

Research Conference Proposal Review Form

Proposal #

Title

Reviewer

1. **Perspectives or Theoretical Framework for the Research**

Review and provide feedback and a rating regarding how well the research work is grounded by (an) overarching perspective(s) or framework(s) and makes an original/creative contribution to the field.

Potential Considerations: What are the intellectual underpinnings for the work? Are the theories or ideas that are driving the study clearly articulated? How do the questions being investigated contribute to research in mathematics education or the linking of research and practice? To what extent does the research suggest and explore creative and original concepts?

- 3 Research work grounded by appropriate and well-articulated argument, framework/perspectives, and intellectual underpinnings
- 2 Research work grounded by argument, framework/perspectives, and intellectual underpinnings with minor concern/lack of clarity from proposal
- 1 Research work grounded by argument, framework/perspectives, and/or intellectual underpinnings with one or more major concerns from proposal
- 0 Research work not grounded by argument, framework/perspectives, and intellectual underpinnings or with multiple major concerns from proposal

[Reviewers choose from a dropdown of 3, 2, 1, or 0. We want this to be numerical data for our analysis]

2. **Methods, Techniques, or Modes of Inquiry for the Research**

Review and provide feedback and a rating on the methods, techniques or modes of inquiry for the topic of the study/work.

Potential Considerations: Are the research questions clearly identified? Has the methodology been clearly articulated? Is the methodology or mode of inquiry appropriate for addressing the research questions? Are the methods supported by the perspectives or theoretical framework? Is the sample identified and adequate?

- 3 Well-articulated and appropriate methods, techniques, or modes of inquiry that are well executed to address clearly stated research questions/objectives
- 2 Appropriate methods, techniques, or modes of inquiry to address research questions/objectives with minor concern/lack of clarity from proposal
- 1 Articulated methods, techniques, or modes of inquiry to address research

Research Conference Proposal Review Form

questions/objectives with one or more major concerns from proposal

- 0 Methods, techniques, or modes of inquiry to address research questions/ objectives not articulated or with multiple major concerns from proposal

[Reviewers choose from a dropdown of 3, 2, 1, or 0. We want this to be numerical data for our analysis]

3. Data Sources or Evidence for the Research

Review and provide feedback and a rating on data sources, evidence, objects or materials for the research work.

Potential Considerations: Are the sources or evidence drawn on in this study described or discussed sufficiently? Are the sources adequate and appropriate for the research? Are quantitative and/or qualitative data utilized in appropriate ways to answer the research questions?

- 3 Clearly articulated and adequate data sources, evidence, objects or materials utilized appropriately to answer research questions
- 2 Adequate data sources, evidence, objects or materials utilized appropriately to answer research questions with minor concern/lack of clarity from proposal
- 1 Articulated data sources, evidence, objects or materials utilized to answer research questions with one or more major concerns from proposal
- 0 Data sources, evidence, objects or materials utilized to answer research questions not articulated or with multiple major concerns from proposal

[Reviewers choose from a dropdown of 3, 2, 1, or 0. We want this to be numerical data for our analysis]

4. Results and/or Conclusions

Review and provide feedback and a rating on the results and/or conclusions from the research work.

Potential Considerations: Do the results and/or findings address the research questions? How are the conclusions consistent with and flow from the analysis? Are the results/analyses situated within a broader context? Does the analysis of the data support the results reported?

- 3 Clearly substantiated and logically-based results or conclusions based on the methods and data/evidence provided
- 2 Substantiated and logically-based results or conclusions based on the methods and data/evidence provided with minor concern/lack of clarity from proposal
- 1 Articulated results or conclusions based on the methods and data/evidence provided with one or more major concerns from proposal

Research Conference Proposal Review Form

- 0 Results or conclusions not based on the methods and data/evidence provided or with multiple major concerns from proposal

[Reviewers choose from a dropdown of 3, 2, 1, or 0. We want this to be numerical data for our analysis]

5. Educational or Scientific Importance of the Research

Review and provide feedback and a rating on the educational or scientific importance of the research work.

Potential Considerations: How does the work advance the knowledge and understanding within the area of mathematics education research or practice? How does the proposal address key issues in mathematics teaching and learning and/or connect research and practice?

- 3 Work is timely and significant for advancing the field/connecting research and practice and is of interest to mathematics educators
- 2 Work advances the field/connects research and practice and is of interest to mathematics educators with minor concern/lack of clarity from proposal
- 1 Work advances the field/connects research and practice and is of interest to mathematics educators with one or more major concerns from proposal
- 0 Multiple major concerns from proposal

[Reviewers choose from a dropdown of 3, 2, 1, or 0. We want this to be numerical data for our analysis]

6. Equity as a Collective Professional Responsibility

NCTM is committed to access, equity and empowerment in its work. Specifically, the mathematics education research community is tasked to move equity from an individual choice to a collective professional responsibility. Including equity as one (but not the only) component considered in a research conference proposal moves the field forward through an important systemic mechanism (i.e., research conferences) that promotes the advancement and dissemination of research.

- 3 Clearly articulated equity lens that is explicitly and consistently integrated in meaningful ways with the research questions, theoretical framing, methodological approach, results/conclusions or educational/scientific importance
- 2 Articulated equity lens is present, but needs further integration with the research questions, theoretical framing, methodological approach, results/conclusions or educational/scientific importance with minor ambiguities
- 1 Articulated equity lens is inconsistent or superficially integrated with the research questions, theoretical framing, methodological approach, results/conclusions or educational/scientific importance
- 0 Equity lens is not articulated or there are multiple major concerns from proposal

Research Conference Proposal Review Form

[Reviewers choose from a dropdown of 3, 2, 1, or 0. We want this to be numerical data for our analysis]

7. **Organization of the Session**

Review and provide feedback and a rating on the organization for the proposed session and the proposed engagement/experience.

Potential Considerations: How do the authors propose to organize the session? How does the presentation content fit the identified session design? How does the presentation allow adequate time and structure for participants' engagement?

- 3 Clear and appropriate organization and participant engagement/experience for the session type
- 2 Clear organization and participant engagement/experience not adequately aligned with the session type
- 1 Limited organization and participant engagement/experience for the session type
- 0 No organization or participant engagement/experience

[Reviewers choose from a dropdown of 3, 2, 1, or 0. We want this to be numerical data for our analysis]

Feedback and Comments

Feedback and comments to submitters:

[Text Box – required.]

Comments to Program Committee (Not seen by submitters):

[Text Box – not required.]

Final Rating

- 3 – Accept without reservation.
- 2 – Accept only if room.
- 1 – Proposal needs significant work.

[Reviewers choose from a dropdown of 3, 2, or 1. We want this to be numerical data for our analysis]