



## Education Session Review Criteria Rubric

Note: Each section (1, 2, 3) carries equal weight. Sub-scores per section will be averaged for a final score.

### Section 1. Quality, organization, and scholarship

	<b>Does not adequately address criteria (1)</b>	<b>Addresses criteria with substantial weakness (2)</b>	<b>Adequately addresses criteria (3)</b>	<b>Strongly addresses criteria (4)</b>	<b>Exceeds expectations in addressing criteria (5)</b>
<b>Quality and Organization</b>	The proposal is not well-written and/or lacks detail, organization, or focus in ways that suggest the presentation would be poor.	The proposal is not well-written and/or lacks detail, organization, or focus in ways that suggest the presentation may be weak or inaccessible to many attendees.	The proposal is adequately written, with sufficient detail, organization, and focus to suggest a presentation of moderate quality that would be accessible to many attendees.	The proposal is well written, with mostly clear, detailed, and relevant descriptions, suggesting a smooth and in-depth presentation that would be accessible to most attendees.	The proposal is very well-written, with unflinchingly clear, detailed, and relevant descriptions, suggesting a high-quality, professional presentation.
<b>Scholarship</b>	The proposal does not take a scholarly approach to practice. The material to be presented is not based within previous research, theory, evidence, and/or assessment and likely anecdotal.		The proposal takes a scholarly approach to practice, and it may be implied that the material to be presented is within previous research, theory, evidence, and/or assessment.		The proposal takes a clearly scholarly approach to practice. The material to be presented is clearly based within previous research, theory, evidence, and/or

					assessment and is not anecdotal.
<b>Timely topic &amp; relevance to conference theme</b>	The topic is not relevant to the theme, is not current, and/or lacks importance or appropriateness to the field. It does not appear to be of value or a worthwhile session for ASMCUE attendees.	The topic is only tangentially related to the field and is not current or important to the field and/or to the potential audience. It may not be a worthwhile session, or its value might be limited to a narrow group.	The topic may not be current, but it is relevant to the field and potential audience. It might be a worthwhile session for some ASMCUE attendees.	Topic is current, important, and appropriate to the field and potential audience. It appears to be a worthwhile session. Likely to be a worthwhile session, possibly for multiple groups.	The topic is current, relevant to the theme, groundbreaking, or significant to the field and potential audience. It appears to be a very worthwhile session. Likely to be a very worthwhile session for multiple groups.
<b>Innovation and Originality</b>	The topic is not innovative, original, or groundbreaking. Attendees are unlikely to gain new knowledge or insights.	The topic may not particularly original, innovative, or groundbreaking. Attendees may not be likely to gain new knowledge or insights.	The topic is fairly original, if not innovative or groundbreaking. Attendees may gain new knowledge and insights.	The topic is original, innovative, and groundbreaking for at least some participants. Attendees are likely to gain new knowledge and insights.	The topic is thought-provoking, innovative, and groundbreaking for many participants. Attendees are very likely to gain new knowledge and insights.
<b>Assessment Methods</b>	The proposal does not describe methods used for collecting evidence and/or data OR data and/or evidence were not collected.	The proposal describes the methods used for collecting and analyzing evidence and/or data, but the methods are poorly designed for addressing the research question or pedagogical goals.	The proposal describes the methods used for collecting and analyzing evidence and/or data. The methods are adequately designed for addressing the research question or pedagogical goals.	The proposal describes well-designed methods for collecting and analyzing evidence and/or data.	The proposal describes rigorously designed methods for collecting and analyzing evidence and/or data.

## Section 2. Impact on Undergraduate Learning

<b>Promotes inclusive and/or anti-racist teaching practices</b>	The proposal does not encourage critical reflections about diversity and contains no elements that address culturally responsive,		The proposal might encourage critical reflections about diversity and contains some elements that address culturally responsive, inclusive,		The session is likely to foster critical reflections about diversity and/or encourage attendees to foster more culturally responsive, inclusive,
---	---	--	---	--	--

	inclusive, and anti-racist classrooms.		and anti-racist classrooms.		and anti-racist classrooms.
<b>Strategies to increase PEER* representation in science</b>	The proposal does not address how the project or activity acts to help recruit and/or retain PEERs in science.		The project or activity may to help recruit and/or retain PEERs in science, but it may be inferred and not clearly stated in the proposal.		The proposal clearly states specifically how the project or activity can help recruit and/or retain PEERs in science
<b>Evidence of Strategy Effectiveness</b>	The proposal does not include evidence and/or data to support the effectiveness of the strategy and/or unsubstantiated conclusions are drawn.	The proposal implies the existence of evidence and/or data to support conclusions, but it leaves unclear whether sufficient substantiation can be provided for conclusions.	The proposal includes some data supporting and/or evidence of the effectiveness of the strategy and support for specific conclusions.	The proposal includes sufficient data supporting and/or evidence of the effectiveness of the strategy and support for specific conclusions.	The proposal includes ample and clear data supporting and/or evidence of the effectiveness of the strategy and as support for well-substantiated conclusions.

### Section 3. Attendee Experience

<b>Format &amp; Timing of Session</b>	The length, and/or format are inappropriate for the session type or scope of the session.	The proposal may be appropriate for the session type. The length, format, may be inappropriate for the session type.	The length and format are generally appropriate for the session type.	The length and format are appropriate for the session type.	The length and format, are very well-suited for the session type.
<b>Attendee Learning Outcomes</b>	The intended attendee learning outcomes are not stated, cannot be inferred, and/or do not seem likely to be achievable.	The intended attendee learning outcomes are not clearly stated, take effort to infer, and/or might not be achievable, given the format of the session.	The intended attendee learning outcomes may not be stated, but can easily be inferred and seem possible to achieve, given the format of the session.	The intended attendee learning outcomes are stated or clearly implied and seem likely to be achieved, given the format of the session.	The intended attendee learning outcomes are explicitly stated and seem very likely to be achieved in the session.
<b>Attendee Engagement</b>	The proposed method for engaging audience participants is not stated, cannot be inferred, and/or is not appropriate for the session type.	The proposed method for engaging audience participants is not clearly stated, take effort to infer, and/or may not be appropriate for the session type.	The proposed method for engaging audience participants is mostly appropriate for the session type. The use of evidence-driven learning strategies is	The proposed method for engaging audience participants intentional and appropriate for the session type. Evidence-based learning strategies are somewhat described.	The proposed method for engaging audience participants is thoughtful, intentional, and appropriate for the session type. Likely a model of exemplary teaching and learning.

---

implied, but not  
thoroughly described.

---

\*PEER Definition: “Persons Excluded due to Race or Ethnicity”. Citation: Asai D. 2020. Excluded. J. Microbiol. Biol. Educ. 21(1):  
[doi:10.1128/jmbe.v21i1.2071](https://doi.org/10.1128/jmbe.v21i1.2071)