



2017 NAGC Session Selection Rubric

Section I: Overall Quality and Alignment with NAGC Mission. The items below are designed to 1) ensure that selected sessions are appropriate to NAGC's mission, and 2) represent quality contributions worthy of presentation on a national stage.

1. The proposal is *well organized and clearly written*....

Very Poorly Written
/Organized

Exceptionally well
Written/Organized

1

2

3

4

5

2. The proposal *specifies knowledge, skills, and/or ideas the presenter will impart to session participant (i.e., includes clear objectives)*.

No mention of knowledge,
skills, and/or ideas

Vague or indirect reference to
knowledge, skills and/or ideas

Clear articulation of
knowledge, skills, and/or
ideas

1

2

3

4

5

3. The proposed session reflects application, practice, or theory related *specifically to gifted children and youth (as opposed to typically developing or general education students)*.

No evident connection to
gifted children and youth

Vague, indirect, or secondary
connection to gifted children and
youth

Clear, direct connection to the
needs of gifted children and
youth

1

2

3

4

5

4. The concepts to be presented represent *high-quality best practice, theory, or research* related to gifted children and youth.

No support demonstrating
high quality best practice,
theory or research

Vague, indirect, or secondary
connection to high quality, best
practice, theory or research

Clear support that ideas
reflect high quality, best
practice, theory or research

1

2

3

4

5

5. The proposed session will convey substantial content, related to gifted children and youth, representative of the most informative ideas in the field and include classic or cutting-edge ideas.

No connection between topic and gifted children and youth	Some connection between topic and gifted children and youth	Strong connection between topic and gifted children and youth
1	2	3
4	5	

6. (Network-specific question, TOTAL 5 POINTS)

(five point scale)

Required Comments:

TOTAL: _____ / 30

Network Specific Questions #6

Section II: Quality Content Related to One or More NAGC Network. Each NAGC network views the items below from the perspective of its distinct emphasis and current priorities.

Arts

6. The proposal presents ideas which will help in the understanding of the artistically gifted individual, or aid in knowing how to work with the artistically gifted.

Will be of little help	Will be of some help	Will be a great deal of help
1	2	3
4	5	

Computers and Technology

6. The proposal emphasizes the purposeful integration of technology in order to deepen and enhance the learning process (i.e. active engagement, participation in groups, frequent interaction and feedback, and connection to real-world experts).

No or little purposeful integration of technology	Some purposeful integration of technology	Strong purposeful integration of technology
1	2	3
4	5	

Conceptual Foundations

6. The proposed session will inspire and challenge participants to re-examine and/or move beyond their current thoughts and perspectives about theory; concepts of giftedness; philosophical foundations; trends, issues, and future directions for the field; historical perspectives; and/or perspectives from outside the field.

No or little re-examination of theory or concepts		Some re-examination of theory or concepts		Strong re-examination of theory or concepts
1	2	3	4	5

Counseling & Guidance

6. The proposed session provides information and strategies that enable teachers, counselors, and parents to serve the affective, social, and psychological needs of gifted and talented children and youth in a variety of settings.

Not at all		To some degree		To a great degree
1	2	3	4	5

Creativity

6. Integration of creativity and high level content (i.e. STEAM, 21st century skills) based on sound pedagogical theory or research.

No or little integration of creativity and high level content		Some integration of creativity and high level content		Strong integration of creativity and high level content
1	2	3	4	5

Curriculum Studies

6. The proposed session focuses on curricular and instructional strategies, issues, and/or areas of research that are a direct response to the learning needs of gifted learners.

No evident focus on the goals outlined		Some focus on the goals outlined		Clear and evident focus on the goals outlined
1	2	3	4	5

Early Childhood

6. The proposal supports information of early childhood (Preschool- 3rd grade) in the areas of identification, assessment, curricula, programs, research and parenting.

No evidence that the proposal will provide information related to Early Childhood mission.	Unclear if the proposal supports Early Childhood mission.	Directly impacts the above areas and mission within the early childhood age span (PS-3 rd grade).
1	2 3	4 5

Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender, and Questioning

6. The proposal provides strong evidence that the presented knowledge, practices, and policies can lead to significant improvements in the lives of gifted GLBTQ youth and their supporters.

No or little evidence	Some evidence	Strong evidence
1	2 3	4 5

Global Awareness

6. The proposed session contributes relevant ideas and best practices that promote an awareness of Self that allows gifted students to understand global perspectives and global issues to assist them in finding a meaningful way to positively develop and influence our global society.

No or little connection between gifted children and global awareness	Some connection indicating how gifted children can influence a global society and/or become more aware of global issues	Strong connection to encouraging global awareness among gifted children and/or gifted children positively impacting our global society
1	2 3	4 5

Middle Grades

6. The proposal addresses topical issues/concerns/conversations reflecting middle grades.

No or little reflection of middle grades issues	Some reflection of middle grades issues	Strong reflection of middle grades issues
1	2 3	4 5

Research & Evaluation

6. Empirical Proposals Only (Scale of 1-10)

Please rate the research design and methodology

Please rate the quality of the data analysis (qualitative or quantitative)

Please rate the interpretations and conclusions made in light of the findings

Non-empirical Proposals Only (Scale of 1-5)

Please rate the applicability of topic to researchers and/or practitioners in the field

Please rate the proposed style of presentation for the intended audience

Parent & Community

6. The proposal contributes relevant ideas, best practices, and resources for parents that address advocacy and awareness, supporting families, diversity (i.e., under-served populations, families of twice-exceptional children, families using alternative schooling), building home/school/community partnerships, or the development of local and state organizations to support gifted education.

No or little evidence of relevant ideas, best practices, and resources for parents	Some evidence of relevant ideas, best practices, and resources for parents	Strong evidence of relevant ideas, best practices, and resources for parents		
1	2	3	4	5

Professional Development

6. The proposal provides standards-based professional development with content and/or pedagogical strategies that impact the Gifted Education community.

No or little evidence of content and/or pedagogical strategies	Some evidence of content and/or pedagogical strategies	Strong evidence of content and/or pedagogical strategies		
1	2	3	4	5

Special Populations

6. The proposal clearly focuses on a special population of gifted children (i.e., historically under-represented racial minority groups or underserved groups) in advanced programs.

No or little focus	Some focus	Strong focus		
1	2	3	4	5

Special Schools & Programs

6. This proposal aligns with the Special Schools and Programs mission focusing on alternative, experimental, innovative ideas and practices beyond the scope of traditional public school settings.

No or little connection to the Special Schools and Programs mission	Some connection indicating alignment to the Special Schools and Programs Mission	Strong alignment to the SSP mission
1	2	3
		4
		5

STEM

6. Will this information be practical, engaging, and based on best practices for STEM stakeholders?

No evidence that the proposer(s) considered practicality, engagement, or best practice when developing the proposal	Evidence that the proposer(s) considered practicality, engagement, <u>or</u> best practice when developing the proposal	Evidence that the proposer(s) considered practicality, engagement, <u>and</u> best practice when developing the proposal
1	2	3
		4
		5