---	---	--	---	---	--

Review Rubric – Vendor Presentation

<p>Well defined product and abstract</p>	<p>Title and abstract are vague or lack enough detail to evaluate. Abstract and outline are unclear what the session or product is about.</p>	<p>Title and abstract provide a limited idea of what the session or product will be about. Abstract and outline may lack details and clarity about intended audience, goals, and follow-up. More information would be needed to fully evaluate.</p> <p>Session format might be better aligned to goals in order to be more appealing to session participants.</p>	<p>Title and abstract are somewhat inviting, clear and descriptive. Clarity of abstract and outline somewhat provides participants with some information about the product, intended audience, goals and follow-up.</p> <p>Session format might be better aligned to goals in order to be more appealing to session participants.</p>	<p>Title and abstract are inviting, clear and descriptive. Clarity of abstract and outline provides participants with explicit and thorough information about the product, intended audience, goals and follow-up.</p> <p>Session format is aligned to goals and will be appealing to session participants.</p>	<p>Title and abstract are very inviting clear, descriptive and interesting. Clarity of abstract and outline provides participants with explicit and thorough information about the product, intended audience, goals and follow-up.</p> <p>Session format is aligned to goals and will be extremely appealing to session participants.</p>	
---	---	---	---	---	--	--

Review Rubric – Vendor Presentation

Qualifications/Background of presenter(s)	Presenter(s) qualification(s) cannot ensure a positive experience for session participants. Presenter(s) is not knowledgeable about the product and does not appear to have expertise based on his/her direct or related experiences in GEM and/or personal, professional or educational background. Presenter(s) has not presented on this product at other conferences.	Presenter(s) qualifications might not ensure a positive experience for session participants. Presenter(s) is not adequately knowledgeable about the product and does not appear to have expertise based on his/her direct or related experiences in GEM and/or personal, professional or educational background. Presenter(s) has presented on this product at other conferences.	Presenter(s) qualifications would ensure a somewhat positive experience for session participants. Presenter(s) is somewhat knowledgeable about the product and appears to have expertise based on his/her direct or related experiences in GEM and/or personal, professional or educational background. Presenter(s) has presented on this product at other highly recognized conferences.	Presenter(s) qualifications would ensure a very positive experience for session participants. Presenter(s) is knowledgeable about the product and appears to have expertise based on his/her direct or related experiences in GEM and/or personal, professional or educational background. Presenter(s) has presented on this product more than once at other highly recognized conferences.	Presenter(s) qualifications would ensure an extremely positive experience for session participants. Presenter(s) is very knowledgeable about the product and appears to have a high level of expertise based on his/her direct or related experiences in GEM and/or personal, professional or educational background. Presenter(s) has presented on this product several times at other highly recognized conferences.	
TOTAL SCORE						