

## Proposals - Marking Criteria – AHEP Annual Conference and Exhibition 2026

### Thriving Together: Reimagining Professional Services in a Shifting Higher Education Sector

	CRITERION	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	EXCELLENT
1	<b>Understanding the aims of AHEP and the relevance of the topic to members' professional practice.</b>	Fails to address relevance to AHEP aims, values and relevance to members' professional practice.	Is aligned to the values of AHEP.  Demonstrates an understanding of the relevance of the topic to members' professional practice and recognises issues that need to be resolved and resulting actions.	Is aligned to the aims and values of AHEP.  Is relevant to HE professional practice.  Shows critical understanding of the relevance of the topic to members' professional practice and how this can promote excellence within higher education.	Is comprehensively aligned to the aims and values of AHEP.  Demonstrates detailed critical understanding of the implications of the topic for members' professional practice and recognises ways of integrating these in the workplace and promoting excellence in higher education through personal and professional development.
2	<b>Alignment of the proposal to the broad purpose of the Conference, 'Thriving Together: Reimagining Professional Services</b>	Is not aligned with 2026 purpose.	Has engaged with the 2026 purpose.	Demonstrates good understanding of the purpose and chosen line of enquiry.	As good plus demonstrates in- depth expertise in the chosen topic with areas of specialisation and an

	<i>in a Shifting Higher Education Sector'</i>				excellent understanding of the wider context.
<b>3</b>	<b>How well does the proposal address the selected AHEP Professional Commitment/s?</b>	Demonstrates little understanding of the professional commitments and fails to align with any of the professional commitments.	Integrates and applies some relevant arguments drawn from appropriate sources and attempts to address selected commitment/s.  Has good ideas of best practice in HE and elsewhere and attempts to align with selected commitments.	Integrates and applies relevant arguments drawn from appropriate sources and addresses selected commitment/s.  Has sound ideas of best practice in HE and elsewhere and aligns with selected commitments.	Has fully integrated the selected commitments into the proposal and fully aligns with at least one conference stream.
<b>4</b>	<b>Has considered and demonstrated how to deliver the content to maximise engagement, and stimulate critical thought and insight</b>	Insufficient evidence of consideration.  Inappropriate style, tone, or format.  Unlikely to engage delegates.	Demonstrates an understanding of pedagogical requirements for the chosen audience in the HE context.  Likely to engage some delegates.	Demonstrates a good understanding of pedagogical requirements for the chosen audience development in the HE context.  Proposes delivery methods likely to deeply engage a significant number of delegates, stimulating thought and critical insight.	As good plus demonstrates excellent approach to content delivery.  Likely to engage and stimulate critical thought and insight for a large number of delegates.

5	<b>The structure and intellectual rigour of the proposal. Clarity of expression (including spelling, grammar, referencing).</b>	<p>Grammar and spelling contain frequent errors.</p> <p>Referencing is absent/unsystematic</p> <p>Disorganised, unstructured, incoherent.</p>	<p>Language mainly fluent; grammar mainly accurate; spelling accurate.</p> <p>Referencing is accurate.</p> <p>Shows reasonable organisation and coherence; mainly in an appropriate style; information mostly presented clearly and concisely.</p>	<p>As 'satisfactory', plus carefully and logically organised, and presented in an appropriate style; a clear and well-focused proposal with relevant supporting information presented in a variety of useful formats.</p>	<p>As 'good', plus demonstrates effective engagement with the topic, and will effectively engage delegates.</p>
6	<b>Has the proposal considered equity and diversity in the context and delivery of their session?</b>  <b>For example:</b>  <b>Is the content inclusive and allows for diverse perspectives and respectful dialogue?</b>	<p>Fails to address either equity or diversity within the content or the format.</p>	<p>Demonstrates an adequate understanding of the impact of the topic and format on equity and diversity.</p>	<p>Shows evidence of clear critical understanding of the impact of the topic and format on equity and diversity.</p>	<p>Demonstrates high level critical understanding of the impact of the topic and format on equity and diversity.</p>
7	<b>Does the content demonstrate that the</b>	<p>Fails to address either equity or diversity</p>	<p>Demonstrates adequate</p>	<p>Demonstrates a clear understanding and</p>	<p>Demonstrates a high-level understanding and</p>

	<p><b>session will be accessible to all?</b></p> <p><b>For example:</b></p> <p><b>Has the proposer described how they could or will, if required, adapt and tailor the format to make it accessible to all?</b></p>	<p>within the accessibility of the format.</p>	<p>understanding of accessibility for all.</p>	<p>awareness of accessibility for all. Outlines ways to adapt the session and materials to make them accessible to all.</p>	<p>awareness of accessibility for all. Outlines ways to adapt the session and materials to make them accessible to all.</p>
--	---	--	--	---	---