

**SWAMTA Criteria for Evaluating Concurrent Session Courses**  
**Blind Review Rubric and Multi-Step**

**Relevance to the Board Certification Domains (0 or 10 or 15 Points)**

0 Points	10 points	15 points
Proposal demonstrates no relevance to the board certification domains.	Proposal outlines some relevance to the board certification domains. Description and learning objectives are somewhat clear and timely.	Proposal clearly outlines relevance to the current board certification domains. Description and learning objectives are clear and timely.

**Clarity of Writing & Completeness (5 points)**

1 point	2-3 points	4-5 points
There are many spelling and grammatical errors. Description seems confusing and unclear. Identifying information is included. The presenter completed all of the application requirements.	There are a few spelling or grammatical errors. The intent of the proposal is somewhat clear and the presenter completed all of the application requirements.	Writing is clear and concise. There are no spelling errors or glaring grammatical errors. The presenter completed all application requirements.

**Suitability for Conference Location (10 points)**

1-3 points	4-7 points	8-10 points
Proposal does not meet a unique need presented in the geographic location of the conference or demonstrates relevance to the projected attendees.	Proposal somewhat meets a unique need presented in the geographic location of the conference and/or somewhat meets a need of the projected attendees.	Proposal clearly meets a unique need presented in the geographic location of the conference and/or meets an intense need of the projected attendees.

**Widespread Appeal (5 points)**

1 point	2-3 points	4-5 points
Presentation has limited appeal to all conference attendees, especially considering the needs of various levels of practice, diversity of theoretical perspectives, current trends, and research.	Presentation demonstrates some appeal to all conference attendees, especially considering the needs of various levels of practice, diversity of theoretical perspectives, current trends, and research.	Presentation demonstrates clear widespread appeal to all conference attendees, especially considering the needs of various levels of practice, diversity of theoretical perspectives, current trends, and research.

**Procedure:**

Step 1: Proposal Selection Committee members may submit questions for clarification about the proposals to the Vice President. All questions must be submitted to the Continuing Education Director within two weeks of the proposal deadline.

Step 2: The Vice President submits the questions to each presenter to maintain blindness and reports back to the committee, prior to meeting to discuss the blind review scoring results.

Step 3: Each member of the Proposal Selection Committee individually scores each proposal and submits their scores to the Vice President. Proposals are evaluated based on the number of points and consideration is given to providing a variety of topics and educational opportunities.

Step 4: The Vice President will combine the individual scores from each member of the Proposal Selection Committee and find the average to create each proposal's final score. The Vice President does not participate in scoring ANY proposals.