

STLHE-SAPES 2018

Evaluation Criteria

(Poster Session, My Research in 300 Seconds, Research in Traditional Presentation)

	1 (weak)	2	3	4	5 (strong)
1. Research Questions (Are the research questions clearly presented? Are they anchored in a relevant review of the literature? Is the theoretical framework clear?)					
2. Objectives (Objectives of study address an educational need, problem, or challenge; Driven by clear questions connected to the literature and practice)					
3. Methodology (Effective selection and description of methodological approach)					
4. Outcomes (Appropriate techniques are used to analyze and organize the data collected. The data are presented in a clear and logical manner)					
5. Significance (New insight is added to the area of study. Interpretation of findings is appropriate in the context of the question and methods)					

- Is the selected format (e.g. poster, my research in 300 seconds, etc.) appropriate for the proposed content? Yes or No.
- What improvements could be made to the proposed session? (If you provided ratings of **3 or below** on statements 1-5 above, please include concrete suggestions for improving these aspects of the proposed session).
- Please provide any other comments you have about the proposed session.

Your **Overall Recommendation** (please select one of the options below as per the following guidelines):

- Accept with no revisions.**
- Accept with minor (or no) revisions** – includes only typographical errors, incomplete references etc.
- Encourage major revisions** - proposal lacks one or more of: relevance to conference threads; clear learning outcomes; appropriate theory, practice or research; sufficient interest to a diverse audience; sufficient level of interactivity.
- Do not accept** - proposal does not meet evaluation criteria, does not demonstrate sufficient understanding of the issues or is not suitable for the STLHE conference format, mission or audience.

STLHE-SAPES 2018

Evaluation Criteria

Traditional Presentation - Point of view or Reflection on Experience

	1 (weak)	2	3	4	5 (strong)
1. Relevance (Corresponds to our theme or our threads)					
2. Transferability (Can be transferred to our practices or to our field)					
3. Originality (Have we learned something?)					
4. Relationship to the literature (Conceptual framework)					
5. Contribution to scholarship and/or new or innovative practice(s) in higher education					

- Is the selected format (e.g. Cracker Barrel, Interactive Workshop, etc.) appropriate for the proposed content? Yes or No.
- What improvements could be made to the proposed session? (If you provided ratings of **3 or below** on statements 1-5 above, please include concrete suggestions for improving these aspects of the proposed session).
- Please provide any other comments you have about the proposed session.

Your **Overall Recommendation** (please select one of the options below as per the following guidelines):

Accept with no revisions.

Accept with minor revisions – includes only typographical errors, incomplete references etc.

Encourage major revisions - proposal lacks one or more of: relevance to conference threads; clear learning outcomes; appropriate theory or practice; sufficient interest to a diverse audience; sufficient level of interactivity.

Do not accept - proposal does not meet evaluation criteria, does not demonstrate sufficient understanding of the issues or is not suitable for the STLHE conference format, mission or audience.