

2017



## **ANNUAL AWARDS PROGRAMME**

Guidelines and Assessment Criteria

May 2017

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Awards Categories.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Nomination and Evaluation Process.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Key Dates - 2017.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Awards Judging Committee.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Awards Presentation Dinner.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Assessment Criteria .....</b>	<b>4</b>
	Innovation.....	5
	Best Newcomer.....	6
	Bid Excellence .....	7
	People Development.....	8
	Writing.....	9
	Fiona Flower - Knowledge Management Award.....	10

## Version Control

Issue No	Description	Author
1-0	2013 APMP UK Annual Awards Guidelines & Assessment Criteria	K. Newland; N. Adams
2.0	2014 APMP UK Annual Awards Guidelines & Assessment Criteria	K Erskine
3.0	2015 APMP UK Annual Awards Guidelines & Assessment Criteria	N Adams
4.0	2017 APMP UK Annual Awards Guidelines & Assessment Criteria – scoring system and additional general criteria updated	R Bannon

## 1 Introduction

Each year the APMP UK recognises the organisations, teams and individuals who have shone over the past 12 months. This is your opportunity to nominate people or companies you feel are deserving of being recognised as outstanding in the bids and proposal industry. The winners will be announced and presented at the Annual Awards Dinner hosted at the APMP UK Conference at the Hampshire Court Hotel, near Basingstoke, Hampshire on October 18<sup>th</sup> 2017.

Members are invited to review the assessment criteria and may submit as many nominations as they wish against the available categories. Nominators may not submit more than one nomination for the same individual or team in each category

Nominees and candidates must be APMP members in good standing and affiliated to the UK Chapter.

## 2 Awards Categories

**Innovation** (individual, organisation or proposal centre) – *to recognise those that do great things through new ways of making a positive impact to successful bid and proposal management.*

**Best Newcomer** (Individual) – *to recognise a new recruit to the profession within the past 18 months who has made a significant contribution or impact to their organisation.*

**Bid Excellence** (Individual or team) – *working on a specific live deal (within the past 2 years), to recognise outstanding achievement in a vendor organisation. Note:*

1. *Not a consulting or software/methodology company.*
2. *Non bid specific achievements should be submitted in another category.*

**People Development** (Organisation) – *to recognise an organisation that has furthered the capability and/or impact of their staff in their bid/proposal function, as well as others involved in proposal development (e.g. sales, content contributors, senior execs) to the success of the business.*

**Writing** (Individual) – *to recognise an individual's ability to write in a bid and proposal context.*

**Fiona Flower - Knowledge Management** (individual, team or organisation) – *to recognise an individual's, team's or organisation's implementation of knowledge management, that has resulted in more-efficient and effective bid or proposal submissions.*

## 3 Nomination and Evaluation Process

People wishing to make an award nomination must follow the guidelines provided on the annual conference website <http://conference2017.apmpuk.co.uk/>.

Evaluation of nominations will be undertaken in confidence by the Awards Judging Committee chaired by the immediate past CEO, supported by the APMP International past Chair.

Nominations submitted after the closing deadline will not be evaluated.

## 4 Key Dates - 2017

- Now – Award Nominations Open
- 9th August – Nominations Close
- 1st September – Shortlisted Nominations Announced
- 18<sup>th</sup> October – APMP UK Awards Dinner | Winners Announced

## 5 Awards Judging Committee

The Judging Committee shall comprise a minimum of five individuals nominated and elected annually by the current APMP UK Board of Directors. This process for 2017 will be managed by the Immediate Past CEO who shall have the casting vote in the event of a tie.

Eligible candidates for the role of judge shall be limited to, current APMP UK Chapter Affiliated members who are either APMP Fellows, APMP Professional Certified Members or Past APMP UK Chapter CEOs.

Each Judge reviews their provided nominations and independently scores each award submittal according to the points system identified with the award criteria. In the event that a Judges own organisation or a candidate thereof is nominated for an award, the Judge will recuse himself/herself from voting in this award category. In this case, a standby judge will be asked to undertake the assessment. Where this is not possible to organise, the APMP International Past Chair will evaluate the nominations in this category and submit evaluation scores in the Judge's place.

The Immediate Past CEO will provide a score sheet to members of the Judging Committee to use as their evaluation matrix. The Judging Committee submits their scores to the Immediate Past CEO, who tallies the scores and submits the names of the nominees receiving the highest number of votes to the UK Chapter CEO. The Awards will be granted based on the highest score for each award.

The judges will not be told who the other judges are and are instructed not to confer or discuss their assessments at any point until after the winners are announced at the Annual Awards Dinner. Names of members elected to serve on the Judging Committee will remain confidential.

The Chapter CEO and Immediate Past CEO will determine the number of awards to be granted in a given year, based on the number of nominees, quality of responses, and rankings provided by the Judging Committee.

## 6 Awards Presentation Dinner

The APMP UK Board of Directors will recognise awards winners at the next APMP UK Awards Dinner. The names of all winners will remain confidential in advance of the Awards opening ceremony.

Each nominated honouree and organisation is encouraged to have a representative at the Annual Awards Dinner in the event that they win an award. No entrant will be given any indication of success or otherwise prior to the envelope opening – the results will only be known in advance by the Immediate Past CEO and APMP International past Chair. The judges will only be aware of the scores they have allocated themselves, not the overall result. They will have access to the final scores after the event.

## 7 Assessment Criteria

### General

Each Award has specific nomination and evaluation criteria, e.g. number of words, attachments, file format and these are detailed on the submission form. The following General Assessment Criteria applies to all Awards.

1. Evidence of the nominee's membership of the APMP UK Chapter must be provided, e.g. membership number or graphic of membership certificate (this graphic will not count towards the graphic total).
2. Where a team is nominated, all members of the team must be APMP members at the time of submission.
3. Where demonstration of evidence of a particular level of APMP Certification is called for, the Candidate Number or graphic of the certificate must be included in the submission.
4. Where graphics are permitted in a submission the number allowed will be stipulated in the individual award nomination details. All graphics submitted must conform to APMP best practice, support the text and add information relevant to the submission. Words within a graphic will not count towards the word allowance; however, they should not be used to attempt to circumvent the word limit. The only exception to this direction is where a graphic is a letter of commendation. Words included in table form part of the total word-count, numbers do not.
5. Judges are directed to the Assessor Guidelines and only values shown in the evaluation criteria will be recognised. i.e. only odd integer scores are valid. This scoring system enables better differentiation between nominations.
6. No attachments or supporting documents / files are allowed except for the Writing Award where a pdf of the writing sample must be provided.
7. Unless otherwise specified, submissions must be made as a single MS Word or Adobe Acrobat format file submission.

Award	Assessment Criteria	Max Assessors Mark	Assessor Guidelines
<b>Innovation</b> (individual, organisation or proposal centre) – to recognise those that do great things through new ways of making a positive impact to successful bid and proposal management. (max 2 graphics allowed)	Has shown the ability to be creative and experiment with new ideas and has implemented new, creative approaches to proposal development during the preceding year.	9	Marks are awarded based on the evidence provided for each of the criteria listed. <b>Full evidence = 9</b> <b>Fairly comprehensive evidence = 7</b> <b>Moderate evidence = 5</b> <b>Partial evidence = 3</b> <b>Very little evidence = 1</b> <b>No evidence = 0</b> Nominees should provide evidence for all the listed criteria.  If a nominee fails to provide evidence for more than 2 listed criteria, the nomination will be discounted.
	Has challenged perceived attitudes, opinions and the status quo within the organisation.	9	
	Has created / assisted to create a safe space for people at all levels to come up with completely new approaches and stimulates people to actively make use of it.	9	
	Has created an atmosphere that balances strong entrepreneurship with calculated risk taking.	9	
	Innovation has resulted in a measurable impact on win rates and/or efficiency as a result.	9	
	Has received excellent feedback on the initiative (internally and/or externally as appropriate).	9	

Award	Assessment Criteria	Max Assessors Mark	Assessor Guidelines
<p><b>Best Newcomer</b> (Individual) – to recognise a new recruit to the profession within the past 18 months who has made a significant contribution or impact to their organisation. (max 2 graphics allowed)</p>	Has a maximum of 18 months working in a proposals environment.	Pass/Fail	<p>Marks are awarded based on the evidence provided for each of the criteria listed.</p> <p><b>Full evidence = 9</b> <b>Fairly comprehensive evidence = 7</b> <b>Moderate evidence = 5</b> <b>Partial evidence = 3</b> <b>Very little evidence = 1</b> <b>No evidence = 0</b></p> <p>Nominees should provide evidence for all the listed criteria.</p> <p>If a nominee fails to provide evidence for more than 2 listed criteria, the nomination will be discounted.</p>
	Has achieved APMP Foundation Level Accreditation and has actively sought to learn about bid and proposal management best practice.	9	
	Has brought forward fresh ideas and helped to deliver improvements to bid / proposal development efficiency / effectiveness in accordance with APMP best practices.	9	
	Has consistently delivered work of the highest standard and ideally has quantitative results to show the improvement achieved.	9	
	Has inspired others around them to grow and develop their capabilities.	9	
	Has received excellent feedback, internally and externally.	9	

Award	Assessment Criteria	Max Assessors Mark	Assessor Guidelines
<p><b>Bid Excellence</b> (Individual or team) – working on a specific live deal, to recognise outstanding achievement in a vendor organisation. (i.e. – not a consulting or tool company). (max 3 graphics allowed)</p>	Individual Nominee, or all members of the nominated team, must be accredited at APMP Foundation, as a minimum.	Pass/Fail	<p>Marks are awarded based on the evidence provided for each of the criteria listed.</p> <p><b>Full evidence = 9</b> <b>Fairly comprehensive evidence = 7</b> <b>Moderate evidence = 5</b> <b>Partial evidence = 3</b> <b>Very little evidence = 1</b> <b>No evidence = 0</b></p> <p>Nominees should provide evidence for all the listed criteria.</p> <p>If a nominee fails to provide evidence for more than 2 listed criteria, the nomination will be discounted.</p>
	Qualitative improvement results.	9	
	Quantitative improvement results.	9	
	Key stakeholder sponsorship and support has been sought and achieved.	9	
	Evidence that bid excellence is embedded in team / division / organisation.	9	
	Plan to maintain and extend excellence over the next 12 months.	9	

Award	Assessment Criteria	Max Assessors Mark	Assessor Guidelines
<p><b>People Development</b></p> <p>(Organisation) – to recognise an organisation that has furthered the capability and/or impact of their staff in their bid/proposal function, as well as others involved in proposal development (e.g. sales, content contributors, senior execs) to the success of the business. (max 3 graphics allowed)</p>	Development of people within team / organisation has been active and consistent during the last 12 months.	9	<p>Marks are awarded based on the evidence provided for each of the criteria listed.</p> <p><b>Full evidence = 9</b>  <b>Fairly comprehensive evidence = 7</b>  <b>Moderate evidence = 5</b>  <b>Partial evidence = 3</b>  <b>Very little evidence = 1</b>  <b>No evidence = 0</b></p> <p>Nominees should provide evidence for all the listed criteria.</p> <p>If a nominee fails to provide evidence for more than 2 listed criteria, the nomination will be discounted.</p>
	APMP Accreditation has formed part of people development in the last 12 months.	9	
	Quantitative or qualitative business results have been achieved as a direct result of the development of more skills and best practice.	9	
	People development has Key stakeholder involvement.	9	
	Has a clear plan in place for all involved in bids / proposals, having analysed their respective development needs to continue to develop people over the next 12 months.	9	
	Has received excellent feedback on training / development activities.	9	

Award	Assessment Criteria	Max Assessors Mark	Assessor Guidelines
<p><b>Writing</b> (Individual) – to recognise an individual’s ability to write in a bid and proposal context. (Graphics are not restricted in this category)</p>	Has achieved APMP Foundation Level Accreditation at minimum.	9	<p>Marks are awarded based on the evidence provided for each of the criteria listed.  <b>Full evidence = 9</b>  <b>Fairly comprehensive evidence = 7</b>  <b>Moderate evidence = 5</b>  <b>Partial evidence = 3</b>  <b>Very little evidence = 1</b>  <b>No evidence = 0</b>                      Nominees should provide evidence for all the listed criteria.                      If a nominee fails to provide evidence for more than 2 listed criteria, the nomination will be discounted.</p>
	Writing is customer focused.	9	
	Win Themes are clear and concise.	9	
	Layout is professional and customer focused and appropriate high-quality graphics (with captions) are included.	9	
	Writing emphasises benefits and not features.	9	
	Writing highlights value.	9	
	Writing is well structured, easy to read, in good English, is grammatically correct with appropriate use of Acronyms and does not use Jargon.	9	
	<b>New Criteria for 2017:</b> Writing is engaging, convincing and compelling	9	

Award	Assessment Criteria	Max Assessors Mark	Assessor Guidelines
<p><b>Fiona Flower - Knowledge Management Award</b></p> <p>(individual, team or organisation) – to recognise an individual’s, team’s or organisation’s implementation of knowledge management, that has resulted in more-efficient and effective bid or proposal submissions. (3 graphics allowed)</p>	<p>The submission should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summary of                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the issue faced</li> <li>○ the details of the storage method chosen</li> <li>○ how the system is indexed</li> <li>○ how access is provided to those in bidding</li> <li>○ how the system is maintained</li> <li>○ value and benefits achieved</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Three examples of content stored</li> <li>• Details of how the knowledge management system has been communicated internally.</li> </ul> <p>The redaction of commercially sensitive information is allowed in this submission.</p>	Pass/Fail	<p>Marks are awarded based on the evidence provided for each of the criteria listed.</p> <p><b>Full evidence = 9</b></p> <p><b>Fairly comprehensive evidence = 7</b></p> <p><b>Moderate evidence = 5</b></p> <p><b>Partial evidence = 3</b></p> <p><b>Very little evidence = 1</b></p> <p><b>No evidence = 0</b></p> <p>Nominees should provide evidence for all the listed criteria.</p> <p>If a nominee fails to provide evidence for more than 2 listed criteria, the nomination will be discounted.</p>
	Evidence that the knowledge management Storage structure is indexed in a logical manner that is easy ( <b>and intuitive</b> ) to navigate.	9	
	Evidence that the knowledge management system contains an extensive range of knowledge that can be used adaptively for different types of bids.	9	
	Evidence that there has been a Communication Strategy deployed to inform and educate a wider audience of the availability and usability of the system.	9	
	Evidence that the knowledge management system contains a balance of written content and graphics.	9	
	Evidence that the knowledge management content is regularly maintained.	9	
	Quantitative or qualitative evidence that the knowledge management system has improved bid process efficiency.	9	
	<b>New for 2017:</b> Evidence that the Knowledge Management system has been adopted as best practice within the organisation	9	