

**Review Rubric – Panel**

<b>Category</b>	Does not meet requirement Rating = 1	Poor Rating = 2	Fair Rating = 3	Satisfactory Rating = 4	Excellent Rating = 5	Category Sub Score
<b>Currency, Importance and Appropriateness of topic</b>	<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. 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</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. 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</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. 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</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. 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</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. 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</p>	

**Review Rubric – Panel**

		session participation satisfaction: Low	participation satisfaction: Good			
<b>Purpose Outcomes</b>	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><b>Well defined topic and abstract</b></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**

<p><b>Qualifications/ Background of panelist(s)</b></p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	
<p><b>TOTAL SCORE</b></p>						