

2018 Three Rivers TESOL Annual Conference: Call for Proposals

Conference Theme:

Assessment in TESOL: Evaluating Students & Reflecting on Practices

TESOL's "6 Principles for Exemplary Teaching of English Learning" calls attention to the topic of assessment from many perspectives, including instructors' knowledge of students, their evaluation of student and class progress, and teachers' reflection on their own strengths and areas for development. More specifically, instructors appraise what students bring to class as individuals with distinct personal and cultural histories and in terms of background knowledge. Moreover, once in the classroom context, instructors plan classes to best meet student and curricular needs efficiently, effectively and with attention to affect, determining the best means to support student achievement as well as when and how to re-present content when necessary (after assessing student progress through informal and formal measures). At the same time, instructors develop as professionals by stepping away from the day to day to observe and critically reflect upon their teaching practices. For the Three Rivers TESOL 2018 Fall Conference, we welcome insight about evaluating students and reflecting on teaching practices as well as other aspects relevant to the field from the perspective of instructor, administrator, and/or scholar.

Proposal Deadline: 9/30/2018 11:59PM EST

Submission Method: Please submit your proposal online via the following link:
<https://tinyurl.com/3RTFallConference2018>

Parts of the Proposal:

1. Session Type (descriptions per TESOL): Please choose one of following the session types for your proposal.

• **Panel Presentation (40 minutes, 3 presenter maximum):**

Multiple, short presentations on and discussion of a current ELT issue focusing on practice, research, and/or advocacy. Proposals should include a synopsis of issue(s) and a plan for the topic and for each presentation (without listing presenters' names). **Panelists should be recruited prior to proposal submission.**

• **Poster Session (55 minutes):**

A summary of an academically sound, scholarly or creative project presented in a visually engaging format, highlighting work through charts, graphs, maps, etc. Proposals should include the main topic(s) and description of the visual display. Presenter(s) should plan on short, informative discussions with convention attendees throughout the entire poster session.

• **Practice-Oriented Presentation (40 minutes, 3 presenter maximum):**

Oral presentations that may be delivered individually or as part of a group discussion. Presenters share their ideas, experiences, and perspectives gleaned from their [practice]. These sessions provide the audience with ample opportunities for participation and engagement, and they serve as springboards stimulating further discussion, dialogue, reflection, and action.

• **Research-Oriented Presentation (40 minutes, 3 presenter maximum):**

Oral presentations that may be delivered individually or as part of a group discussion. Presenters share their ideas, experiences, and perspectives gleaned from their [research]. These sessions provide the audience with ample opportunities for participation and engagement, and they serve as springboards

stimulating further discussion, dialogue, reflection, and action. Presenters may submit a joint proposal focusing on two related techniques, issues, practices, or research projects.

• **Teaching Tip (20 minutes, 2 presenter maximum):**

Oral summary of presenter's work in relation to practice. Proposals should include a synopsis of the techniques, including brief description of the teaching tip.

• **Workshop (40 minutes, 3 presenter maximum):**

Structured hands-on professional development activity tackling an issue or developing a specific teaching or research technique. Proposals should include session goals, a synopsis of the theoretical framework, and a description of workshop tasks and procedures. They should also provide interactive activities in which participants share information, participate in simulations, and/or create materials and action plans.

2. Setting: Please choose one of the interest sections for your proposal.

• **Adult Education:** community-based programs, refugee programs, vocational-workplace programs

• **Higher Education:** community colleges, 4-year colleges/universities, (post-)graduate academic and professional programs, international teaching assistantships

• **Intensive English Programs:** Intensive English Programs/Private Language Teaching Programs

• **PreK-12:** ELs in PreK-12 contexts

• **Teacher Education and Development:** Issues relevant to ESL/EFL teacher education and in-service teacher development.

3. Proposal title: 10 words maximum

4. Abstract: 50 words maximum

5. Session Description: 200 words maximum

Additional information about writing conference proposals can be found at “TESOL 2019 Proposal Guidelines and Resources” under “Helpful Links” (<http://www.tesol.org/attend-and-learn/international-convention/tesol-2019-call-for-proposals/tesol-2019-proposal-guidelines-and-resources>), including the PowerPoint “Writing Successful TESOL Proposals: Engage, Enrich, Empower,” proposal worksheets and checklists, and other resources.

The proposal evaluation rubric can be found on the following page.

Proposal Evaluation Rubric

Each proposal will be reviewed by at least two 3RT board members using the the TESOL proposal rating rubric below (TESOL 2019 Proposal Rating Rubric). Proposals are rated in each category on a scale of 1 (poor) to 4 (excellent).

Evaluation Criteria	Poor (1 Point)	Fair (2 Points)	Good (3 Points)	Excellent (4 Points)
1. Currency, importance, and appropriateness of topic to the field and audience	Topic is not current and/or lacks importance or appropriateness to the field and/or to the potential audience.	Topic is only tangentially related to the field, not completely current or important to the field and/or to the potential audience.	Topic is current, important, and appropriate to the field and potential audience.	Topic is cutting-edge, ground-breaking, and significant to the field and potential audience.
2. Theory, practice, and/or research basis	The proposal does not mention a pedagogical, research, theoretical, and/or policy rationale, or it is unclear how the rationale is connected to the field or content of the presentation.	The proposal refers loosely or tangentially to a pedagogical, research, theoretical, and/or policy rationale, but the citations and/or terminology are not specific, recent, or relevant to the field or content of the presentation.	The proposal presents the pedagogical, research, theoretical, and/or policy rationale for the presentation content via citations and/or terminology related to the field or content of the presentation.	The proposal fully incorporates the pedagogical, research, theoretical, and/or policy rationale for the presentation content into the description via citations and/or terminology related to the field or content of the presentation.
3. Overview of session content	The proposal makes claims with no description of the method, procedure, or plan of action to achieve the goals and objectives of the session.	The proposal lacks coherence and/or loosely describes the method, procedure, and plan of action to achieve the goals and objectives of the session.	The proposal provides a clear and coherent description of the method, procedure, and plan of action to achieve the goals and objectives of the session.	The proposal provides a very clear, detailed, and coherent description of the method, procedure, and plan of action to achieve the goals and objectives of the session.
4. Outcomes and implications for educational settings	The participant outcomes and practical implications for TESOL professionals are not provided.	The participant outcomes and practical implications for TESOL professionals are unclear and/or too broad.	The participant outcomes and practical implications for TESOL professionals are mostly clear and specific.	The participant outcomes and practical implications for TESOL professionals are very clear, specific, and highly relevant.
5. Appropriateness in terms of length, content and delivery methods	The proposal is inappropriate for the session type in terms of length, content, and delivery methods.	The proposal is somewhat inappropriate for the session type in terms of length, content, and/or delivery methods.	The proposal is mostly appropriate for the session type in terms of length content, and/or delivery methods.	The proposal is clearly appropriate for the session type in terms of length, content, and delivery methods.
6. Overall clarity of proposal as indicator of presentation quality	The proposal is vague and/or poorly edited, suggesting that the presentation may be of poor quality. I do not recommend this session.	The proposal is somewhat clear but suggests that the presentation may be of weak quality. I might recommend this session.	The proposal is clear and suggests that the presentation will be of good quality. I recommend this session.	The proposal is very clear and well-written, suggesting that the presentation will be of professional quality. I strongly recommend this session.