**2020 Three Rivers TESOL Annual Conference:**

**Call for Proposals**

Conference Theme:

***Remotely Together: Reconnecting While Working Remotely***

In light of the COVID-19 pandemic, the Three Rivers TESOL Annual Conference will be held *virtually* on October 16 and 17, 2020.

The 3RT Executive Board is diligently working to plan an excellent conference in this new format. This year’s plenary speaker, Dr. Liz England, founder of the TESOL International Association Career Path Development Professional Learning Network, will present on the topic of TESOL career path development during these challenging times.

In addition, we will also be featuring a presentation from Dr. Justin Shewell, Senior International Educator at Arizona State University and a member of the TESOL Board of Directors.

For the 3RT 2020 Fall Conference, we welcome insights about teaching, evaluating and professional development in a digital world.

**Proposal Deadline:**  9/25/2020 11:59PM EST

**Submission Method:** Please submit your proposal online via the following link:

**https://bit.ly/2En3PO2**

**Parts of the Proposal:**

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

• ***Poster Session (8-10 minute presentation + 15 minute live Q/A session):***

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 (15 minutes\* + 15 minute Q/A, 3 presenter maximum):***

Oral presentations that may be delivered through recording (asynchronously) or live (synchronously, 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 (20 minutes\* + 15 minute Q/A, 3 presenter maximum):***

Oral presentations that may be delivered through recording (asynchronously) or live (synchronously, as part of a group discussion). Presenters share their research and implications. 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.

\*Note: Presentations can be delivered synchronously or asynchronously (pre-recorded) but Q/A sessions must be live. You must be present online during your live Q/A session.

• ***Workshop (30 minutes live, 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, etc.

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

• ***Intensive English Programs:*** Intensive English Programs/Private Language Teaching Programs, etc.

• ***PreK-12:***  ELs in PreK-12 contexts, after school programming, etc.

• ***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 2021 Call for Proposals” (<https://www.tesol.org/attend-and-learn/international-convention/tesol-2021-call-for-proposals>), including the TESOL 2021 Proposal Writer's Guide, proposal worksheets and checklists, and other resources.

# Note: 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.  |