

## Appendix A: WEFTEC Workshop Proposal Rating Matrix

June 10, 2024

Scoring Level	WEF Community Sponsorship (WEF Staff will input a score of 1-5)	Topic benefit and significance (Repeat workshop score will be presented as a note/informational item only)	Learning objectives (WEF Staff will input a score of 1-5)	Methods for training (See the interactive guidance document)	Chairs and Facilitators (WEF will provide the scores of previous workshops for each chair & vice chair along with the proposals)	Overall Proposal Quality
1/2	(1) No sponsorship documentation provided.	Not much new material or information is already widely available.	(1) Not presented or does not follow the guidance set forth	Looks like a technical session with long presentations and little audience participation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chairs and/or Facilitators are not good speakers/facilitators from reviewer's prior experience.</li> <li>- No diversity in Facilitators (same consulting firm and/or are clients relating to the same consulting firm)</li> <li>- Too many Facilitators</li> </ul>	Just an outline with substandard descriptions and no confirmations provided.
3/4	(3) One sponsoring WEF community confirmed with letter and only a signature of the chair. No pre-proposal / initial community input provided.	Modest benefit to <b>focused audience</b> .		Mostly just presentations with the addition of a panel discussion or Q&A session or two.		Generally complete without concepts fully defined but poorly presented or rushed development. Some confirmations provided.
5/6	(5) Review and input provided on the final proposal from one sponsoring community. Process included a pre-proposal.	Modest benefit to <b>broad audience</b> . (Collaborative workshops here)	(5) Clear statements of learning objectives that follow the learning objective guidance.	<b>A portion</b> of the workshop is interactive sessions and well-integrated. (50% of the time is presentation and 50% is interaction)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Facilitators and/or chairs are average in their ability to deliver workshops or reviewer is uncertain of the ability.</li> <li>- There is some diversity in the Facilitators.</li> <li>- Or there are way too many Facilitators to truly have an interactive workshop.</li> </ul>	Generally complete without concepts fully defined but well presented. Most confirmations provided.
7/8	(7) Review and input provided on the final proposal from both joint collaborative sponsoring communities. Process included a pre-proposal.	High interest and benefit to <b>focused audience</b> .		The workshop places a <b>strong emphasis</b> on interactive sessions with strong facilitation.		Complete with concepts fully defined and well presented. Most confirmations provided.
9/10		High interest and benefit to <b>broad audience</b> . (Collaborative workshops)		<b>Majority of the day is interactive</b> . The presentations are backed up by exercises to cement the knowledge. Interaction is well-integrated, and presentations are tailored to the interaction.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- (9) Balanced mix of Chairs and Facilitators that match the topic of the workshop.</li> <li>- (10) Include a Young Professional as a Vice Chair and is indicated as such on the proposal.</li> </ul>	Complete with concepts fully defined and well presented. provided. All confirmations provided.