

## SAA RESEARCH FORUM ABSTRACT SUBMISSION RUBRIC

Criteria	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)
<p><b>Overall Quality:</b> <i>The proposal clearly states the context of the problem, and demonstrates sound and replicable research design or practice.</i></p> <p><i>(Weighted x2)</i></p>	<p>Clear, concise, and easy-to-understand proposal.</p> <p>Excellent statement of the theoretical or practical problem.</p>	<p>Clear and generally easy-to-understand proposal.</p> <p>Good statement of the theoretical or practical problem.</p>	<p>Not entirely clear and/or difficult-to-understand proposal.</p> <p>Fair statement of the theoretical or practical problem.</p>	<p>It is unclear what is being proposed.</p> <p>Poor statement of the theoretical or practical problem.</p>
<p><b>Relevance:</b> <i>The proposal is clearly of interest or benefit to archives and/or archivists.</i></p> <p><i>(Weighted x2)</i></p>	<p>Target audience is clearly defined.</p> <p>The significance of the topic to archives and/or archivists is clearly described and is compelling.</p>	<p>Target audience is specified.</p> <p>The relevance of the topic to archives and/or archivists is loosely described, but suggests some value.</p>	<p>Target audience is only generally stated.</p> <p>The relevance of the topic to archives and/or archivists is only generally stated.</p>	<p>The target audience is not described or is only described in vague terms.</p> <p>The relevance of the topic is not described, or is only described in vague terms.</p>
<p><b>Timeliness/Currency:</b> <i>The proposal relates to a topic that is well-timed or in-demand.</i></p>	<p>The topic is an emerging "hot" topic and/or a topic for which there is a perceived high demand.</p>	<p>While this topic is not necessarily timely, it remains in-demand.</p>	<p>This topic is no longer timely and/or little demand exists.</p>	<p>This topic is not timely and/or no demand exists.</p>
<p><b>Innovation:</b> <i>The proposal offers fresh, innovative ideas, methods, or resources that are new and/or underexplored.</i></p>	<p>The proposal content is original and innovative.</p>	<p>The proposal content is a new take on a familiar topic.</p>	<p>The proposal content is a popular approach on a popular topic.</p>	<p>The proposal content is weak and lacks originality.</p>
<p><b>DEIA<sup>1</sup>:</b> <i>The proposal considers issues of diversity, equity, inclusivity, and accessibility in its scope, approach, audience, and/or topic.</i></p>	<p>The proposal highlights inclusion of underrepresented perspectives and/or communities.</p> <p>The proposal advances the audience's understanding of equity, diversity, and inclusion as defined by SAA.</p>	<p>The proposal takes into account underrepresented perspectives and/or communities.</p> <p>The proposal shows some alignment with equity, diversity, and inclusion as defined by SAA.</p>	<p>The proposal includes some representation of underrepresented perspectives and/or communities.</p> <p>The proposal does not fully address a contribution to equity, diversity, or inclusion as defined by SAA.</p>	<p>The proposal does not include underrepresented perspectives and/or communities.</p> <p>The proposal does not contribute to equity, diversity, or inclusion as defined by SAA.</p>

<sup>1</sup> <https://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/0723-III-C-WorkPlanDEIA.pdf>

## SAA RESEARCH FORUM ABSTRACT SUBMISSION RUBRIC

### *Definitions of Criteria:*

**Overall quality:** Submission has a clear problem statement. Original research will be presented.

**Relevance:** Submission is likely to benefit archives and/or archivists and to garner interest.

**Timeliness:** Submission treats a topic of significant current interest.

**Innovation:** Submission demonstrates originality of content and approach.

**DEIA:** Submission addresses concerns of diversity, equity, and representation.

---

### *Recommendations:*

- **Accept in current form.** *Submission is appropriate for presentation, with minor revisions.*
  - **Invite to revise and resubmit.** *Edits required for consideration; see suggested revisions.*
  - **Reject.** *This submission does not meet the criteria and/or is not suitable for presentation.*
- 

This rubric was developed<sup>2</sup> by CORDA's Research Forum Committee in 2023-2024.

Please email questions to [researchforum@archivists.org](mailto:researchforum@archivists.org).

Learn more about the SAA Research forum: <https://www2.archivists.org/publications/research-forum>

---

<sup>2</sup> Closely derived from: American Library Association (2023). Annual Conference Proposal Review Guidelines [PDF]. <https://2023.alaannual.org/sites/default/files/inline-files/AC23%20Proposal%20Review%20Guidelines%20Rubric.pdf>, as well as Society of American Archivists – Case Study – Peer Review Assessment Form, <https://studylib.net/doc/7059600/rubric---society-of-american-archivists> and American Library Association Annual Conference 2024 Education Program Proposal Review Rubric [https://2024.alaannual.org/sites/default/files/inline-files/AC2024%20Education%20Program%20Rubric\\_0.pdf](https://2024.alaannual.org/sites/default/files/inline-files/AC2024%20Education%20Program%20Rubric_0.pdf)