

REVIEWER NOTES



The goal of the Conference is to present a broadly-based program that speaks to the wide range of attendees with a balance of theory and practice, inviting new ideas and concepts that may stimulate additional interest, involvement and educational benefit. In keeping with ongoing membership discussions about diversity and inclusion, we have urged proposers to use the conference sessions as an opportunity to include new voices and offer diverse viewpoints.

Each reviewer receives a package of information that includes the evaluation criteria, the assigned proposals, and links to the online submission form. Proposals have been assigned based on the categories identified in each submission.

We ask that you provide comments and feedback on each of the proposals sent to you for review. If you would like to add comments for additional proposals, your input is very welcome – but we do ask you to review at least the proposals assigned to you. This is to ensure that each proposal under consideration will have a number of comments.

Peer Review includes evaluating the overall quality of the proposal and considering these questions:

- Is the topic timely? Does it reflect current discussions in the field?
- Is there new information being presented?
- How broad an audience does this topic speak to?
- Has the topic been discussed already or been repeated frequently?
- Is there a speaker outlined that is crucial to the success of the panel?
- Is there an effort to bring in new voices and diverse viewpoints on the subject?
- If a single presenter, does the proposal outline a clear perspective?
- If a panel presentation, is this a balanced point of view presented or are there other areas to be considered?

Other Considerations

- There are proposals that have been submitted as connected sessions or as part of a stream. Each proposal should be evaluated as an individual session, but you may add comments about the connected sessions/stream or your comments about the stream as a whole.
- AMIA policy is that speakers may only speak at two sessions during the conference. In the case of multiple proposals, your comments about speakers are critical. If there is a speaker you feel is essential to the success of a proposal, please note it in your comments.
- There are three programs offered in each time slot each day. Sessions should appeal to a number of attendees – consider how broad or narrow a topic might be.
- Screenings proposals included are for hotel viewing.
- If there are proposals that you feel overlap with others, please note it in your comments.

Content Balance

The Committee uses the peer-review notes to program a balance of sessions and workshop topics. It is important that you note whether the proposals you review accurately reflect the categories they have identified. These general areas include, but aren't limited to:

Advocacy/Outreach	Digital Media	Operations/Leadership
Access	Digital Asset Mgmt	Preservation
Case Study	Education	Programming/Curatorial
Cataloging/Metadata	Film History	Solutions/Problem Solving
Collections Content	Film	Technology
Development/Fundraising	Legal/Copyright/Privacy	

AMIA 2017 PEER REVIEW

REVIEW GUIDELINES



This is a peer review process and should be kept confidential. Once you have reviewed the proposals and sent in your feedback, we ask you to destroy all proposal submissions.

Evaluation Criteria

Conference content should be selected based on its relevance to the membership and to the field as well as its potential to contribute effectively to an insightful, engaging, professional experience. In keeping with ongoing membership discussions about diversity and inclusion, we have urged proposers to use the conference sessions as an opportunity to include new voices and offer diverse viewpoints. Please keep this in mind as you review the proposals.

Proposals should be evaluated with the following selection criteria in mind:

- **Topic Relevance**

- Is the topic timely?
- How broad is the audience for this topic?
- Does the proposal indicate that the session been given careful thought?
- Is it an educational opportunity for attendees or the local community?
- Does the topic provide new information on current issues or discussions within the field?
- Has the topic been discussed already or been repeated frequently?
- Will it generate discussion and debate among the attendees?

- **Presenter(s)**

- Is there an effort to bring in new voices or new viewpoints on the subject?
- Is there a speaker outlined that is crucial to the success of the panel?
- Does the number of speakers cover the topic in the format requested?
- Does the proposal indicate that these speakers have the expertise to address the topic?
- Are there others that could be suggested to speak on this panel or topic?

- **Accuracy**

- Would additional work be needed to turn it into an exceptional presentation?
- Does the title provide an accurate description of the content?
- Does the description provide enough information for you to understand what the session will be about and make a decision to attend/not attend?

- **Perspective**

- Does the type of presentation work well to meet the expected outcomes?
 - If a single presenter, does the proposal outline a clear perspective?
 - If there are multiple presenters, is this a balanced point of view presented or are there other areas to be considered?
 - Does the proposal offer diverse perspectives?
-

FORM INSTRUCTIONS



The Peer Review form can be found here: [2017 Peer Review](#).

Each form accepts five (5) proposal reviews, but you do not have to submit them all at once. You may submit your comments at any time by scrolling to the last page of the survey for the SUBMIT button. Then simply go back to the survey link and begin a new entry when you're ready again. If you do complete your form, return to the link above and [submit a second form](#) for additional reviews (and so on).

Please provide comments for each proposal – they are a critical part of the review. The Conference Committee will rely on your comments in making the final programming decisions. If you indicate a proposal needs minor revisions, please indicate what revisions would be necessary.

Based upon your knowledge and with the above selection criteria in mind, assign proposals a numerical value in each category. As a frame of reference, 1 indicates that the proposal doesn't meet the standards for a conference session, 8 indicates that while the proposal may need work in this area it is a solid proposal, and 16 indicates that the proposal is superior and needs no modification or suggestions of any kind. Using those markers, score each category with a number 1-16.

With these scores in mind, please give us your comments and include anything that influenced your scores in each category.

Does the proposal fit into the categories indicated? If not, please explain ...

Proposals that present a conflict of interest for panelists should not be ranked or commented on by panelists. Simply write **"Recuse"** in the area for commentary.
