### ALA 2019 Annual Conference -- Proposal Review Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Excellent = 4</th>
<th>Good = 3</th>
<th>Fair = 2</th>
<th>Poor=1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSAL TITLE: Does the program title clearly describe the program as proposed?</td>
<td>Title is strong, clear, and matches the program proposed. Audience can rely on the title for an accurate idea of the topic.</td>
<td>Title is clear and generally relevant to the program as proposed.</td>
<td>Title is difficult to understand and/or is an inaccurate description of the program as proposed.</td>
<td>Title is unrelated to the proposed program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION: Does the program description clearly, with sufficient detail, outline the proposed presentation?</td>
<td>Description is clear, concise, and easy to understand.</td>
<td>Description is clear and generally easy to understand.</td>
<td>Description is unnecessarily verbose and/or difficult to understand.</td>
<td>It is unclear what is being proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TARGET AUDIENCE/RELEVANCE: Who is the target audience and why would this session be relevant to them?</td>
<td>Target audience is clearly defined &amp; significance of the topic to that audience is clearly described.</td>
<td>Target audience is specified and the relevance of the topic to that audience is loosely described.</td>
<td>Target audience is generally stated, and the relevance of the topic to that audience is not described.</td>
<td>Target audience and relevance are not described, or are described only in vague terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMELINESS/Demand: Is the topic timely, new and/or in-demand?</td>
<td>The topic is an emerging “hot” topic and/or a topic for which there is demonstrated high demand.</td>
<td>While this topic has been explored, it remains an in-demand topic.</td>
<td>This topic has been presented often/recently, and interest may be declining.</td>
<td>This topic has been presented often. There is little demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INNOVATION: Does the content offer fresh, innovative ideas, methods, or resources?</td>
<td>The proposal content is original and innovative.</td>
<td>The proposal content is a new take on a familiar topic.</td>
<td>The proposal content is a popular approach on a popular topic.</td>
<td>The proposal content is weak and lacks originality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING OUTCOMES (TAKEAWAYS): Are learning outcomes (takeaways) clear, specific, observable, and actionable?</td>
<td>Learning outcomes (takeaways) are clear and specific. There are at least two measurable goals.</td>
<td>Learning outcomes (takeaways) are generally clear and specific. There is at least one learning outcome specified.</td>
<td>Learning outcomes (takeaways) are vague and will be difficult to assess.</td>
<td>Learning outcomes (takeaways) are not specified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESENTATION/ENGAGEMENT STYLE: Is the proposed presentation likely to engage participants actively in discussion, thought, or active learning?</td>
<td>The proposal clearly describes multiple strategies for active engagement of the attendees.</td>
<td>The proposal clearly describes at least one strategy for active engagement.</td>
<td>The proposal suggests active engagement, but the description of the strategy is unclear.</td>
<td>The proposal does not suggest any strategies for active engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy; Equity, Diversity &amp; 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?</td>
<td>The proposal clearly articulates a relationship to one (or more) of these strategic directions or core values, with a learning objective clearly articulated.</td>
<td>The proposal indicates a relationship to one (or more) of these strategic directions or core values, but the learning objective is not clearly articulated.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>The proposal does not suggest any relationship to these strategic directions or core values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSPECTIVES: Does the proposal demonstrate how multiple perspectives will be addressed -- and how diversity of viewpoints will be represented?</td>
<td>The session will integrate multiple perspectives and a cohesive theme will be readily apparent to audience. This rating may include presentation of a viewpoint that is underrepresented.</td>
<td>Interaction between multiple perspectives is indicated and some cohesion is likely; the range of perspectives is broad.</td>
<td>The range of perspectives will be narrow.</td>
<td>The presentation of multiple perspectives, if any, is unclear, and there is no diversity of viewpoints.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>