



REVIEW CRITERIA FOR SPECIFIC SESSION FORMATS

1. Oral/poster presentation

Oral (or poster) presentations are individual contributions to the Summit program. Although the presentation may reflect the work of an individual or of a group or program, proposals in this category will most likely be presented during the conference by an individual. The Program Committee will determine whether each accepted submission will be assigned to a panel or poster session.

Use a scale of 1-10 to rate each item on each of the following criteria. Feel free to use the full range of the scale.

First consider six general criteria for all proposals/formats.

GENERAL CRITERIA	RATING SCALES (Select the number between 1-10 that best represents your rating of the item on each scale)
How well does the proposal align with the conference theme for which it was submitted? (See brief description of Themes, above.)	Not well at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very well
How relevant or important is the topic for our field (e.g. does it address issues and challenges that scholars and practitioners will find useful)?	Not at all original 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very original
How clearly are the ideas in the proposal expressed (e.g., objectives, concepts, examples, approaches can be understood; abstract is well organized & logical)?	Not clear at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very clear
How great is the potential of the proposal to expand and/or advance thinking about SBCC (e.g., does it provide and support new insights, new perspectives, new opportunities)?	No potential 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very high potential
How great is the potential audience learning, knowledge sharing, skills building, discussion and debate?	No potential 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very high potential
How appropriate is the proposal for the format for which it was submitted (can the objectives of the proposal be achieved in the format proposed)?	Not appropriate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Highly appropriate

The next two sets of criteria apply to Oral Presentation proposals/abstracts that are Research-oriented or Practice oriented. Complete only the set of scales that is appropriate.

CRITERIA FOR RESEARCH-ORIENTED PROPOSALS	RATING SCALES
--	---------------

	(Select the number between 1-10 that best represents your rating of the item on each scale)
Is the research question stated clearly?	Not clear at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very clear
How well does the research identify and help to clarify or resolve a gap in the literature or previous evidence? (e.g., citations are not necessary, but does the proposal acknowledge and build on existing knowledge)?	Not well at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very well
Is the research design appropriate for answering the research question? (e.g., are the right kinds of information collected/measured; are they measured well)?	Not at all rigorous or appropriate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very rigorous and appropriate
Is the analysis approach rigorous and does it address the research question?	Not at all rigorous or appropriate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very rigorous and appropriate
Are the conclusions and recommendations consistent with the evidence presented?	Not at all consistent 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very consistent

CRITERIA FOR PROGRAM-ORIENTED PROPOSALS	RATING SCALES (Select the number between 1-10 that best represents your rating of the item on each scale)
Does the proposal define clear recommendations based on the program experience??	Not clear at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very clear
How clearly does the proposal explain how evidence was used to inform program <u>strategies</u> or <u>approaches</u> ?	Not clear at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very clear
How well do program activities correspond to the strategy that was described?	Not well at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very well
To what extent are the practice <u>activities</u> guided by evidence?	Not much at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very much
To what extent do insights from this work have the potential for adaptation to new settings, replication or scaling up?	No potential 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very high potential

Finally, please provide an overall assessment of the proposal

<p>Please check one:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Definitely accepted this proposal for the Summit</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Accept this proposal for the Summit if time and space allow</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Do not accept this proposal for the Summit</p>
<p>If you wish to provide any additional comments about this proposal for the organizers to consider, please write them here (e.g., Any clarifications related to your ratings? Should planners consider the proposal for a different session format or theme? Consider for a poster session?)</p>

--	--

2. Performed Panels

Performed Panels consist of 3-4 related proposals submitted together that address an underlying idea, issue, topic, challenge, or question of interest. The related contributions may or may not relate to a single program but should provide a variety of perspectives that—taken together—reveal something greater than what the individual contributions themselves provide. Performed Panels may be research-oriented, program-oriented or both.

Please use a scale of 1-10 to rate each item on each of the following criteria. Feel free to use the full range of the scale.

First consider six general criteria for all proposals/formats.

GENERAL CRITERIA	RATING SCALES (Select the number between 1-10 that best represents your rating of the item on each scale)
How well does the proposal align with the conference theme for which it was submitted? (See brief description of Themes, above.)	Not well at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very well
How relevant or important is the topic for our field (e.g. does it address issues and challenges that scholars and practitioners will find useful)?	Not at all original 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very original
How clearly are the ideas in the proposal expressed (e.g., objectives, concepts, examples, approaches can be understood; abstract is well organized & logical)?	Not clear at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very clear
How great is the potential of the proposal to expand and/or advance thinking about SBCC (e.g., does it provide and support new insights, new perspectives, new opportunities)?	No potential 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very high potential
How great is the potential audience learning, knowledge sharing, skills building, discussion and debate?	No potential 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very high potential
How appropriate is the proposal for the format for which it was submitted (can the objectives of the proposal be achieved in the format proposed)?	Not appropriate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Highly appropriate

The next set of criteria applies specifically to Performed Panels.

CRITERIA FOR PERFORMED PANELS	RATING SCALES
--------------------------------------	----------------------

	(Select the number between 1-10 that best represents your rating of the item on each scale)
How strong is the justification that the individual contributions should be considered together as a preformed panel rather than as individual presentations?	Very weak justification 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very strong justification
To what extent do the individual presentations complement each other and contribute to the overall objective of the panel (e.g, are the presentations redundant or do they each contribute something unique)?	Not at all complementary 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Highly complementary
How well does the panel represent a variety of perspectives (e.g, conceptually, methodologically, institutionally, geographically) on the underlying topic?	Not well at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very well
Does the proposal describe clearly how the session will achieve synthesis or synergy across the individual contributions (e.g., is there a process for linking the separate presentations into a coherent whole)?	Not clear at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very clear
How much does this proposal add to the body of knowledge about effective SBCC?	Adds very little 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Adds a lot

Finally, please provide an overall assessment of the proposal

Please check one: <input type="checkbox"/> Definitely accepted this proposal for the Summit <input type="checkbox"/> Accept this proposal for the Summit if time and space allow <input type="checkbox"/> Do not accept this proposal for the Summit
If you wish to provide any additional comments about this proposal for the organizers to consider, please write them here (e.g., Any clarifications related to your ratings? Should planners consider the proposal for a different session format or theme?)

3. Skills Building Workshops

Skills Building Workshops provide participants with the opportunity to develop new or strengthen existing skills related to some aspect of SBCC practice and/or research. They should provide a genuine learning experience and be more than a simple description of or presentation about SBCC skills. Skills Building Workshops may be research-oriented, program-oriented or both. The length of a workshop is two hours.

Please use a scale of 1-10 to rate each item on each of the following criteria. Feel free to use the full range of the scale.

First consider six general criteria for all proposals/formats.

GENERAL CRITERIA	RATING SCALES (Select the number between 1-10 that best represents your rating of the item on each scale)
How well does the proposal align with the conference theme for which it was submitted? (See brief description of Themes, above.)	Not well at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very well
How relevant or important is the topic for our field (e.g. does it address issues and challenges that scholars and practitioners will find useful)?	Not at all original 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very original
How clearly are the ideas in the proposal expressed (e.g., objectives, concepts, examples, approaches can be understood; abstract is well organized & logical)?	Not clear at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very clear
How great is the potential of the proposal to expand and/or advance thinking about SBCC (e.g., does it provide and support new insights, new perspectives, new opportunities)?	No potential 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very high potential
How great is the potential audience learning, knowledge sharing, skills building, discussion and debate?	No potential 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very high potential
How appropriate is the proposal for the format for which it was submitted (can the objectives of the proposal be achieved in the format proposed)?	Not appropriate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Highly appropriate

The next set of criteria applies specifically to Skills Building Workshops.

CRITERIA FOR SKILLS BUILDING WORKSHOPS	RATING SCALES (Select the number between 1-10 that best represents your rating of the item on each scale)
How clear are the learning objectives for this workshop (e.g., is it clear what participants will learn)?	Not clear at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very clear
How well-suited are the learning activities for achieving the learning objectives (e.g., is it clear how the activities will result in learning)?	Not well suited 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very well suited
How interactive and engaging are the learning activities (e.g., hands on practice, sharing experiences, opportunities for feedback)?	Not very interactive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Highly interactive
Quality of the facilitation team: Are there enough facilitators proposed and do they cover the necessary skills/expertise to conduct the workshop activities effectively?	Definitely not 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Definitely yes
Can the proposed activities and learning objectives realistically be achieved within the allotted two hours?	Definitely not 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Definitely yes

Finally, please provide an overall assessment of the proposal

Please check one: <input type="checkbox"/> Definitely accepted this proposal for the Summit <input type="checkbox"/> Accept this proposal for the Summit if time and space allow <input type="checkbox"/> Do not accept this proposal for the Summit
If you wish to provide any additional comments about this proposal for the organizers to consider, please write them here (e.g., Any clarifications related to your ratings? Should planners consider the proposal for a different session format or theme?)

4. MULTIMEDIA SHOWCASE

Multimedia showcase sessions provide a forum for sharing and discussing multimedia products or materials used in SBCC programs. Media of all sorts are eligible for presentation but must conform to a 15-minute time limit (8 minutes for introduction/contextualization, 7 minutes to show/play/present the product). Submissions in a language other than English should be subtitled in English. Conference planners will organize accepted proposals into appropriate 90-minute sessions based on topics, media types, and content areas.

In addition to the 90-minute sessions, a limited number of Extended Screening sessions (120 minutes total) will be planned to accommodate longer media products that are up to 15 minutes in length.

Please use a scale of 1-10 to rate each item on each of the following criteria. Feel free to use the full range of the scale.

First consider six general criteria for all proposals/formats.

GENERAL CRITERIA	RATING SCALES (Select the number between 1-10 that best represents your rating of the item on each scale)
How well does the proposal align with the conference theme for which it was submitted? (See brief description of Themes, above.)	Not well at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very well
How relevant or important is the topic for our field (e.g. does it address issues and challenges that scholars and practitioners will find useful)?	Not at all original 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very original
How clearly are the ideas in the proposal expressed (e.g., objectives, concepts, examples, approaches can be understood; abstract is well organized & logical)?	Not clear at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very clear
How great is the potential of the proposal to expand and/or advance thinking about SBCC	No potential Very high potential

(e.g., does it provide and support new insights, new perspectives, new opportunities)?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How great is the potential audience learning, knowledge sharing, skills building, discussion and debate?	No potential								Very high potential	
How appropriate is the proposal for the format for which it was submitted (can the objectives of the proposal be achieved in the format proposed)?	Not appropriate								Highly appropriate	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

The next set of criteria applies specifically to Multimedia Showcase proposals.

CRITERIA FOR MULTIMEDIA SHOWCASE	RATING SCALES (Select the number between 1-10 that best represents your rating of the item on each scale)									
How clearly does the proposal describe the multimedia product (e.g., its purpose, format, content, use)?	Not clear at all								Very clear	
How well does the proposal explain how evidence and experience was used to inform the development and use of the multimedia product (e.g., inspired by/adapted from previous initiatives, supported by formative research, co-design with stakeholders, etc.)?	Not well at all								Very well	
How original is the multimedia product itself (e.g., in terms of content, format, technology or medium used)?	Not at all original								Very original	
To what extent do insights from this work have the potential for adaptation to new settings, replication or scaling up?	No potential								Very high potential	
How much does this proposal add to the body of knowledge about effective SBCC?	Adds very little								Adds a lot	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Finally, please provide an overall assessment of the proposal

Please check one: <input type="checkbox"/> This product should be considered for a 90-minute Multimedia Showcase session <input type="checkbox"/> This product should be considered for an Extended Screening Multimedia Showcase session
Please check one: <input type="checkbox"/> Definitely accepted this proposal for the Summit <input type="checkbox"/> Accept this proposal for the Summit if time and space allow <input type="checkbox"/> Do not accept this proposal for the Summit
If you wish to provide any additional comments about this proposal for the organizers to consider, please write them here (e.g., Any clarifications related to your ratings? Should planners consider the proposal for a different session format or theme?)

5. COMM TALKS

A Comm Talk provides a platform for one speaker to showcase well-formed ideas or to share personal experience or insights in 10 minutes or less. The topic should be something new or surprising, a challenge to the status quo, or a compelling new argument about or perspective on a well-established or accepted idea. Comm Talks should be presented in a narrative or story-telling format, rather than in a didactic or academic format.

Please use a scale of 1-10 to rate each item on each of the following criteria. Feel free to use the full range of the scale.

First consider six general criteria for all proposals/formats.

GENERAL CRITERIA	RATING SCALES (Select the number between 1-10 that best represents your rating of the item on each scale)
How well does the proposal align with the conference theme for which it was submitted? (See brief description of Themes, above.)	Not well at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very well
How relevant or important is the topic for our field (e.g. does it address issues and challenges that scholars and practitioners will find useful)?	Not at all original 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very original
How clearly are the ideas in the proposal expressed (e.g., objectives, concepts, examples, approaches can be understood; abstract is well organized & logical)?	Not clear at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very clear
How great is the potential of the proposal to expand and/or advance thinking about SBCC (e.g., does it provide and support new insights, new perspectives, new opportunities)?	No potential 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very high potential
How great is the potential audience learning, knowledge sharing, skills building, discussion and debate?	No potential 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very high potential
How appropriate is the proposal for the format for which it was submitted (can the objectives of the proposal be achieved in the format proposed)?	Not appropriate 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Highly appropriate

The next set of criteria applies specifically to Comm Talks.

CRITERIA FOR COMM TALKS	RATING SCALES (Select the number between 1-10 that best represents your rating of the item on each scale)
How likely is it that this presentation will capture the imagination of the audience (e.g., unique, provocative, challenging, surprising)?	Not likely at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very likely
How well does the proposal describe a narrative structure or natural story behind the talk (e.g., clear progression from introduction to development to resolution)?	Not well at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 Very well

How well does the proposal describe the evidence or experience underlying the story that is told (e.g., origins of the idea, supported by data)?	Not well at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Very well 10
To what extent does the talk draw broader conclusions or implications for the field beyond the immediate details of the story that is told (e.g., recommendations, new insights, new ways forward)?	Not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Very much 10
To what extent do insights from this work have the potential for adaptation to new settings, replication or scaling up?	No potential 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Very high potential 10

Finally, please provide an overall assessment of the proposal

Please check one: <input type="checkbox"/> Definitely accepted this proposal for the Summit <input type="checkbox"/> Accept this proposal for the Summit if time and space allow <input type="checkbox"/> Do not accept this proposal for the Summit
If you wish to provide any additional comments about this proposal for the organizers to consider, please write them here (e.g., Any clarifications related to your ratings? Observations about the proposal itself? Should planners consider the proposal for a different session format or theme?)

6. BLUE SKY SESSIONS

Blue Sky Sessions aim to provide an open forum for free-form “outside the box” group discussion about a topic or issue that pushes the boundaries of what is currently known or practiced and has the potential to be game changing for the field of SBCC. These sessions would bring together 4-5 people who have been wrestling with an issue; each speaker will provide a brief, provocative, 2-3 minute statement about their thinking on the issue. A moderator will then engage the speakers and the audience in responding to the ideas offered. No slide presentations or materials will be shared.

Please use a scale of 1-10 to rate each item on each of the following criteria. Feel free to use the full range of the scale.

First consider six general criteria for all proposals/formats.

GENERAL CRITERIA	RATING SCALES (Select the number between 1-10 that best represents your rating of the item on each scale)
How well does the proposal align with the conference theme for which it was submitted?	Not well at all Very well

(See brief description of Themes, above.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
How relevant or important is the topic for our field (e.g., does it address issues and challenges that scholars and practitioners will find useful)?	Not at all original									Very original
How clearly are the ideas in the proposal expressed (e.g., objectives, concepts, examples, approaches can be understood; abstract is well organized & logical)?	Not clear at all									Very clear
How great is the potential of the proposal to expand and/or advance thinking about SBCC (e.g., does it provide and support new insights, new perspectives, new opportunities)?	No potential									Very high potential
How great is the potential audience learning, knowledge sharing, skills building, discussion and debate?	No potential									Very high potential
How appropriate is the proposal for the format for which it was submitted (can the objectives of the proposal be achieved in the format proposed)?	Not appropriate									Highly appropriate

The next set of criteria applies specifically to Blue Sky Sessions.

CRITERIA FOR BLUE SKY SESSIONS	RATING SCALES (Select the number between 1-10 that best represents your rating of the item on each scale)									
How strong is the justification for a session focused on the proposed idea/topic (e.g., core idea seen in new ways, unsolved challenge, could be transformational)?	Very weak justification									Very strong justification
How likely is it that this session will capture the imagination of the audience (e.g., unique, provocative, challenging, surprising)?	Not likely at all									Very likely
How likely is this session to generate vigorous debate/discussion among participants (e.g., catalyze outside-the-box thinking)?	Not likely at all									Very likely
How high is the potential for this proposal to influence work across diverse settings and objectives (e.g., program practice, research, policy, stakeholder engagement, SDG topics)?	No potential									Very high potential
How well do the proposed speakers represent a variety of perspectives (e.g, conceptually, methodologically, institutionally, geographically) on the underlying idea/topic?	Not well at all									Very well

Finally, please provide an overall assessment of the proposal.

Please check one: <input type="checkbox"/> Definitely accepted this proposal for the Summit <input type="checkbox"/> Accept this proposal for the Summit if time and space allow <input type="checkbox"/> Do not accept this proposal for the Summit
If you wish to provide any additional comments about this proposal for the organizers to consider, please write them here (e.g., Any clarifications related to your ratings? Observations about the proposal itself? Should planners consider the proposal for a different session format or theme?