This rubric is aligned with the Western Museums Association [values.](https://westmuse.org/about)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Awesome!** | **Needs some love—we can work on this with you!** | **Less relevant to the meeting this year** |
| **Relevance and Timeliness, Leadership and Sustainability, Progress and Improvement*** Does the session advance some aspect of the museum field?
* Does the session present a new model for future museum success and vitality?
* Does it inspire deeper investment and meaning in our shared work?
 | * Clear take-away, call-to-action, tools for the participants.
* Brings a fresh or novel perspective on a topic of interest to the field.
* Topic is focused, yet likely to be of interest to a substantial number of attendees.
 | * May have a call to action, but tools and takeaways are not clear.
* May be informative, but connection to WMA values is vague.
* Likely to be of interest to a much more limited number of attendees or a highly specialized audience.
 | * May replicate previous conference sessions without a fresh perspective on a topic.
* Likely to be of interest to few attendees at the 2024 conference.
 |
| **Engagement, Creativity, Innovation Fun and Play** * Provides a variety of ways for people to engage.
* Does it include opportunities to meet and engage with others?
* Does the session incorporate a creative and/or innovative approach?
* Is it fun? Does it incorporate play?
 | * Conversational in nature, but with clear organization.
* Interactive elements that promote participation and learning.
* Includes opportunities to meet and connect with facilitators and participants.
 | * Organized, but may feel a bit dry or didactic—but not to the point where it can’t be improved with modest changes to the proposal.
* May need Program Committee assistance in redesigning session activities to spur more thoughtful and active engagement.
* May include opportunities to connect with facilitators, but not other participants.
 | * Talks **to** participants rather than engaging them.
* Does not factor audience
* Presented rather than facilitated.
* Series of individual presentations that aren’t integrated.
 |
| **Inclusiveness/Collaboration and Outreach*** Does the session include collaboration from a variety of voices from diverse perspectives?
* Is the session and its materials accessible to broad audiences?
* Does the session represent a respectful conversation that helps us learn and grow together?
* Trust and reciprocity
 | * Facilitators are diverse in ethnicity, age, gender, discipline, and/or organizational size.
* The workshop design reveals a trust in the participants, acknowledging their potential contributions to the discussion; it does not appear that facilitators will “talk down” to attendees.
* Allows for [multiple means of engagement and expression](https://udlguidelines.cast.org/). Workshop materials will be available in a digital format, even during the session ([multiple means of representation](https://udlguidelines.cast.org/)).
* If there are references in the proposal, they cite creators or professionals from diverse backgrounds.
 | * Includes some great facilitators, but needs diversity in terms of ethnicity, age, gender, discipline and/or organizational size.
* The workshop design reveals a smaller degree of trust in the participants, providing them with limited opportunities to share and apply their own experiences and expertise.
* Allows for more limited means of engagement and expression. People with certain disabilities may find it difficult to engage with the materials and/or activities.
* If there are references in the proposal, they include a relatively limited pool of creators or professionals.
 | * Facilitator group lacks diversity in terms of ethnicity, age, gender, discipline, and/or organizational size.
* The workshop design suggests the panelists are the sole experts on the topic and may “talk down” to attendees rather than drawing on their experiences and expertise.
* The proposal makes no reference to engaging participants via multiple means, or it appears to misunderstand basic accessibility needs.
* If there are references in the proposal, they include a limited pool of creators or professionals, most of whom appear to have similar backgrounds to the facilitators.
 |