

 *Ready! Resilient!*  
Utah Early Childhood  
Mental Health Conference  
*we care*

**Call for Proposals Review Rubric**

**Alignment with conference focus on IECMH (0–6) and caregiver relationships:**

1	Very Weak	The proposal shows little to no alignment with IECMH (ages 0–6) and does not meaningfully address caregiver relationships.
2	Weak	The proposal includes minimal reference to IECMH (ages 0–6) or caregiver relationships, with weak or peripheral alignment to the conference focus.
3	Average	The proposal addresses IECMH (ages 0–6) or caregiver relationships, but the connection to the conference focus lacks depth or integration.
4	Strong	The proposal is clearly aligned with IECMH (ages 0–6) and meaningfully addresses the role of caregiver relationships.
5	Very Strong	The proposal is highly aligned with IECMH (ages 0–6), with a strong, integrated focus on caregiver relationships as central to the content and outcomes.

**Evidence-informed or clearly grounded in research, best practices, or theory:**

1	Very Weak	The proposal shows little to no evidence of being informed by research, best practices, or relevant theory.
2	Weak	The proposal demonstrates limited use of research, best practices, or theory, with unclear or weak connections to the content presented.
3	Average	The proposal is generally informed by research, best practices, or theory, though references or application may be basic or not well integrated.

4	Strong	The proposal is clearly grounded in research, best practices, or theory, with strong and relevant connections to the proposed content.
5	Very Strong	The proposal is thoroughly evidence-informed, demonstrating deep integration of research, best practices, or theory that meaningfully strengthens the content and outcomes.

**Clarity and feasibility of session goals and learning objectives:**

1	Very Weak	The session goals and learning objectives are unclear, poorly defined, or unrealistic.
2	Weak	The session goals and learning objectives are somewhat unclear or overly broad, with questionable feasibility.
3	Average	The session goals and learning objectives are generally clear and achievable, though refinement or greater specificity is needed.
4	Strong	The session goals and learning objectives are clear, well-defined, and feasible within the proposed session format.
5	Very Strong	The session goals and learning objectives are exceptionally clear, specific, and realistic, with strong alignment to the session content and format.

**Relevance to a designated conference track, or applicable to a wide range of professional roles and settings:**

1	Very Weak	The proposal shows little to no relevance to the designated conference track and has limited applicability to professional roles or settings.
2	Weak	The proposal has minimal relevance to the designated conference track and limited applicability to a narrow set of professional roles or contexts.
3	Average	The proposal is generally relevant to the designated conference track or applicable to several professional roles and settings, but alignment or scope could be stronger.
4	Strong	The proposal is clearly relevant to the designated conference track and applicable to a broad range of professional roles and settings.

5	Very Strong	The proposal is highly aligned with the designated conference track and demonstrates strong, compelling applicability across a wide range of professional roles and settings.
---	-------------	---

**Interactivity and practical application:**

1	Very Weak	The proposal includes little to no interactivity and provides minimal practical application for participants.
2	Weak	The proposal includes limited interactivity and few practical elements, with minimal opportunities for participant engagement or real-world application.
3	Average	The proposal includes some interactive components and practical examples, but participant engagement or application may be limited or uneven.
4	Strong	The proposal incorporates clear interactive elements and practical activities that actively engage participants and support real-world application.
5	Very Strong	The proposal is highly interactive and practice-focused, with well-designed activities that meaningfully engage participants and enable immediate, real-world application.

**Commitment to family responsive practices that honor and reflect the range of families served:**

1	Very Weak	The proposal shows little to no awareness of family-responsive practices or the diversity of families served.
2	Weak	The proposal demonstrates limited consideration of family-responsive practices and reflects a narrow understanding of the range of families served.
3	Average	The proposal demonstrates general awareness of family-responsive practices and acknowledges diverse families, but depth or intentionality is limited.
4	Strong	The proposal clearly reflects a commitment to family-responsive practices that honor and support a broad range of families.

5	Very Strong	The proposal demonstrates a strong, intentional commitment to family-responsive practices, thoughtfully honoring and reflecting the full diversity of families served.
---	-------------	--

**Innovation, timeliness, and contribution to the field:**

1	Very Weak	The proposal shows little to no innovation, is not timely, and offers minimal contribution to the field.
2	Weak	The proposal demonstrates limited innovation or timeliness, with a modest or unclear contribution to the field.
3	Average	The proposal includes some innovative or timely elements and offers a reasonable contribution to the field, though originality or impact may be limited.
4	Strong	The proposal is clearly innovative and timely, making a meaningful contribution to current practice or knowledge in the field.
5	Very Strong	The proposal is highly innovative and timely, offering a significant, forward-looking contribution that advances the field in impactful ways.