NACADA Annual Conference Proposals
Understanding the Reader Evaluation Entry Page

1. **Follow the link to the evaluation webpage provided in your reader instruction email.**

   <u>To-do before beginning reviews:</u>
   - Review all resources provided before beginning your proposal reviews.
   - Print the provided rubric if you prefer to score proposals prior to entering your recommendations in the system.

   The following links are provided to afford a better experience for both you and the person submitting; please read the proposals with these guidelines in mind.
   - Website Instructions   (please review these instructions before evaluating proposals)
   - Guidelines for Reviewing Proposals
   - Providing Feedback on a NACADA Proposal
   - Rubric
   - NACADA Letter to Conference Proposal Readers

2. **Login using Reader credentials provided by the NACADA Executive Office.**

   Userid: [   ]
   Password: [   ]
   [Login]

3. **If you prefer, you may print the abstracts and proposals for all assigned presentations to review in advance of submitting your online reviews using the link shown below.**

   Click here to read all of these abstracts in one document.

4. **Become familiar with the program formats.**

   • The formats listed in the field titled **"Program Format Requested"** are in the order that the applicant chose. Example, if you see PAN, PO that would mean that the applicants first choice would be to present this presentation as part of a Panel discussion; their second choice would be to present it as a Poster. Here is the key to the Program Formats:

   LEC-Concurrent Session in Lecture Format: 60-minute session, usually allowing time for audience questions.
   PAN-Concurrent Session in a Panel Format: A moderator coordinates a 60-minute session on a common topic. There are two or three 15-minute separate presentations plus follow-up question time.
   Panels are to be formed by the submitter (the submitter identifies all panel members and the moderator within the proposal application)
   PO-Poster Presentation, a visual display showcasing an innovative advising program, research, or activity.
   PRE-Preconference Workshop, designed to feature specialized topics in the advising profession. Highly participatory, cannot be effectively addressed in another format.
   SP-Scholarly Papers, designed to lead to a complete manuscript to be submitted one month prior to the conference. Highly focused, cannot be addressed in another format.

   • In the **"Recommended Format" field, ONLY** the readers for Preconference workshops may choose "Preconference" as the recommended format.

   • In the **"Recommended Format" field, ONLY** the readers for Scholarly Paper proposals may choose "SP" as the recommended format.

5. **Read and Review Submissions Individually**

   - You will review each proposal submission separately and submit your evaluation using the option below.

Read Proposal & Abstract	Evaluate
Read Proposal & Abstract	Evaluate Proposal

   Note: You can save your comments and go back in and change them before submitting to the conference planning committee chair. Once submitted you cannot go back in and change your evaluation.

Understanding the Reader Evaluation Form

- Review the proposal again if needed.
- Rate the proposal based on the identified criteria on a scale from 1 to 5.
  - **Note:** Scholary Papers (SP) will have a different set of criteria than shown in the image below.
- Select the "Yes" or "No" option to indicate whether or not you recommend the proposal to be accepted.
- If you selected "Yes" in the "Recommend Accept" field, select the recommended session format from the drop-down box. *See the Program Format descriptions in #4.
- **Provide constructive feedback in the comments section. Proposal submitters are able to see reviewer comments so please be mindful that comments are tempered and beneficial for submitters.**

Abstract Code Number	Program Format Requested (in order requested)	Program Tracks	* Recommend Accept	* Recommended Format
58 (ViewProposal)	LEC,PO,PAN	PRS-Student Persistence, Retention, and Academic Skills	○YES○NO	Select a Format ▾

* Please rate the proposal on all of the following criteria (5=highest rating). Use the rubric provided as guidance on rating proposals:

1. **Interest:** Would there be a high level of interest in this program? ○1 ○2 ○3 ○4 ○5
2. **Application:** Would these ideas be adaptable to other institutions? ○1 ○2 ○3 ○4 ○5
3. **Clarity:** Are the abstract and purpose of the program well articulated? ○1 ○2 ○3 ○4 ○5
4. **Creativity:** Would this introduce new ideas, approaches, concepts? ○1 ○2 ○3 ○4 ○5
5. **Relevance:** Is this topic relevant to current advising issues? ○1 ○2 ○3 ○4 ○5

Not all proposals are based on the criteria below. These scores are intended to provide an appropriate rating score where applicable. Proposals should not be adversely evaluated if they are not based on the criteria below.

6. **Research:** Grounded in research (description of methods, findings, and recommendations, as well as emphasis on research results and collected data where applicable) (N/A means that the proposal is not a research-based proposal) ○1 ○2 ○3 ○4 ○5 ○N/A

7. **Diversity:** Does this proposal include issues of equality and/or inclusion and/or diversity, if appropriate? (N/A means that the proposal does not deal with the issues of diversity) ○1 ○2 ○3 ○4 ○5 ○N/A

Abstain: I wish to abstain from scoring this proposal.
Any scoring information you enter will be ignored if you abstain.   ☐

Comments

6. Evaluate the Proposal

- After you have read the abstract and proposal for a particular submission, you may rate the proposal based on the provided criteria.
- We highly encourage all readers to provide feedback to help the chair make the best informed decisions on acceptance/denial of proposals.
- Once all fields have been completed select:

● Submit Evaluation to Chair

Save -or- Submit

Continue through the remaining proposals until evaluations for all assigned proposals have been submitted.