

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. Rubrics will be reviewed using this rubric. It is suggested that the author create the proposal in a Word document that can then be pasted into the appropriate section of the Cvent template. If you have questions, please contact me at cnixon@fmarion.edu.

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	No evidence of clear rationale for why this topic and session is important to the field	Some evidence of a rationale for why topic is important, but not sufficiently articulated or substantiated	Clear and convincing evidence of reasons why topic is important.
Rationale: Usefulness & Relevance to Practitioners, Families and/or Diverse Groups	No or insufficient descriptions of how the session will translate to improved practices and is relevant to groups from different backgrounds	Description of how the session translates to improved practices OR how the practices are relevant to different groups, however, both of these are not evident	Description of how the session translates to improved practices AND how the practices are relevant to different groups is clearly evident
Measurable Outcomes: Describe the expected learning outcomes for session participants	No participant outcomes stated OR inconsistent with the focus of proposal.	Some outcomes listed; description of what participants will know or be able to demonstrate after the session was not clear or concise.	Outcomes identified and description of skills, knowledge, and/or behaviors participants was evident and clearly stated
Description: Describe the appropriateness content, participant outcomes, and number of presenters	Rationale for content and outcomes not stated	Rationale for content and outcomes is not compelling, given the topic of session.	Rationale for content is clearly aligned with participant outcomes and session information/topic.
Description: Include a discussion regarding the evidence of the effectiveness of the Practice or Content SEE Pg2 for descriptions of 3 categories of evidence	No evidence of effectiveness of policy or practice (from any of the categories of evidence: research study, policy research; or practitioner evidence)	Some evidence of effectiveness of policy or practice (research study, policy research; or practitioner evidence) but not clearly articulated or sufficient	Clear evidence of effectiveness of policy or practice (research study, policy research; or practitioner evidence) but not clearly articulated or sufficient
TOTAL SCORE			

Evidence of the Effectiveness of the Practice or Content

- 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) research 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:

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

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

- o Policy papers that provide expert consensus on the nature of the issue.
- o Research studies on the nature or extent of the problem (e.g., studies on disproportionality in special education, multicultural preparation of personnel).
- o 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:

- o A brief summary of the theory or published research that provides a basis for the principles upon which the intervention is based.
- o 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.
- o Information on consumer feedback or data from other social validity measures on an intervention can include student ratings, parent/family evaluations, and employer surveys.