

NARST

A Worldwide Organization for Improving Science Teaching and Learning through Research

NARST

HANDBOOK

Approved by the Board

19 October 2012

Revised: April 2013, October 2013, April 2014, February 2016 and February 2021

Table of Contents

Awards Committee	7
Early Career Research Award Selection Committee	7
Call for nominations.....	7
Nominee Record Rating Sheet.....	8
Outstanding Doctoral Research Award.....	10
Sample Call for Submissions	10
NARST Outstanding Doctoral Research Award	10
Criteria for Judging.....	11
Rating Sheet for NARST Outstanding Doctoral Research Award	13
Sample Letter to Finalist for NARST Outstanding Doctoral Research Award.....	14
Sample Letter to Non Finalist for NARST Outstanding Doctoral Research Award.....	15
1) Distinguished Contributions Award.....	16
2) Doctoral Research Award	17
3) Early Career Research Award	18
NARST Fellow Award Program Rubric	26
Equity and Ethics Committee.....	29
Jhumki Basu Scholars Program.....	29
Purpose.....	29
Scholarships	29
Eligibility.....	29
Application	30
Selection	30
Jhumki Basu Scholarship Application Form.....	31
External Policy and Relations Committee	36
Becoming an Affiliate of NARST	36
Appointing designees	36

Affiliates Meeting(s)	36
Affiliation Report and Regular Review of the Affiliation	37
Disaffiliation	37
International Committee	38
Scholarships	38
Scholarship Application Procedures:.....	38
Selection process	38
NARST International Committee Scholarships Application	39
Strand Coordinator’s Recommended Groupings	49
Linking Science Educators Program (LSEP).....	50
Application	50
LSEP Reviewer Form	53
Program Committee	56
Annual Conference Proposal.....	56
Specific Coordinator Steps in Processing Proposals.....	56
Step 1. Checking that all proposals are complete, have the correct format, and have no indicators of names or institutions	56
Step 2. Redirecting Proposals and Checking for Proper Submission	57
Step 3. Selecting Reviewers.....	57
Step 4. Resolving Disputes and Conflicts of Interest	59
Step 5. Submitting Strand Decisions (September 30th)	59
Step 6. Submitting Recommended Groupings (September 30 th).....	60
Step 7. Recognizing Reviewers	62
Sample Reviewer’s Letter	68
Sample Reviews from NARST	69
Reviewer’s Rating Sheet for NARST Proposals.....	73
Ratings Summary Sheet for NARST Proposals	74

Publications Advisory Committee	75
Journal of Research in Science Teaching	75
JRST Editor Search Committee	76
Applications for New JRST Editorship	76
Sample Call for New JRST Editor	76
Responsibilities of the Position	76
NARST Commitments	77
Applications for Editor Position	77
Sample Criteria and Scoring for Candidates for JRST Editorship	78
JRST Editorial Board Slate	81
NARST/NSTA Research Worth Reading Recognition	82
Sample Letters/Messages for Research Worth Reading Recognition	84
Research Committee	86
Master Calendar for NARST Research Committee	86
Call for NARST Pre-Conference Workshops	91
Application Procedure	91
Review Process	92
Preconference Workshop Acceptance Letter	96
Preconference Workshop Declination Letter	97
Solicitation Guidelines for NARST Sponsored Presentations at the NSTA National Conference	98
Guidelines for Selecting NARST Sponsored Proposals for NSTA	98
Solicitation Guidelines for NARST Sponsored Presentations	98
The NSTA National Conference	98
Solicitation Letter for NARST Sponsored Presentations at NSTA Regional Conferences	99
Supplemental Proposal Information	100
NARST Research Committee Administrative Session Review Sheet	101

NARST Sponsored NSTA Sessions Review Sheet102

Sandra K Abell Institute for Doctoral Students.....103

 Request for Proposals to Host the Sandra K. Abell Institute for Doctoral Students.....103

 Background & Goals.....104

 Funding104

 Proposal Requirements.....104

 Budget.....105

 Additional Requirements105

 Submission Information.....106

 Review Process & Criteria106

 Resources to Support Proposal Development106

Pre-Institute Student Questions.....109

Critical Friends Photo Recognition Album or Crif-riph-recal.....110

Working Notes with Your Mentor(s)112

Post Participation Survey-Students.....113

 Pre-Institute Week.....118

 Post-Institute Week.....118

Sample Overview of SKA-SRI July, 20XX.....119

RIG: Contemporary Methods for Science Education Research.....121

 Purpose.....121

 Chair Selection and Rotation.....121

 Administrative Structure:.....121

 Potential Plans of Action.....122

Membership Committee.....123

 Documents and Sample Letters for Membership Committee.....124

 Mentor/Mentee Sample Invitation.....127

Elections Committee.....	132
Overview and Position Descriptions.....	132
Relevant Bylaws.....	134
Nomination Procedures:.....	134
Selection of Nominees Procedures.....	138
Assessment Rubric For Elections.....	138
Sample Letters.....	147
Graduate Student Committee.....	153
Graduate Student Research Symposium	153
Graduate Student Committee (GSC)	
Scholarships.....	154
Graduate Student Coordinator.....	155
Application Process	156
Website Committee	157

WARDS COMMITTEE

The Awards Committee consists of Chairs and co-chairs of the subcommittees responsible for award selections and would be convened by the Board Liaison when work and communication is needed across the sub-committees. At least two members on each subcommittee should be international NARST members. When needed to work or communicate across the Sub-Committees, the Board liaison may convene the Chairs and Co-chairs of the Sub-Committees as the Awards Committee. For example, the Board Liaison may convene the Sub-Committee leadership as the Awards Committee to decide how to use the one administrative session per Committee or to use the funds allotted per Committee.

EARLY CAREER RESEARCH AWARD SELECTION COMMITTEE

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

Nominations are invited for the NARST Early Career Research Award.

The NARST Early Career Research Award acknowledges contributions to science education through research by individuals during the five years immediately following receipt of the doctoral degree. To qualify for the award this year, the nominee must have received the doctoral degree on or after January 1. *All NARST members are encouraged to consider nominating an eligible and deserving early career member.* Self-nominations are not accepted.

The following supporting material must accompany nominations for the award

- a) a letter of nomination, which discusses the nominee's impact on the field,
- b) the nominee's vita,
- c) a two-page summary of the nominee's research interests, prepared by the nominee,
- d) three of the nominee's best papers, and
- e) three letters of support to be sent separately.

Six NARST committee members review each candidate independently. If you are interested in seeing the rating sheet that is used in this process, please request it from the Committee Chair.

Nomination materials should be sent to XXXXXXXX at the address below no later than November 15.

NOMINEE RECORD RATING SHEET

Nominee _____

I. Submitted Papers

Paper 1 Title: _____ **Low** _____ **High**

Intellectual Quality of Scholarship 1 2 3 4 5

Quality of Theoretical Foundations 1 2 3 4 5

Methodological Rigor 1 2 3 4 5

Creativity/Innovation 1 2 3 4 5

Paper 2 Title: _____

Intellectual Quality of Scholarship 1 2 3 4 5

Quality of Theoretical Foundations 1 2 3 4 5

Methodological Rigor

Creativity/Innovation 1 2 3 4 5

Paper 3 Title: _____

Intellectual Quality of Scholarship	1	2	3	4	5
Quality of Theoretical Foundations	1	2	3	4	5
Methodological Rigor					
Creativity/Innovation	1	2	3	4	5

Comments on Quality of the Papers:

II. Other Indicators (Vita Review)

Prominence of Journals in Which Published	1	2	3	4	5
Quantity of Publications	1	2	3	4	5
Research Conference Presentations	1	2	3	4	5
Research Grant Awards	1	2	3	4	5

Comments on Other Indicators:

III. Nomination Letters

Nominee’s Letter	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.0	2.5
Support Letter 1	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.0	2.5
Support Letter 2	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.0	2.5
Support Letter 3	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.0	2.5

Comments on the Nomination Letters:

IV. Summary

Total Numeric Rating _____

Overall Rank _____

Among Nominees _____
(1st, 2nd, etc.)\

OUTSTANDING DOCTORAL RESEARCH AWARD

SAMPLE CALL FOR SUBMISSIONS

The NARST Outstanding Doctoral Research Award Selection Committee invites all current NARST members who completed a dissertation within the 15 months prior to September 15, [current year] to submit an expanded ten-page abstract to the committee for consideration for the [following year] NARST Outstanding Doctoral Research Award. Nominations are to be sought from as wide a field of candidates as possible to be inclusive of gender, age and ethnicity.

Judging will occur in two rounds. The first round of judging will be based on the ten-page abstract. From these, a small group of finalists will be asked to submit one unbound copy of the complete dissertation. The final decision of the committee will be based on the complete dissertation. The first round of judging will be completed in November and all applicants will be notified. The recipient will be announced at the awards luncheon at the [following year] Annual International Conference in [location].

The committee welcomes doctoral dissertations from all research perspectives. The ten-page abstract should be structured to describe clearly the following: (1) the purpose or objectives of the study; (2) conceptual/theoretical framework; (3) research approach/method; (4) data sources and methods of analysis; (5) findings or results; (6) conclusions and implications; and (7) significance of the study.

Judging in both rounds (for abstracts and dissertations) will be based on the following three central questions: (1) Is the question being asked of importance to the community of science educators? (2) Are the research approach and its implementation thorough and appropriate for the research question(s)? and (3) Are the results and conclusions appropriate for the context of the study? Specific criteria considered in relation to these questions include: the significance of the research problem/area; conceptual/theoretical background; thoroughness of the research approach and methods; identification of conclusions/outcomes and their implications for science education; clarity and coherence of communication; and overall originality or creativity. In the past, successful applicants have been those able to make a case for the significance of their study to the science education community as a whole; and/or who convinced the reviewers of the originality of the questions asked or methods employed.

Submission Procedure: Persons wishing to be considered for the award must submit an e-mail with the following attachments (in pdf format): (1) one file containing a ten-page, double-spaced abstract (margins are limited to 1 inch all around using 12 cpi font); (2) one file containing a five page abbreviated bibliography; (3) one file containing a cover sheet which includes the author's name, address where they can be reached through December, [current year], e-mail address, telephone and fax numbers, title of the study, the name and address of the institution where the dissertation was completed, a list of the members of the dissertation committee, and the date the dissertation was passed. The cover sheet should be signed by the major advisor/professor/supervisor or chair of the dissertation committee. An electronic signature is acceptable. Alternatively, the dissertation supervisor/director can send an e-mail to the Chair of the Outstanding Doctoral Research Award Selection Committee endorsing the application and attesting to the accuracy of the information provided in the application. (Note: The title of the study should appear on the first page of the abstract, but the author's name and other identifying information should appear ONLY on the cover sheet.)

The Chair of the Outstanding Doctoral Research Award Committee must receive an email with all three attachments including major advisor's signature, at *e-mail address* no later than September 15. We regret that the committee will be unable to consider incomplete or late applications. Questions regarding this award should be e-mailed to the Chair of the Committee at e-mail address.

NARST OUTSTANDING DOCTORAL RESEARCH AWARD

CRITERIA FOR JUDGING

Please read each dissertation/abstract using the following criteria to make your evaluation. Each criterion is worth ten points (i.e., 10 is the highest possible score). Record your ratings for each dissertation/abstract on the rating sheet. Return the ratings sheets and any comments to the Chair of the Committee by the due date.

1.	Significance of the Research Problem	How important or critical is the research problem to the science education community and/or the education community at large? Does the study contribute significantly to the knowledge base in science education?
2.	Conceptual/Theoretical Background	Is the study embedded in theoretical constructs? Does the study fit or reinforce the belief system that underlies the paradigm, which the research follows?
3.	Research Approach	Is the research approach suitable to the question(s) asked (e.g. experimental, correlational, naturalistic, interpretive, ethnographic, historical, etc.)? Is the description sufficient to allow the reader to understand what was done? Are data gathering and data analysis procedures, and context of the study (e.g., sample, setting, description of culture, etc.) adequately described? Are the standards for judging the candidate's knowledge claims explicit, appropriate and well justified?
4.	Conclusions/Outcomes/Significance	Do the conclusions add to, refine, or refute the theoretical constructs? Are the conclusions valid and/or viable? Are they presented in a way that is meaningful to science educators? Are the implications of the study drawn clearly and well justified?
5.	Quality of Communication	Does the presentation of the dissertation demonstrate clarity, coherence, insightfulness, and incisiveness in communication? Is/are the genre(s) used throughout the dissertation appropriate and well justified?
6.	Originality/Creativity	Does the study break new ground? Does it involve risk-taking? Does it invite criticism?

PLEASE E MAIL YOUR RATINGS SHEETS TO [committee chair, give email address]

RATING SHEET FOR NARST OUTSTANDING DOCTORAL RESEARCH AWARD

Reviewer _____

Please rate each dissertation/abstract on each criterion using a ten-point scale in which 10 is highest and 1 is lowest. Each criterion is defined on the attached page.

Abstract ID	1. Signifi- cance	2. Background	3. Research Approach	4. Conclu- sions	5. Commun- ication	6. Origin- ality	Total (Max = 60)
01							
01	Comments:						
02	Comments:						

SAMPLE LETTER TO FINALIST FOR NARST OUTSTANDING DOCTORAL RESEARCH AWARD

[Address]

Dear [give name],

Thank you very much for participating in the NARST Outstanding Doctoral Research Award process for the Year [current year]. The committee's judging of the abstracts is now completed and I am pleased to inform you that your dissertation has been selected as a finalist for the award.

The final judging of the dissertation award is made on the complete dissertation, therefore I request that you send one, single-sided, unbound copy of the dissertation to me at the address below. Please ensure that any information, which might identify you, is removed so that judging is anonymous. I will arrange for copies to be made and sent to the committee members. In order to give me time to do this, and to allow the committee time to complete its deliberations, I need to have the copy of your dissertation by [date of deadline]. Please respond to me at once by email confirming that you have received this letter and that you intend to send your dissertation to arrive by the due date

The recipient will be announced at the awards luncheon at the [following year] NARST Annual International Conference in [location], although when the judging process is complete, you will be informed of the result.

Please accept my congratulations for being selected as a finalist for this award and I look forward to receiving the copy of your dissertation.

Yours sincerely,

Signed

Chair, NARST Outstanding Doctoral Research Award Selection Committee

Please send a copy of your unbound dissertation to the address below, to arrive by [give date]

Place name of Chair, address and contact details here

SAMPLE LETTER TO NON FINALIST FOR NARST OUTSTANDING DOCTORAL RESEARCH
AWARD

[Address]

Dear [name],

Thank you very much for participating in the NARST Outstanding Doctoral Research Award process for the Year [current year].

The committee's judging of the abstracts is now complete and I am sorry to inform you that your dissertation has not been selected as a finalist for the award. The judging process was very thorough and all abstracts received ratings that indicated they were of high quality. We are very pleased to see such high quality research being carried out by NARST members.

On behalf of the Committee, I thank you for your participation in the judging process and wish you the very best of good fortune in your future career.

Yours sincerely,

Signed

Chair, NARST Outstanding Doctoral Research Award Selection Committee

1) DISTINGUISHED CONTRIBUTIONS AWARD

NARST Distinguished Contribution to Science Education through Research Award Nominees

NARST seeks to improve science education through research. To this end, NARST desires to recognize and reward individuals who have made significant contributions to science education through research. Contributions may be of several types including, but not limited to empirical, philosophical or historical research, evaluative studies, policy-related research, and studies reflecting new techniques to be applied in research.

The recipient of the Award should have contributed over a period of at least 20 years since the award of his or her doctorate. This award is the highest recognition NARST can bestow for contributions to science education through exemplary, high quality research.

Nominations are due not later than 30 August xxxx to the address below.

All members are encouraged to consider nominating a leading figure in science education research for this award. Self-nominations are not permitted.

Please note that the award will be made to an individual who over a period of at least 20 years has:

- a) made a **continuing contribution** to science education through research;
- b) provided **notable leadership** in science education through research; and
- c) had **substantial impact** on science education through research.

All that is necessary to start the nomination process is for a NARST member to send a name or names with no more than a one-page letter supporting the nomination of the person.

Please send the names of nominees to the Chair of the Committee by e-mail.

2) DOCTORAL RESEARCH AWARD

NARST Outstanding Doctoral Research Award

The NARST Outstanding Doctoral Research Award Selection Committee invites all current NARST members who completed a dissertation within the 15 months prior to September 15, xxxx to submit an expanded ten-page abstract (in PDF format) to the committee for consideration for the xxxx NARST Outstanding Doctoral Research Award. Submissions are sought from as wide a field of candidates as possible, inclusive of gender, age, and ethnicity.

Judging will occur in two rounds. The first round of judging will be based on the ten-page abstract. From these, a small group of applicants will be asked to submit one copy (in PDF format) of the complete dissertation. The final decision of the committee will be based on the complete dissertation. All applicants will be notified of their status after the first round of judging is completed in early November. The recipient will be announced at the awards luncheon at the xxxx NARST Annual International Conference in yyyy.

The committee welcomes doctoral dissertations from all research perspectives. The ten-page abstract should be structured to describe clearly the following: (1) purpose or objectives of the study; (2) conceptual/theoretical framework; (3) research approach/methods; (4) data sources and methods of analysis; (5) findings or results; (6) conclusions and implications; and (7) significance of the study. It is suggested that nominees model their abstracts after conference proposals submitted for NARST: Abstracts should foreground rationale, methods, and results.

Judging in both rounds (for abstracts and dissertations) will be based on the following three central questions: (1) Are the research question(s) being asked of importance to the community of science educators? (2) Is the research approach and its implementation thorough and appropriate for the research question(s) asked? And (3) Are the results and conclusions appropriate for the context of the study? Specific criteria considered in relation to these questions include: The significance of the research problem/area; conceptual/theoretical background; thoroughness of the research approach and methods; identification of conclusions/outcomes and their implications for science education; clarity and coherence of communication; and overall originality or creativity. In the past successful applicants have been those who were able to make a case for the significance of their study to the science education community as a whole and/or who convinced the reviewers of the originality of the questions asked or methods employed.

Submission Procedure: An all-electronic submission process will be used. Persons wishing to be considered for the award should submit an e-mail with the following three attachments (in PDF format): (1) one file containing a ten-page, double-spaced abstract (margins limited to one inch all around using 12 cpi font); (2) one file containing a five-page abbreviated bibliography; (3) one file containing a cover sheet which includes the author's name, address where they can be reached through December of that year, e-mail address, telephone and fax numbers, title of the study, the name and address of the

institution where the dissertation was completed, a list of the members of the dissertation committee, and the date the dissertation was passed. This cover sheet should be signed by the major advisor/professor/supervisor or chair of the dissertation committee. An electronic signature is acceptable.

Alternatively, the dissertation supervisor/director can send an e-mail to the Chair of the Outstanding Doctoral Research Award Selection Committee endorsing the application and attesting to the accuracy of

the information provided in the application. (Note: The title of the study should appear on the first page of the abstract, but the author's name and other identifying information should appear ONLY on the cover sheet.)

The Chair must receive an email with all three attachments at xxxx no later than September 15, yyyy. We regret that the committee will be unable to consider incomplete or late applications. Questions regarding this award should be e-mailed to the Chair of the Committee.

3) EARLY CAREER RESEARCH AWARD

Early Career Research Award: Submission Invitation

The NARST Early Career Research Award acknowledges contributions to science education through research by individuals during the five years immediately following receipt of the doctoral degree. To qualify for the award this year, the nominee must have received the doctoral degree on or after January 1, (xxxx -5 years). All NARST members are encouraged to consider nominating an eligible and deserving early career member.

The following supporting material must accompany nominations for the award:

- a. a letter of nomination that discusses the nominee's impact on the field;
- b. the nominee's vita;
- c. a two-page summary of the nominee's research interests, prepared by the nominee;
- d. three of the nominee's best papers; and
- e. two additional letters of support to be sent separately.

Nomination materials should be received by the Committee, sent to Committee Co-chair at e-mail address no later than October 15, xxxx.

All-electronic packages (including PDF files of all the above mentioned documents) can be e-mailed to the Committee Chair. Hard copy packages can also be mailed to the Committee Chair at the following address:

Note: Eight committee members review each candidate independently. The rating sheet that is used in this process follows below:

NOMINEE RECORD RATING SHEET FOR EARLY CAREER RESEARCH AWARD

NARST

Assessor _____

Nominee _____

I. Submitted Papers

Paper 1 Title: _____ **Low** _____ **High**

Intellectual Quality of Scholarship	1	2	3	4	5
Quality of Theoretical Foundations	1	2	3	4	5
Methodological Rigor	1	2	3	4	5
Creativity/Innovation	1	2	3	4	5

Paper 2 Title: _____

Intellectual Quality of Scholarship	1	2	3	4	5
Quality of Theoretical Foundations	1	2	3	4	5
Methodological Rigor	1	2	3	4	5
Creativity/Innovation	1	2	3	4	5

Paper 3 Title: _____

Intellectual Quality of Scholarship	1	2	3	4	5
Quality of Theoretical Foundations	1	2	3	4	5
Methodological Rigor	1	2	3	4	5
Creativity/Innovation	1	2	3	4	5

Comments on Quality of the Papers:

II. Other Indicators (Vita Review)

Prominence of Journals in Which Published	1	2	3	4	5
Quantity of Publications	1	2	3	4	5
Research Conference Presentations	1	2	3	4	5
Research Grant Awards	1	2	3	4	5

Comments on Other Indicators:

III. Nomination Letters

Candidate's Statement	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.0	2.5
Nominee's letter	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.0	2.5
Support Letter 1	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.0	2.5
Support Letter 2	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.0	2.5

Comments on the Nomination Letters:

IV. Summary

Total Numeric Rating _____

Overall Rank

NARST Fellow Award Program

Rationale

The NARST Fellow Program is an award program that honors and recognize excellence in science education research and service. This program promotes and advances the NARST mission in science education, and the role of science education in the local and global community, by designating NARST members as Fellows. This program recognizes excellence in research and service that represents the full gamut of science education related work.

The NARST Fellow will be a current and active member of the NARST community. The award, which will honor and recognize the contributions of NARST members, will simultaneously provide opportunities for NARST members to engage in service to NARST and the broader science education community, and education community more broadly through (a) NARST Fellow Society (b) Mentoring (c) Advisory Roles, and (d) Fellows Award Committee.

Who is a NARST Fellow?

The NARST Fellow program is a NARST Award Committee effort that aims to recognize members who demonstrate significant research and service excellence in science education; that is, contributions and leadership in science education in formal and informal teaching and learning contexts through evidence of

- (a) a research trajectory that exemplifies continuous research contributions
- (b) service to NARST, local, and global science education communities
- (c) impact of research in science education (e.g. engagement with important and urgent questions, robust dissemination, development of new ideas, peer reviewed publications in high impact journals, application of research via professional development, research to practice initiatives; use of creative and alternative research methodologies)
- (d) impact of service in science education (e.g. service to NARST, evidence of community-research participations; collaborations and service with schools and other community organizations, application of research in practice, orientations of science education in the community, professional development, social justice and inclusive science education, international service)
- (e) current and active NARST membership of at least 10 years

Nomination Process

The information below is intended to give you basic information regarding how to apply for a NARST Fellow. We encourage you to nominate a qualified colleague for this prestigious award.

The nominee should be

- A current and active member of NARST for a minimum of 10 continuous years
- Consistent attendance and participation at NARST conferences
- Significant and excellence in contributions to science education research
- Significant and excellence in service to NARST, the profession, and science education community

The nomination is a two-step process. In the first step, a nominator must write a two-page letter of nomination addressing the selection criteria. A 10-page abbreviated vita of the nominee must be submitted with the letter. Both documents are submitted to the Chair/Co-Chair of the NARST Fellow program. The materials are reviewed by the NARST Fellow program committee. After review, nominees may be invited to submit a complete nomination package.

Nomination Materials

The complete nomination package contains:

- A letter of nomination. The letter is written by the nominator addressing the above criteria. A nominator can only nominate one person per cycle
- A statement of Research and Service (max: 3 pages) written by the nominee
- A nomination form provided by the nominee
- Two additional letters of support discussing the contributions of the nominee to the science education community (A letter writer may write only one letter of support for the nomination)
- The nominee's curriculum vita: Abbreviated 10-page CV which highlights research and service to the NARST and Science Education community

Timeline

- A call is issued for NARST Fellows in May
- A nomination letter and vita are submitted to the NARST Fellow Committee Chair/Co-Chair by the beginning of July
 - Only one letter will be accepted by an individual for nomination or support
 - Fellows may not self-nominate

- The first-round evaluation of the materials will be based upon:
 - contributions to the NARST mission
 - evidence of active and sustained research program
 - research contributions, which include (but are not limited to) the development of curriculum, research to practice initiatives...)
 - service to NARST, which includes (but not limited to) the work on committees, public support of science education, work in local, national, and global communities)
 - the emphasis of the review is on excellence in research and service, and advancing the NARST mission.
- The NARST Fellow program committee will review the materials and invite nominees for complete packages. These will be due to the committee Chair/co-Chair by the beginning of November. The nomination package must include the materials stated above and be submitted as one combined document.
- The second-round of review will involve in selection of a NARST Fellow designate(s). An application that is not selected can be resubmitted in the following years.
- Fellows will be announced in January, and will receive the title and award (framed certificate) at the annual NARST meeting
- The Fellow status can be revoked for misconduct, breeches in professional ethics, or when the Fellow is no longer merits the status. The revoking of the Fellow status requires a letter to the President of NARST and the NARST Board Liaison who passes the materials on to the Chair of the Fellow committee. Additional items may be requested to verify the request.

Criteria for Selection

Research Criteria

- Evidence of an active research program
- Engaging important and urgent questions that respond to 21st century science education
- Application of research in practice
- Quality of Peer reviewed publications
- Impact of Research

Service Criteria

- Service to NARST
- Collaborations with schools and other community organizations
- Professional development in schools, community organizations (funded vs. unfunded)
- Evidence of social justice and inclusive mission for science education

NARST Fellow Award Committee

The committee members will be selected from NARST members who volunteer to work with the Awards Committee. Subsequently, the expectation is that the committee will be comprised of a mix of volunteers and named NARST Fellows. A committee Chair and Co-Chair will be identified.¹

¹ Updated: September 8, 2020

NARST Fellow Award Program Rubric

Nominee: _____

Round I

On a scale of 1-10 (with 10 being the highest), rate the contributions of research and service as per the nomination letter. Focus on:

Criteria 1: Research

- _____ Evidence of an active and sustained research program
- _____ Engaging important and urgent questions that respond to 21st century science education
- _____ Application of research in practice
- _____ High quality peer reviewed publications
- _____ Impact of research

As you evaluate the research criteria, consider if the nominee's scholarship is active and if it reflects a research program that addresses urgent and important questions that respond to 21st science education issues. What are the contributions to the NARST mission? To what extent is the research program reflected in high quality peer reviewed science education/and or related journals. Does the body of published research reflect an active and sustained program? What are the research contributions? Is there evidence of research to practice initiatives? Does the body of published research target critical and urgent issues in science education? What is the nature of the impact of the research program?

Criteria 2: Service

- _____ Service to NARST
- _____ Service to local, national and global communities
- _____ Collaboration with schools and/or community organizations
- _____ Professional development in schools, community organizations
- _____ Evidence of social justice and inclusive mission for science education

As you evaluate the service criteria, consider the nature of the nominee’s service to NARST, their local, national and global communities. In what ways have they provided service that is impactful? Is there evidence of public support for science education? What are the nature of the collaborations? And are these collaborations related to (a) funded projects (b) university-partnerships (c) volunteer work? Is professional development provided as part of service, application of research, funded and unfunded projects, volunteer service? Is there evidence of a social justice and inclusive mission for science education?

Comments:

Round II

On a scale of 1-10 (with 10 being the highest), rate the contributions of research and service as per the Statement of Research and Service. Focus on:

Criteria 1: Research

- _____ Evidence of an active research program
- _____ Engaging important and urgent questions that respond to 21st century science education
- _____ Application of research in practice
- _____ High quality peer reviewed publications
- _____ Impact of research

Criteria 2: Service

- _____ Service to NARST
- _____ Service to local, national and global communities
- _____ Collaboration with schools and/or community organizations
- _____ Professional development in schools, community organizations
- _____ Evidence of social justice and inclusive mission for science education

Comments:

On a scale of 1-10 (with 10 being the highest), rate the contributions of research and service for the following documents.

To what extent do the supporting letters describe a nominee that is deserving of being named a NARST Fellow? Do the support letters provide a compelling case for the nominee's research and service?

_____ Support Letter 1

Comments:

_____ Support Letter 2

Comments:

EQUITY AND ETHICS COMMITTEE

JHUMKI BASU SCHOLARS PROGRAM

APPLICATION DEADLINE: OCTOBER 30

PURPOSE

As part of NARST's mission to broaden and diversify membership, the NARST Equity and Ethics (E & E) Committee offers a Scholars Program for members from underrepresented groups within the United States (see Eligibility #2 below). The program is designed to support and to nurture promising young scholars (advanced doctoral students, postdoctoral fellows, and junior faculty) from underrepresented groups. It is more than a financial stipend – it is intended to intellectually support the development of Scholars' programs of research. Scholars are required to participate in the NARST Pre-Conference Workshop to help them craft questions, strengthen their theoretical frameworks, and improve their research skills. Scholars are also invited to participate in other NARST events and to contribute to science education research, scholarship, and leadership more broadly.

SCHOLARSHIPS

Fifteen scholarships in the amount of \$700 each are offered to defray expenses to attend the NARST Conference, and the Pre-conference Workshop offered by the NARST Equity and Ethics Committee. The scholarship to be used for conference-related expenses, which may include conference registration fee, air travel, lodging, and ground transportation. Calls for application will be sent to NARST members at the beginning of September. Applications will be due by the end of October. Scholarship recipients will be notified at the beginning of December.

Note: Awards are available to support members outside the U.S. through the NARST International Committee.

ELIGIBILITY

An applicant should meet the following criteria:

1. Member of NARST;
2. Member of an underrepresented group, as defined by the charge of the Equity and Ethics Committee as follows: "The Equity and Ethics Committee is responsible for providing leadership and guidance to the Association on issues of equity, including but not limited to gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, disabling conditions, sexual orientations, language and religion."
3. Advanced-level doctoral student or junior scholar within 6 years of completion of doctoral degree;
4. Attends or works at a US university at the time of application;
5. Agrees to participate in the NARST Pre-conference Workshop offered by the Equity and Ethics Committee

Note: Recipients of the previous year's NARST Jhumki Basu Scholars Program are not eligible. Members may re-apply more than once, but may not receive the award in two consecutive years.

APPLICATION

Information about this Scholars Program, along with the application form, is available on the NARST website (<http://www.narst.org/applications/scholarships.cfm>). Applicants must include the following in their application: (a) the application form, (b) a 2-page vitae, and (c) a 2-4 double spaced statement of research interests.

Please combine these three application materials into **one** Word or PDF file. Submit your document electronically to Chair(s) of the Equity and Ethics Committee, no later than **October 30 20xx**:

name

email:

phone:

It is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure that the application is complete and that it has been received. There could be problems in email communication. The Chair(s) will notify the applicant electronically when the application is received. Please keep this email communication for your records.

SELECTION

The Equity and Ethics Committee will select scholars by consensus based on the merit and need of applicants. Selection will favor first time applicants. Further, selection will favor those who demonstrate that: (a) their personal backgrounds as members of underrepresented groups can provide unique insights about science teaching and learning among students traditionally marginalized in science education, (b) their research and scholarship will contribute to the knowledge base on equitable educational opportunities and science achievement among marginalized students, and (c) their work will contribute to the diversity-related mission and goals of NARST (see <http://narst.org>). These points should be addressed in the 2-4 page statement of research interests. Finally, selection will favor applicants who will attend the Pre-conference Workshop and present at the 20XX NARST Conference.

To protect the anonymity and integrity of the selection process, the Chair(s) of the Equity and Ethics Committee will:

- Solicit, collect, and blind the applications;
- Not engage in the review of the candidates or cast votes for recipients, including in the case of a tie;
- Distribute and synthesize the recommendations of the sub-committee members who review the applications;
- Report to the NARST Board of Directors and the applicants regarding final awardees and alternates.

Any member of the NARST Equity and Ethics Committee applying for the scholarship will be excluded from **the selection** sub-committee and the selection process.

NARST ANNUAL CONFERENCE

JHUMKI BASU SCHOLARS PROGRAM APPLICATION EQUITY AND ETHICS COMMITTEE

APPLICATION DEADLINE: OCTOBER 30

I. Contact Details	
Last name:	
First name:	
Email address:	
Institution:	
Institution address:	
Mailing address:	
Telephone number:	
Fax number:	
II. Current Status	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Are you a science education graduate student studying in the US.
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Are you a science education scholar within six years of completion of Ph.D. and working in the U.S.
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Will you receive other financial aid to attend the 20XX NARST conference?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Are you currently funded through a graduate assistantship, fellowship, or grant? If yes, specify the amount and duration of the funding:

III. Eligibility	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Are you a current member of NARST?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Do you attend or work at a U.S. university?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Have you ever received a NARST Jhumki Basu Scholars Award? If yes, what year(s) did you receive the award?
	The year that you obtained (or will obtain) your doctoral degree:
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Did you submit a proposal(s) to the 20XX NARST Annual Conference? If yes, what is the title(s) of the proposal(s) you submitted? 1. 2. 3.
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Have yet to hear	Has your proposal(s) to the 20XX NARST Annual Conference been accepted?
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Are you willing to participate in the Pre-conference Workshop offered by the NARST Equity and Ethics Committee?

IV. Additional Information

The charge for the Equity and Ethics Committee is to provide *“leadership and guidance to the Association on issues of equity, including but not limited to gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, disabling conditions, sexual orientations, language and religion.”*

With the above charge in mind, **please describe your eligibility in one paragraph.**

Please merge this application form with the two additional documents listed below into one Word or PDF file.

- A curriculum vitae (maximum of 2 pages) describing your education, research, and work experiences in science education
- A statement of research interests and current research activities (2-4 pages, double spaced)

One must be a graduate student or have received their doctoral degree within the last 6 years to be eligible for this scholars program. Please have your advisor or department chair (electronically) sign below or send a separate email verifying this is indeed the case.

Name of Graduate Advisor or Department Chair:

Signature:

Date:

JHUMKI BASU SCHOLARSHIP APPLICATION FORM

Submitted to the NARST Equity and Ethics Committee

Application Deadline: October 30, 20xx

This form serves two purposes: (1) assessing your eligibility for the scholarship and (2) collecting contact details to keep you informed about the status of your application. For matters of the administration of NARST and the Equity and Ethics Board other details are collected as well, but completing is optional. Please complete the form by using a word processor.

1. Contact details

Last name:

Middle name(s):

First name:

Address and telephone numbers where you
can be reached during the daytime hours.

Street:

City:

State:

County:

Zip:

Office phone:

Home phone:

E-mail:

2. Eligibility

Are you a member of NARST? Yes No

Are you a U.S. citizen or a permanent resident in the U.S.? Yes No

Did you submit a paper(s) proposal to the XXXX (year) NARST conference? Yes No

Title(s) of the paper(s) proposals you submitted:

1.

2.

3.

The year that you obtained (or will obtain) your doctoral degree:

Are you willing to participate in the NARST pre-conference workshop to be offered by the Equity and Ethics Committee? Yes No

The charge for the Equity and Ethics Committee is to provide "leadership and guidance to the Association on issues of equity, including but not limited to gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, disabling conditions, sexual orientations, language and religion."

With the above charge in mind, please describe your eligibility in a paragraph or two below.

3. Current institution and position:

Are you currently funded through a graduate assistantship, fellowship, or grant? Yes

No

If yes, specify the amount and duration of the funding:

Will you get financial assistance to attend the 2009 NARST conference? Yes No

EXTERNAL POLICY AND RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Affiliation Procedures

BECOMING AN AFFILIATE OF NARST

Ultimately, The Board determines external organizations with which NARST is affiliated. The NARST President will inform the society of the results of the decision. However, the External Policy and Relations Committee will evaluate all nominations for NARST to become an Organizational Member and make a recommendation to the NARST Board. Upon receiving a *Letter of Request* from a potential affiliate, the NARST Executive Director will forward the letter and documentation to the NARST President and the Board Liaison of the External Policy and Relations Committee. The External Policy and Relations Committee will review the documentation and will make a recommendation to the NARST Board of Directors. The application will be discussed at the next Board meeting, and any action items or further information needed from potential affiliate will be identified. If necessary, the External Policy and Relations Committee will convey information back to the petitioning organization, which will submit a revised *Letter of Request* and documentation. If necessary, the NARST Board of Directors will discuss the letter and documentation at the subsequent Board meeting or, if that is not possible, at another scheduled meeting, electronically, or via a conference call. After discussion and resolution of remaining issues, the NARST Board of Directors will vote on the request.

APPOINTING DESIGNEES

The NARST point of contact ("designee") for an affiliation may be a member of the NARST Presidential team. Alternatively, depending on specifics detailed within the Memorandum of Understanding, the point of contact may be a Board Member or a member of a NARST Standing Committee.

AFFILIATE MEETING(S)

The Affiliates Meeting (or meetings) will occur on an annual basis. The Affiliates Meeting(s) will take place via conference call, free video conferencing, or equivalent, or at the NARST Annual International Conference. Participants will include the NARST President (or other member(s) of the Presidential team), the NARST Executive Director, the Board Liaison and the chair(s) of the External Policy and Relations Committee, and Board Members representing other relevant NARST Standing Committees, as well as each of the designees from the Affiliates. A member of the NARST

Presidential team and the Board Liaison to the External Policy and Relations Committee will facilitate the meeting.

The meeting will focus on issues of importance pertaining to the affiliates. If the meeting occurs at the NARST Annual International Conference, whenever possible, arrangements will be made so that Affiliate representatives who are not able to attend the NARST Annual International Conference can participate without being physically present. The meeting will typically last no longer than three hours.

AFFILIATION REPORT AND REGULAR REVIEW OF THE AFFILIATION

The External Policy and Relations Committee (and, possibly, other committees) will review the Affiliation Memorandum of Understanding and the Affiliation Reports on a regular basis.

DISAFFILIATION

In some instances the letter of disaffiliation may serve as notice indicating that the Affiliation is in a probationary status and stating specific steps that must be taken to rectify the probationary status within 12 months. In others, this may serve as notice of the disaffiliation itself.

MISSING CONTENT (in comparison to the P&P document)

- No mention of coordination with Stands 15: Policy, Reform, and Program Evaluation
- A detailed procedure related to Affiliation Renewals should be added to the Handbook (EPRC will propose this at the next meeting suggesting a categorization for two-types of affiliations)
- A detailed procedure related to Policy Briefs should be added to the Handbook. The detailed language in the P&P document should be deleted. (EPRC will propose a detailed process for Policy Briefs at the next meeting)

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE

The membership consists of 9-13 members including a Chair. The Board Liaison (the International Coordinator) is a Board Member elected by the members of NARST. The NARST President-elect appoints the other members of whom at least two must be International NARST members, with two to four members rotating out every year from their three years of service. The President and Executive Director also act as ex-officio members. In the third year of the International Coordinator's service on the Executive Board, a new International Coordinator is elected in the Board elections. We ask the exiting coordinator to serve as a liaison to the incoming International Coordinator for the next year as an ex officio, non-voting Board member.

SCHOLARSHIPS

SCHOLARSHIP APPLICATION PROCEDURES:

Applicants should

- a. Fill out the attached application form
- b. Provide evidence for needing support

Please combine all materials into one word or PDF file and submit your document electronically to Mei-Hung Chiu, Chair of the International Committee, no later than December 14, 20xx.

SELECTION PROCESS

The International Committee will decide scholarships by consensus based on the merit and need of applicants. Preference will be given to applicants who will present papers at the conference. In order to protect the anonymity and integrity of the selection process, the chair of the International Committee, who is not eligible to apply for the scholarships, will:

1. Solicit, collect, and blind the applications.
2. Not engage in the review of the candidates or cast votes for recipients, including in the case of a tie.
3. Remove those applications submitted by members of the international committee from reviewing their own applications.
4. Distribute and synthesize the recommendations of the committee.
5. Distribute and synthesize the recommendations of the Committee.
6. Report to the NARST Board of Directors and to the applicants regarding final awardees and alternates.

Application deadline for the scholarships is December 14.

Detailed information and the application form for the scholarships are posted on the NARST Web site.

Selection decisions: January 31, 20xx

Notification: Early February 20xx

NARST 20XX INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE SCHOLARSHIPS APPLICATION

Deadline: December 14, 20xx

Last name: _____ **First name:** _____

Institution name: _____

Institution address: _____

Mailing address: _____

Telephone:

Email:

Fax

Current status:

___ International science education graduate student studying outside the USA.

___ International science education scholar within 6 years of completion of PhD and working outside the USA

Have you ever received a NARST International Committee scholarship? Yes No

If yes, what year did you receive the scholarship? _____

Estimated budget:

Travel: _____

Conference registration: _____

Lodging/meals: _____

Other: _____

Other funding (source and amount)

- Please provide a written statement (a maximum of 300 words) describing the nature of your participation in NARST Conference (Title of your presentation or seminar in which you will participate...). In addition, describe the benefits you expect to reap from participating in the conference
- Please provide a written statement (a maximum of 300 words) describing your attempts to get other funding, if any.
- Please provide your curriculum vita (a maximum of 2 pages) describing your educational and working experiences in science education.
- Please provide your proposal for NARST 2009 if it is accepted for presenting at the conference.

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE SCHOLARSHIP APPLICATION

REVIEW FORM

APPLICANT:

Criteria that are not scored

Minimum criteria for eligibility:

In order to be eligible for the IC scholarship, the applicant should have “yes” response for the following items.

Yes	No	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Applicant is a current member of NARST
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Applicant resides outside of the US
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Applicant is either a current graduate student or an early career faculty member of researcher (within the 6 years of completion of Ph.D.).
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Applicant provides evidence of participating in the Annual Conference (e.g., presenting a paper, chairing a committee, or serving on the Board,etc.)

Applicants country income level (Refer to Appendix A)

Applicant’s country of residence:

Income level of applicant's country:

- Low income (Less than \$995 per capita/per year)

- Lower middle income (Between \$ 996-3945 per capita/per year)

- Upper middle income (Between \$ 3946-12,195 per capita/per year)

- Higher income (More than \$12,195 per capita/per year)

Criteria that is scored

SUMMARY TABLE

EVALUATION CATEGORY	POINTS	SCORES
	(MAX 3)	
1 Nature of Participation at Conference		_____
2 Benefits expected by attending		_____
3 Contribution or Potential Contribution to Field (see CV)		_____
	TOTAL	_____

One point for each following criterion

Criteria 1: NATURE OF PARTICIPATION AT ANNUAL CONFERENCE

- Description of participation included all required information requires – title of presentation, seminar, or role/position in service to NARST (**1 point**)
- Description of participation provides a **strong (2 pts)**, **fair (1 pt)**, or **weak (0pts)** argument as to why their attendance at the conference is necessary.

Criteria 2: BENEFITS EXPECTED BY ATTENDING

- Applicant describes how attending will benefit their own line of research and/or teaching. (**1 point**)
- Applicant describes how attending will benefit the goals of improving science education in their country of residence. (**1 point**)
- Applicant describes how their attendance may help with NARST's overall goal of expanding as an international leader for promoting quality science learning and teaching globally. (**1 point**)

Criteria 3: SCHOLARLY CONTRIBUTIONS OR POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE FIELD OF SCIENCE EDUCATION

(refer to CV)

- Applicant's CV demonstrates a strong record of scholarly research or activity through multiple publications, grants, and/or presentations at conferences. (**3 points**)

NOTE for assessors: Keep in mind that for graduate students a "strong record" may be shown more through collaborative work with advisors and conference presentations than actual publications and grants.

- Applicant's CV demonstrates a good record in mainly one of following scholarly activities: publications, grants, and/or presentations at conferences. (**2 points**)
- Applicant's CV demonstrates very limited record of any scholarly activities, such as: publications, grants, and/or presentations at conferences. (**1 point**)
- Applicant's CV did not include any scholarly activities listed. (**0 points**)

Overall Comments

APPENDIX A

Low-income economies (\$995 or less) – Scholarship amount \$1000

Afghanistan	Guinea	Nepal
Bangladesh	Guinea-Bissau	Niger
Benin	Haiti	Rwanda
Burkina Faso	Kenya	Sierra Leone
Burundi	Korea, Dem Rep.	Solomon Islands
Cambodia	Kyrgyz Republic	Somalia
Central African Republic	Lao PDR	Tajikistan
Chad	Liberia	Tanzania
Comoros	Madagascar	Togo
Congo, Dem. Rep	Malawi	Uganda
Eritrea	Mali	Zambia
Ethiopia	Mauritania	Zimbabwe
Gambia, The	Mozambique	
Ghana	Myanmar	

Lower-middle-income economies (\$996 to \$3,945) – Scholarship amount \$800

Angola	India	São Tomé and Príncipe
Armenia	Iraq	Senegal
Belize	Jordan	Sri Lanka
Bhutan	Kiribati	Sudan
Bolivia	Kosovo	Swaziland
Cameroon	Lesotho	Syrian Arab Republic
Cape Verde	Maldives	Thailand
China	Marshall Islands	Timor-Leste
Congo, Rep.	Micronesia, Fed. Sts.	Tonga
Côte d'Ivoire	Moldova	Tunisia
Djibouti	Mongolia	Turkmenistan
Ecuador	Morocco	Tuvalu
Egypt, Arab Rep.	Nicaragua	Ukraine
El Salvador	Nigeria	Uzbekistan
Georgia	Pakistan	Vanuatu
Guatemala	Papua New Guinea	Vietnam
Guyana	Paraguay	West Bank and Gaza
Honduras	Philippines	Yemen, Rep.
Indonesia	Samoa	

Upper-middle-income economies (\$3,946 to \$12,195) – Scholarship amount \$500

Albania	Mauritius	Suriname
Algeria	Mayotte	Turkey
American Samoa	Mexico	Uruguay
Dominica	Montenegro	Venezuela, RB
Colombia	Dominican Republic	Namibia
Cost Rica	Fiji	Palau
Cuba	Gabon	Panama
Antigua and Barbuda	Grenada	Peru
Argentina	Iran, Islamic Rep.	Romania
Azerbaijan	Jamaica	Russian Federation
Belarus	Kazakhstan	Serbia
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Lebanon	Seychelles
Botswana	Libya	South Africa
Brazil	Lithuania	St. Kitts and Nevis
Bulgaria	Macedonia, FYR	St. Lucia
Chile	Malaysia	St. Vincent and the Grenadines

High-income economies (\$12,196 or more) – Scholarship amount \$300

Andorra	Germany	New Caledonia
Aruba	Gibraltar	New Zealand
Australia	Greece	Northern Mariana Islands
Austria	Greenland	Norway
Bahamas, The	Guam	Oman
Bahrain	Hong Kong SAR, China	Poland
Barbados	Hungary	Portugal
Belgium	Iceland	Puerto Rico

Bermuda	Ireland	Qatar
Brunei Darussalam	Isle of Man	San Marino
Canada	Israel	Saudi Arabia
French Polynesia	Netherlands Antilles	Virgin Islands (U.S.)
Cayman Islands	Italy	Singapore
Channel Islands	Japan	Slovak Republic
Croatia	Korea, Rep.	Slovenia
Cyprus	Kuwait	Spain
Czech Republic	Latvia	Sweden
Denmark	Liechtenstein	Switzerland
Estonia	Luxembourg	Trinidad and Tobago
Equatorial Guinea	Macao SAR, China	Turks and Caicos Islands
Faeroe Islands	Malta	United Arab Emirates
Finland	Monaco	United Kingdom
France	Netherlands	United States
French Polynesia	Netherlands Antilles	Virgin Islands (U.S.)

LINKING SCIENCE EDUCATORS PROGRAM (LSEP)

APPLICATION

APPLICANT

PART A

<i>for administrative use only</i>	
Date	
Project Title	
Time Frame	
Keywords	(at least 3 keywords)
Task Group Chairperson (has to be NARST member)	(including address and e-mail)
Task Group Members	(including address and e-mail)
Name of the person submitting this form <i>if not the proposed Task Group</i>	(including address and e-mail)

<i>Chairperson</i>	
Objectives	(<50 words)
General Description (including names and institutions of resource persons who have to be NARST members. If not, they have to register before conducting the project)	(suggest approx. 2 pages)
Duration	
Audience (who and how many)	
Place	
Type of LESP	(Conference, workshop, lecture, etc.)
Program agenda	

<p>Outcome</p> <p>(please tick box)</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Yes No</p> <p>Journal papers</p> <p>Book</p> <p>Workshop or conference proceeding</p> <p>Set of instructional materials Database</p> <p>Web page</p> <p>Newspaper</p> <p>Other:</p>
<p>Dissemination Plan</p>	
<p>Budget</p> <p>(Total from all sources)</p> <p>Travel</p> <p>Administrative (copies of materials)</p> <p>Local transportation</p>	

Other (<i>describe</i>)	
Total (in USD)	
Requested from NARST	
External Funding Agency Applied to (if any)	
Anticipated Impact	
Criteria for Retrospective Evaluation	
Reference persons	

LSEP REVIEWER FORM

Applicant:

Country:

LSEP Type: (Conference/Workshop/Seminar) (choose one)

Summary Table

Review category

Points (Max 100 scores)

Scores

- 1 Applicant's Status 10
- 2 Meets LSEP Requirements 15
- 3 Content and Value of the Proposal 20
- 4 Contribution to NARST and International Community 20
- 5 Contribution to Applicant's Own Country and/or to country in collaboration 20
- 6 Qualification of Resource Persons 15

Total:

- i. Strongly recommend (85-100)
 - ii. Recommend (75-84)
 - iii. Recommend with reservations (60-74)
 - iv. Not Recommend (50-59)
 - v. Strongly not recommend (under 50)
-

Descriptions of review categories:

Scores

- 1. Applicant's status (10%)
 - (1) Applicant is a CURRENT member of NARST
 - (2) Applicant is the chair of science education association in his/her country
 - (3) Applicant shows strong competence in conducting LSEP

all fit well (7-10%) partially fit (3-6%) all NOT fit well (0-2%)

Comments _____

- 2. Meets LSEP Requirements (15%)
 - (1) An emergent need for improving science education quality (1-8%)
 - (2) Economically disadvantaged or underrepresented countries (1-7%)

Comments _____

3. Content and Value of the Proposal (20%)
 - (1) With the value of promoting science education (1-7%)
 - (2) Planned activity is feasible (1-7%)
 - (3) Anticipated outcomes could be achieved (1-6%)

Comments _____

4. Contribution to NARST and International Community (20%)
 - (1) Fulfill the mission in promoting quality of teaching and learning in science (1-10%)
 - (2) Fulfill the mission in communicating with researchers internationally (1-10%)

Comments _____

5. Contribution to Applicant's Country (25%)
 - (1) Fulfill the mission in promoting quality of teaching and learning in science (1-7%)
 - (2) Fulfill the mission in communicating with researchers (1-6%)
 - (3) Potential influence on changing science education policy (1-6%)
 - (4) Invite various types of participants to attend the activity (1-6%)

Comments _____

6. Qualification of Resource Persons (10%)
 - (1) Background and experience of resource persons in science education (1-5%)
 - (2) Appropriateness to the anticipated activity (1-5%)

Comments _____

General Comments:

PROGRAM COMMITTEE

ANNUAL CONFERENCE PROPOSAL

SPECIFIC COORDINATOR STEPS IN PROCESSING PROPOSALS

STEP 1. CHECKING THAT ALL PROPOSALS ARE COMPLETE, HAVE THE CORRECT FORMAT, AND HAVE NO INDICATORS OF NAMES OR INSTITUTIONS

All required information must be provided during the submission process. However, it is possible for proposers to submit information incorrectly or to not follow page limits or other rules. Therefore, please examine all proposals submitted to your Strand. For standalone paper, poster, and roundtable presentation proposals, check that the proposal has the name of the presenter(s), the abstract, and a PDF file with the paper and references (*no more than five pages excluding references*). For related paper sets, the proposal must include an abstract and a PDF with the paper and references (*no more than five pages excluding references*) for each paper in the set. Symposium proposals must have the abstract and a single PDF file with a summary of the symposium and references (*no more than 10 pages excluding references*).

To check your proposals, enter the proposal system and go to the section labeled “Strand Coordinator Tasks.” In that section, click on the link to “Manage All Proposals.” You will be directed to a page listing all of the proposals submitted to your Strand. Click on the proposal ID code for information about that proposal, including the title, abstract, all authors, and a link to download the proposal PDF file. At the bottom, you will see a link to “Assign Reviewer(s) to This Proposal”. The function of that link is described later in this document.

Be sure that all proposals are in the proper format and meet the submission rules (e.g. page length, masking the identities of the authors) (see Proposal Submission Checklist in appendices). If a proposal does not meet the requirements, please return the proposal once to the submitting author and note individuals have until the submission deadline if notification occurred prior to August 15 or 48 hours from the date of the notification to resubmit if notification occurred after August 15. We will allow one week following the submission deadline to make any necessary changes to proposals prior to review.

It is especially important to make certain the proposal is masked/ blind. Check every proposal to be sure that it does not contain any indicators of the submitting author or any co-author, including their institution(s). Examples of such indicators include citing a publication written by one or more co-authors or naming a project on which the authors worked. If you find indicators

of the author's identity, e-mail the submitting author and ask them to replace the file within the previously stated time periods.

Please note that most reviewers are also proposal-writers who are aware of the rules regarding masking of proposals. Upon finding identifying information, they may stop reviewing that proposal to report the identifiers to you. This slows down the review process. The best time to check for identifiers is before reviewing begins!

The week after the proposal submission deadline is the recommended time to assign reviewers to each proposal (see below). Approximately 10 days after the deadline, an e-mail message explaining the review process will be sent to all assigned reviewers.

STEP 2. REDIRECTING PROPOSALS

If you have received any proposal that you feel is more appropriate for another Strand, please notify the Program Coordinator with a specific suggestion for a more appropriate Strand. The proposal will be moved if the Coordinators for the other Strand agree to receive it.

If you deem the proposal is not an appropriate proposal for NARST and does not relate the NARST mission, you may decide not to send the proposal for external review. If you elect to do so, then please send the proposal with a justification to the NARST President and NARST President-Elect for their review and they will communicate with the author(s).

STEP 3. SELECTING REVIEWERS

Each proposal should receive three reviews and two must be performed by external reviewers. Preferably, all the reviews should be conducted by external reviewers, but the third review by a strand coordinator is acceptable. All reviewers must register in the proposal system. Most do so by having registered to submit a proposal. During registration in the proposal system, they are asked to identify Strands for which they would be willing to review. The volunteers for your Strand can be viewed using the "Manage All Reviewers" link in the "Strand Coordinator Tasks" section of the proposal system.

Many NARST members are willing to review proposals even if they have not submitted one for the upcoming meeting. We encourage you to reach out to other potential reviewers known for their expertise in your Strand's subject matter. It is imperative to get good reviewers as they serve as your advisors on accepting or rejecting a proposal. Their input is vital to maintaining a high quality of proposals presented at the conference. Since approximately 20-30% of proposals come from international members, please seek some international members as reviewers. Under Strand Coordinator Tasks, you will find a link to Prior Year Reviewers, a helpful, downloadable Excel file to assist you with identifying potential reviewers. You can solicit assessors by contacting individual NARST members. Please direct these additional reviewers to <https://proposals.narst.org> and ask them to register in the proposal system if they have not done so already. After registering and

logging in, they will find a link under User Tasks to [“User Account/Volunteer to Review Proposals and Preside”](#). They will be able to select the Strands for which they are willing to review.

BEFORE YOU CAN ASSIGN REVIEWERS, you must indicate which volunteers you will accept as potential reviewers for your Strand. Under Strand Coordinator Tasks you will see a link to “Manage All Reviewers”. That link will list all who of the individuals who have volunteered to serve as an assessor for your Strand (and they may have volunteered for other Strands). Click on each person’s name to indicate your acceptance. Until you accept a volunteer, that person will not be listed as a possible reviewer for any proposal in your Strand.

After completing this first step, you are ready to assign reviewers to proposals using the “Manage All Proposals” link, which displays all submissions to your Strand. For each individual paper, related paper set, poster, roundtable presentation, or symposium, you will need to assign 2-3 reviewers. Reviewers are not assigned to administrative sessions.

IMPORTANT: Most reviewers are willing to review multiple proposals, most will complete their reviews, and most have volunteered to review for more than one Strand. **Reviewers are a limited resource shared with other Strands. Please do not routinely assign 4 or 5 reviewers to each proposal submitted to your Strand; in effect, that would be consuming more than your fair share of a limited resource.** Each reviewer will indicate the maximum number of reviews they are willing to provide. After they have been assigned that maximum number they are no longer available to any Strand. We suggest that you **seek reviews from 2-3 individuals**, and check review progress regularly. Reminders work! Please reach out to reviewers who have not turned in a review. Shortly before the review period closes, a final email will be sent to all reviewers who have an outstanding review.

To assign reviewers to a proposal:

1. Click on Manage All Proposals.
2. Select a proposal by clicking on its ID.
3. At the bottom of the next page, click on Assign Reviewers to This Proposal. A list of available, accepted volunteers will be displayed.
4. Select 2-3 volunteers.

After reviewers have been assigned to all proposals in all Strands, an email will be sent to every assigned reviewer with instructions for their review. The review process cannot begin until you have completed your reviewer assignments!

Inevitably, some reviewers will be unable to complete one or more of their assigned reviews. Rarely, a proposal may have only one review submitted, or one of its reviews may be cursory, but if these situations occur, then please be prepared to expeditiously them.

The deadline for completed reviews is set each year, on or near September 15th. You can encourage your reviewers to submit early – the sooner you have reviews in hand, the sooner you

can begin making decisions. You will be able to monitor the review process for each proposal under the “Manage All Proposals” link. When all reviews for a given proposal have been submitted, a pink background (review is missing) will turn to green (reviews are in).

STEP 4. RESOLVING DISPUTES AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Strand Coordinators should submit a **final rating and recommendation** for every proposal. If reviewers disagree, you can either opt to elicit another external review or review the proposal and use your own judgment to reach a final decision. However, should you not be able to reach a decision, or have any other issue with a specific proposal, please notify the Program Coordinator who will endeavor to provide advice or will solicit advice from the Program Chairs.

If you have authored or co-authored a proposal submitted to your own Strand, or a proposal was authored by a close colleague, please ask your Strand Co-Coordinator to manage its review.

Please check the institution(s) at which the proposers work against the institution of the reviewer; this will help avoid conflicts of interest inherent in asking someone from the same institution to review a proposal.

All proposals should be sent to reviewers in the normal way, avoiding conflicts of interest to the best of your ability. However, please notify the Program Coordinator regarding any proposal that has a potential conflict of interest. Conflicts of interest and their resolution will be assessed by the President.

STEP 5. SUBMITTING STRAND DECISIONS

Reviewers vary in their scoring habits; one reviewer’s score for a particular proposal may appear much worse or better than another reviewer’s despite that they have written similar comments about the proposal. It is important to read all reviews fully before making your final accept/reject decisions. To view a reviewer’s written comments, go to Strand Coordinator Tasks, click on Manage All Proposals, and select a proposal. At the bottom of the abstract page, a list of assigned reviewers is displayed with the status of each review. If a review has been submitted, click on the “Read Review” link.

To submit your ratings, go to Strand Coordinator Tasks, click on the link entitled “[SC Recommendation \(Accept/Reject\)](#)”, where you will see a summary of the ratings from individual reviewers and a column entitled “Strand Coordinator Recommendation”.

Reviews are made available to the first author of all proposals. If you receive emails from authors asking where to find their reviews (often from co-authors who do not have direct access to the reviews), please forward them to the Program Coordinator who will respond on your behalf.

STEP 6. SUBMITTING RECOMMENDED GROUPINGS

After you have completed the process of accepting or rejecting proposals, your next task is to group individual proposals into recommended program sessions. Although the Program Committee Co-Chairs will make the final decisions on the conference program, they rely on you to recommend these groupings.

You will be advised of the total number of sessions slots allocated to your Strand for the conference. Allocations for a given meeting are based on the level of interest in each Strand, where interest is gauged by the distribution of submissions among Strands. Proposal formats that occupy an entire session slot (e.g., related paper sets, special symposia, and admin proposals) do not need to be grouped, but they do count toward your Strand's total allocation of session slots. To make your groupings:

1. Go to "Create A Grouped Session" under Strand Coordinator Tasks. Be sure that your Strand is selected.
2. Use the pull-down menu to select which type of grouping you are creating. The options are SC-Organized Paper Sets, Posters, and Roundtables. See below for more information about each type. We suggest that you work on poster proposals first, as they will all go into a single group.
3. Provide a recommended title for this grouping. Poster groups have a default title; please use it. The title for other groupings should reflect a theme common to the proposals placed in this grouping.
4. Select the proposals you want to group together by using the Ctrl key (Apple Command key on a Mac) to highlight specific accepted proposals in the right-hand column.
5. Next, identify a presider for the set. Individuals who have volunteered to act as Presider for your Strand are listed. Poster groupings do not require a Presider.
6. Finally, click on the "Save This Grouping". The grouped proposals will no longer appear in the right-hand column.
7. Repeat until all papers, posters, and roundtables have been grouped into sets.

Please submit your Rating/Decision and your Grouping/Format Recommendations by September 30th.

This deadline is set to allow us to post a draft version of the preliminary program in December.

Remember that you should attempt to honor the author's preference for presentation format, for instance by grouping Standalone Paper proposals into paper sets, and poster proposals into a poster grouping. You may need to put some stand-alone papers into poster sessions to remain within your allocation of session slots. You may also place poster proposals into a roundtable grouping, or the

converse. There is no distinction among the formats in terms of paper quality--all papers should be reviewed on their merit. **We advise against moving either poster or roundtable proposals into a SC-Organized Paper Set grouping.**

The invitation email sent to the authors of accepted proposals will include the grouping into which their proposal was placed. Some may choose to withdraw their presentation rather than change format, or may request reconsideration of your recommended grouping. Under most circumstances, the groupings will remain as recommended.

Grouping Paper Sets

You will create multiple Strand Coordinator (SC) Organized Paper Sets, recommend a title for each set, and select a presider for each set from a list of volunteers. Each grouping typically consists of 3-4 papers grouped around a common theme. Each grouping will count as one session toward your total allocation of session slots.

Grouping Posters

Group all accepted poster proposals into a single set named Strand [X] Poster Session (the default title will appear when you select the Poster format). No presider is needed for a poster set. The poster set does not count against your session allocation. Again, it is possible to move a proposal into the poster set even though it was not submitted as a poster. Try to respect the submitters' requested formats, unless it is not possible to do so and remain within your session allocation.

Grouping Roundtables

Roundtable presentations are a new, discussion-rich format in which presenters are literally seated at tables, typically with 3 or 4 presenters sharing a 1-hr time slot to discuss their work with one another and with interested persons who opt to sit at that table. All roundtables will happen simultaneously in a single time slot. Consequently, roundtable groupings do not count against your session allocation. However, the total number of tables is limited by the available physical space. **You may be allocated a maximum number of roundtable groupings, independent of your allocation of session slots.** Group 3-4 proposals based on a common theme and recommend a title for the roundtable grouping. It is not necessary to select a presider. Instructions will be provided at the roundtable for the presenters to follow. You may move a poster proposal to a roundtable format, or a roundtable proposal to a poster format.

STEP 7. RECOGNIZING REVIEWERS

Names of reviewers will be listed in the Annual International Conference program. *We also recommend that you send a letter of appreciation to your reviewers, which can be done using the Group Email function under Strand Coordinator Tasks.* We receive occasional requests for a more formal acknowledgement of reviewing. Please forward all such requests to the Program Coordinator.

APPENDICES for annual conference proposal processing

1. Proposal Submission Checklist
2. Reviewer's Letter
3. Reviewers' Rating Sheet
4. Ratings Summary Sheet
5. Strand Coordinator's Recommended Groupings

Administrative Sessions

In addition to peer-reviewed proposals, Administrative Session proposals may be submitted by Strand Coordinators, Standing Committees by way of Board Members, Research Interest Groups, and the NARST President.

Submission is optional and is not required. In addition, NSTA is allotted one session and JRST Editors one session. For all Administrative Session submissions, the event must be directly related to the committee's or entity's charge, the Strand domain, or the RIG area. Even though Administrative Session proposals are not subject to peer review, it is important to keep in mind their inclusion in the program reduces the overall number of presentation slots available to the general membership.

First Step: Sign into the Proposal System!

If you have received this email but have not visited the Proposal System recently, please do the following:

1. Log into the Proposal System (<https://proposals.narst.com/>) as soon as possible.
2. Click on **User Account/Volunteer to Review Proposals and Preside**.
3. We hope you will volunteer to review or preside, but at minimum please **click on Submit**. This creates an entry for you in the 2021 conference database.
4. Send a note to Paul Kemp (paulkemp@narst.org) afterward, letting him know that you have logged in. He will assign you **Board Member** or **Strand Coordinator** privileges in the Proposal System, as appropriate.

Strand Coordinators, you will not be able to start your work until you have completed this step!

When to Submit Administrative Sessions

The long lead time required for conference planning demands that we keep to a carefully developed timeline. Administrative Session Proposals should be submitted by 5 pm your local time the first Friday of September. The areas of the Proposal System used to submit Administrative Sessions will be activated late July for more than four weeks to submit Administrative Sessions.

Submitting an Administrative Session

General comments

Please note that ALL relevant information related to the session must be entered in the system. This includes every presenter participating in your session, and every presentation title – you are submitting a complete description of the session that will appear in the program exactly as you enter the information. You are not entering a ‘place holder’ to be updated later. If you are submitting a proposal on behalf of a committee or another entity, you might want to check that the proposal is the final, complete version. Incomplete proposals cannot be considered.

During conference scheduling, we make every effort to minimize the possibility that someone is scheduled to be in two places at the same time. However, the conference scheduling software treats “Robert L. Smith” and “Bob L. Smith” as two different people, not just variations on a name. It will freely schedule “Robert” and “Bob” to be in different places concurrently. Please use the Proposal System’s built-in user lookup to search for the names of all individuals involved in your Administrative Session. If the person is not found by the user lookup, enter the name manually. We will do our best to find any unintended variations on a name.

Individuals named in a proposal (e.g. presenters in a Related Paper Set, co-authors on a presentation) often ask why they cannot see their proposal in the Proposal System. **Only the submitter can view or edit the proposal.** If the proposal needs to be edited (e.g. an author’s name was left out, a typo was found), you can edit the proposal yourself, or ask Paul Kemp (paulkemp@narst.org) to assist. Proposals will be editable through the deadline for submission, by 5 pm your local time the first Friday of September.

If you have a strong reason to hold your session on a particular date or in the morning vs. afternoon, please email your preference to paulkemp@narst.org before the first Friday of September. We will do our best but cannot guarantee to accommodate your preference; for every session assigned to a fixed date/time, we lose degrees of freedom to avoid scheduling conflicts.

Strand-Sponsored Sessions

Each Strand may propose **ONE** Administrative Session. The inclusion of Strand-sponsored sessions into the final program is subject to the Program Chair’s discretion. Either of the Strand Co-Coordinator can enter the proposal. Please use the Coordinator Abstract Entry link under Strand Coordinator Tasks. **Please remember that the Administrative Session will count toward your Strand’s total allocation of session slots.**

Standing Committee-Sponsored Sessions

Every Standing Committee may sponsor **ONE** Administrative Session for the entire committee (not one session per subcommittee). The proposal must be submitted by the committee’s

Board Liaison using the Board Member Tasks area of the Proposal System. This area will be activated at the end of July. You will not be able to see this area until it is activated.

A few exceptions are made to the one-session-per-committee rule. The Membership Committee has two Administrative Sessions and usually sponsors the Mentee-Mentor Nexus and Early Career Forum. The Equity and Ethics Committee sponsors the Jhumki Basu Poster Symposium in addition to a separate Administrative Session.

President and JRST Editors

The President and Directors representing NSTA and JRST should upload their Administrative Session proposals to the proposal system using the Board Member Tasks area. This area will be activated at the end of July. You will not be able to see this area until it is activated.

Research Interest Groups

Each Research Interest Group may propose **ONE** Administrative Session. The proposal must be submitted by email to the Board Liaison to the Research Committee and copied to paulkemp@narst.org. He will enter your proposal into the Proposal System on your behalf. As with all other Administrative Session proposals, provide all pertinent information in your proposal. In addition to the names of the presenters and title of the presentation, please include a 200-word abstract.

Funding Requests

NARST Standing Committees and RIGs are eligible to request funding. Funding requests, accompanied by the Administrative Session proposal, must be submitted by email to the Executive Director with NARST Secretary-Treasurer, President, and Immediate Past President copied on the email.

The funding request should include a budget and budget justification for each item. The deadline for the funding request is the same as the administrative session proposal submission—by 5 pm your local time the first Friday of September.

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

- _____ Submission is properly masked/ 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 the reference list, used "Author" or "Authors" followed by publication date for self-citations and alphabetized accordingly

- _____ Format of the submission meets requirements

- _____ 1" margins all around

- _____ No font smaller than 12-inches

- _____ 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

- _____ Inclusion of abstract of no more than 200 words

- _____ All citations included in the proposal body are included in the reference list

- _____ References adhere to APA format

- _____ Submission is converted to a PDF document

- _____ After creating PDF, opened it and clicked on File/Properties to check if name, institution or other identifying information were displayed. If so, deleted that information and saved the PDF

- _____ Submission indicated alternative format, where applicable

- _____ Submission indicated to if email address could be included in program

- _____ Submission indicated if author(s) submitted a proposal to AERA (this information is needed for scheduling purposes)

SAMPLE REVIEWER'S LETTER

Date [INSERT DATE]

Dear [Reviewer's name]:

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a Reviewer for NARST proposals submitted to [*Strand 1-Science Learning, Understanding and Conceptual Change*]. Your task is relatively straightforward; you are to provide a fair assessment of the proposals assigned to you. Please go

to <http://proposals.narst.org/abstracts21> and log in with your user name and password (the same one you used to register as an reviewer or to submit a proposal).

Under "Reviewer Tasks," you will find a link(s) to the proposals assigned to you indicating the status of your review. Simply click on the proposals you need to review, and you will be taken to an electronic form that you should complete for each proposal you are assigned to review. A form is provided with this letter, titled "Reviewer Rating Sheet", illustrates for you the information you will need to enter into the proposal system. Although you may want to type your reviews onto this sheet first, all ratings must be submitted on via the proposal system. The rating form requires you to rate all categories of questions and provide written comments on at least your overall rating (the system will not accept rating sheets without written comments). Also please check your overall recommendation of definitely accept, probably accept or reject. Please be sure that your name does not appear anywhere on the rating form. Your goal is to provide high quality reviews that authors will find most helpful and informative.

The proposal system will notify you when your review has been posted. Additionally, next time you log into <http://proposals.narst.org/>, you will see a comment that your review has already been completed. **Please post your completed reviews by September 15th!**

I would also like to remind you that 20-30% of NARST conference attendees are international members. Thus, although it is certainly helpful to point out deficiencies in proposals, please be cognizant of US bias. For example, not addressing US standards (e.g., No Child Left Behind) is not necessarily a deficiency. Careful review and rating of proposals will ensure a quality NARST program for the upcoming meeting. The authors of the proposals, the program committee, and the members of NARST thank you.

Sincerely,

NARST President

SAMPLE REVIEWS FROM NARST

Three sample reviews are included here. Review #1 is an example of the *most helpful review*, as it offers information useful in making a decision for inclusion in the NARST program and also offers the submitter constructive feedback to improve their paper. As a reviewer, we ask that you aim to provide reviews that are most helpful. Review #2 is an example of a *somewhat helpful review*, because it includes details needed to make a good decision regarding inclusion in the NARST program. Review #3 is an example of a *less helpful review*.

Review #1 [Most helpful to the Strand Coordinators in making a decision and the author(s) for making modifications to their paper.]

Subject/Problem - Focus, rationale, model, theory and/or philosophy are clear.

It is well documented in the literature that teachers need support in developing environmental knowledge and awareness. This is a great example that accomplishes that goal. One recommendation to strengthen this section is to also draw on the major policy statements of AAAS with regard to scientific literacy.

Design/Procedure - Methodology, procedure, design and/or organization are appropriate.

Sample is a bit skewed to the female slant but, overall, the data sources and procedure seems complete. I am interested in seeing the complete questionnaire in the paper. Also, please make sure to include a detailed description of the activities the teachers were involved in through the PD program—I understand space limitations are a concern at the proposal stage.

Findings and Analysis - Syntheses of ideas or data analyses and findings appear to be appropriate and complete.

Seems robust and complete - findings reported in terms of increasing knowledge, feelings, and pedagogy as well as evaluation of professional development. I look forward to seeing a more detailed discussion of the content analysis of lesson plans - since this is the long term impact that we are looking for as science researchers involving teachers in professional development programs.

Contribution - The conclusions contribute valuable insights into the teaching/learning of science.

The core characteristics of EE are a valuable contribution to begin with. Then the application of a professional development opportunity designed around these characteristics adds to the value of using them as a design framework for professional development. You also are accomplishing something else that is really weak in the teacher learning literature - the link between increased teacher knowledge and increased student knowledge. Very few professional development opportunities continue the analysis of effectiveness into the classroom. You have designed your professional development to really think about student learning and how what the teachers do in professional development can apply to their classrooms. If you have any student data to add that empirically supports the link between teacher knowledge and student knowledge, you can reach a broader audience than just those interested in environmental education.

General Interest - The presentation promises to be of general interest to NARST members.

On many levels NARST members will be interested in this work: those interested in environmental education will find the core characteristics for professional development valuable; those interested in teacher learning will find the design of your professional development and your method and analysis useful; and those interested in inquiry-based learning and reflective science practices will find the content of your professional development and how you are bringing this into the classroom interesting.

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

I look forward to the full paper.

In the next two reviews, details that would lead to knowledge of the paper were omitted. The second review was somewhat helpful, but the third review was less helpful. Both were for papers that were not accepted.

Review #2 [somewhat helpful for the authors to learn how to improve the paper and more instructive for the Strand Coordinators to make a decision.]

Question 1: Subject/Problem — 3/5

The focus is somewhat diffuse but supported with adequate literature. My concern is the multiple contexts being measured. The model imposed on the design is sound and the theory is explicitly described.

Question 2: Design/Procedure — 3/5

The methods are sound, but I have some questions about the integrity of the interviews. Be sure to clearly describe your participants. Were those interviewed undergraduates, master's students, lateral entry; were the participants traditional and/or non-traditional? It may help the generalizability and the relevance of the study if the audience can draw some relationships to the participants' experiences.

Question 3: Findings and Analysis — 2/5

There are multiple themes being expounded upon in the study (characteristics of students, school and student financial situations [how are these being measured?], and teachers' knowledge of the teaching profession and of educational technology). As a reader, I'm having difficulty with your justification of each theme. I have some questions about the findings of these themes with the in-depth analysis of those three participants from the 2005 data. It will be interesting to compare and contrast with the 2006 group. The data will at least increase the sample's generalizability to other populations of lateral entry teachers.

Question 4: Contribution — 2/5

I'm not convinced we have realized anything new from the research based upon the statements of findings. I see the relationships between the broad domains and case study findings as tenuous, at best.

Question 5: General Interest — 3/5

Interest will be moderate because of the population being studied. But, I fail to see many new findings. Although, there is potential in terms of the data speaking to preservice, lateral entry teaching and learning with technology.

Question 6: Overall Rating (1-not recommended; 5-highly recommended) — **3/5**

I may recommend the overall rating for the proposal to be higher if the study were complete and the findings to be more concrete.

Review #3 [less helpful for the authors to learn how to improve the paper and less instructive for Strand Coordinators to make a decision.]

Question 1: Subject/Problem — **4/5**

Question 2: Design/Procedure — **4/5**

Question 3: Findings and Analysis — **4/5**

Question 4: Contribution — **4/5**

Question 5: General Interest — **4/5**

Question 6: Overall Rating (1-not recommended; 5-highly recommended)) — **4/5**

Well written.

REVIEWER’S RATING SHEET FOR NARST PROPOSALS

Strand Number: _____

Identification Code of Proposal: _____

Assessment Criteria and Ratings: (5--highest quality; 1--lowest quality)

Criteria	Description of criteria	Rating
1. Subject/Problem	Focus, rationale, model, theory and/or philosophy are clear. <i>Comments (required):</i>	/5
2. Design /Procedure	Methodology, procedure, design and/or organization are appropriate. <i>Comments (required):</i>	/5
3. Findings and Analysis	Syntheses of ideas or data analyses and findings appear to be appropriate and complete. <i>Comments (required):</i>	/5
4. Contribution	The conclusions contribute valuable insights into the teaching/learning of science. <i>Comments (required):</i>	/5
5. General Interest	The presentation promises to be of general interest to NARST members. <i>Comments (required):</i>	/5
6. Overall Rating	(1-not recommended; 5-highly recommended) <i>Comments (required):</i>	

Overall Recommendation: Definitely Accept Probably Accept Reject

PUBLICATIONS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Publications Advisory Committee serves in an advisory capacity for all NARST–sponsored publications, including JRST, position papers, and research–practice documents. The PAC coordinates publication efforts with the External Policy and Relations Committee and Research Committee, which involves recommending policy, as well as overseeing the development and dissemination of publications specifically designed for use by media, policymakers, education officials, teachers, and other professional organizations.

The membership consists of one chair, one co-chair and 10-11 additional members, 1-2 of whom are graduate students and at least two of whom are International NARST members, and the Board Liaison. The Board Liaison and the additional committee members are appointed by the NARST President-elect, with three committee members rotating out after three years of service and graduate students rotating out after two years of service. The JRST Editor(s), Directors of other NARST publication efforts, along with the NSTA Research Director, the NARST Liaison to NSTA, and the NARST President and Executive Director serve as ex officio members. The chairs compile information for the report and submit it to the Board Liaison. The Board Liaison makes a report to NARST at the Annual Membership Meeting. The chairs compile information for the report and submit it to the Board Liaison. The Board Liaison makes a report to NARST at the Annual Membership Meeting. The co-chairs compile information for an annual report and submit it to the Board Liaison. The Board Liaison Chair makes a report to NARST at the Annual Membership Meeting.

Each member of this committee is expected to participate in collective committee work. The committee work includes four major tasks: 1) Overseeing the Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 2) Organizing the reviewing process for the NARST/NSTA Research Worth Reading Award, 3) Provide scholarships for classroom teachers and/or informal science educators to attend the NARST Annual Conference and 4) Organizing publication-related pre-conference and conference workshops.

JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN SCIENCE TEACHING OVERSIGHT

Task: Oversight over JRST involves i) supporting NARST in searching a new team of editors every five years and ii) reviewing the JRST Editorial Board slate and making a motion for approval by the Board on the final version of the slate.

JRST EDITOR SEARCH

Procedures and Timeline: Every five years NARST needs to organize a committee to advertise for NARST members to apply for the position of JRST Editor. The Chair of the committee is the Immediate Past President. Other committee members included Chair of the Publications Advisory Committee, President-elect, Co-Chair of the

Awards Committee, Chair of the Research Committee, and a NARST member selected to diversify the committee such that the NARST membership is represented in its full variety.

SAMPLE ADVERTISEMENT FOR NEW JRST EDITORSHIP

The following advertisement is posted on the website in the summer:

The National Association for Research in Science Teaching is searching for the new Editor of the *Journal of Research in Science Teaching* for [INSERT DATE].

Interested persons are encouraged to discuss the nature of this position informally with the Chair of the JRST Editor Search Committee, [INSERT NAME], or the current and past journal editors, or other members of the NARST Board.

Applicants should forward a letter describing the reasons for seeking the position and providing details related to the relevant criteria listed above. With the application, please provide evidence of institutional commitment, a curriculum vitae, and names of three persons who may serve as professional references. A letter of intention is due by [INSERT DATE] at which time a mailing address will be provided for submitting final submissions due by [INSERT DATE].

SAMPLE CALL FOR APPLICATIONS FOR NEW JRST EDITOR

The following call is posted to the website and sent through the listserv in autumn:

The National Association for Research in Science Teaching is searching for the new Editor of the *Journal of Research in Science Teaching* for [INSERT DATE]. Applications will be welcomed either by individuals for the position of sole Editor or for the position of Co-Editors. *JRST* is a leading international journal and as such applications are encouraged from international members. The position provides the person(s) chosen, as well as the host institution(s), with international visibility in the area of science education. The *JRST* Editor provides the world's science educators with the organization's broad views and goals as illustrated by published manuscripts. By providing editorials, the *Journal* can and should assume a leadership role in science education, as well as influence policy and practice. Upon approval by the NARST Board of Directors, the new *JRST* Editor(s) will begin working with the current Editors for transition purposes during the calendar year [INSERT DATE]. Full responsibilities as Editor will be from [INSERT DATE] through [INSERT DATE], with the current Editor(s). The first issue for which the new Editor is fully responsible [INSERT DATE] would be due to the publisher, Wiley - Blackwell, three months in advance of the publication date.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE POSITION

Vision: Each applicant should indicate very clearly the vision, innovation, and creative leadership that will be provided, thereby ensuring *JRST* continues to be a premier journal. Individual qualifications: Each applicant must be a respected scholar in science education. Please articulate how you will be committed to: 1) publishing a diversity of styles of research; 2) ensuring the review process remains international, so as to reflect multiple perspectives and diversity; and 3) being highly visible and active within NARST and other science education organizations (e.g., being a regular attendee / presenter at conferences). Each

applicant should possess a strong research record of publications in high-quality journals, excellent writing and editing skills, and the ability to work with an Editorial Board and reviewers to maintain the high quality of manuscripts published in the *Journal*. The individual(s) selected must possess the ability to work with the staff of the publisher, Wiley- Blackwell, to assure an efficient manuscript flow and publication process. The Editor must possess skills in computer technology to work within the online submission and review system, ScholarOne Manuscripts, which is maintained by Wiley-Blackwell. Regular, reliable online access is imperative to the success of the *Journal*.

Institutional qualifications: The Editor(s) must demonstrate the abilities to: 1) manage approximately 450-500 manuscripts each year; 2) conduct extensive correspondence with authors, reviewers, and the Wiley-Blackwell publication and production staff; 3) be responsible for producing 10 issues of *JRST* per year comprising 1,160 journal pages annually; 4) attend meetings of the NARST Board of Directors at the NARST Annual International Conference and during the 3rd weekend of October each year; 5) solicit and nominate NARST members for the Editorial Board when required; 6) acquire institutional office space for accommodating *Journal* production activities; 7) provide computers to process the *Journal*, and 8) possess the e-infrastructure to efficiently and securely manage the electronic submission and review system.

Given that NARST provides up to \$40,000 in support, applicants may want to consider seeking in-kind contributions not covered by this amount from your institution/university including for example:

1. Course release for Editor(s)
2. Summer salary for Editor(s)
3. Full or half time support for a Managing Editor (to manage online editorial system and manage flow of manuscripts)
4. One or more half-time graduate assistant(s)

NARST COMMITMENTS

The NARST organization will provide: 1) financial support up to \$40,000 per year to cover office expenses, clerical support, and communication costs; 2) financial support to attend the NARST Board Meeting in October; and 3) reasonable efforts by the NARST Board to facilitate the Editor's responsibilities, as directed by the Board from time to time and consistent with previous expectations.

APPLICATIONS FOR EDITOR POSITION

Interested persons are encouraged to discuss the nature of this position informally with the current Editors and / or NARST Executive Director **[INSERT NAME AND EMAIL]**. A letter of intention is **due by [INSERT DATE]** to the Search Chair in which the rationale for seeking the position is described in detail.

The complete proposal for *JRST* Editor is due **[INSERT DATE]**. The proposal should be submitted to the Search Committee Chair in a single Adobe PDF document (.pdf) file. Finalists may be invited to attend a portion of the NARST Board of Directors meeting in Reston, Virginia (USA) for the purpose of interviewing for the position. Applicants are expected to be available to travel to Reston, VA, USA at NARST expense during these dates. The proposal should address, but not be limited to, the following:

1. YOUR VISION FOR JRST

What will you do to further enhance the *Journal's* reputation beyond the status it already enjoys?

What is your view/vision of science education research over the next five years? How will this view/vision affect how you plan to manage the *Journal*?

Are there aspects of the *Journal* that you would wish to change and what new approaches are you considering that may move the *Journal* forward?

2. MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE AND PROCEDURES What management structure do you envisage for the *Journal*?

How will you structure the relationship between the Editor(s) and Associate Editor(s)? Will you be the sole Editor and have support from Associate Editors?

What will be the specific logistics of review and editorial decisions? Can you provide the Board with details about how this will be put in place within the opportunities and constraints of ScholarOne?

How will the structure and procedures that you create produce a reduction in the time required for editorial review while maintaining the quality of the journal congruent with journal rating systems

Please specify the names, institutions, departments, and specialties of your Associate Editors?

3. FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS

Specify the financial support required of NARST

Specify the contribution (financial / physical / and release time) provided by your institution. Provide evidence of this contribution by including letters from the Dean of your faculty and/or other such administrators.

4. PROFESSIONAL DETAILS

Submit abbreviated vitae (maximum of three pages each) for all Editor(s) and Associate Editors.

SAMPLE CRITERIA AND SCORING FOR CANDIDATES FOR JRST EDITORSHIP

The Search Committee Chair will distribute applications to the committee members with the criteria upon which the committee had agreed. Each committee member sends her/his comments only to the Chair, so

each person would give her/his appraisal independently. Once all evaluations were submitted, the Chair summarizes the results in a series of tables, one for each applicant, with the scores and text from each committee member for each of the seven criteria.

Next the committee will hold a conference call and decide on a ranked list, and ask the top choice(s) to come to the NARST Fall Board meeting. The NARST Board must approve the nominees for *JRST* Editor.

Below are the criteria for the evaluation:

Scoring of candidates for *JRST* Editorial team:

5 excellent

4 very good

3 good

2 fair

1 poor

JRST Editor team names: _____

Criteria	Score (1-5)	Comments
Vision for <i>JRST</i> , proposed direction and foci, with respect to the future of science education over the next five years		
Creative leadership/innovation: what specific changes and new approaches, including computer/technology, are needed to realize the vision out above?		
Outward looking and understanding of relevant cognate areas of science education research; publishing a diversity of styles of research with methodological pluralism; international perspectives; international review process		
Collective effort of Editors and Associate Editors as respected scholars; strong record of publications, excellent writing and editing skills		
Activities within and beyond NARST		
Institutional support...space, computer technology, equipment, time, money...		
<p>A. Suggested Management structure: Editors/Associate Editors/Editorial Board</p> <p>B. Evidence/experience of working collaboratively/effectively with teams of people</p>		
Total		

JRST Editorial Board Slate

Procedures and Timeline: Each year, the JRST editors put forward for our consideration a slate of candidates to fill open positions as Editorial Board members and as Associate Editors. The slate of nominees for JRST Editorial Board and Associate Editors is reviewed and discussed by PAC members, who then make a motion to the Board to endorse the final version of the slate. Members of the JRST Editorial Board are appointed for a three-year term and may not be appointed to consecutive terms. Exceptions to this policy must be submitted to and be approved by the Publications Advisory Committee.

In February prior to the NARST Annual International Conference, JRST Editors provide a slate of candidates for the Editorial Board and Associate Editors, as needed. PAC members review and discuss the slate, and then make a motion at the Board meeting during the conference to endorse the final version of the slate.

Editorial Board Slate

Prior to the PAC meeting(s) at the Annual Conference the JRST Editors will submit a slate for appointing new Associate Editors (AEs) and Editorial Board Members (EBs) to replace those whose terms have expired. The Editors will submit a list of suggestions of AEs and EBMs in the form:

<NAME>

<Affiliation>

<Areas of Expertise>

plus a three-page CV for each AE/EBM. The information will be forwarded to the PAC members using the following e-mail:

One of the main responsibilities of the PAC is oversight of NARST's official journal, the Journal of Research in Science Teaching. Each year, the JRST editors put forward for our consideration a slate of candidates to fill open positions as Editorial Board members and as Associate Editors. Our job is to consider each candidate, as well as the slate as a whole, and to raise any concerns (either about qualifications of an individual candidate or about the composition of the Editorial Board and/or team of Associate Editors). If any concerns are raised (i.e., if we request changes to the slate), **[INSERT NAME OF BOARD LIAISON]** and I will take those concerns back to the JRST editors so that we can work together to compose a slate that will be acceptable to the committee. In other words, we are not deciding which of these candidates is more/less qualified. (The editors have already chosen the slate that they would prefer from among the available candidates.) So, there is no need to compare candidates to each other – only to consider whether or not you approve of the slate as constituted.

To that end, please review the attached application materials (described in the forwarded email below), and make the following decisions:

Do you have concerns about any of the candidates? (For each candidate, decide whether you think the person is/is not qualified to serve as an Editorial Board member/as an Associate Editor).

Do you have any concerns about the slate as a whole?

If you wish to initiate a conversation with the committee about your responses to these questions, please reply to all. If you wish to simply register your vote/decision, you may just respond to me. Please treat as confidential the attached materials, as well as any discussion about the slate.

Based on the committee's decision, the Board Liaison to the PAC will make a motion to approve the Editorial Board Slate:

Motion

I move that the Board approves the JRST Editorial Board Slate. [Add potential additional information based on committee discussions].

Rationale

The publications advisory committee has received the JRST Editorial Board slate prior to its meeting on **[FILL IN DATE]**. The slate included **[FILL IN NUMBER]** Associate Editors and **[FILL IN NUMBER]** Editorial Board Members. The committee has carefully reviewed the slate and the additional information (i.e. short CVs) prior to the meeting and discussed the slate at the meeting. [Briefly describe conclusions, i.e. if there were or were not concerns about individuals listed on the slate].

NARST/NSTA Research Worth Reading Recognition

Task: In the beginning of each year, PAC members select three articles from the previous year's volume of JRST for the NARST/NSTA Research Worth Reading Recognition. The articles are selected on the basis of relevance and readability for science teachers.

Procedures and Timeline: Each PAC member focuses on one (or, if needed, two) issues from the last JRST volume, and nominates paper(s) from that issue(s). This may lead to an initial selection of 10-12 articles. To organize this step the following e-mail is sent to members:

The NARST Publications Advisory Committee coordinates the NARST/NSTA Research Worth Reading Recognition selection process by reviewing all JRST articles from the **[FILL IN YEAR]** calendar year (Volume **[FILL IN NUMBER]**) and recommending up to three for this initiative. For this to happen, this group needs to have reviewing completed in two steps.

Step 1) Each member of this group will select zero, one or two articles that are relevant for practitioners from the JRST issue(s) assigned to the member:

[ASSIGN ISSUES TO MEMBERS' NAMES]

Kindly find the following criteria, which were previously approved by NARST, when ranking potential articles:

Review Criteria

- Addresses themes relevant for the teaching and learning of science (in preK-12, higher education, and informal education settings)
- Bridges gaps between theory and practice and/or research and practice

- Addresses concerns and needs of practitioners
- Identified implications for the ideas that have direct implications for the classroom or learning environment (if in informal education spaces)

All you need to send is **no more than 2 articles** per issue that you want the full committee to consider. It is also fine to send **0 recommendations** from a particular issue - not everything in JRST will be appropriate.

Step 2) The first author of those selected in step one will be asked to provide an extended abstract which addresses the implications of their research for curriculum and instruction. After we receive those, a second round of voting will determine the 3 winners.

Since NARST will be **[INSERT DATE]** next year, we are hoping to finish our work by **[INSERT DATE]**.

The following e-mail is sent to the authors identified in step one:

To: Authors of selected papers

Subject: NARST/NSTA Research Worth Reading Award

My name is **[INSERT NAME]**, chair of the NARST PAC subcommittee to select the three winners of NARST/NSTA Research Worth Reading award.

This is a two-step process: First the committee members read all the JRST (year) issues and select all articles that can be useful for teachers/practitioners, and we ask those nominees to provide a 500 word abstract of their article which emphasizes how this work is relevant for classroom teachers and practitioners. Next, the committee will then screen all the abstracts and nominated papers a second time and select the three winners. The winners will be recognized by NSTA and they will have a special session at NARST to present their work.

Your article (reference) was nominated by the first screening. Therefore and we would like you to provide the 500 words abstract by **[INSERT DATE]** so that we can move forward with the process. In case you are one of the winners, we will notify you by **[INSERT DATE]**.

The extended abstracts and articles are then read and ranked by each member. Each member will inform the chairs about the top 6 articles they have identified. The chairs will then compile a ranking of all identified articles and the top three will be recommended to the NSTA. To organize this step the following e-mail is sent to members:

Email for part 2

[INSERT NUMBER] articles were recommended by our group and **[INSERT NUMBER]** abstracts were received from the authors. As we enter the final round of reviews, you are asked to do the following:

- Please look over each article and its teacher-friendly abstract. You will need two files to complete each review: (1) the articles, which are listed here:**[INSERT LINK]** and (2) the teacher-friendly abstracts, which are located here **[INSERT LINK]**
- Then, reply with your **top 6 article selections**, and a list will be compiled of the rankings and the top 3 will be recommended to NSTA.

These top three articles are made available to NSTA members by providing hard copies at the NARST booth during the NSTA annual conference. In addition, the three articles are submitted to the NSTA Representative to NARST, who compiles a list that also includes articles from other journals. Last but not least the awardees are recognized at the NARST/NSTA Research Worth Reading Recognition session at the Annual NARST conference.

Scholarships for Classroom Teachers and Informal Science Educators

Task: Provide scholarships for classroom teachers and/or informal science educators to attend the NARST Annual International Conference.

Procedures and Timeline: Each year in September, the PAC Scholarship committee sends out a call to the NARST membership for applications for 9 scholarships, each worth \$700. An application can only be made by a NARST member, on behalf of a collaborating classroom teacher or informal science educator. The scholarship is meant to facilitate attending the NARST Annual International Conference. Applications are submitted by December 15. The committee members use a rubric to review the applications. On the basis of the scores, a ranking is made, with only one application per NARST member/PI/adviser being considered in the first round of the selection process. The nine applicants with the highest scores are selected to receive the scholarship. Scholarship recipients are informed by the committee about the scholarship being granted to them. Throughout this procedure, the PAC committee members communicate with the chairs of the International Committee, the Equity and Ethics committee, and the Executive Director, to: (a) check for 'double' applications and (b) pool the different scholarships if the number of applicants for one scholarship is lower than another set of applicants.

Pre-Conference and Conference Workshops / Sessions

Task: i) Sponsor two sessions at the NARST Annual International Conference - one by the Editors of *JRST* on publishing in the journal and the other to be determined by the committee. ii) Sponsor two Pre-Conference Workshops at the NARST Annual International Conference – one aimed at reviewing for *JRST* and the other to be determined by the committee. iii) Coordinate the NARST/NSTA Annual Research Worth Reading Recognition session.

Procedures and Timeline: Beginning with the committee meetings in spring and extending throughout the summer the PAC discusses, agrees upon, and organizes the committee-sponsored sessions and workshops for the next NARST Annual International Conference. An abstract for this session and for the *JRST* Editors' session, is submitted approximately October 1. In the same time period, the PAC contacts the *JRST* editors about the abstract for the pre-conference workshop aimed at reviewing for *JRST*. Workshop plans are submitted with the PAC report for the Fall NARST Board Meeting. Finally, the PAC coordinates with the NSTA liaison to NARST to submit an abstract for the NARST/NSTA Annual Research Worth Reading Recognition session.

RESEARCH COMMITTEE

MASTER CALENDAR FOR NARST RESERCH COMMITTEE

30 January

Task & Dates	Timeline & Activities
Meetings during the NARST Annual International Conference	Report on work of subcommittees during previous year Thank subcommittee members and chairs
	Establish Subcommittees for upcoming year and appoint chairs. Subcommittees are: RC-sponsored pre-conference workshops NSTA Area conferences (NARST Liaison to NSTA is Chair) NSTA National Conference (NARST Liaison to NSTA is Chair) (even-numbered years) Sandra K. Abell Institute for Doctoral Students Selection Committee (RC Chair is Chair) (odd-numbered years) Sandra K. Abell Institute for Doctoral Students Evaluation Review Committee

	<p>(every third year beginning in 2011—"yy minus 11" evenly divides by 3) Subcommittee to review the applications for the NARST-NSTA Liaison (RC Chair to Chair) position and to make a recommendation for appointment to the Board of Directors</p> <p>Solicit ideas for RC-sponsored administrative session</p> <p>Other planning</p>
<p>Abell Institute RFP (even-numbered years)</p> <p>End of June to end of September</p>	<p><i>End of June:</i> Send email to the entire NARST membership with request for proposals (deadline end of August) to host the Sandra K. Abell Institute for Doctoral Students during the following Summer</p> <p><i>First week of September:</i> Send proposals to the Sandra K. Abell Institute for Doctoral Students Selection Committee</p>

	<p><i>End of third week of September:</i> Evaluations due from Selection Committee members</p> <p><i>End of September:</i> Institute offered to highest ranked proposal</p>
<p>Pre-Conference Workshops</p> <p>Mid-Summer to early Fall</p>	<p><i>Mid-July:</i> Call for proposals for pre-conference workshops for the following Spring Annual International Conference (deadline for proposals: 31 August)</p> <p><i>First week of September:</i> Proposals forwarded to Subcommittee by Subcommittee Chair with request for reviews by end of third week of September</p> <p><i>First week of October:</i> Decision made on which workshops (usually no more than two) to sponsor</p>
<p>NSTA Liaison Position</p> <p>(every third year: “YY-11” evenly divides by 3)</p> <p>Early September to early February</p>	<p><i>Early September:</i> Call for applications for NARST Liaison to NSTA to be submitted by end of November</p> <p><i>First week of December:</i> Applications forwarded to the Subcommittee to review the applications</p> <p><i>First week of January:</i> Reviews due back to RC Chair</p> <p><i>Mid-January:</i> Motion made to NARST Board of Directors to offer position to top-ranked candidate to be decided using electronic ballot</p> <p><i>First week of February:</i> Announcement on final decision made</p>

<p>Abell Institute Evaluation</p> <p>(odd-numbered years)</p> <p>Early September to</p>	<p><i>Early September:</i> Request from the Organizer of the Sandra K. Abell Institute for Doctoral Students to submit a copy of the external evaluation report by beginning of October</p>
---	---

January	<i>Mid-October:</i> Send external evaluation report to the Sandra K. Abell Institute for Doctoral Students Evaluation Review Committee with a request to review the evaluation report, and, by end of the coming January, to send to the RC Chair recommendations on the conduct of future institutes to be brought to the NARST Board of Directors following Spring meeting
Administrative Session Mid-October	RC sponsored Administrative Session during the Annual International Conference (if any) to be established and information entered into conference site
NSTA Sessions Early December to Late January	<p><i>Early December:</i> NARST proposal submissions for NSTA National Conference (for the Spring two years on) and NSTA Area Conferences (for Fall of the following year) received from NARST annual conference program development person</p> <p><i>By Mid-December:</i> NARST Liaison to NSTA forwards proposals and rating sheets to members of both national and area subcommittees</p> <p><i>Mid-January:</i> Deadline to return ratings to NARST Liaison to NSTA</p> <p><i>Third week of January:</i> Deadline for final decisions on presenters</p> <p><i>End of January:</i> Deadline for presenters to submit proposals to NSTA and return information to NARST Liaison to NSTA (proposal ID number, title with "NARST:" at beginning, primary presenter's name)</p>

CALL FOR NARST PRE-CONFERENCE WORKSHOPS

The NARST Research Committee invites submission of pre-conference workshop proposals for the upcoming 20XX Annual Meeting in XXXXX, XX. Pre-conference workshops provide opportunities for NARST colleagues and others to engage in extended academic interaction and in-depth discussion of current issues facing our field. Workshops can serve as mini-courses focusing on research methodologies, specific research milestones or current issues. We encourage proposals that promote the advancement of scientific knowledge about science education and/or methodology through science education research and contain new ideas in collaboration, reflection or training. We also encourage and seek workshops that focus on the theme of the annual meeting: XXXXX. Workshop facilitators are encouraged to use the time to help participants work with resources, individuals, materials and ideas in a more interactive and in-depth manner than is often possible in traditional NARST presentation formats.

Workshops are scheduled for 4 hours on the first day of onsite registration at the NARST 20XX Annual Meeting prior to the start of concurrent sessions. Workshops should be planned for at least 30 participants. NARST members are encouraged to register for the workshops prior to the conference through the online conference registration site. If space permits, individuals may also register on-site. Workshop participants pay a \$50 registration fee. Workshop facilitators will receive \$1500 to offset costs associated with workshop materials, presentation expenses, and/or travel. If sufficient interest in a particular workshop is not demonstrated (i.e. a minimum number of participants do not register for the workshop) prior to the conference, a workshop may be cancelled. In some cases, presenters may choose to forgo the \$1500 workshop payment, in which case, participants will not be charged the \$50 registration fee. Questions regarding any of these issues may be directed to the individuals identified below.

APPLICATION PROCEDURE

To apply to present a NARST 20XX Pre-Conference Workshop, please submit the following information to XXXXX (email address) of the NARST Research Committee, no later than September 1st, 20XX:

1. Title of workshop
2. Contact information
3. Requested fee per participant (select among the following choices: \$0, \$25, \$50 per participant)
4. Requested maximum number of participants (between 30 and 50)
5. Short description of relevant areas of expertise for each workshop facilitator
6. Workshop abstract (for recruiting participants)
7. Workshop description (*no more than 5 pages*) including a detailed description of the proposed workshop goals, schedule and activities, information on the roles of workshop participants and facilitators, and a short review of literature relevant to the workshop topic and/or format. Please also indicate what materials or artifacts, if any, participants will take away from the workshop.

REVIEW PROCESS

Review of proposals and selection of workshops will be conducted through the NARST Research Committee. Committee members will review proposals based on the following criteria:

- *Focus*: Degree to which the workshop focuses on issue(s) related to the advancement of science education knowledge and practice and/or methodology in conducting science education research.
- *Relation to Conference Theme*: Degree to which the workshop topic is related to the conference theme “[Insert Annual Theme Title].”
- *Outcomes*: Degree to which the workshop design will lead to fruitful outcomes for workshop participants, which are related to the advancement of science education knowledge and practice or research methodology.
- *Literature Base*: Degree to which the workshop content is well grounded in one or more research literatures relevant to science education.
- *Systemic Importance*: Degree to which the workshop content addresses an issue that is of systemic importance to the field of science education.
- *Interest*: Degree to which the workshop topic is of interest to science education researchers.
- *Engagement*: Degree to which the workshop delivery will enable all workshop participants to fully engage with the workshop foci.

Please submit proposals electronically in order to expedite the review process by members of the Research Committee. All proposers will be notified of the review outcome by early November

20XX.

Please direct inquiries to [enter chair email], Chair of the Research Committee, or to [enter other member contact].

Jhumki Basu Scholars Program Application Rubric

APPLICANT'S NAME: _____

SUMMARY SCORE

1	ELIGIBILITY	
2	PROMISE AS A SCHOLAR	

1. ELIGIBILITY

#	EVALUATION CATEGORY	POSSIBLE SCORE*	SCORE
1	Current NARST member ⁹³	1	
2	From an underrepresented group	1	
3	Advanced-level doctoral student or junior scholar (< 6 years PhD)	1	
4	Attends or works at a US university at time of application	1	
5	Will attend the pre-conference workshop	1	
TOTAL SCORE			

(*) Possible scores: 0 = criterion is not met; 1 = criterion is met

APPLICANT’S PROMISE AS A SCHOLAR

#	EVALUATION CATEGORY	POSSIBLE SCORE**	SCORE
1	Personal background as a member of an underrepresented group can provide unique insights about science teaching and learning for students traditionally marginalized in science education	2	
2	Scholarship will likely contribute to the knowledge base on equitable educational opportunities and science achievement for marginalized students	2	
3	Scholarship will likely contribute to the diversity-related mission goals of NARST	2	
4	First time applicant	2	
5	Will present at NARST Annual Conference	2	
TOTAL SCORE			

(**) Possible scores: 0 = Criterion is clearly not met; 1 = Criterion is not met yet, but within applicant’s reach (case of doubt); 2 = Criterion is met

**NARST Research Committee Sponsored Pre-Conference Workshop
Review Sheet**

Rater:

Proposal Author(s):

Proposal Title:	
Criteria	Rating: 1-5 (1 is low; 5 is high)
Focus: Degree to which the workshop focuses on issue(s) related to the advancement of science education knowledge and practice and/or methodology in	
Relation to Conference Theme: Degree to which the workshop topic is related to the conference theme <i>Awakening Dialogues: Advancing Science Education Research, Practices, and Policies</i>	
Outcomes: Degree to which the workshop design will lead to fruitful outcomes for workshop participants, which are related to the advancement of science education knowledge and practice or research methodology	
Literature Base: Degree to which the workshop content is well grounded in one or more research literatures relevant to science education	
Systemic Importance: Degree to which the workshop content addresses an issue that is of systemic importance to the field of science education	
Interest: Degree to which the workshop topic is of interest to science education researchers	
Engagement: Degree to which the workshop delivery will enable all workshop participants to fully engage with the workshop foci	
Average	
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Other comments:	

PRECONFERENCE WORKSHOP ACCEPTANCE LETTER

Date

Dear,

Thank you very much for submitting a NARST Pre-conference Workshop proposal for the 20XX annual meeting in XXXXX. We are pleased to report that your proposal was reviewed quite favorably by this year's review committee and has been accepted for presentation.

The committee received several strong proposals and a thorough review was conducted for each of the submissions. The committee used the following criteria to help guide the review process:

- Focus: The focus of the workshop is upon the advancement of knowledge and practice relative to science education and/or methodology in conducting science education research.
- Likely Outcomes: The design of the workshop would result in the advancement of knowledge and practice relative to science teaching and learning or research methodology for workshop participants.
- Literature Base: The content of the workshop is well-grounded in one or more research literatures relevant to science teaching and learning.
- New Developments: The content of the workshop would advance the knowledge of participants about new developments (from within science education and/or other disciplines) that is relevant to research in science teaching and learning.
- Systemic Importance: The content of the workshop addresses an issue that is of systemic importance to the field of science education.
- Interest: The workshop topic would be of interest to science education researchers.
- Engagement: The delivery of the workshop will fully engage workshop participants.

This year, the Pre-conference Workshops will be scheduled on XXXXX from 8 am to noon. The conference will be held at XXXXX. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact XXXXX, Chair of the review committee (email). Congratulations and we look forward to attending your workshop session.

Sincerely,

The 20XX Pre-Conference Workshop Review Committee

PRECONFERENCE WORKSHOP DECLINATION LETTER

Date:

Dear,

Thank you very much for submitting a NARST Pre-conference Workshop proposal for the 20XX annual meeting in XXXXX. We regret to report that your proposal was not recommended for presentation at this year's meeting. We reviewed many more high quality proposals than we were able to recommend.

The committee received several strong proposals and a thorough review was conducted for each of the submissions. The committee used the following criteria to help guide the review process:

- Focus: The focus of the workshop is upon the advancement of knowledge and practice relative to science education and/or methodology in conducting science education research.
- Likely Outcomes: The design of the workshop would result in the advancement of knowledge and practice relative to science teaching and learning or research methodology for workshop participants.
- Literature Base: The content of the workshop is well-grounded in one or more research literatures relevant to science teaching and learning.
- New Developments: The content of the workshop would advance the knowledge of participants about new developments (from within science education and/or other disciplines) that is relevant to research in science teaching and learning.
- Systemic Importance: The content of the workshop addresses an issue that is of systemic importance to the field of science education.
- Interest: The workshop topic would be of interest to science education researchers.
- Engagement: The delivery of the workshop will fully engage workshop participants.

We regret that we are unable to host more workshops and sincerely hope that your work described in the proposal will be presented in an alternative venue. We look forward to interacting with you further at the 20XX meeting in XXXXX.

Sincerely,

The 20XX Pre-Conference Workshop Review Committee

SOLICITATION GUIDELINES FOR NARST SPONSORED PRESENTATIONS AT THE NSTA NATIONAL CONFERENCE

GUIDELINES FOR SELECTING NARST SPONSORED PROPOSALS FOR NSTA

To be eligible for section a proposal must:

1. Address the themes relevant for the teaching and learning of science.
2. Bridge the gaps between theory and practice and research and practice
3. Address the concerns and needs of practitioners
4. Be interactive and engage the audience
5. Provide materials or ideas that can be used with a little or no modification by teachers, teacher educators, or administrators
6. Have a title and abstract that will attract a wide audience

NARST members who wish their NARST paper to be considered as a NARST sponsored paper at NSTA should submit a proposal to the Research Committee that addresses the criteria outlined above. Potential presenters may use their recent NARST presentations as a basis for a proposal, but it is likely that the proposal and ultimate presentation will require modification to meet the selection criteria and the needs of the NSTA community.

Proposals should be no longer than 3 pages, single spaced, with 12 point font. In addition, there should be a 200 word abstract. All author contact information should be placed on a separate cover sheet. Proposals should clearly state how the presentation will address all six of the selection criteria. Information about meeting themes can be found on the NSTA website. Proposals should be submitted to by (Date).....

Questions may be directed to XXXXX, the NARST Research Committee Member coordinating the review and selection of NARST sponsored NSTA sessions, or the Research Committee Chair, XXXXX.

SOLICITATION GUIDELINES FOR NARST SPONSORED PRESENTATIONS

THE NSTA NATIONAL CONFERENCE

The NARST Research Committee is soliciting proposals for NARST sponsored sessions at the 20XX National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) national conference. The 20XX NSTA national conference will be held in [insert date].

For many years the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) has provided the NARST membership with the opportunity to give presentations at their meetings. The NARST Research Committee has developed a set of criteria that will aid in the selection of NARST sponsored presentations at NSTA. The criteria are intended to help the Research Committee select presentations that will be relevant to the NSTA community and bridge the research and practice gap.

SOLICITATION LETTER FOR NARST SPONSORED PRESENTATIONS AT NSTA REGIONAL CONFERENCES

Dear Colleague,

Each year, NARST is able to sponsor two hours of programming at each of the three NSTA regional meetings. In responding to the 20XX solicitation for NARST proposals, you indicated an interest in presenting your work at a NSTA regional meeting. We encourage scholars to prepare a version of the work they will present at the 2010 NARST conference specifically geared toward a practitioner audience. The NSTA presentation should be related to your NARST proposal, but the NSTA presentation may have a different focus and title. Please consider submitting a proposal for presenting at one of the 2010 regional meetings: XXXXX (date); XXXXX (date); and XXXXX (date). In order to apply, submit the NARST proposal associated with your presentation along with the attached form providing information specific to the NSTA presentation.

Proposals will be reviewed by the NARST Research Committee. The Research Committee will make selections based on the potential for the presentation to bridge gaps between theory and practice and research and practice as well as the extent to which the presentation will address the concerns and needs of practitioners. In order to be reviewed, proposals should be submitted to XXXXX via email (email address), Chair of the Research Committee, by February 10.

NARST Research Committee

XXXXX

SUPPLEMENTAL PROPOSAL INFORMATION

NARST Sponsored Sessions at NSTA Regional Meetings

To propose a NARST sponsored session at a NSTA regional meeting, submit this completed form and the full NARST Proposal to XXXXX (email) by date.

Authors (Institutional Affiliation):

Contact information for *first Author*

Mailing Address:

Phone number:

Email address:

Presentation Title (*The title does not have to be the same as the NARST title*):

Identify the 20XX NSTA Regional Conference(s) at which you would like to present:

XXXXX (date) XXXXX (date) XXXXX (date)

In no more than one page of text, indicate how this presentation would help bridge the gaps between theory and practice and research and practice. Also, discuss how the presentation would address the concerns and needs of practitioners.

NARST RESEARCH COMMITTEE ADMINISTRATIVE SESSION REVIEW SHEET

Rater: _____

Proposal Author(s):	
Proposal Title:	
Criteria	Rating: 1-5 (1 is low; 5 is high)
Focus: Degree to which the session focuses on issue(s) related to the advancement of science education knowledge and practice and/or methodology in	
Relation to Conference Theme: Degree to which the session is related to the conference theme <i>Awakening Dialogues: Advancing Science Education Research, Practices, and Policies</i>	
Systemic Importance: Degree to which the session addresses an issue that is of systemic importance to the field of science education	
Interest: Degree to which the session is of interest to science education Researchers	
Uniqueness: Degree to which the session addresses issue(s) in new and distinctive ways	
Average	
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Other comments:	

Rank Order: _____

NARST SPONSORED NSTA SESSIONS REVIEW SHEET

Rater: _____

Proposal Author(s):	
Proposal Title:	
Criteria	Rating: 1-5 (1 is low; 5 is high)
A. Addresses theme(s) relevant for the teaching and learning of science	
B. Bridges gaps between theory and practice and research and practice	
C. Addresses concerns and needs of practitioners	
D. Is interactive and designed to engage audience	
E. Provides materials or ideas that can be used with little or no modification by teachers, teacher educators, or administrators	
F. Has a title and abstract that will attract a wide audience	
G. NARST proposal evaluation score: 5.0-4.5 --> rating 5 4.4-4.0 --> rating 4 3.9-3.5 --> rating 3 3.5-3.0 --> rating 2	
Average	
Strengths:	
Weaknesses:	
Comments:	

SANDRA K. ABELL INSTITUTE FOR DOCTORAL STUDENTS

NARST sponsors the Sandra K. Abell Institute for Doctoral Students every other summer on odd-numbered years. The chart below outlines a timeline that extends over three calendar years for this initiative.

Time	Activity
Yr 1 Summer	Research Committee solicits and reviews proposals to host the Abell Institute.
Yr 1 Fall	Research Committee recommends a host proposal to the Board.
	Board makes funding decision. The host team begins recruitment of participants.
Yr 2 Spring	Host team selects participants and finalizes plans.
Yr 2 Summer	Abell Institute is hosted.
Yr 2 Fall	The host team and the external evaluator provide reports to the Research Sub-Committee. Research Sub-Committee forwards reports to the Board liaison who communicates with the Board.
Yr 3 Spring	Research Committee and host team may collaborate on a culminating activity for the Abell Institute participants at the NARST Annual Conference (e.g. poster session).

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS TO HOST THE SANDRA K. ABELL INSTITUTE FOR DOCTORAL STUDENTS

NARST is soliciting proposals to host the 20XX Sandra K. Abell Institute for Doctoral Students. The purpose of the Sandra K. Abell Institute for Doctoral Students is to support the education and professional development of doctoral students involved in the study of science education.

BACKGROUND & GOALS

NARST sponsored the first institute for doctoral students in 2009, and the first Abell Institute in 2011. Based on the success of this initial offering, the organization committed to sponsor future institutes on a biennial basis. Organizers of the 2009 event created a model for the organization and structure of the institute based loosely on the European Science Education Research Association (ESERA) Summer School. Central to this model is a week-long event that provides opportunities for science education doctoral students and established researchers from diverse programs to share perspectives, discuss current research, and collaborate. The established researchers, most likely faculty members, serve as mentors for the students. Students and mentors interact through a variety of formats including small groups dedicated to the discussion of student research projects, seminars and workshops. Proposers should plan to build from the successes of the models created for the 2009 and 2011 institutes but are encouraged to customize their proposals in order to maximize attainment of the institute goals. The following list identifies the primary goals for the Sandra K. Abell Institute for Doctoral Students. Proposers may supplement these goals with program-specific aims.

- Support development of doctoral student research practices including those related to research design, research methods and communication of research;
- Support doctoral student understanding of the science education research community and their positioning within the community;
- Develop networks of emerging and established researchers in science education.

FUNDING

NARST will provide up to \$25,000 to support the organization and implementation of the 20XX Abell Institute.

These funds may not be used to pay for indirect operating expenses typical of many federal grants. Other sources of funding may include student fees and contributions from the host institution. The \$25,000 organizational contribution is meant to minimize costs for participating students. However, modest fees to be paid by students or their home institutions are likely necessary for successful implementation of the Abell Institute and may be helpful in ensuring that participants are committed to Abell Institute activities and expectations. Proposers are encouraged to seek additional support from the host institution.

This support may come in the form of direct financial contributions and/or in-kind contributions of staff time, facilities, or other resources that support successful implementation of the Abell Institute.

PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

Proposals should be organized with the following components: *Program Description, Budget, Curriculum Vitae,* and *Supplemental Materials.*

Program Description

The Program Description should not exceed five pages including tables and figures. The Program Description should address all of the issues presented in the following list.

- Identify the organizer or organizing team and discuss the qualifications of this individual or group. Members of the organizing team should be current members of NARST.
- Identify the host institution. Discuss its capacity and commitment to host the Abell Institute.
- Discuss how the proposed event will meet the Abell Institute goals outlined in the introductory section of this call for proposals and any other aims specific to the proposed program.
- Present a plan for organizing and structuring the experience. This plan should identify foci for the Abell Institute as well as the structure(s) that will be used for organizing the event. Proposers should offer a model for how student and faculty participants will interact and present a tentative schedule of activities.
- Identify plans and procedures for recruiting and selecting both student and faculty participants. This discussion should explicitly highlight the number of students and faculty that are expected to participate.
- Describe facilities to be used as a part of the proposed Abell Institute. This description should include facilities that will be used for the group and mentoring activities central to the Abell Institute as well as lodging arrangements for student and faculty participants.
- Present a plan for evaluating the Abell Institute.

BUDGET

The budget section must clearly identify expected expenses as well as sources and amounts of funding. Proposers should include evaluation expenses within the budget. The detailed budget should be accompanied by a budget justification.

Curriculum Vitae

A two-page curriculum vitae (CV) should be included for each member of the organizing team. The CV should highlight the individual's research and mentoring experiences.

Supplemental Materials

Proposals may include supplemental materials that provide evidence of capacity for successful implementation of the Abell Institute. For example, proposers are encouraged to submit a letter indicating institutional support from the host institution.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

The individual or team that hosts the 20XX Sandra K. Abell Institute for Doctoral Students will be expected to submit an interim report on planning and recruitment activities by March 15, 20XX. The individual or team will also be expected to submit a final report by October 1, 20XX. The final report must include results of the evaluation efforts, the plans for

which are identified in the proposal. The interim and final reports should be submitted to the Chair of the Research Committee. These reports will be reviewed by the NARST Research Committee and the Board of Directors. The final report will be made available to the NARST membership, and proposal teams for future Abell Institutes will be encouraged to review this report.

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Proposals should be prepared and submitted electronically. Organizing individuals or teams should prepare proposal materials in a single pdf document. If it is not possible to include a Supplemental Material resource within the primary proposal file, it may be submitted separately as an electronic document. Proposal files should be submitted via email to the Chair of the NARST Research Committee (XXXXX, email). Proposal files should be labeled using with the last name of the lead proposer followed by “Abell2011” (e.g., “Sadler.Abell2011”). If a supplemental file is required a similar format should be used for labeling (e.g., “Sadler.Abell2011.supplement1”).

To be granted full consideration, proposals should be submitted by August 1, 20XX.

REVIEW PROCESS & CRITERIA

The NARST Research Committee will review all proposals and forward a recommendation to the NARST Board of Directors for final approval. In reviewing proposals, the Research Committee will consider the following criteria: qualifications of the organizers, host institution’s capacity and demonstrated commitment to host the Abell Institute, potential to meet Abell Institute goals, organization and structure of the proposed program, plans for recruiting and selecting student participants, plans for recruiting and selecting faculty mentors, proposed site and facilities, evaluation plan, and budget plans. The NARST Research Committee and Board of Directors may contact proposers to request additional information or to suggest changes to the Abell Institute as proposed. Proposers are encouraged to examine the review rubric that will be used in the evaluation process.

RESOURCES TO SUPPORT PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT

In conducting and evaluating the first doctoral student institute, the University of Missouri organizing team, the NARST Research Committee, and Board of Directors learned a great deal. In some cases, these groups developed new understandings of successful approaches; in other cases, the groups identified challenges. Absolute solutions to these challenges may not exist, but organizers of future events will likely benefit from their identification. Findings, lessons learned, and recommendations are presented in two reports both of which are available to the NARST. The first document is the final report prepared by the 2009 organizing team; the second document is the formal evaluation report prepared by the Research Committee. All proposers are encouraged to review these reports carefully.

Review Rubric for Sandra K. Abell Institute for Doctoral Students Proposals

Proposal Team: _____

Host Institution: _____

The proposal evaluation process will be guided by several criteria each of which will be scored by raters using a point system. Please note that criteria have variable point values. Higher scores indicate a better rating.

Review Criterion (Available points)	Score	Rater Comments
Qualifications of the organizer(s) (20)	/20	
Host institution: capacity and demonstrated commitment to host the Abell Institute (20)	/20	
Potential to support development of doctoral student research practices including those related to research design, research methods and communication of research. (10)	/10	
Potential to support doctoral student understanding of the science education research community and their positioning within the community (10)	/10	
Potential to develop networks of emerging and established researchers in science education (10)		

	/10	
Organization and structure of the proposed program (20)	/20	
Plans for recruiting and selecting student participants (10)	/10	
Plans for recruiting and selecting faculty mentors (10)	/10	
Suitability of the facilities (10)	/10	
Evaluation plan (10)	/10	
Budget plans (including reasonable student expenses) (20)	/20	
Total	/150	

PRE-INSTITUTE STUDENT QUESTIONS

Sandra K. Abell 20XX

Pre-Institute Questions---Students

Name :

Date:

University:

First language:

1. What is it that attracted you to participate in the Abell Institute this year?
2. What do you anticipate will be the most useful components to you of the Institute and why?
3. What supports and challenges did you have to arrange to participate? (family, funding, schedule and???)
4. Any other comments before you begin

CRITICAL FRIENDS PHOTO RECOGNITION ALBUM OR CRIF-RIPH-RECAL

Name _____ Date _____

These pages will help us evaluate the effectiveness of the “critical friends” goal of the 2013 Sandra K. Abell Summer Institute. Please keep a copy to jot notes into as you meet your colleagues. I am asking you to send me this form before and after the Institute. Please write about your personal knowledge of each of those you will meet (or have met) without using any other resources. There are 4 pages of photos. Please save on your computer for your own reference and email a copy back to me. – Thank you again for sending in your photos so that we can use this tool.

- 1) For each photo, jot down the person’s name, if you know it
- 2) Note briefly what the person’s science education interest is
- 3) Note how you might connect professionally (linkage, collaboration of any sort)

*Insert mentor picture here	*add additional cells as needed
	110

S.K. Abell Institute 20XX

WORKING NOTES WITH YOUR MENTOR(S)

<p>Tuesday, July 16 (insert new date)</p> <p>What did you gain from interacting with your mentor and group today?</p>	<p>What would you like to follow up on?</p>
<p>Wednesday, July 17</p> <p>What did you gain from interacting with your mentor and group today?</p>	<p>What would you like to follow up on?</p>
<p>Thursday, July 18</p> <p>What did you gain from interacting with your mentor and group today?</p>	<p>What would you like to follow up on?</p>
<p>Friday, July 20</p> <p>What did you gain from interacting with your mentor and group today?</p>	<p>What would you like to follow up on?</p>

Sandra K. Abell Institute 20XX

POST PARTICIPATION SURVEY-STUDENTS

On a scale of 1-6, where 1= not useful and 6 = extremely useful, how useful would you rate the following activities?
Please mark an "x" in the box for your rating.

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Initial presentation of your work (on the first day)						
Critical friends group meetings						
Individual meetings with mentors from your team						
Individual meetings with mentors not on your team						
Faculty talks						
Presentations (lunch time and beyond)						
Time spent working alone						
Walks from GW to AAAS in the morning						
Group dinners						
Visit to Capitol Hill						
Preparation of NARST proposal						

Please rate the institute's impact on the following skills, knowledge and abilities, where 1 = no positive impact and 6 = extensive positive impact.

	1	2	3	4	5	6
My ability to develop an effective literature review						

My ability to develop a theoretical framework for my study						
My ability to develop a rationale for my study						
My ability to develop high quality research questions						
My ability to clearly describe the methodology (theory of method) and research methods						
My ability to develop a plan for collecting data						
My ability to align theoretical framework and research questions						
My ability to align research questions and methods						
My ability to communicate my research						
My understanding of the science education research community						
My research connection to policy						
My research connection to practice						

Please rate the following statements where 1 = strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= agree, 4= strongly agree

	1	2	3	4
The Institute changed the way I will conduct my dissertation research				
The Institute allowed me to create a new network with science education colleagues				
The Institute made me feel more a part of the science education research community				
The Institute increased my confidence as a researcher				
The Institute increased my ability to talk about my research to others				
The Institute made me feel less isolated in my endeavors as a researcher				

Please rate the quality of the following aspects of the Sandra Abell Institute, where 1= unacceptable quality and 6= outstanding quality.

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Accommodations						
Lunches						
Snacks and drinks						
AAAS meeting facilities						
Internet access						
Dinners						

Open-ended questions.

1. What aspect of the Institute did you find to be most useful to you? Why?

2. What aspect of the Institute did you find to be least useful for you? Why?

3. What recommendations do you have regarding the schedule of activities and sessions for future Institutes?

4. What recommendations do you have regarding the role of the mentors in future Institutes?

5. In what ways did the Institute most influence your research project?

6. In what ways did the Institute most influence you as a researcher?

7. What impact do you think participation in the Institute will have on your career?

8. If there were one type of activity that you wished the Institute spent more time on, what would it be and why?

9. If there were one type of activity that you wished the Institute spent less time on, what would it be and why?

10. Please write any other comments that you think would be helpful in planning for future Institutes.

Questions for Mentors (By email)

PRE-INSTITUTE WEEK

1. What led you to apply for the SA Institute this year?
2. What do you expect to learn from your participation?
3. What did you have to arrange in your life to participate for the Institute's week?

POST-INSTITUTE WEEK

1. What were the highlights of your mentoring role at this summer's Institute?
2. What changes would you suggest to improve the experience and why?
3. What are things we should continue? (added by one mentor)

SAMPLE OVERVIEW OF SKA-SRI - JULY, 20XX

	Monday-15	Tuesday-16	Wednesday-17	Thursday-18	Friday-19	Saturday-20
8:00 am	Breakfast-downstairs	Leave for AAAS	Leave for AAAS	Leave for AAAS	Leave AAAS	Leave Washington DC
9:00 am		Overview of week; group assignments; Critical Friends Group	Developing proposals; Critical Friends Group	Visit to Capitol Hill	Overview; Feedback on proposals	
10:00 am						
11:00 am		Faculty Talks: Alicia & Jan	Faculty Talks: Brian & Gale	Faculty Talks: Angie & Tali	Faculty Talks: Anat & Julie	
Noon	Mentor meeting and Lunch/ Students on their own	Lunch-Jodi Peterson, NSTA	Lunch	Lunch- Jay Labov, NSTA	Lunch- Ann Culter, NSTA	

1:00 pm		Connecting to Practice: AAAS Curriculum & Assessment	Meet a Mentor	Meet a Mentor	Feedback on proposals; Work on presentations;	
2:00 pm			Meet a Mentor/ Writing time	Critical Friends		
3:00 pm	Arrive at GWU by this time	Critical Friends Group	Writing in Critical Friends Groups – Proposal due for group review	Groups & work on writing proposals	Closing presentations; Final reminders	
4:00 pm			Next Generation of Standards & Other initiatives – Dr. Joe			
5:00 pm	Name tags, Abell Institute scavenger hunt, pictures of participants	Recap and walk to dinner	Return to GWU	Recap and walk to dinner	Return to GWU	
6:00 pm	Opening Dinner & Welcome	Group Dinner	Group Dinner	Mentor “thank you” dinner; Graduate students dine on their own	Gala Dinner	

RIG CONTEMPORARY METHODS FOR SCIENCE EDUCATION RESEARCH

PURPOSE:

The broad purpose of the RIG is to advance the mission of NARST by maintaining the rigor of science education studies and the validity of their findings, as well as promoting more standardized research practices across the organization such that we are better able to learn from and synthesize each other's work. The intent is that these outcomes will, in turn, allow us to keep advancing the field and maintain the relevance of our research to improving science teaching and learning. More specifically, our goal would be to facilitate learning of and discussion about philosophical (i.e., ontological, epistemological) issues related to research methodology, as well as about recent developments and best methodological practices for science education research. The RIG will focus on methods and their applications in both the qualitative and quantitative traditions.

Long Term Contact: Joseph A Taylor (jtaylor@bscs.org/719.219.4104)

CHAIR SELECTION AND ROTATION:

Joseph A Taylor volunteers to be the chair between now and the

2014 conference. At that time Joseph A. Taylor will seek nominations for a co-chair that would remain in the position with Joseph for 3 years. If one nomination is received, that person will become the co-chair. If multiple nominations are received, there will be an election. Prior to the 2017 meeting, nominations will be sought for two new co-chairs and elections will be held if 3 or more nominations are received. Nominations will be accepted from members who have participated in the RIG for the previous three years. One of the initial co-chairs will agree to serve as advisor to the new co-chairs for a one-year transition period (2017-18) into the new 3-year term. This transition mechanism for will continue for future changes in the chair position.

ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE:

In addition to co-chairs, the RIG will seek nominations for a "communications officer" that will take minutes, disseminate announcements, and help coordinate the activities of the RIG.

Should the work of the RIG grow and evolve such that subcommittees are needed to best utilize the human resources of the RIG membership, volunteers for committee chairs will be sought from the RIG co-chairs. The RIG co-chairs will conduct quarterly phone meetings with committee co-chairs throughout the year to provide input and monitor progress.

POTENTIAL PLANS OF ACTION:

Initial meetings of the RIG will be somewhat exploratory as the purpose of these meetings will be to surface the most salient methodological issues in our work. After this preliminary work, we envision the RIG proposing symposia, pre-conference workshops, and other sessions to the Research Committee on both broad and specific methodological topics.

One example of a near-term idea is for the RIG to conduct a pre-conference workshop toward the goal of helping NARST researchers learn from, build upon, and synthesize each other's work.

This can be thought of as increasing the coherence of our body of knowledge through appropriate standardization in research reporting practices. The title could be something like: Toward More Consistent Quantitative Approaches in Science Education Research. In such a workshop, we could share with participants trends in quantitative research reporting practices in science education journals, note the diversity of approaches that are used for a given research question, and suggest some recommended practices for statistical reporting where the recommendation comes from the perspective of practices being the most replicable, rigorous, and accessible to the broadest set of audiences. We at BSCS have collected extensive information on research practices as part of our NSF-funded meta-analysis of science education effect sizes of which I am the Principal Investigator (NSF DRL#1118555). After sharing findings about common reporting practices and making some recommendations thereof, the workshop participants would engage with real data sets to see how some of the recommendations are applied. Finally, participants would be encouraged to assess the strengths, limitations, and other implications of implementing the recommended practices.

To develop session and workshop ideas such as the one proposed above, the RIG will meet at each annual conference, with the administrative team (and other RIG members as appropriate) meeting quarterly between conferences.

MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE

Charge of the Committee

The Membership Committee examines the membership of NARST as an organization and reports on the membership as dictated by the NARST Board; generates plans to recruit more members to NARST; and ascertains and responds to the ongoing needs and interests of the membership as a way to retain members.

Committee Composition

The Committee consists of 12 members. Nine of these members are voting members with two additional non-voting members serving as advisory and one non-voting Board Director working with the Committee. The voting membership of the committee must include at least one graduate student and two International NARST members at all times. With the exception of the inaugural year of the Committee, the appointment term for voting committee members is 3 years with 3 voting members rotating out every year replaced by 3 members appointed by the President-elect. The Committee members represent the diversity of the membership and their interests as a whole.

One representative from the International Committee and one representative from the Equity and Ethics (E & E) Committee will be appointed by their respective committees to serve as advisors to the Membership Committee. Each appointed individual must have already served at least one year on his or her committee (E&E or International). These representatives will assist the Committee in addressing any questions or concerns regarding the diverse needs of the membership. Each appointed individual will serve a one-year advisory term with the Committee, although each may be selected for multiple terms if his or her committee (E&E or International) so chooses.

Two Co-chairs lead the Committee and a designated elected Board Director serves as a liaison between the Committee and the Board. The President-Elect, in consultation with the Board Director, recommends Co- chairs to the Board for approval.

Committee Member Commitments

Committee Activities

The Committee, in isolation or in collaboration with other NARST entities, will implement appropriate data collection activities (e.g., surveys, focus groups) to ascertain the needs and interests of the membership. The Committee, in isolation or in collaboration with other NARST groups, will seek to address these needs and interests through NARST constituency-specific activities (e.g., early career conference sessions) that may occur at or outside the NARST Annual International Conference.

Past Practices

In the past, the membership activities, as part of the previous Membership & Elections Committee, included the planning and implementation of sessions at the annual conference (practices summarized below). Now, the Membership Committee is a stand-alone committee; consequently, its members may be able and want to offer more services to the membership—surveying the membership to gauge interests and desires and work with other NARST committees to offer webinars accessible throughout the year are two examples.

Mentor/Mentee Nexus

- In January, the lead coordinator for the event informs the committee co-chair of any specific room needs for the event. For example, if the event utilizes small groups and expects a large number of participants then the committee co-chair can submit a request to the Program Coordinator for a room with a certain capacity and room set up of round tables.
- Approximately 6-8 weeks prior to the conference, the lead coordinator for the event contacts the NARST Executive Director and Drohan, the management company, to receive a list of individuals who volunteered during conference registration to be a mentor and a list of individuals who requested mentors. The Board Member liaison can provide contact information for the NARST Executive Director and the Drohan contact, if needed.
- The coordinating group for the event sends emails to the mentors and mentees (see Appendix A for samples).
- Appendix B includes an example of a past structuring (2016) of the conference session.
- The NARST conference meeting is a space for discussing the session—challenges and ways to improve it. The coordinators also submit a written report to be included in the spring Board report (see Appendix C for an example report)

DOCUMENTS AND SAMPLE LETTERS FOR MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE

MENTOR/MENTEE SAMPLE INVITATION

We invite all new NARST members and experienced NARST members to participate in a Mentor/Mentee program and special NARST session at the Annual International Conference. To aid new members in the navigation of the NARST community and conference, we match newer members (mentees) with more seasoned members (mentors) to engage in discussion to help launch or expand professional networks.

Mentors and mentees are encouraged to communicate before and during the Annual International Conference and then participate in this informal discussion session during the conference. We encourage all NARST members who are early in their professional career to attend this session. We encourage all experienced NARST members to consider sharing their wisdom and experience by being a mentor.

Are you a new member to the NARST community? Do you have questions about how to get the most out of your conference experience? Do you have questions about how to get involved in NARST committees? Do you want to begin networking with others in your field and in the broader NARST community? Please sign up as a mentee, and we will match you with an experienced NARST member to help mentor you through the early phases of your NARST career.

Are you an experienced member in the NARST community? Would you like to help the newer members get the most benefit from their conference experience? Can you show them how to navigate the program and conference events? Can you answer questions about sessions, committees, and ways to get involved in the association? We need experienced NARST members who want to continue making a difference in the association by helping build and foster our new membership. If you would like to serve as a mentor for a new NARST member, please sign up. We will match you with a mentee before the conference.

To Sign Up

Please mark all appropriate responses with an X:

(1) I would like to participate this year as a ___Mentor ___Mentee

(2) I would prefer to work with someone in one of the following research areas:

- ___ 1. Science Learning, Understanding and Conceptual Change

- ___ 2. Science Learning: Contexts, Characteristics, and Interactions

- ___ 3. Science Teaching—Primary School (Grades preK-6)

- ___ 4. Science Teaching—Middle and High School (Grades 5-12)

- ___ 5. College Science Teaching and Learning (Grades 13-20)

- ___ 6. Science Learning in Informal Contexts Cultural, Social, and Gender Issues

- ___ 7. Preservice Science Teacher Education

- 8. In-service Science Teacher Education

- 9. Reflective Practice

- 10. Curriculum, Evaluation, and Assessment

- 11. Cultural, Social and Gender Issues

- 12. Educational Technology

- 13. History, Philosophy and Sociology of Science

- 14. Environmental Education

- 15. Policy

(3) Optional. If you have any additional special requests to consider in matching mentor/mentee pairs, please describe: _____.

Once you have completed this short questionnaire, click on the SEND button to return to XXXXX,

XXXXX, Chair, Membership Committee

Sample Email to Mentee

Here is a sample email sent to mentees about three weeks prior to the conference.

Dear Mentees,

On behalf of NARST, let us be the first to welcome you to San Antonio, Texas! We are glad you have agreed to work with a mentor, and we hope that your mentor will help to make your NARST conference experience a good one.

The Mentor/Mentee Nexus will take place on Saturday, April 22, 6-7pm, in the Hyatt Presidio ABC. The purpose of this meeting is to provide you with an opportunity to meet with a mentor and discuss ways to maximize the benefits of NARST meetings. In the past, some people have assumed that this would be a long-term relationship, but that is not the purpose of this initiative.

Please check the attached list to find the name and email address of your mentor. Contact the person by email to say hello. Send a BRIEF paragraph to your mentor related to your interests.

Here are some typical questions you might want to ask your mentor:

1. What role does content play in NARST members' research since the only clearly identified content strand is environmental science? How can we easily identify sessions with a content focus?
2. What is NARST conference etiquette? Can we go in to sessions and leave if we are only interested in one of the papers in the set? When do we ask questions - before, during after a presentation or after all presentations? What kinds of questions are appropriate?
3. What strategies do people use to decide what to listen to; do they pick a strand or only go to sessions of people they recognize?
4. Should grad students have business cards?
5. What is appropriate attire?
6. What are the best ways to network?
7. How important are the social events (equity dinner, president's reception, etc.)?

You and your mentor are welcome to make arrangements to meet outside of the scheduled time for the Nexus. If you decide to do so, please let Malcolm Butler (Malcolm.Butler@ucf.edu) know about such arrangements. Also, be sure to complete your Mentee survey, which will be provided to you at the Nexus, as well as online.

We look forward to seeing you in a couple weeks! Safe travels.

Malcolm B. Butler
Lynn Bryan
Daniel Dickerson
Nexus Organizing Group

Sample Email to Mentors

Dear Mentors,

On behalf of NARST, thank you so much for agreeing to be a mentor for the 2017 NARST conference. The Mentor/Mentee Nexus will take place on Saturday, April 22, 6-7pm, in the Hyatt Presidio ABC. The purpose of this meeting is to provide you with an opportunity to meet with mentees and discuss ways to maximize the benefits of NARST meetings. In the past, some people have assumed that this would be a long-term relationship, but that is not the purpose of the program.

For your information, we have included a copy of the message we are sending to all mentees.

Please check the attached list to find the name and email address of your mentees. Contact them by email to say hello. Here's some information that might be good to share with your mentees before the meeting: your organization, department, and title; your history with NARST; and a brief summary of your research.

You and your mentees are welcome to make arrangements to meet outside of the scheduled time for the Nexus. If you decide to do so, please let Malcolm Butler (Malcolm.Butler@ucf.edu) know about such arrangements. Also, be sure to complete your Mentor survey, which will be provided to you at the Nexus, as well as online.

We look forward to seeing you in a couple weeks! Safe travels.

Malcolm B. Butler

Lynn Bryan

Daniel Dickerson

Mentor/Mentee Nexus Organizing Group

EARLY CAREER FACULTY FORUM HANDOUT SAMPLE

Early Career Faculty Forum

NARST Year

Location

Session Organizers		
X	X	X

Forum Overview

The membership committee hosts an annual Early Career Faculty Forum. This year the forum will use a panel approach to introduce junior faculty members and post-doctoral fellows to peers, recently promoted colleagues, and prominent scholars. The forum will focus on the nuances of succeeding during the early career years as a faculty member. Our discussions will include issues of developing and maintaining a research agenda (e.g., publications & grant writing), adhering to teaching responsibilities, and effective ways for engaging in meaningful service experiences. In addition, the forum will explore many of the challenges of transitioning into new professional roles and maintaining balance in your life in the process. The Early Career Faculty forum will provide participants with a detailed examination of the many small nuances that impact the successful navigation of early faculty careers in science education.

Forum Goals:

- To provide a basic introduction to strategies to negotiate professional relationships
- To provide opportunities to discuss grant writing and acquisition approaches
- To provide a forum to explore questions with senior colleagues
- To provide supplemental support to junior faculty for questions they may not be able to address at their home institutions

Senior Scholars:

- X
- X
- X
- X
- X
- X

POTENTIAL GUIDING QUESTIONS

Maintaining balance

1. What strategies have you used to maintain balance in your life?
2. What should I say yes or no to prior to tenure?
3. How do I say no appropriately?
4. What do you wish you had done differently, if anything, in your first few years?
5. How do you deal with difficult colleagues?
6. What suggestions do you have for ensuring work doesn't take over everything?
7. If I encounter discrimination, what should I do?

Developing and maintaining a research agenda

1. What general suggestions do you have for acquiring grants?
2. Where do you get your information about available grants?
3. What writing strategies do you use to acquire grants?
4. How do you manage to write collaborative grants?
5. What suggestions do you have for successfully publishing research?
6. How do you address negative feedback?
7. How do you know which journals are respected for tenure?
8. What is a reasonable number of publications to expect for tenure in an average year?
9. How do you suggest developing relationships with international colleagues?

Meeting teaching expectations

1. How do you manage your teaching and research responsibilities?
2. What challenges do you encounter in attempting to manage teaching and research responsibilities?
3. What strategies do you use to make your research connect with your teaching?
4. How are you able to keep up with reading new research in the field while teaching and conducting research?
5. What suggestions do you have about maximizing the relationship between teaching and research?
6. What difficulties do you encounter with assessing your students work?
7. How do you design your courses?
8. How do you ensure you are meeting the needs of culturally diverse and underrepresented groups?

Engaging in meaningful service experiences

1. How do you identify and distinguish between meaningful service opportunities?
2. What strategies do you use to make your service experiences connect with your research interests?
3. What challenges do you encounter with managing multiple service experiences with your other professional responsibilities?
4. Where do you start in finding service opportunities?
5. How do I find ways to serve in professional organizations?
6. Should I focus more on institutional, state, national, or international service?

Mentoring and creating a strong research group

1. What strategies do you have for choosing good/excellent students for your research group?
2. Did you encounter a situation where you decided a student was not a good fit for your group? What did you do?
3. How do you manage your research group regarding group meetings? Their agenda? Students responsibilities beyond their individual research?
4. What can we ask our students in our research groups to help with (beyond their own research)?
5. What suggestions do you have for mentoring graduate students well?
6. How do you ensure you create a diverse research group?

SAMPLE EMAIL SENT TO SENIOR SCHOLARS FOR EARLY CAREER FACULTY FORUM

Dear X,

I am part of the group organizing the Early Career Faculty Workshop on **DATE from TIME** at NARST this year. I was wondering if you would be willing to serve as a senior scholar during this forum. This year we are planning on having a panel that will talk through different issues encountered by early career faculty followed by a meet and greet time for early career faculty members to interact more personally with senior scholars. During the panel, you would talk with the early career faculty about developing and moving forward in their careers in relationship to scholarship, teaching, service, and balance. We will provide some starter questions to support the start of these conversations.

Please let me know if you have any questions and if you would be willing to serve.

Thank you in advance for your consideration,

ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

OVERVIEW and POSITION DESCRIPTIONS

Charge of the Committee

The committee develops recommended slates for the organization's elections. These slates should reflect the diversity of the NARST membership.

The Committee organizes nominations made by the membership and evaluates potential candidates in order to develop recommended slates of candidates to be approved by the NARST Board. The development of the slates occurs for the following NARST offices:

1. President-Elect; member of the Board
2. Directors-at-Large (hereafter referred to as "Director" or "Directors"); members of the Board
3. International Coordinator; member of the Board
4. Graduate Student Coordinator; member of the Board and
5. Secretary-Treasurer; member of the Board.

Criteria for the evaluations of candidates by the Committee include: (a) the candidates' research records, (b) their contributions to NARST to date, (c) their leadership in NARST, and (d) their expected contributions to and potential leadership in NARST serving in the mentioned offices. Expertise and experience is an additional criterion for Secretary-Treasurer.

The Committee also organizes the selection process for the Graduate Student Coordinator. The Committee organizes the nominations made by the membership and evaluates the potential candidates in order to recommend one candidate to the Board for approval. Criteria for the evaluations of candidates by the Committee include: (a) the candidates' record with respect to the NARST mission, (b) their past contributions to NARST, (c) their leadership in general and in NARST, and (d) their potential leadership of graduate students and contribution to NARST.

Committee Composition

The Committee consists of 11 members. Seven of these members are voting members with four additional members in ex officio capacities. The voting membership of the committee must include at least one graduate student and two International NARST members at all times. With the exception of the inaugural year, the appointment term for committee members is 3 years with 2-3 members rotating out every year, replaced by 2-3 members appointed by the President -elect. The Committee members represent the diversity of the membership and their interests as a whole.

One representative from the International Committee and one representative from the Equity and Ethics Committee (E &E) will be appointed by their respective committee to serve as advisors to the Elections Committee. Each appointed individual must have already served at least one year on his or her committee (E&E or International). These representatives will assist the Committee in addressing any questions or concerns. Each appointed individual will serve a one-year advisory term with the Committee, although each may be selected for multiple terms if his or her committee (E & E or International) so chooses.

The Immediate Past President and an assigned elected Board Director are non-voting members of the committee. The Immediate Past President is primarily responsible for securing nominations for President-elect and informing the committee of executive aspects of the Board as needed. The Board Director serves as the liaison between the Board and the Committee.

Two Co-chairs lead the committee. The President-Elect, in consultation with the Board Director working with the Committee, recommends Co-chairs to the Board for approval.

No member of the Elections Committee can be a nominee for an elected position during his/her full appointed term of service on the Committee.

The Elections Committee assesses and recommends to the Executive Board an elections slate of candidates for the following positions: President-Elect and Executive Board members including Directors-at-Large, International Coordinator, Graduate Student Coordinator, and Secretary-Treasurer. For descriptions of each position, please see the NARST Policies & Procedures Manual.

NOMINATION PROCEDURES:

In accordance with the NARST Bylaws, Article IV, Section 9:

The Elections Committee shall propose to the Board a slate of at least two nominees for each vacant position, except that the Committee may, should it so choose, propose only one candidate for the office of Secretary-Treasurer.

Association members may offer potential nominees for the consideration by the Election Committee by forwarding a petition to the Chair(s) of the Election Committee. Each petition must be signed by at least ten (10) Association members. This does not include Graduate Student Coordinator.

To ensure nominations are in compliance with the Bylaws, please take note of the eligibility requirements in Article IV, Section 5:

- Only members in good standing are eligible to serve as a Director or Officer of the Association.
- A nominee for President-Elect must have served previously on the Board and have been a member of the Association for a minimum of ten (10) years). A candidate for President-Elect who has not served on the Board, but who has been a member of the Association for a minimum of ten (10) years, must have the nomination endorsed by at least ten (10) NARST members.

20XX-20XX Election Timeline

For more information about the timeline associated with elections, we have provided the following timeline of the elections process.

Activity	Timeline
Call For Nominations	May XX, 20XX
Deadline to Submit Nomination packets to the NARST Executive Director	June XX, 20XX
Completed Nomination packets are sent to the Elections Committee	July XX, 20XX

Elections Committee members submit nominations	July XX, 20XX
Elections Committee reviews nominations using assessment rubrics and submit ratings to committee Chairs.	August XX, 20XX
Elections Committee discusses and votes as needed on final slate of candidates to recommend to the Board	August XX, 20XX
All nominees contacted by Elections Chairs about their continued willingness to run for office	August XX, 20XX
Elections Chairs submit recommendations to the Board for approval <i>(included in Board Report)</i>	September XX, 20XX
Board Votes on recommended slate	October Board Meeting TBD
NARST elections open <i>(Call for electronic voting sent to membership by Executive Director)</i>	January XX, 20XX
NARST elections closed	February XX, 20XX

Nomination packets should be sent by email to the Executive Director by the stated deadline. The responsibility of the Executive Director is to ensure the nominee's packet is complete. Shortly after the submission deadline, completed packages received by the submission deadline will be sent by email to the co-chairs of the Elections Committee. Incomplete packets will not be reviewed.

HOW TO COMPLETE A NOMINATION PACKET

To provide basic information regarding each NARST applicant, please provide basic information regarding your desire to become a nominee for the upcoming NARST election. A potential candidate or their nominator should include completed documents listed below in the nomination packet. A completed packet (submitted as one pdf file) must be delivered to the NARST Executive Director.

All completed packets received by the due date will be forwarded to the Elections Committee for review. Incomplete packets will not be reviewed.

Nomination Packet: President-Elect and Board of Directors positions (except for the Graduate Student Coordinator)

- 1. A Letter of Nomination**

This letter is written by the nominator (or self-nominator), proposing why the candidate should be considered for office. This letter can address how the potential candidate is qualified to be the nominee for President-Elect or for a position on the Board of Directors. *This requirement is waived for self-nominators.*

- 2. Nominee's Written Statement of Qualification**

This is a letter from candidates explaining why they consider themselves qualified for the position being considered (up to 2 pages). Please use the template included below this list.

- 3. Nominee's Curriculum Vita:**

A full CV is required for President-Elect; a modified 5-page CV is required for Board positions.

- 4. 10 written endorsements**

(can be emails from 10 NARST members indicating support of the nomination). These emails can be a short statement indicating support of the nomination; the language of the emails will not be evaluated by the Elections Committee.

Nomination Packet: Graduate Student Coordinator position

1. Letter of Support from Nominee’s Graduate Program Advisor

This letter proposes why the candidate should be considered for office, including the nominee’s knowledge and experience most beneficial to the position. This letter can address how the potential candidate is qualified to be the nominee for the Graduate Student Coordinator position.

2. Completed Application Form

3. Nominee’s *Curriculum Vita* (up to 2 pages)

4. Nominee’s Graduate School Transcript (up-to-date, unofficial is acceptable)

TEMPLATE: Graduate Student Coordinator Nominee’s Written Statement of Qualification

Name

University

Address

City

State

Zip

Code Country

Phone E-mail

- Describe your past contribution to the NARST community (up to 250 words). This may include presentations, review of proposals, past committees or volunteer activities you completed in service of NARST for the annual conference.
- Describe your potential contributions to NARST while serving as the Graduate Student Coordinator (up to 250 words)
- Describe your plans for leading graduate students in NARST (up to 250 words).

SELECTION OF NOMINEES PROCEDURE

After the applications are received, the members of the Elections Committee will convene to review the applications. Our goal is to provide the membership with a minimum of 2 candidates per available position. There is one exception to this; the Secretary-Treasurer position can have 1 candidate. The rubrics will be provided to all committee members. Upon reviewing the candidates and collecting the scores from the Committee members, the nominees with the top combined rubric scores will be selected for candidacy. At that time, the Elections Committee will propose the top candidates to the NARST Board of Directors for approval.

ASSESSMENT RUBRICS FOR ELECTIONS

Overview

The rubrics below provide an overview of the criteria to analyze the candidates for elected Board of Directors positions and the President-Elect position. In your review of the nominee’s application package, please review the application by using the rubrics and offer notes. Only whole-number scores are used (1-3).

Rubrics for President-Elect & Board Members (except for the Graduate Student Coordinator)

Special Note: nominee for President-Elect must have served previously on the Board OR been a member of the Association for a minimum of 7 of the past 10 years. [YES / NO]

Item #1: Research Record*		
<i>Score 1</i>	<i>Score 2</i>	<i>Score 3</i>
CV demonstrates a research record that establishes a <i>history of research and/or</i> teaching scholarship.	CV demonstrates a research record that establishes a history of publication and research in <i>the most prominent science education journals</i> (based on ISI impact factor <u>and/or</u> teacher audience).	CV demonstrates a record of <i>distinguished scholarship</i> and leadership in the science education community as indicated by awards and citation record.
<i>Notes regarding the nominee’s record of distinction:</i>		

*The intent of the options (“and/or”) is to value research contributions from different types of institutions (e.g., research and/or teaching institutions).

**Example Research Journals – *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, International Journal of Science Education, Science Education, Science & Education, Cultural Studies of Science Education.*
 Example Practitioner Journals – *Journal of Science Teacher Education, The Science Teacher, Science and Children, Science Scope, Journal of College Science Teaching.*

Item #2: History of Participation* in the NARST Annual International Conference		
<i>Score 1</i>	<i>Score 2</i>	<i>Score 3</i>
Record of <u>participation in</u> NARST for 1-2 of the past 5 years.	Record of <u>participation in</u> NARST for 3- 4 of the past 5 years.	Record of <u>participation in</u> NARST for each of the past 5 years.
Notes regarding nominee’s participation in the NARST Annual International Conference.		

* Participation can include research presentations, organizing symposia and workshops, reviewing proposals, serving as discussant or presider.

Item #3: Record of Leadership* Contribution to NARST		
Score 1	Score 2	Score 3
Record of <u>some</u> version of <u>leadership</u> in NARST in 1-2 of the past 5 years	Record of <u>consistent</u> and <u>regular</u> leadership in NARST in 3-4 of the past 5 years	Record of consistent and regular leadership in NARST that includes serving as <u>Chair, Strand Coordinators, Board Member, JRST editor/Associate Editor or other executive position.</u> <u>Some aspect of leadership should have been demonstrated</u> in each of the past 5 years.
Notes regarding candidate's leadership contribution to NARST:		

**NARST leadership can include serving as Chair, Strand Coordinators, Board Member, JRST Editor/ Associate Editor or other executive position.*

Item #4 : Potential Leadership in NARST		
Score 1	Score 2	Score 3
The nominee's statement of qualification provides a <u>description</u> of their potential contribution.	The nominee's statement of qualification provides a <u>clearly articulated vision</u> of a potential contribution that is <u>aligned with the NARST mission*</u> but <u>not innovative</u> .	The candidate's statement provides a <u>clearly articulated vision</u> of a potential contribution that is both <u>aligned with the NARST mission*</u> and <u>innovative</u> .
Notes regarding candidate's potential leadership in NARST:		

NARST Mission Statement

NARST is a worldwide organization of professionals committed to the improvement of science teaching and learning through research. Since its inception in 1928, NARST has promoted research in science education and the communication of knowledge generated by the research. The ultimate goal of NARST is to help all learners achieve science literacy. NARST promotes this goal by: 1) encouraging and supporting the application of diverse research methods and theoretical perspectives from multiple disciplines to the investigation of teaching and learning in science; 2) communicating science education research findings to researchers, practitioners, and policy makers; and 3) cooperating with other educational and scientific societies to influence educational policies.

RUBRIC FOR SECRETARY-TREASURER POSITION ONLY

<i>Item #5: Experience and Expertise (for Secretary-Treasurer only)</i>		
<i>Score 1</i>	<i>Score 2</i>	<i>Score 3</i>
The nominee’s packet lists expertise and some experiences necessary in fulfilling the duties of the position.	The nominee’s packet clearly discusses requisite expertise and several experiences necessary in fulfilling the duties of the position.	The nominee’s packet lists, discusses, and provides evidence for requisite expertise and many experiences needed in fulfilling the duties of the position.
<p>Special Note: Each candidate for the office of Secretary-Treasurer should, at a minimum, be able to translate and communicate financial information to laypersons, have some experience with and understand budgets for organizations (e.g., departments), and possess some knowledge of Robert’s Rules of Order regarding minutes.</p>		
<p>Notes regarding nominee’s experience and expertise:</p>		

Total Score:

Rubric for Graduate Student Coordinator

Assessment Process

Overview

The rubric below provides an overview of the four criteria the Elections Committee uses to assess the nominees for Graduate Student Coordinator Board Member. The review of the nominee's packet is guided by the rubric with opportunities for reviewers to record notes.

Special Note: The graduate student nominee must be a member in good standing at the time of the nomination.

Please use whole numbers (1, 2, or 3) for the evaluations.

- The Elections Committee will consider all applications and will assess them according to the following criteria: 1. Graduate Student Record. 2. Past Contributions to NARST. 3. Potential Contribution to NARST. 4. Potential Contribution to NARST. 5. Potential Leadership in NARST.
- The Elections Committee will recommend its choice of candidate to the Board, which will make the final decision and appointment.
- Criteria for adjudicating applications for the NARST Graduate Student Coordinator Position.
 - i. Graduate school record
 - ii. Past contributions to NARST
 - iii. Potential contributions to NARST

Potential Leadership in NARST

Scale: Rate each applicant on each criterion using a scale of 1-3, 3 being the highest rating.

Item #1: Graduate Student Record		
<i>Score 1</i>	<i>Score 2</i>	<i>Score 3</i>
<p>The nominee has a record that illustrates an exposure to NARST mission-related content and issues.</p> <p>Record is supported by sources (CV, transcript, advisor letter)</p>	<p>The nominee has a record that illustrates an exposure to and understanding of NARST mission-related content and issues.</p> <p>Record is supported by sources (CV, transcript, advisor letter)</p>	<p>The nominee has a record that illustrates an exposure to, understanding and application (e.g. publication, engagement) of NARST mission-related content and issues.</p> <p>Record is supported by sources (CV, transcript, advisor letter)</p>
<p><i>Notes regarding the nominee's record:</i></p>		

Item #2: Past Contribution to NARST		
Score 1	Score 2	Score 3
The nominee has <i>attended</i> NARST in the past.	The nominee has <i>attended and contributed</i> to NARST.	The nominee has a record of <i>consistent and recent</i> (within past 2 years) <i>attendance and contribution</i> to NARST.
Notes regarding nominee's attendance and contributions at the NARST Annual International Conference:		

Item #3: Leading NARST Graduate Students		
Score 1	Score 2	Score 3
<p>The nominee has a record of <i>consistent</i> leadership in some domain.</p> <p>The nominee provided general goals <i>or</i> future vision in the application about leading NARST graduate students.</p>	<p>The nominee has a record of <i>consistent</i> leadership in some domain and <i>some</i> version of leadership in NARST.</p> <p>The nominee provided general goals <i>or</i> future vision and specific, related details (e.g. activities) in the application about leading NARST graduate students.</p>	<p>The nominee has a record of <i>consistent</i> leadership in some domain and <i>consistent</i> leadership in NARST.</p> <p>The nominee provided general goals <i>or</i> future vision, specific details (e.g., activities) and strategies related to goals <i>or</i> future vision in the application about leading NARST graduate students.</p>
Notes regarding nominee's past leadership:		

Item #4: Future Contribution to NARST		
Score 1	Score 2	Score 3
The nominee's statement provides a <i>description</i> of their potential contribution in the future.	The nominee's statement provides a clearly articulated vision of a potential contribution in the future. The vision is <i>innovative and somewhat aligned with the NARST mission*</i> .	The nominee's statement provides a clearly articulated vision of a potential contribution in the future. The vision is <i>innovative, aligned with the NARST mission*</i> , and has the potential to move NARST forward.
Notes regarding nominee's vision of potential future contribution in NARST:		

***NARST Mission Statement**

NARST is a worldwide organization of professionals committed to the improvement of science teaching and learning through research. Since its inception in 1928, NARST has promoted research in science education and the communication of knowledge generated by the research. The ultimate goal of NARST is to help all learners achieve science literacy. NARST promotes this goal by: 1) encouraging and supporting the application of diverse research methods and theoretical perspectives from multiple disciplines to the investigation of teaching and learning in science; 2) communicating science education research findings to researchers, practitioners, and policy makers; and 3) cooperating with other educational and scientific societies to influence educational policies.

SAMPLE LETTERS

LETTERS RELATED TO PRESIDENT-ELECT POSITION

LETTER #1: OFFER TO BE ON THE SLATE FOR PRESIDENT-ELECT

Name and address of applicant

Dear (Name):

On behalf of the Elections Committee, I would like to invite you to be considered as a candidate for the NARST President-Elect commencing at the Annual International Conference in XXXX.

There will be two candidates and one person will be elected. The Elections Committee believes that you would be an ideal candidate for this position.

Thank you for your consideration.

Past President

LETTER #2: APPROVAL TO BE ON THE SLATE FOR PRESIDENT-ELECT

Name and address of applicant

Dear (Name):

At its October meeting, the NARST Board of Directors approved the slate of officers proposed by the Elections Committee. Now it is official; you are a candidate for the NARST President.

As a president-elect candidate, you have the opportunity to place a statement in the ballot that will help NARST members make informed choices in the election. I have attached a copy of last year's statements for your perusal. Please send the Executive Director, Helen Schneider Lemay, the text of your statement no later than XX November, 20XX.

The first spring 20XX Board meeting has been scheduled for XXX and the second meeting for XXX. If elected, you will be expected to attend the following meetings: one prior to the Annual International Conference, one following the Annual International Conference, and one in October. Please plan accordingly.

Thanks again for agreeing to stand for election.

Sincerely,

Co-Chairs of Elections Committee

LETTERS RELATED TO BOARD POSITIONS

LETTER #1: OFFER TO BE ON THE SLATE FOR THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Name and address of candidate

Dear (Name):

On behalf of the Elections Committee, I would like to invite you to be considered as a candidate for the NARST Board of Directors commencing at the Annual International Conference in XXXX.

There will be two candidates for each open position. The open positions on the Board are XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX.

Membership of the Board requires attendance at three Board meetings: one prior to the Annual International Conference, one following the Annual International Conference, and one in October. Expenses are provided for the October meeting only. Members of the Board of Directors chair committees and take a leadership role in the Association.

Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

Co-Chairs of the NARST Elections Committee

LETTER #2: SENT TO CANDIDATES BY PAST-PRESIDENT AFTER THE OCTOBER BOARD MEETING

Name and address of candidate

Dear (Name):

At its October meeting, the NARST Board of Directors approved the slate of officers proposed by the Membership and Elections Committee. Now it is official; you are a candidate for the NARST Board of Directors.

As a candidate, you have the opportunity to place a digital photograph and a statement of about 250 words for the electronic ballot that will help NARST members make informed choices in the election. I have attached a copy of last year's statements for your perusal. The Executive Director (include email address) should receive an electronic version of your statement and photograph no later than 15 November.

The April 20XX Board Meeting has been scheduled for XXX and XXX. If elected, you will be expected to attend these meetings, so please plan accordingly.

The Board also meets once on the third weekend of October; that meeting is scheduled for XXX. The attached list of Board Member responsibilities should help you understand the expectations, should you be elected.

Thanks again for agreeing to stand for election.

Sincerely,

Past-President

Enclosure: Board Member Responsibilities

Board Member Responsibilities

1. Attend and participate in Board meetings

- Attend entire Board meeting—October (third weekend in October) and Spring (two sessions, one prior to the Annual International Conference and one following the Annual International Conference). NOTE: New Board members are expected to attend the Board meeting prior to the Annual International Conference, although they do not have voting rights until the Board meeting following the Annual International Conference.

o Confidentiality of Board Members: At times the Board will go into closed sessions. It is critical that the substance of these sessions be kept confidential.

- Take part in conference calls
 - Respond to email conferences and votes
 - Attend NARST Awards Luncheon and Business Meeting, at the Annual International Conference.
2. Act as Liaison to Committees
 - Chair one or more NARST Standing Committees
 - Meet with committee via email as needed throughout the year
 - Delegate committee work to members
 - Keep committee members informed of meetings, Board decisions, etc.
 - Write committee reports for fall and spring Board meeting books
 3. *Ad hoc* Committee
 - Chair or serve on ad hoc committees as requested by the President (examples include JRST Editor Search Committee; Executive Director search committee)
 4. Represent NARST
 - Serve as liaison between NARST members and Board
 - Represent NARST at other professional meetings
 - Seek ways to further the interests of the association
-

LETTER #3: SENT TO ELECTED BOARD MEMBERS BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Name and address of candidate

Dear (new Board member):

As the Executive Director of NARST, it is my pleasure to inform you that the election results have been tallied and you have been elected as a member of the Executive Board for a period of three years (Annual International Conference, XXXX- Annual International Conference XXXX). Congratulations on such a deserving accomplishment!

Your Board member responsibilities are outlined in the attached statement. In terms of this year's Annual International Conference, your responsibilities are as follows:

1. Attend the first Board meeting on XXXX at XXXX (dinner provided). During this meeting your role will be as guest and observer. You are welcome to participate in the discussion but cannot yet make, second, or vote on motions.
2. Attend committee meetings for any committee(s) you are assigned to chair. The outgoing chair will conduct the meeting. President-elect XXXX will correspond with you about potential committee assignments prior to the meeting.

3. Attend NARST Awards Luncheon (seated at one of the reserved tables) and the Business Meeting
4. Attend the second Board meeting on XXXX from XXXX (breakfast and lunch provided). You will have full voting rights at this meeting and will be asked to present a brief summary from your committee meetings.

Congratulations again, and see you in xxxx!

Sincerely,

NARST Executive Director

Attached: Board Member
Responsibilities NARST
Mission Statement

LETTER #4: SENT BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO UNSUCCESSFUL CANDIDATES TO THE BOARD

Name and address of candidate

Dear (name):

The NARST election results have been tallied, and I am very sorry to inform you that your nomination to the Executive Board has not been successful.

As Executive Director of NARST, I sincerely thank you on behalf of the Board and the membership for taking the time, effort, and commitment to be a candidate.

I look forward to seeing you in XXXX. Best wishes for continued success in your science education research, teaching, and service efforts.

Sincerely,

Executive Director

GRADUATE STUDENT COMMITTEE

Graduate Student Research Symposium

The NARST Graduate Student Committee holds a Graduate Student Research Symposium each year. The purpose of this annual event is to support graduate students as they develop their research projects by providing an opportunity to present works-in-progress and receive feedback from scholars in science education. Participants are matched with a mentor for individualized feedback during the NARST conference. Advanced science education researchers (i.e., faculty, postdoctoral scholars, senior scholars) serve as mentors to graduate student researchers during the event. Up to 20 graduate student submissions are accepted for this sponsored session. The research symposium sub-committee led by a co-chair/member is in charge of organizing the event.

Submission Guidelines & Procedures:

- 500-word abstract (does not include references)
- Abstracts should include the following: Title, Subject/Problem, Design or Procedure, Analyses and Findings, Contributions or Significance
- Abstracts should also include a reference list
- Example works-in-progress include literature review, research design and question development, data collection and analysis, dissertation analysis and writing, etc.
- Upon acceptance, a conference paper (10-15 pages, double spaced, 12pt font, length does not include references) is due mid-February
- Abstracts and required information are submitted through a google form
 - [2020 Abstract Submission Form](#) (as an example)
 - [2020 Abstract Review Form](#) (as an example)

Mentor Commitment

- Read a 10-15 page double-spaced draft proposal and provide written feedback to a graduate student mentee
- Attend the NARST Graduate Student Research Symposium and/or meet a graduate student mentee in person. Partial Symposium attendance is acceptable. We ask that mentors who cannot attend the symposium make arrangements to meet in person during the conference.
- [2020 Mentor Recruitment Form](#) (as an example)

Graduate Student Committee (GSC) Scholarships

The NARST Graduate Student Committee offers up to four travel scholarships based on funding availability designed to provide partial support for the travel of graduate students in science and STEM education to attend the NARST Annual Conference. Scholarships are one-time, competitive, need-based awards and in the amount of \$500, and they must be applied toward the cost of attending the NARST Conference.

NARST-GSC Scholarship Eligibility Requirements

To be eligible for the scholarship, the applicant must:

- be a member of NARST
- have an accepted proposal and/or be a first-time conference attendee
- demonstrate some declared financial need
- not be receiving any financial support from parent institution
- not also be receiving a scholarship from another NARST committee (i.e., Basu Scholarship, International Committee travel award, etc.)

Priority will be given to applicants who are coming from 'underrepresented' institutions at NARST. Eligibility decisions will be made based on collaborative sub-committee discussions. Applications which are ranked highest will be selected for the scholarship on a lottery basis.

Application Process

Deadline: coordinated with other travel awards offered by other committees – in the early winter prior to the annual conference

Sample Application Form: <https://forms.gle/CGi1ZMgjiBhX7QEfA>

Recommendation Letter: This needs to be drafted by the applicant's Graduate Coordinator or Advisor. The letter should include information about the applicant's academic standing as well as financial need. Furthermore, the recommendation should mention the financial support that the applicant already has to attend the conference. The applicant needs to upload the letter at the end of the application form.

Sample Evaluation Rubric: [NGSCS RUBRIC for NARST 2020](#)

Condition of Acceptance

Notification of Awardees: coordinated with other travel awards – in the late winter prior to the annual conference

After receiving a scholarship, graduate students will be asked to:

- Attend the GSC committee/business meeting to get the award (with exceptions for those who communicate a need for the money in advance)
- Submit a brief biographical statement (up to 200 words) along with a headshot photo for use in future advertising for the scholarship

Graduate Student Coordinator

POSITION DESCRIPTION

As currently constructed, the NARST Graduate Student Coordinator is a 2-year elected position to serve on the NARST Board of Directors, fully participating in Board discussions and deliberations with the possession of voting rights. The graduate student holding this position will serve to ensure graduate student viewpoints are represented in the discussions and decisions being made by the NARST Board. Responsibilities of the position involve serving as the Chair of the Graduate Student Committee, soliciting graduate student concerns, reporting Board decisions to the graduate students, and working to further the goals of NARST. The purpose of this Board position is to ensure graduate student voices are heard by the organization and to contribute positively to the governance of NARST.

Date of Election

The election of the Graduate Student Coordinator will take place at the same time as the rest of the slate of NARST elections, as coordinated by the Membership & Elections Committee. The successful individual will begin their role as of the committee meeting during the subsequent Annual International Conference. The commitment to the NARST Board will end at the committee meeting at the NARST Annual International Conference two years later.

Duties

- Participates in NARST activities including meetings at the NARST Annual International Conference held annually, an annual fall business meeting, and electronic communications with the Board through the year.
- Participates in the planning of the annual Graduate Student Forum and Graduate Student Research Symposium, in addition to other events as determined by the Graduate Student Committee.
- Serves as a liaison between the NARST Board of Directors and NARST Graduate Student Committee.

Qualifications

Graduate student applicants must be current members of NARST, with sufficient knowledge of and leadership in furthering NARST's mission and improving science education through research.

Application Process

Applicants should submit a completed application form, an up-to-date curriculum vitae, and Nominee's Graduate School Transcript, and a letter of support from the graduate program advisor. Additional information is in the Election Committee section.

WEBSITE COMMITTEE

Charge of the Committee

The NARST Website Committee provides leadership and guidance to NARST regarding the organization's website and social media presence. The responsibilities include advising about the curation and modification of the website, listserv, and social media platforms. This may include periodic evaluation of the website and content creation within social media platforms with input from the NARST membership. The Website Committee shall recommend changes to the website and social media platforms and offer suggestions to the Board of Directors.

Committee Composition

The website committee composition should be designed to bring expertise and continuity to the discussion of the NARST website, listserv, and social media platforms on an ongoing basis. Two Co-chairs chosen from the NARST membership lead the committee. A member of the elected Board of Directors serves as a liaison and non-voting member. The President-Elect recommends Co-chairs to the Board for approval. In addition to the co-chairs, the committee membership consists of five other voting members (two international). A subset of the committee will aid in managing the social media platforms. The President-elect appoints these members for a term of three years of service, renewable once. The co-chairs and appointed members' terms should be staggered to maintain continuity in membership.