HIMSS20
March 9 – 13, 2020
Orange County Convention Center, Orlando, FL

How Proposals Are Evaluated

Proposals are evaluated by a panel of peer reviewers using the following criteria.

1. Please rate the value of this proposal's content.
2. Please rate the timeliness/appropriateness of data provided in this proposal.
3. Please rate how well the proposal title, description and learning objectives were consistent throughout the proposal.
4. Please rate past speaking experience.
5. Please rate the avoidance of product/market supplier commercial.

---

1. Please rate the value of this proposal's content.

Does this proposal contain information that attendees want to hear? Is there significant value to the attendees? Is the proposal relevant to current topics affecting healthcare? What are the practical applications of the ideas that are presented? Does it include reasoning and documentation to support conclusions, recommendations, and outcomes? Does this proposal advance existing ideas or present new ideas? Has this material been presented elsewhere where attendees may have been present? Will this proposal expand the attendee's knowledge of technologies and applications beyond entry-level basics? Does the proposal provide guidelines or models to manage attendee's own implementations or applications?

2. Please rate the timeliness/appropriateness of data provided in this proposal.

There is no substitute for timeliness. Will the proposal be up-to-date and cutting-edge at the time of presentation in six to nine months? Will the topic have implications in the future? How relevant is the topic in the context of pending legislation, regulations and technology? Does the proposal document pre-and post-process or system changes? If there is data in the proposal, does it appear to be accurate? Does the information provided validate the data? Does the proposal attest to the accuracy of the data? Have the conclusions been supported with data? Is the data representative of the key points of the presentation? For example, have cost savings or increases been documented? Are effects to processes or outcomes measured and documented? How well are the purpose and outcomes of the session expressed? Are referenced sources and data appropriately used?

3. Please rate how well the proposal title, description and learning objectives were consistent throughout the proposal.

What attendees want to learn is the reality versus the hype, the positive and negative attributes, problems encountered but not often discussed, and realistic expectations for the operational use, and adaptability to a changing environment? Is there a well-defined focus? Was the proposal clear and complete with good examples providing a logical conclusion? Attendees are searching for guidelines and models to simplify or manage their own application or installation. Are the learning objectives appropriate and the right number for the proposal content? Do the objectives match the content? Does the proposal title match the content? Is the writing clear, jargon-free, and coherent? The quality, completeness, and accuracy of the proposal will be a judging factor in the proposal selection process. Are there enough details in the proposal to understand what the speaker is presenting? Has the proposal been implemented with comparative results available? Does the proposal document

the pre-and post-implementation status? Does it sufficiently list reasons in support of the conclusions or recommendations?

4. Please rate past speaking experience.

Do the speakers have adequate and sufficient experience with the subject matter? Have the speakers documented their speaking experience? Do the speakers have actual project or implementation experience? Does the proposal include a user perspective?

5. Please rate the avoidance of product/market supplier commercial.

Does the proposal avoid commercial content? If a consultant/market supplier is the speaker, did they include a user perspective as the primary speaker?