NYLA Annual Conference -- Proposal Review Guidelines

CRITERIA	Excellent = 4	Good = 3	Fair = 2	Poor=1
PROPOSAL TITLE: Does the program title clearly describe the program as proposed? *Weight: 1*	Title is strong, clear, and matches the program proposed. Audience can rely on the title for an accurate idea of the topic.	Title is clear and generally relevant to the program as proposed.	Title is difficult to understand and/or is an inaccurate description of the program as proposed.	Title is unrelated to the proposed program.
PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION: Does the program description clearly, with sufficient detail, outline the proposed presentation? *Weight: 2*	Description is clear, concise, and easy to understand.	Description is clear and generally easy to understand.	Description is unnecessarily 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? *Weight: 2*	Target audience is clearly defined & significance of the topic to that audience is clearly described.	Target audience is specified and the relevance of the topic to that audience is loosely described.	Target audience is generally stated, and the relevance of the topic to that audience is not described.	Target audience and relevance are not described, or are described only in vague terms.
TIMELINESS/DEMAND: Is the topic timely, new and/or in-demand? *Weight: 3*	The topic is an emerging "hot" topic and/or a topic for which there is demonstrated high demand.	While this topic has been explored, it remains an in-demand topic.	This topic has been presented often/recently, and interest may be declining.	This topic has been presented often. There is little demand.
INNOVATION: Does the content offer fresh, innovative ideas, methods, or resources? *Weight: 4*	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, observable, and actionable? *Weight: 4*	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 outcome specified.	Learning outcomes (takeaways) are vague and will be difficult to assess.	Learning outcomes (takeaways) are not specified.
PRESENTATION/ENGAGEMENT STYLE: Is the proposed presentation likely to engage participants actively in discussion, thought, or active learning? *Weight: 3*	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 strategies for active engagement.
PERSPECTIVES: Does the proposal demonstrate how multiple perspectives will be addressed -- and how diversity of viewpoints will be represented? *Weight: 3*	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.	Interaction between multiple perspectives is indicated and some cohesion is likely; the range of perspectives is broad.	The range of perspectives will be narrow.	The presentation of multiple perspectives, if any, is unclear, and there is no diversity of viewpoints.