Advancing Chicanos/Hispanics & Native Americans in Science

Evaluation of STEM Symposia Proposals

Scoring Metrics

In the Grading Rubric, there are points for each of the session components. For each session, please provide numeric values that indicate the strength of the session and the relevance to the SACNAS audience. The scores will range from the lowest (1) to the highest (4), where the highest score always represents that the session is very strong on those aspects, and where 1 represents that the session is lacking in those aspects.

Guiding Considerations: One of the fundamental aspects of the scientific symposia sessions presented at SACNAS is diversity. The session's diversity components should include but not be limited to the following areas:

1. Disciplinary diversity: Are various disciplines overly represented or underrepresented in your highest scoring cohort?
2. Demographic diversity: Does the session speakers represent diversity in terms of racial and ethnic backgrounds?
3. Institutional diversity: Is there diversity of institutions represented in the session?
4. Scientific/STEM Symposia should include a minimum of 3 presenters in order to provide varying perspective on research.

PLEASE SKIP TO FOLLOWING PAGE FOR RUBRIC

SACNAS – STEM Symposium Session Proposal Grading Rubric				
Title, Goals & Description	**Title, goals and description should be appealing, relevant and well-defined.**			
	Scoring: Yes = 4, Somewhat True = 2, Barely= 2, No= 1, NA	**Weight**	**Score**	**Total**
	1. Is the title relevant and interesting to the intended audience?	1		
	2. Does the description of this session explain the topic well?	4		
	3. Are the goals of the session clearly stated?	4		
	Total Possible Title Description Score	9		
Scientific Talks and Scientific Panel Discussion Sessions	**Talks** should be on cutting edge topics relevant to the particular discipline in which the sessions would be presented, and relevant to the attendees			
	Scoring: Yes = 4, Somewhat True = 3, Barely = 2, No= 1, NA	**Weight**	**Score**	**Total**
	1. **Is the** session structure clearly described?	3		
	2. Are the talks (or expertise of panelists) under this session cohesive and complement each other well?	3		
	3. Is the session topic exciting and at the cutting edge of the field?	4		
	4. Does the session present relevant knowledge on this topic to the attendees?	3		
	Total Possible Scientific Talks Score	13		
Speaker(s) Contribution	**Speakers should have experience in the field being presented and/or have other qualifications to speak on the given topic(s) of the session.**			
	Scoring: Yes = 4, Somewhat True = 3, Barely = 2, No = 1, NA	**Weight**	**Score**	**Total**
	1. Are the speaker(s) experienced in the topic or well suited to present the talks?	4		
	2. Is the contribution of each speaker clearly explained?	4		
	Total Possible Speaker Contribution Score	8		
Diversity	**Speakers' representation of diversity components should include but not be limited to the following areas: gender, race/ethnic/cultural background, institutions, academic levels and/or sectors in STEM as appropriate to the topic.**			
	Scoring: Yes = 4, Somewhat True = 3, Barely = 2, No= 1, NA	**Weight**	**Score**	**Total**
	1. Do the speakers have a balanced gender representation?	2		

	2. Do the speakers represent a variety of racial/ethnic/cultural backgrounds?	2		
	3. Do the speakers represent a variety of institutions?	2		
	4. Do the speakers represent diverse expertise levels and/or STEM sectors?	2		
	5. Were there any other components of diversity represented by the included speakers?	2		
	Total Possible Diversity Score	10		
TOTAL POSSIBLE OVERALL SCORE *(max 160)*		40		
Please provide additional comments that you deem important regarding the strengths and potential areas of improvement of this session (These comments may be anonymously shared with the chair and/or speakers of the session):				
Yes or No - Was this session multi-disciplinary?				