**2012 SOS Submission: Cascadia**

**RFP and Selection Process: Conference Speakers**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Chapter Name**  | ASTD-Cascadia |
| **Chapter Number (ex. CH0000)**  | CH8029 |
| **Chapter Location (City, State)**  | Portland, OR |
| **Chapter Membership Size**  | Large (301+) |
| **Contact Person for this Submission:**  | Pamela Moore, SPHR |
| **Email Address:**  | pam@compasshumanresources.com |
| **Phone Number:**  | (503) - 281 - 1528 |
| **Chapter Board Position:**  | President-Elect |
| **Chapter Website URL:**  | <http://www.astd-cascadia.org> |
| **Submission Title:**  | RFP and Selection Process: Conference Speakers |
| **Submission Description:**  | The ASTD-Cascadia Conference Team developed and implemented an automated Request for Proposal to gather a pool of potential session speakers for our annual conference. We utilized our database of several thousand contacts and sent them an online form that they could use to propose a session program. Each speaker was required to include a video clip of them presenting something consistent with their proposed topic. We didn't require professional footage - something from their phone would also work - just something that would allow us to see a bit of their style. Included in the RFP form were questions directed at how their presentation met the ASTD model, as well as the HRCI model. This allowed us to collect information to submit for CE credits at a later date.For the selection process, we gathered the conference team, and a few past team members on a Saturday to review the candidates. We used an automated evaluation tool donated by a team member's employer. The voting and results were available in real time, and saved many hours of manpower compiling results. |
| **Need Addressed:**  | Fast, easy way for speakers to apply for the session slots.A format that was easy for our contacts to forward to interested parties.A way for us to evaluate whether each candidate would be a suitable presenter.An efficient way to evaluate submissions and compile results. |
| **Does this effort align with your chapter's mission?**  | - Yes |
| **Does this submission align with ASTD's mission?**  | - Yes |
| **Target Audience:**  | Target audience for this submission is any committee focused on events that include contacting and evaluating a significant pool of speakers.Target audience for this tool is all speakers who want to present a relevant topic to workplace learning professionals. |
| **Costs/Resources Used: (include any funding you were able to get through donations, contributions, barter, etc. and how you went about getting these resources. Also include how much volunteer/board member time this effort took)**  | This process didn't require any additional funds to implement. We already had the means to use online forms and used that for the RFP data gathering. The evaluation tool was donated by the training department of a team member. This process is time-intensive for the designated team members. It did not require any time for the Board; however several of them volunteered to assist with the evaluations. We estimate up to 4 hours per week per committee member assigned to the core duties of this process. This takes place over approximately a 9-month period. |
| **How did you implement: (please give a brief description)**  | We dedicated two team positions to dealing with session speakers. Their job included refining the RFP document from the previous year, gathering the submissions, leading the evaluation and selection process, and carrying the task through to the day of the event. All contact with session speakers was carried out through these two people.The committee set the timeline for the RFP itself, and a target date when we would have a full slate of speakers to announce to the public.  |
| **What were the Outcomes: (include financial, membership increases, target audience satisfaction levels, publicity for the chapter, and of the profession)**  | We were able to get very high-quality speakers who were willing to donate their time to our event. A number of those speakers were non-local, which greatly enhanced our event. All of those speakers are now in our database and will get the call for RFPs every year. Our hope is that they will forward that to their colleagues, along with positive feedback about their experience with our chapter.We now have tools and a process that can be replicated from year to year without having to recreate from scratch. |
| **Lessons Learned: (hints and tips for other chapters who may be considering a similar effort)**  | Coordinating these efforts is very time consuming and should be split between two team members. We highly recommend an automated evaluation tool similar to Turning Technologies, to compile results, especially if you get a large pool of candidates. |
| **Please list the specific ASTD chapter resources that helped guide you in the process of completing this best practice.**  | None of this would have been possible without the large database of contacts that is maintained by our Executive Director. Having a team of diligent volunteers to manage the process is also essential. |
| **Please attach any documents that help support this submission: (additional documents should be sent to** SOS@astd.org**)**  |  [2011 RFP Process.pdf](http://forms.astd.org/download.php?q=Zm9ybV9pZD0xMSZpZD0zMyZlbD1lbGVtZW50XzE2) |
| **additional supporting documents:**  |  [2011 RFP Submission Form.pdf](http://forms.astd.org/download.php?q=Zm9ybV9pZD0xMSZpZD0zMyZlbD1lbGVtZW50XzIy) |
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