Proposal Review

Collaborations for Empowerment & Learning:
Innovative Pedagogy & Course Redesign
15th Annual Summer Conference
May 26, 2016 | Fairfield University, CT

Submit your proposal by March 1, 2016!

Review of Proposals

All proposals will be blind-reviewed by at least 2 reviewers using the following criteria. Authors will be notified if there are conditions for acceptance, and all authors will receive reviewer commentary along with notice of acceptance or rejection.

Criteria

1. Is the session/poster proposal clear as to purpose and goals?
2. Is the rationale reasonable and well articulated?
    a. Is the proposal contextualized in appropriate literature and/or previous research and practice?
    b. Are the modes of inquiry appropriate?
3. Does the proposed presentation have a significant potential contribution to research, theory, and/or practice?
    a. Is attention to diversity included as context or content?
4. Does the proposal fit the conference theme of collaborations for empowerment and learning?
    a. Do the content and process of the proposed session/poster support collaborations, empowerment and learning for session participants and/or their constituencies?
    b. Does the session/poster offer participants opportunity for critically reflective practice?
5. Does the proposal match one of the highlighted topics?
6. Will the session attract participation from our attendees?

Reviewer Form

Collaborations for Empowerment & Learning:
Innovative Pedagogy & Course Redesign
15th Annual Summer Conference
May 26, 2016 | Fairfield University, CT

Reviewer: _____

Proposal #: _____ Proposal Title: _____

Proposed Session format: ❑ poster ❑roundtable ❑ interactive session

Rating: *score each item in descending order of quality with **1** as **highest**, and **3** as **lowest**.*
Use N/A if the criterion is not suitable for the proposal.

Criteria	Rating				Overall Rating
1. Is the session/poster proposal clear as to purpose and goals?	1	2	3	N/A	**Overall rating of proposal quality** *(consider criteria 1, 2, 3)*
2. Is the rationale reasonable and well articulated?	1	2	3	N/A	
a. Is the proposal contextualized in appropriate literature and/or previous research and practice	1	2	3	N/A	
b. Are the modes of inquiry appropriate?	1	2	3	N/A	
3. Rate the significance of the presentation for its potential contribution to research, theory, and/or practice. Please annotate briefly in comment section	1	2	3	N/A	
a. Rate the attention to diversity as context or content	1	2	3	N/A	
4. Does the proposal fit the conference theme of collaborations for empowerment and learning?	1	2	3	N/A	**Overall rating of proposal fit for the conference** *(consider criteria 4)*
a. Do the content and process of the proposed session/poster support collaborations, empowerment and learning for session participants and/or their constituencies?	1	2	3	N/A	
b. Does the session/poster offer participants opportunity for critically reflective practice?	1	2	3	N/A	
5. Does the proposal match one of the highlighted topics?	1	2	3	N/A	**Probable appeal of the session** *(consider criteria 5 & 6)*
6. Will the session attract participation from our attendees?	1	2	3	N/A	

Reviewer recommendation

❑ **Accept this session.**
(*overall rating of 1 on both quality and fit and at least a 2 on appeal*)

- Recommended Session format: ❑ poster ❑roundtable ❑ interactive session

❑ **Accept this session with revisions for a different session format.**
(offer substantive formative feedback) (both overall quality and fit ratings are at 2, or one is a 2 and the other is an easily remedied 3, and probably appeal is a 1 or 2)

- Recommended Session format: ❑ poster ❑roundtable ❑ interactive session

❑ **Reject this session**
(if possible, offer suggestions for either improvement or for an alternative venue that might be more appropriate. (All overall ratings are at 3)

Rater's comments for conference organizers *(not to be shared with session authors)*

Rater's formative comments for session authors. *Please be respectful, collegial and helpful.*