

ALA 2018 Annual Conference -- Proposal Review Guidelines

CRITERIA	Excellent = 4	Good = 3	Fair = 2	Poor=1
PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION: Does the program description clearly, with sufficient detail, outline the proposed presentation?	Description is clear, concise, and easy to understand	Description is clear -- and generally easy to understand	Description is verbose and/or difficult to understand	It is unclear what is being proposed.
TARGET AUDIENCE/RELEVANCE: Who is the target audience and why would this session be relevant to them?	Target audience is clearly defined & significance of the topic to that audience is clearly articulated.	Target audience is specified and the relevance of the topic to that audience is loosely described.	Target audience is generally described, but the relevance of the topic to that audience is not articulated.	Target audience and relevance are not described -- or described only in vague terms.
TIMELINESS/DEMAND: Is the topic timely, new and/or in-demand?	The topic is an emerging "hot" topic and/or a top for which there is proven high demand	While this topic has been explored, it remains an in-demand topic.	This topic has been presented often/recently. Interest may be declining.	This topic has been presented often. There is little demand.
INNOVATION: Does the content offer fresh, memorable ideas, methods, or resources?	The proposal content is original and innovative.	The proposal content is a new take on a familiar topic.	The proposal content is a popular approach on a popular topic.	The proposal content is weak and lacks originality.
LEARNING OUTCOMES (TAKEAWAYS): Are learning outcomes (takeaways) clear, specific, and actionable?	Learning outcomes (takeaways) are clear and specific. There are at least two measurable goals.	Learning outcomes (takeaways) are generally clear and specific. There is at least one learning goal specified.	Learning outcomes (takeaways) are vague and it will be difficult to assess achievement.	Learning outcomes (takeaways) are not specified.
PRESENTATION/ENGAGEMENT STYLE: Is the proposed presentation likely to engage participants actively in discussion, thought or active learning?	The proposal clearly describes multiple strategies for active engagement of the attendees.	The proposal clearly describes at least one strategy for active engagement.	The proposal suggests active engagement, but the description of the strategy is unclear.	The proposal does not suggest any strategy for active engagement.
COLLABORATION: Is collaboration, <u>either internal or external to ALA</u> , involved in the proposed program?	The proposal clearly describes a collaborative approach and the added value being contributed through that collaboration.	The proposal clearly describes a collaborative approach, but is not clear about the added value contributed through collaboration.	The proposal suggests some collaboration, but neither the collaborative approach nor the added value are clearly articulated.	The proposal does not include collaboration or indicates "in name only" collaboration.
Advocacy; Equity, Diversity & Inclusion; Information Policy; Professional and Leadership Development: Does the proposal support one or more of these broad ALA strategic directions and/or ALA Core Values?	The proposal clearly articulates a relationship to one (or more) of these strategic directions or core values, with a learning objective clearly articulated.	The proposal indicates a relationship to one (or more) of these strategic directions or core values, but the learning objective is not clearly articulated.	The proposal suggests a relationship to one (or more) of these strategic directions or core values, but it is not clearly articulated and there is no related learning objective.	The proposal does not suggest any relationship to these strategic directions or core values.
PANEL EVALUATION: Does the proposal demonstrate how the perspectives of 2-4 presenters will be brought into a cohesive conversation/ dialogue -- rather than multiple, unrelated presentations -- and how diversity will be represented?	The session will integrate diversity and multiple perspectives, so that a cohesive theme or argument will be readily apparent to audience.	Interaction between diverse speakers is indicated and some cohesion is likely; the range of perspectives is broad.	The range of perspectives will be narrower and there is little indication of how topics/speakers will relate to each other; diversity is not clearly indicated.	The relationship between presentations, if any, is unclear, and there is no diversity.