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. |