

2027 AASLH Annual Meeting
Madison, WI
September 20-23
Session Proposal Criteria

The total score for each proposal should be between 1 and 60 points, with 60 being the best score. You should give points for each of the following areas based on how well each part of the proposal is handled. Outstanding proposals should get the most points. You should make short notes about the good points of each proposal so that you can use them at the meeting of the Program Committee. Please make note of sessions that talk about the same topics and be ready to bring these to the attention of the group. Also, please make a list of topics and representation gaps that you want to bring up for discussion in the Committee. Finally, a "nuts and bolts" session might not have much to do with the theme, but it might be a great way for first-timers or people wanting to learn a new skill.

1. **Theme:** Does the session address the “Interwoven Histories and Shared Stewardship” theme? Is it a call to action to reflect on where we have been, who shaped the foundations of our work, and how we move forward together? Does it center shared authority, collective memory, and the responsibility to steward history with the communities, not for them? Is the abstract compelling enough to attract the intended audience to participate? [1-5]
2. **Learning Objectives:** Are the learning objectives clear, meaningful, and supported by specific takeaways for participants? [1-10]

Example of strong learning objectives from 2026 Session Proposal “Revolutionizing Public Knowledge: Historians Editing Wikipedia”

- Understand how expert participation transforms Wikipedia’s knowledge ecosystem.
 - Evaluate opportunities to support and expand Wikipedia’s coverage of American history
 - Identify effective strategies for contributing high-quality historical content to Wikipedia
3. **Content and Relevance:** Is the content timely, relevant, and useful? Does it offer practical information, new perspectives, meaningful discussion, or approaches that participants can apply? [1-10]
 4. **Format:** Can presenters accomplish their objectives in the suggested format (roundtable, community collaboration, workshop)? Rate this session as it stands; however; if you believe that the session would be more impactful in another format, please make a note and be prepared to bring this to the committee’s attention. [1-5]
 5. **Structure and Engagement:** Is there a clear flow? Will participants be actively engaged, with activities that support the learning objectives and allow them to apply or reflect on the

content? [1-10]

6. **Creativity/Innovation:** Does the session offer a fresh perspective, approach, format, or treatment of the topic rather than simply repeat familiar conference content? Creative formats, new perspectives, or innovative approaches to age-old issues are desired. [1-10]
7. **Overall Quality:** AASLH is dedicated to ensuring that the learning programs at our Annual Conference are thoughtfully designed and serve the needs of all members. Is the proposal clear, coherent, and well organized? Does the session seem thoughtfully designed and realistic for the conference? [1-10]

For discussion in Program Committee Meeting:

Presenters: (This point is only for the second round of reviews as the first round will be blind.) Is the group of presenters credible and appropriate for the format and topic? Did the proposal include enough information to convince you that the presenters have the expertise necessary to speak to the issues and/or adequate experience to address the issues outlined in the proposal? Consider the range of representation on the proposal, broadly defined: by region, race/ethnicity, gender identity, discipline, institution/form of employment, career stage, etc. For proposals with more than one presenter, note if there are multiple voices and perspectives represented (e.g., university faculty, museum professional, consultant, student, etc.). Note whose stories/histories will be discussed in the presentation and whether people from those groups are represented among the speakers – if not, consider if there are other proposals where the speakers backgrounds align more closely with the topic proposed.