

REVIEW CRITERIA FOR DCDT 2020 PROPOSALS –

Please use the following rubric for writing your presentation proposal(s). Refer to the directions sheet for the exact number of characters to be used in each required section. Session will be reviewed using this rubric.

Title **(300 characters)**

Strand **(choose from the drop-down list)**

Measurable Outcomes **(300 characters)**

Rationale **(2,000 characters)**

Description **(6,000 characters)**

Abstract Summary **(1,500 characters – this will be uploaded into the conference program)**

| | 0 | .5 | 1 |
|--|--|--|---|
| Rationale: Importance of Topic for policy, practice, or research | No stated or implied connection to the importance of the topic | Some evidence of importance of the topic, but not clearly articulated | Clear and convincing evidence of why topic is important for policy, practice, or the field. |
| Rationale: Usefulness & Relevance to Practitioners | No descriptions of how the session is relevant to practitioners or translates to improved practices. | Proposal integrates specific strategies for practitioners OR how their research will translate to improved practices | Proposal integrates specific strategies for practitioners AND how their research will translate to improved practices |
| Rationale: Incorporates elements of culturally responsive and sustaining practices in transition planning | No description of how the session incorporates elements of culturally responsive and sustaining practices in transition planning | Proposal integrates specific strategies reflective of culturally responsive and sustaining practices in transition planning | Proposal integrates specific strategies reflective of culturally responsive and sustaining practices AND describes how the practices improve transition outcomes for youth from diverse communities |
| Measurable Outcomes: Describes the expected learning outcomes for session participants | No participant outcomes stated OR inconsistent with the rationale of proposal. | Learning outcomes are unclear or not stated (or not aligned with rationale), although there is potential for participant learning | Outcomes identified and description of skills, knowledge, and/or behaviors participants will demonstrate after the session are clearly stated and aligned with rationale |
| Description: Grounded in theory, research, or best practices. | No indication that session is grounded in theory, research, or best practices and value for participants is unclear. | Proposal states no specific theories, research, or best practices; but shows potential for participant learning of a valued program, practice, skill, or experience. | Clearly indicates a grounding in and intent to apply theory, research, or best practices. |
| Description: “Evidence of Effectiveness” Describes experimental design, policy research, or practitioner evidence SEE Pg2 for categories | No (or very limited) “Evidence of Effectiveness” is provided | Meets some “Evidence of Effectiveness” indicators for the appropriate proposal category | Meets or exceeds each “Evidence of Effectiveness” indicator for the appropriate proposal category |
| TOTAL SCORE | | | |

“Evidence of the Effectiveness” Indicators

- The term *evidence of effectiveness* is used here to include policy practices and practitioner sources of evidence as well as rigorous research studies and results. The proposal should describe the category of evidence: (1) experimental design (group design, single-subject intervention, or rigorous qualitative research); (2) policy research; or (3) practitioner evidence.

(1) Experimental Design: Specify the design used to appropriately address the research questions (e.g., efficacy of an intervention (randomized control trial, quasi-experimental study, single-subject design, or exploratory qualitative study) You must include:

- A brief summary of the research literature that served as a foundation for the study.
- Research questions.
- Research design
- Results (If the study is incomplete, indicate when it will be completed.)
- Discussion points.

(2) Policy Research: Describe the legislative or legal basis for the issue:

- Policy papers that provide expert consensus on the nature of the issue.
- Research studies on the nature or extent of the problem (e.g., studies on disproportionality in special education, multicultural preparation of personnel).
- Persuasive argument that the issue has not received sufficient attention from researchers or practitioners and noting types of questions to be asked in future.

(3) Practitioner Evidence: Describe the following:

This category required the presenter describes the (a) theoretical or research basis for using a particular program or strategy and (b) “how they know a program or strategy is working.” The focus should be on providing a:

- A brief summary of the theory or published research that provides a basis for the principles upon which the intervention is based.
- Clinical data on student learning that suggests the effectiveness of the intervention (e.g., curriculum-based measurement, rubric scores, course grades, criterion-referenced measures, and behavioral observations). Data are stronger if they include pre-/post-testing or baseline/intervention data.
- Information on consumer feedback or data from other social validity measures on an intervention can include student ratings, parent/family evaluations, and employer surveys.