



NARST

A global organization for improving
science education through research

CALL FOR PROPOSALS 2026 NARST Annual International Conference

April 9, 2026, All-Virtual Day

April 19 – 22, 2026, In-person

Seattle, WA, United States

Presidential Theme	2
Program Strands	3
2026 NARST Strands and Descriptions	3
Virtual Sessions.....	4
Proposal Types: Empirical Research or Theoretical/Position.....	4
Program Presentation Formats	4
<i>Stand-Alone Paper by individual author or co-authors</i>	4
<i>Related Paper Set by multiple authors or co-author groups</i>	4
<i>Interactive Poster Paper by individual or co-authors</i>	5
<i>Symposium by multiple presenters</i>	5
<i>Roundtables by individual or co-authors</i>	5
Presentation Limitations (Number and Originality)	6
Criteria for Review	7
Blinding the Proposal	7
Creating an Account and Submitting a Proposal.....	8
Reviewer Rubric and Checklist	13
Confirmation of Submission	13
Submission Deadline	14
Requirements for Presenting Authors	14
Registration Requirement	14
Presentation Needs at the In-Person Conference	14
NARST Proposal Review Rubric	15
Proposal Submission Checklist	17
Timeline	18

Presidential Theme

JOYFUL TRANSGRESSIONS AND RADICAL IMAGINATION IN SCIENCE EDUCATION

The classroom, with all its limitations, remains a location of possibility. In that field of possibility, we have the opportunity to labor for freedom, to demand of ourselves and our comrades an openness of mind and heart that allows us to face reality even as we collectively imagine ways to move beyond boundaries, to transgress. -bell hooks

What could science teaching, learning and research look like in our wildest dreams? What could science teachers, learners, communities, and researchers be saying, thinking, doing, and feeling? What could be the priorities of science education?

Urgent times calls for radical actions and opportunities to collectively imagine different worlds and plot futures where we all can flourish. Uncertainty and global transitions create openings for radical world-building—moving beyond what is given, including the imaginations imposed by those in power. Could we dare to envision a world where everyone can thrive, where the flourishing of all humans and more-than-humans is the status quo? As such, it is imperative that we locate and create spaces of hope, imagination, and joy in science education—spaces where we re-envision how we can live well together on this pale blue dot that we call home.

The NARST 2026 annual meeting invites us to collectively imagine and build a world where scientific knowledge making is connected to lived experience and recorded through, as Sylvia Wynter suggests, “representational and biological feelings,” and the creation of spaces where “there is unlimited access to the pleasure and power of knowing,” as bell hooks advocates. This challenges us to re-engage with the fully human aspects of science learning considering some of the following provocations: What would happen if we considered play in science learning across contexts and lifespan?

What joyful methodologies could we employ to research science learning? How could we enact care alongside students, teachers, communities, and peers in our work? What would happen if we started our projects from a place of trust and relationship-building? Given that NARST's ultimate goal is to help all learners achieve science literacy, how might we reimagine science literacy with social, environmental, and epistemological justice at its core?

This conference theme invites us to share the ways that we can transgress canonical boundaries in science education and expand dialogues on strategies for disrupting structures that sustain inequities, and in the spirit of bell hooks, “[envision] new, alternative, oppositional aesthetic acts that both challenge and transcend [given] frameworks and limitations.” This conference is a step toward forging deeper connections between science and social life across formal, informal, and lived contexts—unpacking histories, reimagining relationships with science, and ultimately working toward a scientific endeavor of joyful transgressions and world-building. Together, we will envision and enact future-oriented approaches that cultivate a radical reimagining of what science education—and the world—can be.

Jennifer Adams, NARST President

Program Strands

The 2026 NARST program will feature sessions focused on 14 Program Strands and delivered in several session formats. Proposals must identify the Strand that most closely aligns with their proposed topic. The NARST Strands are:

2026 NARST Strands and Descriptions

<i>Strand 1. Science Learning: Development of Student Understanding</i> How students learn from a variety of theoretical perspectives
<i>Strand 2. Science Learning: Contexts, Characteristics, and Interactions</i> Learning environments, teacher-student and student-student interactions, and factors related to and/or affecting learning
<i>Strand 3. Science Teaching--Primary School (Grades preK-6): Characteristics and Strategies</i> Teacher cognition, content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, instructional materials, and strategies
<i>Strand 4. Science Teaching--Middle and High School (Grades 5-12): Characteristics and Strategies</i> Teacher cognition; content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and instructional materials and strategies.
<i>Strand 5. College Science Teaching and Learning (Grades 13-20)</i> Instructor cognition, content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, student understanding and learning, and conceptual change at postsecondary level
<i>Strand 6. Science Learning in Informal Contexts</i> Learning and teaching in museums, outdoor settings, community programs, communications media, and after-school programs
<i>Strand 7. Pre-service Science Teacher Education</i> Pre-service professional development of teachers, pre-service teacher education programs and policy, field experience, and issues related to pre-service teacher education reform
<i>Strand 8. In-service Science Teacher Education</i> Continuing professional development of teachers, in-service teacher education programs and policy, and issues related to in-service teacher education reform
<i>Strand 9 Dissolved (approved by Board March 15, 2020)</i>
<i>Strand 10. Curriculum and Assessment</i> Development, implementation, dissemination, and evaluation of curriculum. Development and validation of assessments, including alternative forms of assessment of teaching and learning
<i>Strand 11. Cultural, Social, and Gender Issues</i> Equity and diversity issues: sociocultural, multicultural, bilingual, racial/ethnic, and gender equity studies
<i>Strand 12. Technology for Teaching, Learning, and Research</i> Advancing applications of technology and digital tools to promote teaching, learning, and research
<i>Strand 13. History, Philosophy, Sociology, and Nature of Science</i> Historical, philosophical, and social issues of science as related to science education
<i>Strand 14. Environmental Education and Sustainability</i> Education related to Earth and ecological systems, environmental literacy and justice, experiential learning, Indigenous perspectives, public participation in science, socio-scientific issues, sustainability, and sustainable development.
<i>Strand 15. Policy, Reform, and Program Evaluation</i> The construction, interpretation, and implementation of science education policies and reforms at the local, regional, national, or international levels

Virtual Sessions

The NARST 2026 conference is being planned as an in-person event, **with an additional day dedicated to virtual presentations**. If you would like your proposal to be considered for a virtual presentation, you will indicate this by checking a box within the proposal submission form. All the session formats listed below may be considered for virtual sessions. The authorship and presenter policies described below will apply across in-person and virtual sessions, as our goal is to increase opportunities for members to present.

Given the significant costs involved, in-person sessions will not be live-streamed. These sessions may not be attended virtually. If you are unable to travel to the in-person conference, please select the virtual option when submitting your proposal. During a short window following notification of acceptance of your proposal, you are allowed to switch from in-person to virtual providing space is available in the virtual schedule. After this deadline, the in-person and virtual sessions will be set, and we will not accommodate any further changes.

We will try to schedule presentations at times that are reasonable for presenters located around the world. If you are planning to present during the virtual conference day, please respond to a question regarding the nearest time zones to your location. It will help us during scheduling.

Proposal Types: Empirical Research or Theoretical/Position

You will be asked to indicate if your proposal is an empirical research paper or a theoretical/position paper. In most cases, an **Empirical Research** paper reports on a completed empirical study. Works in progress that do not have sufficient data to address the research questions at the time of proposal submission should not be submitted. However, works in progress may be submitted as a proposal for a *Work in Progress Roundtable*. A **Theoretical/Position** paper can be a literature review, an evidence-based position paper, or a paper that presents an original perspective on a theoretical and/or conceptual framework. Theoretical papers should include recommendations for future research. Refer to the proposal review criteria to determine the best fit for your proposal type.

Program Presentation Formats

Note: For all presentation formats, authors should have a method to disseminate their paper if appropriate, such as a handout, a link to a website, or a downloadable PDF (exception: work in progress roundtables).

Stand-Alone Paper by individual author or co-authors

Traditional presentation format allows for 15-20 minutes of individual presentation time in a theater-style setting. Typically, four papers are scheduled per session for 90 minutes total, and Strand co-coordinators will group them by theme.

Related Paper Set by multiple authors or co-author groups

A session proposal is submitted for review on behalf of all authors and co-author groups. The session consists of four or five topically related papers presented in a single 90-minute time block. The proposal must clearly show the topical focus of the session and must identify a presider. Separately, authors/co-author groups submit their individual papers to

be included in the session, but do not need to submit a proposal.

Interactive Poster Paper by individual or co-authors

A single author or a group of co-authors may prepare a paper for presentation in poster format. Poster presenters will be grouped with other poster presenters from the same Strand for a 90-minute time block. Many posters will be scheduled at the same time., allowing attendees to interact with presenters and move to other posters in the same session.

Symposium by multiple presenters

Groups of participants may propose a symposium on a topic or issue. The session will involve four to ten participants and must relate to the Strand to which it is submitted. The goals of the symposium should be clear and focused, as should the role of each participant. Symposium sessions will have a 90-minute time block in the program.

Symposium proposals must be submitted as a single document; they may not contain individual papers. However, a symposium can include short presentations to provide context for discussion. The group submitting the proposal will be required to identify their own presider and will decide on the time allocation for presentations and discussion within the 90-minute block. Representation from multiple contexts and countries is encouraged.

Roundtables by individual or co-authors

Roundtable sessions allow maximum interaction among presenters and with attendees. They are discussion-oriented and **are not intended to be a substitute for a Standalone Paper presentation or Poster**. The primary focus of the Roundtable is to consider the broader implications of the work and discuss possibilities for the future. Papers accepted for a roundtable session will be grouped into "discussion tables" with three or four papers per table, clustered around shared interests. The session will be scheduled for a 60-minute time slot with authors proceeding according to guidelines distributed at the roundtable sessions. No additional audiovisual equipment, such as a screen or LCD projector, is provided. No power source will be provided. Authors wishing to display information may do so from their own laptop computer screens or distribute handouts. Please **do not** expect to deliver a full presentation – the purpose of a Roundtable discussion is to **discuss**.

Roundtables may be submitted as works in progress. The primary focus is to encourage discussion aimed at moving developing work forward. A discussion table may intermingle works in progress with more fully developed work.

Strand Coordinators may recommend moving a proposed presentation into a different presentation format. The Co-Chairs of the Program Committee are **Jennifer Adams**, NARST President, and **Maria Varelas**, NARST President-Elect, who have the final decision in the assignment of presentation format. If the proposer does not want the format assigned to their presentation, the proposer will have the opportunity to withdraw the proposal.

Presentation Limitations (Number and Originality)

NARST recognizes the value of conference participation to professional reputation and advancement. To ensure an equitable distribution of opportunities to present papers or organize sessions, NARST limits the number of times a person can appear as first author or session organizer.

Additionally, NARST now limits the number of presentations delivered by an individual.

Please note the italicized changes to policy below. An individual may be:

First author *or presenter* of only one stand-alone paper or paper within a related paper set, AND

First author *or presenter* of only one interactive poster paper, AND

First author *or presenter* of only one roundtable paper, AND

Organizer/Co-organizer of only one symposium, AND

A non-presenting co-author on any number of stand-alone, related paper set, roundtable, and/or interactive poster papers.

Authorship and designated presenter information will be checked. If you are first author or designated presenter on more than the allowed number, the additional proposals must be withdrawn, or authorship or designated presenter must be changed.

NARST proposals submitted for presentations at the Annual International Conference MUST be original work that has not been published or presented at any other conference (e.g., AERA, ASERA, ASTE, ESERA).

Preparing and Formatting the Proposal

These guidelines apply to all proposals regardless of mode of conference attendance (in person or virtual).

Stand-Alone Paper or Poster. The maximum length is five single-spaced pages (excluding references but including tables and figures). All in-text citations should be included in the reference list and references must be in APA format.

Related Paper Set. The maximum length is 10 single-spaced pages (excluding references but including tables and figures). This should begin with a summary of the entire set describing how all of the papers are related, and then provide details of each individual paper integrated into one document. All in-text citations should be included in the reference list and references must be in APA format.

Symposium. The maximum length is 10 single spaced pages (excluding references but including tables and figures). This should include a description of the overall session topic or issue in one document and indicate how the session will run (e.g., panel discussion followed by group discussion). All in-text citations should be included in the reference list and references must be in APA format.

Related Paper Set and Symposium proposals sometimes involved a mixed format (e.g. a panel discussion plus several posters). If your session requires a **room setup** other than standard theater seating (e.g. poster boards, roundtables, classroom tables), you must describe it in the proposal.

Roundtable and Work in progress Roundtable. The maximum length is 5 single spaced pages (excluding references but including tables and figures). All in-text citations should be included in the reference list and references must be in APA format.

Proposals must be **single-spaced with 1" (2.54 cm) margins all around, and in font no smaller than 12 on US Letter size paper (8.5" x 11")**. If you usually use A4 paper, please convert to US letter size as you finalize your proposal, ***before*** converting to a PDF format for submission.

Criteria for Review

Your proposal must address the primary criteria that are part of the review process. See the rubric included in this call for details of each criterion.

- (a) subject/problem
- (b) design/procedure
- (c) findings and analysis
- (d) contribution to the teaching and learning of science
- (e) how likely is this presentation to impact members?
- (f) for Roundtables only, have the authors clearly articulated what they would like to discuss?

Blinding the Proposal

All proposals submitted to NARST go through a **blinded, peer-reviewed process**. Blinded means there is no information within the proposal that could identify who the author/co-authors are or where they work. Authors are **required** to remove **any** identifiers in the proposal pertaining to the authors and their institutional affiliations, or pertaining to the study and research grant or project identifiers. Authors must disguise any information that may lead to the identification of authors. For example, instead of the name of a university use a general description like “research university located in the southeast of the United States”. In addition, for self-citations please use the third person, instead of “we” or “I”. Include in-text citations as “Author” (e.g. Author, 2019). In the reference list, use only the term "Author" or “Authors” followed by date of publication. These items should be alphabetized in the reference list using the term “Author” or “Authors,” not by the author’s real name.

Please be aware that PDF files contain metadata that may identify you as the author.

After creating your proposal PDF, open it and click on File/Properties. Check whether your name, institution or other identifying information are displayed. If so, delete that information and save the PDF file.

NOTE: Proposals that do not meet these criteria must be corrected or they will not be reviewed.

Creating an Account and Submitting a Proposal

The 2026 NARST Annual International Conference will employ the Oxford Abstracts System, hereafter referred to as “**OAS**”. OAS supports proposal submission and review, session building and scheduling, conference program creation, and a mobile-friendly conference program display with personal itinerary and other advanced features.

Step 1. To begin, you must have an OAS account. Go to the OAS Dashboard:

<https://app.oxfordabstracts.com/dashboard>

If you submitted or reviewed proposals via OAS for previous NARST conferences, OAS will recognize your login and you do not need to create a new account. Please test your login by entering your email address and password. **If you successfully log in, proceed to Step 2.**

If your email address is not recognized by OAS, you must create an account before you can submit a proposal. Please click on **Create an Account**, then **Continue with email**. Enter your preferred email address; it will be used as your login username. **NARST members, we recommend that you use the same email address as you use to log into the NARST member portal.** Enter your name, professional title (optional), and choose a strong password that you can remember (8+ characters including a letter and a number). Thereafter, OAS will recognize you by your login email, whether you are submitting, editing, or reviewing a proposal; browsing the conference program; reading presentation abstracts; or other conference functions. All communications sent via OAS will be addressed to your login email.

You will receive an email from OAS; click on the **Verify your email address** link to complete the creation of your OAS account.

The OAS dashboard display will inform you that you are not connected to any events. That only means that you haven’t interacted with the NARST 2026 Conference yet. For many people, their first OAS interaction will be submitting a conference proposal.

Step 2. Now that you have an OAS account, you can begin submitting your proposal. Go to the NARST 2026 Conference Proposal Submissions form:

<https://app.oxfordabstracts.com/stages/77744/submitter>

As soon as you start a draft proposal, your account will be linked to the 2026 Conference. Enter some of the proposal information (e.g. the proposal title), then save your work by scrolling down and clicking on **Submit** at the bottom of the proposal submission form. A popup window will list the items that you have not yet completed; just click on **Continue** to save your draft proposal. You will receive an email confirming that you have saved an incomplete proposal.

To continue working on your draft proposal, return to OAS at any time using the convenient Dashboard link:

<https://app.oxfordabstracts.com/dashboard>

If the 2026 Conference is your first interaction with OAS, the 2026 Conference working area will be displayed.

If you previously submitted a proposal for the 2023, 2024, or 2025 Conferences, you will see a link to the 2026 conference working area, and additional links to previous Conferences. **Click on the 2026 Conference** to enter the 2026 working area.

You will see your draft proposal listed in the Submissions section, initially labeled as “Incomplete” with an Edit link to allow you to continue working on your proposal. When you have provided all required proposal information, the Dashboard will indicate that the proposal is Complete.

If you are submitting more than one proposal (e.g., one Standalone Paper and one Poster), each proposal will be listed in the Submissions section of the OAS Dashboard.

Entering Proposal Information into the OAS Proposal Submission Form

Q1. Empirical Research or Theoretical/Position

An **Empirical Research** paper reports on completed empirical study. Works in progress that do not have sufficient data to address the research questions at the time of proposal submission should not be submitted. *The sole exception is Work-in-progress Roundtable proposals.*

A **Theoretical/Position** paper can be a literature review, an evidence-based position paper, or a paper that presents an original perspective on a theoretical and/or conceptual framework. Theoretical papers should include recommendations for future research.

Related Paper Sets may include a mix of research and theoretical papers.

Q2. Methodological approach

Select the most appropriate option for your proposal:

Mixed Methods
Positional/review
Qualitative
Quantitative
Theoretical

Q3. Proposal title

All submissions must provide either a **presentation title** or a **session title** here. Please read and follow these instructions carefully.

Stand-Alone Papers, Posters, and Roundtables: Enter your presentation title.

Symposium: Enter the session title.

Related Paper Sets: Related paper sets will involve one submission from a session organizer that includes the full proposal; and additional submissions by the presenting authors. The latter are used to collect author and presentation information.

- If you are a session organizer submitting the full proposal on behalf of a Related Paper Set, enter the session title.
- If you are submitting an individual presentation within a Related Paper Set, enter your presentation title here, and enter the session title in the next field.

Q4. If your presentation is part of a Related Paper Set, enter the session title here

If you are submitting one of the presentations included in a Related Paper Set proposal, please enter your presentation title above, and enter the Related Paper Set session title here. This will allow us to place your submitted presentation within the session.

Q5. Abstract

Enter an abstract of your proposed presentation or session (max 200 words). The abstract will be provided to reviewers. If your proposal is accepted, the abstract will be made available to all conference attendees in the conference program.

Do not include any identifying information in your abstract.

Do not use ALL CAPS, all lowercase letters, or undefined abbreviations in your abstract. Please write in complete sentences.

Q6. Authors and Affiliations

IMPORTANT: Please check with your co-authors or session co-organizers regarding their correct affiliation and email address. They will be identified by the email address they used in the Oxford Abstracts system. If you enter a different email address for them, it will be treated as a different person.

Presentations and panels may have up to TEN authors, including yourself.

Stand-Alone Papers, Posters, Roundtables: Enter the names of ALL authors - including yourself - in the order in which you wish them to appear in the program. Omitted names will not appear in the author index or in the final program. At least one author must be identified as the Presenting Author.

Symposia: Enter the names of all panelists - including yourself - in the order in which you wish them to appear in the program. Omitted names will not appear in the author index or in the final program. **Check the Presenting Author box to identify one panelist who will act as President.**

Related Paper Sets:

Session organizer: If you are the lead organizer of this Related Paper Set and are submitting the session proposal, enter information for yourself and any co-organizers. **Check the Presenting Author box to identify one organizer who will act as Presider.**

Paper authors: If you are submitting an individual paper within a Related Paper Set, enter the authors - including yourself - in the order in which you wish them to appear in the program. At least one author must be designated as the Presenting Author.

Q7. Strands

All proposals are associated with one of the Strands. Please select the appropriate Strand for this proposal.

Q8. Presentation format

Please choose the preferred presentation or session format. The format types are:

Stand-Alone Paper

Poster

Roundtable

Work-in-progress Roundtable

Symposium

Related Paper Set

For Stand-Alone Papers, Posters, and Roundtables, Strand Coordinators will endeavor to respect your preferred format, but limitations on available space and time slots may require that your presentation be assigned to a different format. You may choose an acceptable alternative format in the next form field.

The final decision regarding presentation format rests with the Program Chairs.

Q9. Alternative presentation format

For Stand-Alone Paper, Poster, and Roundtable presentations, please select an acceptable alternative format to be used if your preferred format is not available. We will endeavor to respect your preferred format. Leaving the alternative format blank will not affect the likelihood that your presentation will be accepted.

Q10. Alternative room layouts for Symposium and Related Paper Set sessions

If your Symposium or Related Paper Set session requires an alternative room setup, you must explain it in the proposal PDF and select the most appropriate room setup. The alternative setup options are theater seating with long tables for poster boards; and round tables. If you do not make a selection, standard theater seating is assumed.

Q11. Proposal PDF

Most submissions will include a full proposal for peer review.

Related Paper Sets require submission of a single proposal describing the session. Individual presentations within the Related Paper Set are submitted with author and presentation information but do not include individual proposals.

To prepare your proposal, refer to the Proposal Formatting guidelines described above. Proposal files will be examined by Strand Coordinators, and proposals that do not conform to the guidelines must be corrected and replaced before they can be reviewed.

Upload your proposal file as a PDF document of 20 MB or less.

Your proposal PDF file will be renamed automatically to help mask the identity of the authors and submitter.

Q12. In-person / Virtual Presentation

The NARST 2026 conference is being planned as an in-person event, with an additional day (April 9) dedicated entirely to virtual presentations. Given the significant costs involved, we are not planning to allow remote presentations during in-person sessions, and we are not planning to live-stream any in-person sessions.

If you are unable to travel to the in-person conference but wish to present during the online conference day (April 9), select the Virtual Presentation option. All presentation and session formats will be considered for the virtual sessions, but the allotted time may differ from an in-person presentation.

Your choice of In-person vs Virtual Presentation will not be visible to reviewers and will not affect the accept/reject decision.

Q13. Your time zone (virtual presentations only)

If you are planning to present during the Virtual Conference Day on April 9, 2026, please indicate the band of time zones closest to your physical location. This will help us to schedule presentations at reasonable times for the presenters.

Q14. Volunteer to serve as a session presider

Conference sessions benefit from having a Presider who keeps the session on time. Stand-Alone Paper Sets and Roundtable sessions depend on volunteers to act as Presider. Please volunteer! We will endeavor to match your expertise with an appropriate topical session, will only assign you as Presider for one session, and will re-confirm your availability well in advance of the conference. To volunteer, please select 1-3 Strands for which you would be willing to act as a Presider for one Stand-Alone Paper Set or Roundtable session.

Q15-17. Volunteer to review

Careful peer review is crucial to the quality of the NARST Conference. Reviewers are leadership roles that may contribute to your professional development and can be notated on your curriculum vita.

Please consider volunteering to be a proposal reviewer by completing this section of the proposal submission form. You will be asked to select 1-3 appropriate Strands, to choose the number of proposals you are willing to review, and to select 2 keywords that best fit your reviewing expertise.

Some conference proposal reviewers are not planning to submit a proposal, but will be co-authors or session co-organizers, or are willing to review even if they cannot attend the conference. If you will not be submitting a proposal but are willing to review, please complete the Volunteer to Review form. A link will be provided on the conference website at:

<https://narst.org/conferences/2026-annual-conference>

Thank you in advance for contributing to the success of the conference!

Other Information

Reviewer Rubric and Checklist

See the Reviewer Rubric in this document for a more complete description of the review criteria. In addition, the checklist at the end of this document may help you to ensure you have addressed the proposal requirements.

Answers to **Frequently Asked Questions** (FAQs) regarding preparation and submission of proposals are available at <https://narst.org/conferences/faq>. The FAQ will be updated periodically to address new recurring questions.

Confirmation of Submission

All proposal submission and updates including completion of the submission process will be acknowledged by auto-generated email to the submitting author or session organizer. Additionally, when all required information has been provided, the submitter's OAS Dashboard will list the proposal as Complete rather than Incomplete.

Only the submitter will be able to view the proposal and its reviews in OAS.

Only the submitter will receive the decision email.

The submitter is responsible for relaying information about submissions, reviews, and decisions to their co-authors or co-organizers.

To inquire about your proposal, please contact paulkemp@narst.org, and provide the proposal ID number in addition to your name.

Submission Deadline

The submission deadline is **5:00 pm (17:00) YOUR local time on Friday, August 15, 2025** (the annual NARST proposal submission deadline). Typically, over 90% of proposals are submitted in the final 72 hours. This rush can result in system slowdowns. We encourage you to submit your proposal before these last hours to avoid potential delays.

Requirements for Presenting Authors

All presenting authors on accepted proposals must register for the conference. The **presenting author(s) must register for the Annual International Conference by the close of the Advance Registration period, to be announced**. Registration reminders will be emailed. Presenting authors who do not register by the Advance Registration deadline may have their presentation removed from the conference program. It is the responsibility of each presenting author to comply with this requirement. By submitting a proposal, you agree that the Presenting Author will register by the deadline or the presentation will be removed from the program.

Registration Requirement

All presenting authors – and all conference attendees – are required to register for the NARST Annual International Conference. Conference registration opens in early December.

Presentation Needs at the In-Person Conference

One LCD projector and screen are provided in each presentation room throughout the conference for Stand-Alone Papers, Related Paper Sets, and Symposia. Computers, speakers, and other presentation devices are not provided, so you will need to make your own arrangement for the presentation of electronic material. Please bring connectors as needed.

NARST Proposal Review Rubric

For each category, 3-4 criteria are required. Given the constraints of the 5-page limit for individual paper, poster, and roundtable proposals (10-page limit for related paper set and symposium session proposals), please assign a numerical rating using the following descriptors as a guide:

5	Highly evident:	Proposal provides clear, substantive, and coherent evidence of all criteria
4	Adequately evident:	Proposal adequately describes all criteria in the category.
3	Mostly evident:	Proposal adequately describes 2 out of 3 criteria in the category
2	Somewhat evident:	Proposal adequately describes 1 out of 3 criteria in the category
1	Not evident	Proposal does not adequately describe any of the criteria in the category

You should explain your numerical ratings by responding to the rubric questions with constructive feedback identifying the proposal's strengths and weaknesses in the text boxes provided. Answering Yes or No to the criteria questions is not considered acceptable feedback. With respect to proposals for related paper sets and symposia, your comments should reflect the quality of *each* of the papers included in the proposal in addition to your summative recommendation and underlying rationale for the proposal as a whole. Reviews should be constructive and respectful.

Subject/Problem

1. Is there a clear focus for the study?
2. Does the proposal include a clear rationale for the study?
3. Does the proposal describe the model, theoretical framework, or philosophy of the study?

Design or Procedure

Research Papers [Empirical Studies]

1. Does the proposal clearly describe the methodology (theory of method)?
2. Does the proposal clearly describe the research methods, design, and study context?
3. Are the methodology, procedure, and design appropriate for the study and clearly aligned with the problem?

Theoretical Papers [Non-Empirical Studies (e.g., conceptual or position papers, reviews of literature)]

1. Does the proposal clearly describe the approach used to develop the argument or conduct the review?
2. Are the ideological/philosophical positions of the author and sources made clear?
3. Does the proposal include an appropriate range of literature?

Analyses and Findings

Research Papers [Empirical Studies]

1. Do the data analyses appear to be appropriate, coherent, complete, and aligned with the research questions?
2. Are the arguments or interpretations supported by the data and linked to prior literature?
3. Does the proposal discuss alternative interpretations, bias, reliability, or validity as appropriate?

Theoretical Papers [Non-Empirical Studies (e.g., conceptual or position papers, reviews of literature)]

1. Do the syntheses of ideas appear to be appropriate, coherent, and complete?
2. Are the arguments or interpretations supported by evidence?
3. Does the proposal discuss alternative interpretations, counterarguments, or bias, as appropriate?

Contribution

1. Do the conclusions add to, refine, or refute theoretical constructs?
2. Do conclusions contribute valuable insights and implications into teaching/learning/researching science education?
3. Does the proposal clearly address, and have implications for, equity issues related to NARST's goal of helping all learners achieve science literacy, including but not limited to race, sex, gender expression, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, access, ability, sexual orientation, language, national origin, and/or religion?

Cohesiveness* (Related Paper-Sets ONLY)

1. Are all of the papers in the set focused on a similar concept/theme?
2. Do all papers contribute new information to the set, making a meaningful strongly related whole?
3. Do all papers contain high quality information leading to a rigorous and comprehensive understanding of the theme?

General Interest

1. Does the content of the presentation promise to be of general interest to NARST members interested in this strand?

2. Is the content presented in a way that will be meaningful to NARST members interested in this strand?
3. Does the paper promise to be of interest to the education community at large?
4. For **Roundtables only**, has the author clearly articulated what they wish to discuss in the Roundtable session?

Overall Rating (1-not recommended; 5 highly recommended)

To maintain the high quality of NARST presentations, please ensure your recommendation aligns with your ratings.

Proposal Submission Checklist

The completion of this checklist may be helpful in ensuring your proposal meets the requirements.

- _____ Names of author(s) correct and consistent throughout
- _____ Used preferred email address for all co-authors
- _____ Submission is properly blinded
 - _____ Uses pseudonyms to mask locations that may identify author(s)
 - _____ Omit names or other information that may identify author(s)
 - _____ Specific descriptions (e.g., curriculum developed by authors) that may identify author(s) are made more general
 - _____ Third person is used to refer to self-citations
 - _____ In-text citations and the reference list use “Author” or “Authors” followed by publication date for self-citations and alphabetized accordingly
 - _____ PDF File/Properties does not have any references to name, institution or other identifying information
- _____ Format of the submission meets requirements
 - _____ 1” margins all around
 - _____ No font smaller than 12pt
 - _____ US letter size paper (8.5” x 11”) is used
 - _____ No more than 5 pages (excluding references) for paper, poster, or roundtable
 - _____ No more than 10 pages (excluding references) for symposium or related paper set
 - _____ Proposal does not include abstract (to be submitted separately)
 - _____ All citations included in the proposal body are included in the reference list
 - _____ References adhere to APA format
- _____ Submission indicates alternative presentation format, if applicable
- _____ Submission indicates alternative room setup, if applicable; reason for an alternative room setup is stated in proposal
- _____ For virtual-day submissions, submission indicated presenter's approximate time zone

Timeline

Target Date	Tasks
Tuesday July 1	Call for proposals.
Friday August 8	Solicit reviewers for Strands.
Friday August 15	Submission deadline for peer-reviewed proposals. OAS will then close for new submissions, remain open for edits.
~Thursday August 21	Requested revisions to proposals take place directly within OAS. Reviewers receive proposal assignments.
Tuesday September 16	Reviewers post completed proposal ratings and recommendations in OAS.
Tuesday September 30	Strand Coordinators submit Rating Summaries, recommend decisions and presentation formats, and propose SC-organized Paper Set sessions.
Mid-late October	Decision notifications are sent to submitting authors. Reviews are available to submitting authors in OAS.
December	Conference registration opens
February	Deadline for presenters to register; Advance Registration ends