CHLA/ABSC Evaluation Rubrics for Proposals

Rubric for Paper, Lightning talks, and Posters

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

CHLA-ABSC Evaluation Rubric September 2026 Page 1

3 (Excellent):	3 (Excellent):	3 (Excellent):	3 (Weak Accept):
The proposal has a clear connection to	The proposal is original,	The proposal has potential to be impactful,	The proposal is acceptable; minor
health information professionals or	introduces new ideas or	with clear and substantial significance to the	revisions or refinements are
health library workers contexts,	approaches, and makes a	community of health information	suggested to areas of low scoring to
insights, or applications to the field.	contribution to the field.	professionals. It demonstrates why the	strengthen the presentation.
		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.	
			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):	1 (Poor):	1 (Poor):	1 (Poor):	1 (Reject):
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	The proposal lacks originality, offers minimal new insights, or duplicates existing research/ideas	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	The proposed panel lacks diversity in speakers, with minimal representation of different perspectives, backgrounds, or lived experiences.	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 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.	original, introduces new ideas or approaches, and	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		What is the overall recommendation
1 (Poor):	1 (Poor):	1 (Poor):	1 (Poor):	1 (Poor):	0 (Missing):	0 (Missing):	1 (Reject):
The proposal is minimally	The proposal	The proposal overall	The learning objectives	The activities	Did not	Did not	The proposal has
relevant to the interests	lacks	impact potential is	are vague, too	proposed are passive	address this	address this	significant weaknesses
or needs of health	originality,	minimal, with limited	broad/unrealistic,	or there are no		or not	and is not suitable for
information	offers minimal	significance to the	irrelevant, or a minimum	activities included in		feasible	acceptance.
professionals/health	new insights,	community of health	of 3 learning objectives	the proposal. The			
library workers. Its	or duplicates	information professionals.	were not provided. The	learning activities			
connection to the field of	existing	It fails to demonstrate why	learning objectives lack	proposed do not			
health	research	the research, project, or	specific actions or	encourage interaction,			
libraries/information is	without	topic matters and how it	outcomes, making them	collaboration, or			
vague or superficial,	meaningful	could make a difference in	difficult to understand or	hands-on learning.			
and/or not accessible for	innovation.	practice, approach, or	measure.				
many people		thinking.					

CHLA-ABSC Evaluation Rubric September 2026 Page 4

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

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

CHLA-ABSC Evaluation Rubric September 2026 Page 6