

## Proposal Rubric Criteria

This rubric has three main foci are engagement, diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI), and relevance.

**Engagement** is defined as active learning strategies to ensure participants are fully engaged within the virtual or in-person environment and ensure that the proposal objectives and outcomes are achieved. We assess engagement with the following criteria:

- Facilitation Timing
- Potential for Participant Interaction
- Assessment of Learning (formative/summative)

**Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI)** is defined as the focus on diversity, equity, and inclusion. Our mission is to increase visibility and discussion of diversity issues; to help develop inclusive and pervasive environments for all engineers to thrive; and to facilitate and encourage use of translatable strategies that enable both bottom up and top down empowerment.

**Relevance** is the alignment of proposals and to the needs of both the Engineering and Education communities.

- Engineering
- Education Community

Each proposal will be evaluated on a 0-5 pt scale for each main focus. Reviewers will use the defined criteria below to help facilitate their scoring.

Proposal Content			
		Needs Improvement (0)	Excellent (5)
<b>Engagement</b>	<b>Facilitation of Time</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Over 50% of time is use in lecture</li> <li>● More than 20 minutes of consistent lecture</li> <li>● Timeline is unpractical for session proposed (i.e. # breakout sessions too high, too many activities)</li> <li>● Lack of time for participant questions and/or processing of material</li> <li>● No timeline proposed or not clearly identified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Lecture and activity time are well balanced: less than 50% non-interactive time, no more than 15 minutes of consistent lecture, no more than 30 minutes of lecture total</li> <li>● Time allocated for participant feedback and/or questions</li> <li>● Clearly planned and realistic timeline provided with proposal</li> </ul>

	<b>Potential for Participant Interaction</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No planned activities</li> <li>Only plans to use breakout rooms or small group/pair time</li> <li>Discussion time and topic not structured (timing, what/how shared out)</li> <li>Poor explanation of activity/tool use (i.e. lack of detail, inappropriate use)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use of Zoom and tools (i.e. whiteboards, polls, apps)</li> <li>Procedures in place for discussion time (i.e. who talks for share out)</li> <li>Clear topic and discussion product for breakouts</li> <li>Cues and timers present for individual and/or group time</li> </ul>
	<b>Assessment of Learning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No assessment planned</li> <li>Only end of session assessment planned</li> <li>Assessment is loose/unstructured (i.e. does anyone have any questions?)</li> <li>Too much time between learning and assessment (i.e. 45 minutes without any chance for assessment)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formative and summative assessment planned</li> <li>Assessment at incorporated into the workshop to build participant understand (not only to provide feedback to facilitators)</li> <li>Assessments occur periodically, to prevent overload of content.</li> <li>Formative assessments or structures with specific questions/activities that directly align to learning outcomes.</li> </ul>
<b>DEI</b>	<b>DEI</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of audience member focus</li> <li>Outcomes and content mentions DEI focus for does align with audience focus</li> <li>No facilitator motivation provided</li> <li>Lack of acknowledgment of privilege that provides context for work</li> <li>Session does not contain sufficient citations to base presentation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear DEI audience focus (i.e. women in general, Hispanic women, neurodivergent, visible and invisible disability, LGBTQ+, etc.)</li> <li>Outcomes and content of session align with DEI audience focus</li> <li>Facilitators demonstrate motivation for presenting in context of their privilege (insider/outsider)</li> <li>Session includes relevant citations by leaders in that area (i.e. grounded in literature)</li> </ul>
<b>Relevance</b>	<b>Engineering</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General engineering focus mentioned only, not specific population/application</li> <li>STEM focus instead of specifically engineering (i.e. not applicable to engineering)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Facilitators clearly identify field and/or level of engineering (i.e. freshman engineers, mechanical engineers in industry, engineering faculty)</li> <li>Clearly identify why engineering (not just a STEM topic)</li> </ul>
	<b>Education</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Action items not clearly identified or stated</li> <li>Educational application unclear or missing</li> <li>Too specific of impact area (i.e. only for their company or department)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Facilitators clearly identify action items for educational application (i.e. theory to practice)</li> <li>Provides community-based scenarios or relevance (broad impact)</li> </ul>