CHLA/ABSC Evaluation Rubrics for Proposals

Rubric for Paper, Lightning talks, and Posters

Relevance to information professionals/conference	Innovation/ Originality	Perceived Impact/Significance	What is the overall recommendation
1 (Poor): The proposal is minimally relevant to the interests/needs of health information professionals or health library workers. Its connection to the field of health libraries or health information is vague or superficial, and/or the topic is not accessible for many people.	**1 (Poor):** The proposal lacks originality, offers minimal new insights, or duplicates existing research/ideas without meaningful innovation.	**1 (Poor):** The proposal's overall impact potential is minimal, with limited significance to the community of health information professionals. It fails to demonstrate why the research, project, or topic matters and how it could make a difference in practice, approach, or thinking.	**1 (Reject):** The proposal has significant weaknesses and is not suitable for acceptance.
2 (Moderate): The proposal is somewhat relevant to the interests or needs of health information professionals or health library workers, but lacks a clear connection to practical applications or professional interests.	**2 (Moderate):** The proposal presents some new ideas or perspectives but builds on well-established concepts or lacks depth.	**2 (Moderate):** The proposal has the potential for impact and shows the potential for the research/ program/topic to influence the field or address challenges. It may acknowledge EDIA, social responsibility and/or ethical issues but does so in a limited or underdeveloped manner. The broader significance to the community of health information professionals is not fully articulated.	**2 (Probably Reject):** The components of the proposal have merit, however overall the submission has areas of weakness. Could be considered for acceptance according to scheduling needs.

3 (Excellent): The proposal has a clear connection to health information professionals or health library workers contexts, insights, or applications to the field.	**3 (Excellent):** The proposal is original, introduces new ideas or approaches, and makes a contribution to the field.	**3 (Excellent):** The proposal has potential to be impactful, with clear and substantial significance to the community of health information professionals. It demonstrates why the research/ program/topic matters. The proposal may integrate EDIA principles thoughtfully, or reflects a strong commitment to social responsibility and/or ethical issues, offering actionable approaches to drive meaningful change.	**3 (Weak Accept):** The proposal is acceptable; minor revisions or refinements are suggested to areas of low scoring to strengthen the presentation.
			4 (Strong Accept): The proposal is outstanding and should be accepted.

Rubric for Panels

Relevance to information professionals/conference	Innovation/ Originality	Perceived Impact/Significance	Diversity of speakers (up to 4 panelists + 1 moderator)	What is the overall recommendation
1 (Poor): The proposal is minimally relevant to the interests/needs of health information professionals or health library workers. Its connection to the field of health libraries/information is vague or superficial, and/or not accessible for many people	**1 (Poor):** The proposal lacks originality, offers minimal new insights, or duplicates existing research/ideas without meaningful innovation.	**1 (Poor):** The proposal's overall impact potential is minimal, with limited significance to the field. It fails to demonstrate why the research, project, or topic matters and how it could make a difference in practice, approach, or thinking.	**1 (Poor):** The proposed panel lacks diversity in speakers, with minimal representation of different perspectives, backgrounds, or lived experiences.	**1 (Reject):** The proposal has significant weaknesses and is not suitable for acceptance.

2 (Moderate): The proposal is somewhat relevant to the interests/needs of health information professionals or health library workers, but lacks a clear connection to practical applications or professional interests.	**2 (Moderate):** The proposal presents some new ideas or perspectives but builds on well-established concepts or lacks depth.	**2 (Moderate):** The proposal has the potential for moderate impact, showing the potential to influence the field or address challenges. It may acknowledge EDIA, social responsibility and/or ethical issues but does so in a limited or underdeveloped manner. The broader significance to the community of health information professionals is not fully articulated.	**2 (Moderate):** The panel includes some diversity in speakers, but representation of different perspectives, backgrounds, or lived experiences is limited or not well-balanced.	**2 (Probably Reject):** The components of the proposal have merit, however overall the submission has areas of weakness. Could be considered as scheduling needs.
3 (Excellent): The proposal has a clear connection to health information professionals or health library workers contexts, insights, or applications to the field.	**3 (Excellent):** The proposal is original, introduces new ideas or approaches, and makes a contribution to the field.	**3 (Excellent):** The proposal has potential to be impactful, with clear and substantial significance to the community of health information professionals. It demonstrates why the research/program/topic matters. The proposal could integrate EDIA principles thoughtfully, or reflects a strong commitment to social responsibility, offering actionable approaches to drive meaningful change.	**3 (Excellent):** The proposed panel is diverse, showcasing a broad range of perspectives, backgrounds, and/or lived experiences. The speakers selected indicate thoughtful integration of representation from underrepresented or marginalized groups and fostering meaningful inclusion.	**3 (Weak Accept):** The proposal is acceptable; minor revisions or refinements are suggested to areas of low scoring to strengthen the presentation.
				4 (Strong Accept): The proposal is outstanding and should be accepted

Rubric for Workshops

Relevance to information professionals/ conference	Innovation/ Originality	Perceived Impact/ Significance	Learning Outcomes (3 minimum)	Learning activities	Target audience	Tech/ space requirements - optional	What is the overall recommendation
1 (Poor): The proposal is minimally relevant to the interests or needs of health information professionals/health library workers. Its connection to the field of health libraries/information is vague or superficial, and/or not accessible for many people	**1 (Poor):** The proposal lacks originality, offers minimal new insights, or duplicates existing research without meaningful innovation.	**1 (Poor):** The proposal overall impact potential is minimal, with limited significance to the community of health information professionals. It fails to demonstrate why the research, project, or topic matters and how it could make a difference in practice, approach, or thinking.	**1 (Poor):** The learning objectives are vague, too broad/unrealistic, irrelevant, or a minimum of 3 learning objectives were not provided. The learning objectives lack specific actions or outcomes, making them difficult to understand or measure.	**1 (Poor):** The activities proposed are passive or there are no activities included in the proposal. The learning activities proposed do not encourage interaction, collaboration, or hands-on learning.	**0 (Missing):** Did not address this	**0 (Missing):** Did not address this or not feasible	**1 (Reject):** The proposal has significant weaknesses and is not suitable for acceptance.

2 (Moderate): The proposal is somewhat relevant to the interests or needs of health information professionals or health library workers, but lacks a clear connection to practical applications or professional interests.	2 (Moderate): The proposal presents some new ideas or perspectives but builds on well-established concepts or lacks depth.	2 (Moderate): The proposal has the potential for moderate impact, showing the potential to influence the field or address challenges. It may acknowledge EDIA, social responsibility and/or ethical issues but does so in a limited or underdeveloped manner. The broader significance to the community of health information professionals is not fully articulated.	2 (Moderate): The learning objectives are somewhat clear and achievable, but may lack sufficient detail or specificity in describing the desired outcomes or actions participants. They may focus only on lower-order cognitive skills (e.g., recall or recognition) and do not encourage critical thinking, analysis, or application.	2 (Moderate): The activities are somewhat engaging and interactive, but could include more opportunities for active participation or collaboration. They are partially aligned with the learning objectives proposed but may not fully support goals or outcomes of the workshop.	1 (Present): Addressed this in the submission	1 (Present): Addressed this in the submission & feasible	2 (Probably Reject): The components of the proposal have merit, however overall the submission has areas of weakness. Could be considered as scheduling needs.
3 (Excellent): The proposal has a clear connection to health information professionals or health library workers contexts, insights, or applications to the field.	3 (Excellent): The proposal is original, introduces new ideas or approaches, and makes a contribution to the field.	3 (Excellent): The proposal has potential to be impactful, with clear and substantial significance to the community of health information professionals. It demonstrates why the research/program/topic matters. The proposal could integrate EDIA principles thoughtfully, or reflects a strong commitment to social responsibility, offering actionable approaches to drive meaningful change.	3 (Excellent): The learning objectives are clear, feasible, relevant and address a range of cognitive levels. It is easy to understand what participants could learn or achieve. They include precise verbs such as Bloom's taxonomy that define measurable actions.	3 (Excellent): The proposed activities are engaging and interactive, promoting active participation, collaboration, and/or hands-on learning experiences. The learning activities strongly aligned with and would support participants in achieving the intended learning outcomes/ goals of the workshop.			3 (Weak Accept): The proposal is acceptable; minor revisions or refinements are suggested to areas of low scoring to strengthen the presentation.

							4 (Strong Accept): The proposal is outstanding and should be accepted.