

MDLS 2025 Proposal Evaluation Rubric

Section A - For all formats

Novel or timely topic/approach? No = 0 / Y = 1	
Early career presenter? No = 0 / Y = 1	

Sub - TOTAL (out of 2)

Section B- For all formats

<i>Criterion</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	SCORE
Scope & Relevance to Applied Topic	1: Out of scope or irrelevant to conference focus on data librarianship.	2: Proposed topic makes loose/vague connections to data librarianship.	3: Strongly aligned with MDLS focus on data librarianship.	
Explores practical problems, advice, and experiences of data librarian work	1: Maintains a high-level, research-based view of the topic, <u>that does not connect to</u> practical problems, advice, or highlight experiences.	2: Proposed topic makes loose/vague connections to practical experiences.	3: Proposed topic is practitioner-based (e.g. centers experience, practice, focuses on practical advice, take-aways, or exploration of common problems).	
Topic addresses issues of diversity/inclusivity in the field	1: Proposal does not address any aspect of diversity/inclusivity.	2: Proposed topic makes loose/vague connections to diversity/inclusivity.	3: Diversity/inclusivity is addressed in the proposal and part of learning objectives and/or take-aways. Proposal adopts inclusive language and perspectives.	

Sub - TOTAL (out of 9)

If the Proposal Format is a lightning talk, add Section A and B together and score for decision

Lightning Talk Score:

TOTAL (out of 11)

Section C - For all other format types (not lightning talks)

Criterion	1	2	3	Score
Interactivity and engagement of audience	1: Proposed session is not interactive or interactivity is not addressed.	2: Proposal includes limited interactive elements (e.g. audience discussion or Q&A). Role of the proposer(s) is primarily a presenter.	3: Proposal centers audience participation and/or opportunities for group learning (e.g. breakout groups, case studies, or other unconference elements). Role of the proposer(s) is primarily a facilitator.	
Learning outcomes	1: No outcomes were stated.	2: Weak articulation of learning outcomes (e.g. loosely defined or stated, no connection to audience).	3: Clearly articulated learning outcomes with defined outcomes for the stated audience.	
Feasibility and approach	1: Too ambitious for the proposed format. May require additional resources beyond conference capabilities.	2: Feasible, but proposal requires adaptation based on committee feedback to be feasible for time, format, and venue technical resources.	3: Ready to go! Appropriate to conference venue and adheres to tech-lite instruction in the CFP.	

Sub - TOTAL (out of 9)

Score for Non-Lightning Talk Submissions

If the Proposal Format is a presentation, panel, workshop or other applicable format, add Section A, B, and C together and score for decision

TOTAL (out of 20)

Accessibility concerns/thoughts:

Adaptation consideration - change of format:

Additional comments (e.g., concerns, questions, or suggestions about applicability, or feasibility remarks, or inclusivity concerns, etc.):