

Navigating Tomorrow: AI, Community, and the Future of NJ Libraries Conference Proposal Rubric

We want to hear about the incredible work you're doing to support NJ Libraries through technology, collaboration, and community. Thank you so much to everyone who submits and helps to shape the future of librarianship in the Garden State!

Some General Info

- All submissions will be stripped of names/identities of people (but not organization, institution, etc. if mentioned in the session description).
- Each proposal receives a reference number to be used during scoring and scheduling.
- Proposals will be scored out of 25 points, with some additional points available in case of a tie.

Part 1: Core Content Categories (15 points)

Innovation & Originality

5: The proposal presents a novel approach, emerging practice, or creative application that advances library work and shows originality in its method of presentation.

4: The proposal presents a novel approach, emerging practice, or creative application that advances library work or shows originality in its method of presentation.

3: The proposal builds on or expands existing library knowledge/content and/or provides a slightly modified take on typical library presentations.

2: The proposal features traditional, incrementally built-upon library content with a standard mode of presentation.

1: The proposal contains unoriginal content and a standard mode of presentation.

0: The proposal does not make clear its content or how it will be presented.

Application & Impact

5: The proposal is applicable and/or has impact across all/most library types (public, academic, school, special) and functional areas, as well as provides clear ideas, strategies, or insights that attendees can adapt within their own organization easily.

4: The proposal is applicable and/or has impact across all/most library types or functional areas and is adaptable.

- 3: The proposal is applicable and/or has impact across some library types or functional areas and may be hard to adapt.
- 2: The proposal is applicable and/or has impact on one or two library niches and may be hard to adapt.
- 1: The proposal is applicable and/or has impact for only one specific discipline/functional area and may be hard to adapt.
- 0: The proposal does not make clear if it is at all applicable or impactful to the library community.

Proposal Content

- 5: The proposal is highly relevant across a large number of library roles (librarians, technologists, support staff) and clearly identifies the intended audience (school librarians, early career staff, front-facing staff, etc.).
- 4: The proposal is relevant across a large number of library roles or functional areas and an intended audience has been considered.
- 3: The proposal is relevant across a small number of library roles and/or functional areas and an intended audience has been considered.
- 2: The proposal is relevant across one specific library role or functional area and an intended audience has been considered.
- 1: The proposal is relevant across one role or functional area and an intended audience may not have been considered.
- 0: The proposal is relevant to the presenter only and an intended audience has not been considered.

What do these first elements prioritize?

- Presentations about local, specific library initiatives (like a single branch's makerspace or AI pilot) that are clearly generalizable beyond the individual's context.
- Topics and themes that align strongly with our two main tracks: AI & the Future of Work or Community & Connection.
- In-scope presentations that address the "Navigating Tomorrow" theme of equipping New Jersey libraries.
- Original proposals that are tailored specifically for us, rather than generic submissions sent to multiple conferences.

Part 2: Proposal Elements & Execution (10 points)

Depth of Proposal

2: All elements of the proposal (including the 300-word session description and actionable learning takeaways) are included and well clarified.

1: Most of the proposal elements are included, but may not be sufficiently in-depth or specific.

0: Most of the elements of the proposal are completely absent.

Organization

2: The proposal is well organized, clear, and deeply addresses potential challenges or issues related to the topic.

1: The proposal lacks some organization and/or does not consider obvious challenges or issues.

0: The proposal is entirely unorganized and/or ignores obvious logistical or practical issues.

Audience & Conversation

2: The proposal outlines a plan that will stand up beautifully to interactions with a live, in-person audience and will keep the post-session conversation flowing.

1: The presentation style may encounter hiccups with a live audience and/or struggle to keep an active conversation going.

0: The proposal is not built for a live setting or is unlikely to generate any audience engagement or conversation.

Style & Content Match

2: There is an excellent match between the proposed content and the proposed format (breakout session or lightning talk).

1: The content of the proposal might actually benefit from a different session style, but should still function okay within the proposed format.

0: The content in the proposal does not match the proposed format at all.

Note: If a proposal scores highly in other categories but doesn't quite fit the proposed time slot, the committee may reach out to offer an alternative presentation format.

Familiarity of Presenter(s) and Content

2: The proposal indicates the presenter is highly familiar with the content, practical workflows, and the existing professional conversation behind it.

1: The proposal indicates the presenter has some familiarity with the content but seems to be disconnected from some of the current professional conversations or trends surrounding it.

0: The proposal indicates the presenter is not familiar with the ongoing trends or conversations behind the content they are proposing.

What do the content rubric elements prioritize?

- Clear, complete, and concise session descriptions that respect the word limit.
- A realistic scope of content that can actually be delivered comfortably within a 45-minute or 15-minute window (depending on proposed format) without rushing.
- Clear evidence that the presenter knows our unique professional landscape and has tailored their session description specifically to the needs of modern library workers.

Part 3: Tie-Breakers

Extra Credit: Would Scorer Personally Attend This If Given the Choice?

2: Scorer is super excited for this proposal and would actively shift their conference schedule around to ensure they sit in on this session.

1: Scorer wants to see this proposal, but if they had a scheduling conflict, they would not necessarily shift their day around for it.

0: Scorer would not personally attend the proposed session.

How is “extra credit” used?

This metric helps exceptional, high-interest presentations stand out. It is primarily used to break ties and rescue strong proposals that are hovering right near the "no" cutoff line if the review committee displays keen enthusiasm for the topic.

Note: This rubric is adapted from the [STEM Librarians Collaborative Rubric](#).