2021 AFP ICON Proposal Rating Rubric

Evaluation Criteria	Poor (1 Point)	Fair (2 Points)	Good (3 Points)	Very Good (4 Points)	Excellent (5 Points)
1. Current relevance to the profession and contribution to the conference program in terms of topic, sector and experience	Topic is not current/lacks importance or appropriateness to the profession.	Topic is only tangentially related to the profession, not current or important to the profession and/or to the ICON audience.	Topic may not be current or groundbreaking, but is relevant to the profession and the ICON audience.	Topic is current, important, and appropriate to the profession and the ICON audience.	The topic is cutting-edge, relevant, groundbreaking or significant to the profession and the ICON audience.
2. Evidence of innovative thinking and fresh insights	Idea does not respond directly to needs of fundraisers; proposed ideas seem far-fetched and unlikely to realistically be implemented.	Idea is similar or exactly like an existing approach. There is no innovation or new perspective.	Idea is interesting but not fundamentally distinctive from existing approaches. If idea is distinctive, there may be some gaps related to realistic implementation.	Idea is an improvement upon existing approaches and demonstrates potential to have real impact.	Idea is fundamentally distinctive from existing approaches and demonstrates proven ability to impact the profession in a new way.
3. Research-based content (where appropriate or relevant)	The proposal does not mention theory, practice or research, or it is unclear how the session is connected to the profession.	The proposal provides background references to theory, practice or research but the references are not specific or recent or the proposal does not relate the theory, practice, and/or research content.	The proposal refers somewhat to theory, practice and/or research in an understandable way and relates to content.	The proposal refers clearly to relevant theory, practice or research in a thorough and comprehensible manner and relates it directly to the content.	The proposal refers specifically to the relevant, theory, practice and or research in a detailed and comprehensive manner and relates to it directly to the presentation content.

Evaluation Criteria	Poor (1 Point)	Fair (2 Points)	Good (3 Points)	Very Good (4 Points)	Excellent (5 Points)
4. Knowledge and expertise of speaker	No information is provided to assess speaker's knowledge and expertise.	Limited/insufficient information is presented to assess speaker's knowledge and expertise.	Information provided indicates speaker possesses an adequate knowledge of and expertise in content.	Information provided indicates speaker possesses an in-depth knowledge of and expertise in content.	Information provided indicates speaker possesses a full knowledge of and expertise in content.
5. Previous speaker experience and session ratings	No previous speaker conference experience and session ratings are not provided.	Limited speaker conference experiences are provided with no session quality ratings.	Limited speaker conference experiences are provided with average session quality ratings.	Multiple speaker conference experiences (of smaller size gatherings) are provided with good session quality ratings.	Multiple speaker conference experiences (of larger size gatherings such as ICON) are provided with excellent session ratings.
6.Interactivity/engagement with session attendees	No information/ example is provided on how the presenter(s) intends to engage the attendees or utilize adult learning principles.	Presentation relies mainly on direct instruction with few/no opportunities for attendee engagement. Does not utilize adult learning principles.	Presentation relies on one or two strategies designed to engage learners with the presentation focused more on direct instruction than on active learning.	Presentation provides multiple strategies including active learning to maximize engagement and ensure full participation by attendees.	Presentation achieves a focus on learner-centered engagement and incorporates various adult learning principles thereby maximizing the learning experience for all attendees.
7. Diversity of speaker background, experiences, perspective and ideas	Diversity of speakers is a critical factor in selecting speakers for AFP ICON. We value diversity and want our conference speakers to represent a wide range of backgrounds, experiences, perspectives and ideas as does the AFP membership.				
8. Demonstrated thought leadership	Thought leaders are the informed opinion leaders and the go-to people in their field of expertise. They are trusted sources who move and inspire people with innovative ideas; turn ideas into reality, and know and show how to replicate their success.				

Evaluation Criteria	Poor (1 Point)	Fair (2 Points)	Good (3 Points)	Very Good (4 Points)	Excellent (5 Points)
9. Learning Objectives	There are no learning outcomes provided.	Learning outcomes provided are vague or confusing.	Learning outcomes are satisfactory. However, they could be enhanced to be clearer and more specific.	Learning outcomes provided are clear, support the purpose of the session proposal and are realistic for time allotted.	Learning outcomes provided support the session proposal and experiential education and are realistic for time allotted.
10. Clarity of Proposal as Indicator of Presentation Quality	The writing suggests that the presentation may be poor.	The writing suggests that the presentation may be weak.	The proposal is adequately written but suggests that the presentation may be uneven or of moderate quality.	The proposal is clearly well written and suggests that the presentation will be of very good quality.	The proposal is very well written and suggests that the presentation will be of professional quality.