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, February 2021, December 2022, May 2023

Table of Contents

Awards 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 [YEAR]. *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,
e) signed acknowledgement of compliance with the NARST Code of Ethical Conduct (https://narst.org/code-ethical-conduct), and
f) 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 XXXXXXX at the address below no later than July 31.

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:

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.)\

NARST 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.)

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) signed acknowledgement of compliance with the NARST Code of Ethical Conduct (https://narst.org/code-ethical-conduct),
(4) 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 July 31. 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.

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.

stract 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

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,

Chair, NARST Outstanding Doctoral Research Award Selection Committee

Distinguished Contribution to Science Education through Research Award

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 at the time of nomination. 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 July 31, 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

Nominees that move forward in the process will submit a signed acknowledgement of compliance with the NARST Code of Ethical Conduct (https://narst.org/code-ethical-conduct).

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.

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, (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

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:

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:

II. 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:

III. Summary

Total Numeric Rating

Overall Rank

NARST Fellows Award Program
(updated July 2021)

Rationale

The NARST Fellows Award Program is an award that honors and recognizes the work of a NARST member that has made an exceptional impact in science education. The emphasis is on translational scholarship, wherein scholars extend the boundaries of traditional research and service in order to impact formal and informal science education. Through this award program, we celebrate work that makes a difference in the lives of children, teachers, and communities at local, national and international levels.

The NARST Fellows will be a current and active member of the NARST community. The award, which will honor and recognize the work of scholars who make exceptional impact in science education, will simultaneously provide opportunities for NARST members to engage in service to NARST and the broader science education and education community through (a) NARST Fellows Society (b) Mentoring (c) Advisory Roles, and (d) Fellows Award Subcommittee.

Who is a NARST Fellow?

To be eligible for recognition as a NARST Fellow, members must meet the following criteria:

a) Current and active NARST membership of at least 10 years
b) Evidence of service to NARST
c) Evidence of leadership and/or service in science education (e.g., service and leadership through collaborations 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)
d) Evidence of translational impact in science education (e.g., development of new ideas, illumination of novel areas, pursuit of a line of work, robust dissemination)

Nomination Process

We encourage you to nominate a qualified colleague for this prestigious award. The

nominee should be and have demonstrated:

- 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 the science education community

The nomination process is described below:

The nominator must write a two-page letter of nomination addressing the selection criteria. A nominator can only nominate one person per cycle

- Append a 10-page abbreviated CV of the nominee with the letter
- A statement (max: 3 pages) that describes the impact and transformative work of the nominee. The statement should be written by the nominee
- Two additional letters of support discussing the contributions of the nominee's work. (A letter writer may write only one letter of support for the nominee)
- The nominee should submit all of the above as one pdf document to the Chair/Co-Chair of the NARST Fellows Subcommittee

The completed package will be reviewed by the NARST Fellows Subcommittee.

*Incomplete packages will not be accepted.

Nomination Materials

The complete nomination package contains:

- A letter of nomination. The letter is written by the nominator addressing the selection criteria.
- A 10-page abbreviated CV
- A statement of impact and transformative work (max: 3 pages) written 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)

Timeline

- The first call for NARST Fellows nomination will be released by May 15. Second and third calls will be issued by June 15 and July 15 respectively. Due dates for submission of completed packages will be slated for August 1.
- Fellows will be announced in January, and will receive the title and award (Octavia/plaque)

- The Fellow status can be revoked for misconduct, breeches in professional ethics, or when the Fellow 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

What is the Translational Impact?

The ways in which scholarship is translated into concrete impact

- The type and nature of impact on the lives of people: to what extent is the work transformative and equitably consequential?
- The ways in which the work attend and address inequity and injustice: who were the most impacted people through the work, and how did the work contribute to promoting equity and justice?

What is the Depth of Impact?

- To what degree did the work change lives?
- How profoundly were lives changed?
- How enduring is the change?
- Sustainability of program development, commitment to working with community organizations, etc.

What is the Breadth of Impact?

- How many people are likely to be affected?
- How many units of an intervention were created? Distributed?
- How long-standing is the impact?

NARST Fellow Award Program Rubric
(updated July 2021)

Nominee: _____ Position: _____

Institution: _____

Email: _____ Phone: _____

Nominator: _____ Position: _____

Institution: _____

Nominee NARST membership: _____(#

of years) Nominator NARST membership:

_____(# of years)

Review of Nominee's Package

Each of the categories will be rated on a scale of 1-5 (5 being highest). The criteria below will guide review of the nominee's package:

Criteria 1: What is the Translational Impact?

- The type and nature of impact on the lives of people: to what extent is the work transformative and equitably consequential?
- The ways in which the work attend and address inequity and injustice: who were the most impacted people through the work, and how did the work contribute to promoting equity and justice?

Criteria 2: What is the Depth of Impact?

- To what degree did the work change lives?

- How profoundly were lives changed?
- How enduring is the change?
- Sustainability of program development, commitment to working with community organizations, etc.

Criteria 3: <u>What is the Breadth of Impact?</u>

- How many people are likely to be affected?
- How many units of an intervention were created? Distributed?
- How long-standing is the impact?

To what extent do the nominator and other supporting letters align with the above criteria?

_____Nominator Letter

Comments:

_____Support Letter 1

Comments:

_____ Support Letter 2

Comments:

_____Nominee Statement

Comments:

_____CV 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:

a) Member of NARST;
b) 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."
c) Advanced-level doctoral student or junior scholar within 6 years of completion of doctoral degree;
d) Attends or works at a US university at the time of application;
e) 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**, including name, email, and 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 to Equity and Ethics Committee

APPLICATION DEADLINE: OCTOBER 30

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

Eligibility	
□ Yes □ No	Are you a current member of NARST?
□ Yes □ No	Do you attend or work at a U.S. university?
□ Yes □ 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:
□ Yes □ 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.
Yes □No Have yet to hear	Has your proposal(s) to the 20XX NARST Annual Conference been accepted?
□ Yes □ No	Are you willing to participate in the Pre-conference Workshop offered by the NARST Equity and Ethics Committee?

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 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 member93	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

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

(updated November 2021_
Disaffiliation will be accomplished through written notice and Board action.

1. Written notice by initiating organization
    a. An Affiliate may disaffiliate from NARST at any time by submitting a letter to the NARST Executive Director citing the Affiliate's Board action to initiate disaffiliation and the reasons for this request. It is agreed that specific contractual or fiscal agreements must be handled separately from these proceedings.
    b. NARST may move to terminate an Affiliation relationship by submitting a letter from the NARST President to the Affiliate President citing related NARST Board action to initiate disaffiliation and the reasons for this request. In the case of disaffiliation, it is agreed that specific contractual or fiscal agreements must be handled separately from these proceedings.
2. Board Action
    a. The NARST Board of Directors must act on any disaffiliation request and on the resolution of any related business issues in order to confirm and effect disaffiliation.
    b. The governing body of the disaffiliating organization must confirm such disaffiliation, and accommodate for this action in their records. Upon confirmation, the affiliation will be terminated. If confirmation does not occur within six months, then confirmation will be assumed and the affiliation will be terminated.

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.

Announcement to be posted on narst.org in October/November: (updated December 2021)

To NARST International Members:

The NARST International Committee is offering travel scholarships* to support the travel of PhD students and Early-career scholars within 10 years of completion of their PhD to travel to the NARST XXXX Annual Meeting to be held ***(fill in details)*** USA.

International members (scholars living and working outside of the USA) are invited to submit an application to the International Coordinator at ic.narst@gmail.com by January XX, 20XX.

*The amount of the scholarship varies depending on where the researcher lives and what activities are to be supported. Please review the application materials carefully for more details.

For the application form please visit ***(insert link to application, shown below).***

NARST 20XX INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE TRAVEL SCHOLARSHIP APPLICATION (updated

December 2021)

Last name:	**First name:**
Institution name:	
Institution address:	
Mailing address:	
Email:	

To qualify for the scholarship you must meet the following criteria:

1. What is your NARST Membership #: _____ Current professional status (must comply with ONE of the following)
2. I am a science education graduate student studying outside the USA. ___Yes _____No
3. I am a science education scholar within 10 years of completion of PhD and working outside the USA (*doctoral degree conferred on or after 20XX) _____ Yes No
4. Have you received a NARST scholarship in the past? _____Yes _____No

If yes, in what year did you receive the scholarship and for which purpose/program was the scholarship awarded? _____

(*Guidelines stipulate that members are eligible for the IC Scholarship twice in a 10 year period*)

Please estimate your budget for attending the virtual conference.	
Conference registration fee:	**Infrastructure to support virtual attendance** *(List **item(s)**, such as headset, internet, etc. including a **price** for the item(s))*:
Please describe any additional funding you are guaranteed to receive in support of your travels to attend the 20XXAnnual (Virtual) NARST Conference. For example, will your institution cover the cost of conference registration, infrastructure (internet, headset) costs independent of this award? As the IC Awards are awarded based on both merit and need, we ask you to describe any additional support that you will receive outside of this IC Award. **There is not any institutional funding for conference attendance in my institution that I can cover my expenses.**	

Please attach <u>THREE</u> additional documents to your application materials that include:

<u>DOCUMENT 1</u>

A. **<u>Provide a written statement</u>** (*maximum of 300 words*) answering the following questions:

- What is the nature of your participation in the 20XX NARST Conference (e.g. title of your presentation, symposium, poster etc.)?
- What benefits do you expect to gain from participating at the conference?
- How may your participation at the NARST XX at this conference benefit the goals for science education in your country?
- How might the international NARST community benefit from your contribution?

<u>DOCUMENT 2</u>

B. **<u>Evidence of participation in NARST</u>** that include the following:

- Copy of your proposal acceptance email for the 20XX NARST conference.
- If you are not presenting, but are serving NARST membership in another way, please provide evidence to explain (e.g., serving on a committee, serving on the Board, etc.)

<u>DOCUMENT 3</u>

C. **<u>Provide your curriculum vita</u>** (*maximum of 2 pages*) that includes the following:

- Education and professional experiences in science education,

Contributions to the field of science education research both within your country and internationally (including any publications, grants, conference papers, presentations, etc.)

NARST 20xx INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE TRAVEL SCHOLARSHIP APPLICATION (updated December 2021)

REVIEW FORM

APPLICANT NAME:

Criteria that are not scored

Minimum criteria for eligibility:

In order to be eligible for the IC scholarship, the applicant should have "yes" responses for the following items.

Yes	No	
		Applicant is a current member of NARST
		Applicant resides outside of the US
		Applicant is either a current graduate student or an early career faculty member of researcher (within the 10 years of completion of Ph.D.).
		Applicant provides evidence of participating in the Annual Conference (e.g., presenting a paper, chairing a committee, or serving on the Board, etc.)

Applicant's country income level (Refer to Appendix A) **Applicant's country of residence:**

Income level of applicant's country:

- ☐ Low income (Less than $1,025 per capita/per year)
- ☐ Lower middle income (Between $ 1,026-3995 per capita/per year)
- ☐ Upper middle income (Between $ 3996-12,735 per capita/per year)
- ☐ Higher income (More than $12,736 per capita/per year)

Check country income levels for each year at this site and check Appendix A

Criteria that are scored - SUMMARY TABLE

	EVALUATION CATEGORY	POINTS (MAX 3)	SCORE
1	Nature of Participation at Conference	3	
2	Expected benefits for attending conference	3	
3	Contribution or Potential Contribution to Field (see CV)	3	
		TOTAL	

RUBRIC 1 point for each following criterion (updated December 2021)

Criterion 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.

Criterion 2: BENEFITS EXPECTED BY ATTENDING

- Applicant describes how attending the conference 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)

Criterion 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

(please provide your comments here)

APPENDIX A (updated December 2021)

Low-income economies ($1,085 or less)- Scholarship amount $1000

Lower-middle-income economies (1,086-$4256)– Scholarship amount $800

Upper-middle-income economies ($4,256 to $13,205) Scholarship amount $500

High-income economies ($13,206 or more) Scholarship amount $300

Andorra	Gibraltar	Palau
Antigua and Barbuda	Greece	Panama
Aruba	Greenland	Poland
Australia	Guam	Portugal
Austria	Hong Kong SAR, China	Puerto Rico
Bahamas, The	Hungary	Qatar
Bahrain	Iceland	San Marino
Barbados	Ireland	Saudi Arabia
Belgium	Isle of Man	Seychelles
Bermuda	Israel	Singapore
British Virgin Islands	Italy	Sint Maarten (Dutch part)
Brunei Darussalam	Japan	Slovak Republic
Canada	Korea, Rep.	Slovenia
Cayman Islands	Kuwait	Spain
Channel Islands	Latvia	St. Kitts and Nevis
Chile	Liechtenstein	St. Martin (French part)
Croatia	Lithuania	Sweden
Curaçao	Luxembourg	Switzerland
Cyprus	Macao SAR, China	Taiwan, China
Czech Republic	Malta	Trinidad and Tobago
Denmark	Monaco	Turks and Caicos Islands
Estonia	Netherlands	United Arab Emirates
Faroe Islands	New Caledonia	United Kingdom
Finland	New Zealand	United States
France	Northern Mariana Islands	Uruguay
French Polynesia	Norway	Virgin Islands (U.S.)
Germany	Oman	

International Committee Call for Proposals Linking Science Educators Program (LSEP)

(updated December 2021)

Description

NARST is a worldwide organization committed to help all learners to achieve scientific literacy as an ultimate goal and to cooperate with educational and scientific societies to influence science education policies. The Linking Science Educators (LSEP) program is an initiative designed to contribute to the improvement of science education in countries interested in science education reform. In particular, the program intends to support representatives from countries that are either economically disadvantaged (e.g., UNDP Human Development Index 0.80 or below) or educationally disadvantaged countries (e.g., low financial support towards science education with respect to their gross national product for education). However, the LSEP award can also be awarded to researchers and science education practitioners who seek to implement new ideas on science educational reform in their countries but cannot attain enough financial support.

The LSEP program seeks to act as a catalyst whereby NARST members contribute their expertise and experiences in theory and in practice to people in different countries by participating as resource- individuals.

The LSEP program supports economy round-trip airfare for resource-individuals (who must be NARST members) and the host country is expected to provide the cost for the resource person's stay and for expenses for the proposed activities (e.g., conference, workshop, seminar, or other activity). Countries that are involved in science education reform are encouraged to submit a proposal for the LSEP program via the chairpersons of their science education association, or other recognized bodies in the country, to the NARST International Coordinator/International Committee Chair.

Purpose

The Linking Science Education Program (LSEP) has been established for the following purposes:

1. To connect science educators with countries interested in improving science education, in particular, with economically disadvantaged or underrepresented countries in order to support implementing new ideas in science education reform.
2. To encourage NARST members to contribute their expertise and experiences in theory and practice to different regions and countries.
3. To demonstrate the commitment of NARST to improving science education research in different communities.
4. To share responsibilities for improving scientific literacy of all citizens in the 21st century.
5. To promote active interaction among science education associations/groups.

Who is eligible for this LSEP program?

1. Countries that are willing to implement science education reform will be strongly encouraged to submit the proposal for the LSEP program either via the chairpersons of their science education association or from other internally recognized bodies/Leaders that are associated with the improvement of science education.
2. The LSEP program will act as a catalyst to encourage NARST members to contribute their expertise and experiences in theory and in practice to different regions and

countries.

Budget anticipated

The maximum total award amount is $7,000.

Submission deadlines: February 1, 20XX

Starting and ending time: March 20, XXXX - December 31, 20XX

Who are the resource experts?

All NARST members are eligible and encouraged to serve as resource experts and to contribute their experiences and expertise to the LSEP program.

Procedures and requirements of application

The following procedures are recommended to those interested in applying for LSEP funding:

1. Download LSEP announcement, application form and evaluation forms from www.narst.org.
2. Search for potential resource persons who will agree to collaborate.
3. Consult the NARST International Coordinator or the Chair of the LSEP committee, ***(insert name and email address***) with questions and for help with the preparation of the proposal if needed.
4. Submit the proposal to the NARST International Committee, electronically at ic.narst@gmail.com

Additional Requirements (for funded projects)

5. Write a 1-page description of the project to advertise the project on the NARST website. The description should be submitted to the NARST International Coordinator. Any questions about how to prepare the summary can be directed to the International Coordinator.
6. Write a 1-page report after completing the project for NARST and submit it to the NARST International Coordinator. The report will describe how the project was implemented and outcomes from the project. Support will be provided by the International Coordinator in writing the report if needed.

Selection Process

The LSEP Sub-Committee will review all applications based on the provided criteria. Preference will be given to applicants who demonstrate a strong case for science education reform in their country that would benefit from international expertise. Recipients are chosen through a review process by the International Committee, and upon approval by the NARST Board of Directors.

Linking Science Educators Program (LSEP)Application
(updated December 2021)

Part 1: Applicant Information

First Name	
Last Name	
Name of Institution	
Address of Institution	
Postcode	
Country	
Email	
Telephone	

Part 2: Project Description

Project Title	
Project Time Frame	
Keywords (at least 3)	
Task Group Chairperson (needs to be NARST member)	(Name, email, address)
Task Group Members	(Name, email, address)
Project Objectives	(50 word max)
Project Description **(including names and institutions of resource persons who need to be NARST members. If not,**	(Max 1000 words or 2 pages)

they have to register before conducting the project)	
Duration	
Audience (who and how many)	
Location	
Format	(conference, workshop, lecture, combination of formats – please explain)
Proposed agenda	
Outcome(s)	(Select as many as relate from the list below, or add additional outcomes) Journal papers Book Conference proceeding Set of Instructional materials Workshop Database Web page Other
Dissemination Plan	
Budget Travel Administrative	

Local transportation Other (describe) **Total (in USD)**	
Amount of funding requested from NARST	
External funding (agency and amount, if any)	
Anticipated Impact	
Criteria for Retrospective Evaluation	
Reference Persons	

LSEP Reviewer Form

Applicant	
Country	
LSEP Format: (Conference/Workshop/Seminar)	

LSEP Review **Summary Table**

Review Category Points (Max 100 points)

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 points:

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

1. Applicant's status (10 points)

(1) Applicant is a CURRENT member of NARST
(2) Applicant is currently in a position to facilitate/lead the LSEP project in her/his country
(3) Applicant shows strong competence in potential to conduct proposed LSEP project

□ all fit well (7-10 points) □ partially fit (3-6 points) □ all do NOT fit well (0-2 points) Comments:

2. Meets LSEP Requirements (15 points)

(1) Project addresses an emergent need for improving science education quality (1-8 points)

(2) Project to be conducted in/with economically disadvantaged or underrepresented countries (1-7 points)

Comments:

3. Content and Value of the Proposal (20 points)

(1) Project clearly addresses value of promoting science education (1-7 points)

(2) Planned activity is feasible (1-7 points)

(3) Anticipated outcomes are achievable (1-6 points) Comments:

4. Contribution to NARST and International Community (20 points)

(1) Fulfills the LSEP/ NARST mission of promoting quality of teaching and learning in science (1-10 points)

(2) Fulfill the LSEP/ NARST mission in communicating with researchers internationally (1-10 points)

Comments:

5. **Contribution to Applicant's Country (25 points)**

(1) Fulfills the LSEP mission of promoting quality of teaching and learning in science (1-7 points)

(2) Fulfill the LSEP mission in communicating with researchers (1-6 points)

(3) Potential to influence science education policy (1-6 points)

(4) Involves various participants/stakeholders to participate in the activity (1-6 points) Comments:

6. Qualification of Resource Persons (10 points)

(1) Background and experience of resource persons in science education (1-5 points)

(2) Appropriateness of expertise relative to the proposed activity (1-5 points) Comments:

International Committee Scholarships

xxxx Doctoral Research School (updated 2022)
Application deadline is xx xx, 20xx.

As part of its increased focus on international communication and collaboration, NARST will be funding **xx** doctoral students to participate in this virtual doctoral school, The main purpose of the funding is to support the learning experiences of science education doctoral students by providing an opportunity to meet with science education researchers and peers from other parts of the world

The NARST International Committee is offering xx scholarships to support attendance of PhD students at the 20xx xxxx Research School. NARST members are encouraged to apply.
As part of its increased focus on international communication and collaboration, NARST will be funding **xx** doctoral students to participate in this virtual doctoral school. The main purpose of the funding is to support the learning experiences of science education doctoral students by providing an opportunity to meet with science education researchers and peers from other parts of the world. The research school will be hosted by *xxx*, xx, xx over the following dates: **xx, 20xx**. Participants will xxx. More information on the school can be found here: (insert link here)
Eligibility

The three eligibility requirements detailed below will be used to evaluate applications and select two awardees. The evaluation rubric (insert doc link) outlines the criteria that will be used in the evaluation of the applications.

1. ***NARST Membership:*** You or faculty members representing your institution have been NARST members for at least 2 years. Proof of membership is required upon application submission.
2. ***PhD candidate:*** You must present proof that you are currently registered as a candidate in a recognized PhD or equivalent program at your institution.
3. ***Letters of Recommendation:*** Two brief letters of recommendation are required.

Funding

Two scholarships awarded will be awarded this year. The scholarship will cover the cost for xxxxx.

Application process:

1. Complete the application form (Personal Information page and Personal Statement). (link to application document)
2. Attach
   a. proof of NARST membership,
   b. proof of enrollment in a doctoral study program, and
   c. 2 brief letters of recommendation
3. Submit the application package (PDFs or docs) to the NARST International Committee via email at ic.narst@gmail.com by XX XX, 20XX.

Questions? Contact the NARST International Committee at ic.narst@gmail.com

The deadline of application is XX XX, 20XX.
Submit all the application materials to the NARST International Committee: at: ic.narst@gmail.com.

Selection Process:
The NARST International Committee will follow a selection process that adheres to the criteria outlined in Review Form posted with this announcement. The proposals will be evaluated by a sub-committee with the use of the evaluation rubric posted above. Awardees will be notified in late XXX and asked to provide XXXX with a brief summary of their PhD research.

NARST PhD SCHOOL SCHOLARSHIP EVALUATION RUBRIC (updated December 2021)

The international committee, according to the criteria in the following table, will review applications for the 20XX NARST international PhD School Scholarships. In addition to these criteria, the international committee will consider the application criteria for the 20XX XXX Summer School (see Summer School website) and will confer with 20XX XXX Summer School organizers to make the final decision when awarding each scholarship.

	EVALUATION CATEGORY	YES/NO	COMMENTS
1.	The applicant is a (full-time) doctoral student and student OR advisor is an active member of NARST (i.e., at least 2 years' of NARST membership).		
2.	The applicant is from a region/continent outside of the host institutions of the summer school (XX/XX)		
3	The applicant shows a strong interest in science education research globally (as evidenced by application materials)		
4.	The applicant has a clear goal for why it is important to attend the PhD school.		
5.	The applicant has a solid plan to disseminate his/her experience from participating in the PhD school.		
6.	The PhD school may significantly contribute to the student's dissertation research e.g. data analysis approaches, framing of results.		
7.	The applicant has a satisfactory level of the English (which will be the language used in the summer school). Language exam scores, publications or conference presentations in English, and assessment of English language proficiency by advisors in recommendation letters can all serve as evidence.		
8.	The applicant demonstrates that financial support is necessary to attend the PhD school (as evidenced by letter from advisor and described by applicant in budget request)		
9.	The applicant is in the middle stage of his or her doctoral research (i.e. has already collected data, and is still conducting analysis).		
10.	The applicant demonstrates ability to adapt to new environments (can be evidenced by research, participation in service, remarks by advisors/recommendation letters about adaptability)		

11.	Applicant included all required materials for application		

Program Committee

Annual Conference Proposal

Specific Strand Coordinator Steps in Processing Proposals (TO BE UPDATED)

NOTE: NARST migrated to a new conference Proposal and Submission System for the 2023 conference. Although the information below is broadly applicable, the specific tools used in the Oxford Abstracts proposal system have changed. This section of the Handbook will be revised in summer 2023 to incorporate the changes.

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.

Strand Coordinator's Recommended Groupings

Session Format	Presider	Recommended Session Title	Proposals in this Session (ID# only)

These completed data must be posted in electronic format to the NARST Web site no later than September 30th.

Administrative Sessions (TO BE UPDATED)

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 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 the correct 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-Coordinators 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

four Administrative Sessions and usually sponsors a Welcome Session, Writing Retreat, 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.

APPENDICES for annual conference proposal processing

A. Proposal Submission Checklist

B. Reviewer's Letter

C. Reviewers' Rating Sheet

D. Ratings Summary Sheet

E. Strand Coordinator's Recommended Groupings

Appendix A: 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)

Appendix B: 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

Appendix C: 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.]

1 ***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.

1 ***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.

4 ***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.

4 ***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.

5 ***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.

5 ***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.

Appendix D: Reviewer's Rating Sheet for NARST Proposals

Strand Number: _____

Identification Code of Proposal:

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

Criteria	of criteria
1. Subject/Problem	3. Findings and Analysis
2. Design /Procedure	

	Focus, rationale, model, theory and/or philosophy are clear. *Comments (required):*	or organization are appropriate. *Comments (required):*
Methodology, procedure, design and/		Syntheses of ideas or data analyses and findings appear to be appropriate and complete. *Comments (required):*

4. **Contribution** — The conclusions contribute valuable insights into the teaching/learning of science. *Comments (required):*

5. **General Interest** — The presentation promises to be of general interest to NARST members. *Comments (required):*

6. **Overall Rating** — (1-not recommended; 5-highly recommended)

Comments (required):

Overall Recommendation: **Definitely Accept** **Probably Accept** **Reject**

Appendix E: Ratings Summary Sheet for NARST Proposals (For Use by Strand Coordinators)
Strand Number: _____

Proposal ID Code	Author	Title	Rating by Reviewer 1	Rating by Reviewer 2	Rating by Reviewer 3	Rating by Reviewer 4	Rating by Reviewer 5	**SC** Recommendation (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 the following tasks: 1) Organizing the reviewing process for the NARST/NSTA Research Worth Reading Award, 2) Provide scholarships for classroom teachers and/or informal science educators to attend the NARST Annual Conference and 3) Organizing publication-related pre-conference and conference workshops and 4) Overseeing the Journal of Research in Science Teaching,.

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

a) Addresses themes relevant for the teaching and learning of science (in preK-12, higher education, and informal education settings)
b) Bridges gaps between theory and practice and/or research and practice Addresses concerns and needs of practitioners
c) Identified implications for the ideas that have direct implications for the classroom or learning environment (if in informal education spaces)
d) 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 about a month ahead of the deadline or the submission of proposal for the upcoming conference, the PAC chair(s) send out a note to the membership informing them about the availability of scholarhips for classroom teachers and informal science educators and that a formal call will be send out later that year.

After the acceptance / rejection notes are sent out, 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 workshops / Conference administrative sessions / virtual events

Task: i) Sponsor two pre-conference workshop at the NARST Annual International Conference – one aimed at reviewing for JRST and the other to be determined by the committee. ii) Sponsor one session at the NARST Annual International Conference by the Editors of JRST on publishing in the journal. iii) Coordinate the NARST/NSTA Annual Research Worth Reading Recognition session. iv) Organize two virtual events throughout the year on publishing in scholarly journals.

Procedures and Timeline: During the summer the PAC discusses, agrees upon, and organizes the committee-sponsored pre-conference workshop for the next NARST Annual International Conference. In the same time period, the PAC chairs contact 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. Abstracts for the *JRST* Editors' session and for the NARST/NSTA Annual Reearch Worth Reading Recognition session are submitted before the deadline for the submission of administrative sessions, typically October 1st. Two virtual events (e.g. webinars) are offered, one in spring, the other in autumn with the editors of selected scholarly journals on publishing in these

journals.

Journal of Research in Science Teaching Oversight

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

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].

JRST Editor Search Committee

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 *JRST*, 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…		
A. Suggested Management structure: Editors/Associate Editors/Editorial Board Evidence/experience of working collaboratively/effectively with teams of people		
Total		83

Research Committee

Master Calendar for NARST Research Committee

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 (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 Solicit ideas for RC-sponsored administrative session Other planning
Abell Institute RFP **(even-numbered years)** End of June to end of September	*End of June*: 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 *First week of September*: Send proposals to the Sandra K. Abell Institute for Doctoral Students Selection Committee *End of third week of September*: Evaluations due from Selection Committee members

	End of September: Institute offered to highest ranked proposal

Pre-Conference Workshops Mid-Summer to early Fall	*Mid-July*: Call for proposals for pre-conference workshops for the following Spring Annual International Conference (deadline for proposals: 31 August) *First week of September*: Proposals forwarded to Subcommittee by Subcommittee Chair with request for reviews by end of third week of September *First week of October*: Decision made on which workshops (usually no more than two) to sponsor
NSTA Liaison Position **(every third year: "YY- 11" evenly divides by 3)**	*Early September*: Call for applications for NARST Liaison to NSTA to be submitted by end of November
Early September to early February	*First week of December*: Applications forwarded to the Subcommittee to review the applications
	First week of January: Reviews due back to RC Chair
Abell Institute Evaluation (odd-numbered years) Early September to January	*Early September*: 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 *Mid-October: 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**	Early December: 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 By Mid-December: NARST Liaison to NSTA forwards proposals and rating sheets to members of both national and area subcommittees Mid-January: Deadline to return ratings to NARST Liaison to NSTA Third week of January: Deadline for final decisions on presenters

	End of January: 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)

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)

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 theworkshop.

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].

NARST Research Committee Sponsored Pre-Conference Workshop

Review Sheet

Rater:

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 *Awakening Dialogues: Advancing Science Education Research, Practices, and Policies*	
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 *Awakening Dialogues: Advancing Science Education Research, Practices, and Policies*	
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 for 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 $45,000 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
$45,000 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

Working Notes with Your Mentor(S)

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

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						

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						
My ability to develop an effective literature review						

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

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 Groups & work on writing proposals		
3:00 pm	Arrive at GWU by this time	Critical Friends Group	Writing in Critical Friends Groups – Proposal due for group review		Closing presentations; Final reminders	
4:00 pm			Next Generation of Standards & Other initiatives – Dr. Joe			

5:00 pm	Name tags, Abell Institute scavenger	Recap and walk to dinner	Return to GWU	Recap and walk to dinner	Return to GWU	

	hunt, pictures of participants					
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:

Chair Selection and Rotation:

Current chair will seek nominations for a co- chair that would remain in the position with the chair 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. 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 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 coms 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

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. The Committee will also provide a Writing Retreat, Welcome Session, the Mentor-Mentee Nexus, and the Early Career Forum at the annual conference. In addition, the Committee will oversee quarterly approval of NARST Virtual Events.

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 September, the lead coordinator for the event informs the Board Liaison of any specific room needs for the event and submits the proposal for the event. For example, if the event utilizes small groups and expects a large number of participants then the Board Liaison can submit a request to the Program Coordinator for a room with a certain capacity and room set up of round tables when they submit the Administrative Session Proposal.
- Approximately 6-8 weeks prior to the conference, the lead coordinator for the event contacts the NARST Executive Director and/or 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 Liaison can provide contact information for the NARST Executive Director and management company contact, if needed.
- The coordinating group for the event sends emails to the mentors and mentees (see Appendix A, B, and C for samples).

- 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.

Early Career Forum

- In September, the coordinating group should determine the format for the session and if any changes will be made from the previous year. Using these decisions, the Administrative Session proposal should be written for submission. Appendix D includes an example of past structuring of the conference session.
- In September, the lead coordinator for the event informs the Board Liaison of any specific room needs for the event and submits the proposal for the event. For example, if the event utilizes small groups and expects a large number of participants then the Board Liaison can submit a request to the Program Coordinator for a room with a certain capacity and room set up of round tables when they submit the Administrative Session Proposal.
- In December or January, the coordinating group should start recruiting senior scholars via email to participate in the forum and ensure their ability to participate and take part in the session. Appendix E provides a sample email to send to senior scholars.
- In the week prior to the conference, the coordinating group should photocopy a handout to pass out at the session with senior scholar information and guiding information for the participants.
- Following the session, the coordinating group should submit a written report to be included in the Spring Board report.

Documents And Sample Letters for Membership Committee

Appendix A: 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:

- Science Learning, Understanding and Conceptual Change
- Science Learning: Contexts, Characteristics, and Interactions
- Science Teaching—Primary School (Grades preK-6)
- Science Teaching—Middle and High School (Grades 5-12)
- College Science Teaching and Learning (Grades 13-20)
- Science Learning in Informal Contexts Cultural, Social, and Gender Issues
- Preservice Science Teacher Education
- In-service Science Teacher Education
- Reflective Practice
- Curriculum, Evaluation, and Assessment
- Cultural, Social and Gender Issues
- Educational Technology
- History, Philosophy and Sociology of Science
- Environmental Education
- 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, Membership Chair.

Appendix B: 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.

Appendix C: 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 the 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.

Appendix D: Early Career Faculty Forum Handout Sample

Early Career Faculty Forum

NARST Year Location

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

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?

Appendix E: 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.

Appendix F: Sample Email Sent for Call for Proposals to Host Early Career Faculty Forum

Call to submit a Proposal
to Host the NARST Early-Career Institute

Background & Goals
The Membership Committee hosts an Early Career Forum each year at the annual conference. Over the last 9 years, it has consistently been suggested that there is a need for an ECI to support early-career NARST members in their first years as they will ideally become part of the NARST organization in dynamic and new ways. The following list identifies the primary goals for the ECI and proposers may supplement these goals with program-specific aims.

- Assist early career NARST members in their professional growth.
- Reach a diverse group of early-career NARST members.
- Guide early career NARST members in participating in NARST.
- Support early career NARST members by building a community.

Components/Products
The following list identifies the components and products for ECI.

- It is expected that there will be a three-day pre-conference event prior to the conference at the conference hotel. It is also expected that there will be some amount of contact time between the early career NARST members and the mentors that is virtual before and after the event.
- The Institute will be organized in a way to maximize interactions among early career NARST members and mentors.
- Participating early career NARST members should receive mentorship to aid their academic positions.

Funding
NARST will provide up to $25,000 to support the organization and implementation of the 2024 ECI. These funds cannot be used to pay for indirect operating expenses typical of many federal grants. Other sources of funding may include participant fees and contributions from organizers' institution(s). The $25,000 organizational contribution is meant to minimize costs for mentors and participating early-career NARST members. Proposers are encouraged to seek additional support from the organizers' institution(s) or other associations/organizations. This support may come in the form of direct financial contributions and/or in-kind contributions of staff time, or other resources that support the successful implementation of the ECI.

Proposal Requirements
Proposals should not exceed five pages, excluding the title page and CV. The proposal should address each area presented in the following list:

- Title page - Proposers' names, affiliations, and contact information
- Goals and Aims for ECI
- Qualifications of Proposers - this section should address the ability of proposers to enact the program
- Recruitment and Selection - this section should address how the proposers will broaden participation through the ECI
- ECI Schedule - this section should detail the plan for the ECI that includes both in-person and synchronous activities before or after the ECI
- Budget - proposers should provide a budget and a budget justification for the ECI. 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.
- Evaluation - proposers should provide a plan for collecting evaluation data to provide a report to the Membership Committee
- Proposers' CV

Additional Requirements
The individual or team that enacts the ECI will be expected to submit a final report by August 31, 2024. The final report must include results of the evaluation efforts and should be submitted to the Chair of the Membership Committee. These reports will be reviewed by the NARST Membership Committee and the Board of Directors. The final report will be made available to the NARST membership, and proposal teams for future ECI 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 Membership Committee (Dr. Mihwa Park, Mihwa.Park@ttu.edu).** Proposal files should be labeled using with the last name of the lead proposer followed by "ECI2024" (e.g., "Johnson.ECI2024"). If a supplemental file is required a similar format should be used for labeling (e.g., "Johnson.ECI2024.supplement1").

To be granted full consideration,
proposals should be submitted by August 15, 2023.

Review Process & Criteria
The NARST Membership Committee will review all proposals and forward a recommendation to the NARST Board of Directors for final approval. In reviewing proposals, the Membership Committee will evaluate the proposals on four different criteria:

1. Intellectual strengthening (25%) - ECI will have ample opportunities to enhance and strengthen their work in the ECI - this area focuses on the opportunities that early-career NARST members will have to contemplate their work and strengthen proposed products.
2. Building a trajectory (25%) - ECI will ensure that ECI NARST members will have opportunities to contemplate their emerging and future identity.
3. Broadening participation in NARST (25%) - The proposal clearly has an emphasis on increasing the diversity of NARST and considers these factors in the design of the institute. The diversity of mentors should mirror the diversity of participants as much as possible.
4. Budget plan (25%) - The budget is reasonable and ensures a broad number of people will participate. The minimum number of expected participants is 20. A detailed budget is provided in the budget.

The NARST Membership Committee and Board of Directors may contact proposers to request additional information or to suggest changes to an ECI as proposed.

Thank you,
NARST Membership Committee

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")
3. Secretary-Treasurer
4. International Coordinator
5. Graduate Student Coordinator

Criteria for the evaluations of candidates (except for the Graduate Student Coordinator) by the Committee include: (a) the candidates' research records, (b) their contributions to NARST to date, (c) their leadership in NARST, (d) their expected contributions to and potential leadership in NARST serving in the mentioned offices, (e) their skills and dispositions, and (f) additional criteria pertaining to specific experiences and expertise.

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 a slate 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, (d) their potential leadership of graduate students and contribution to NARST, and (e) their potential to provide voice and perspectives of NARST's diverse graduate student community.

Call for Nominations

Date: May XX, 20XX

From:

Lead Co-Chair, Elections Committee

Co-Chair, Elections Committee

NARST Director, Board Liaison

NARST Immediate Past President

To: NARST Membership
Dear NARST Members:

We take great pleasure in announcing the opening of the XXXX-XXXX elections for leadership positions for *NARST: A Worldwide Organization for Improving Science Teaching and Learning through Research*. Following the NARST 2016 Bylaws (accessible on the NARST website), current members of NARST are encouraged to nominate potential candidates for offices by following a simple nomination procedure (*see below*). **[list the positions available here]** (see specific nomination information below) will be elected (see NARST 2016 Bylaws on NARST website for position information https://narst.org/narst-bylaws). We invite you to help us advance and improve NARST by soliciting the participation of dedicated and effective leaders. This letter provides the basic information about the election process and encourages you to nominate yourself or qualified colleagues for offices.

Relevant Bylaws

The NARST Bylaws (Approval by NARST Membership February 2016) specify the roles and responsibilities of each elected official https://narst.org/narst-bylaws. Eligibility, terms, and nominations policies include:

Article IV: Governance and responsibilities

Section 5: Eligibility for Service on Board

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.

ByLaws Section 7: Terms

Terms of office begin at the close of the Annual International Conference following the election and continue until the close of the Annual International Conference of the year in which the term ends.
The term of office for President-Elect is for the duration of the presidential cycle, which is one year as President-Elect, followed by one year as President, and one year as Immediate Past President.

The term of office for the Secretary-Treasurer is three years. The Secretary-Treasurer may serve two (2) consecutive, full, three-year terms.

The term of office for the International Coordinator is three years. The International Coordinator may not serve additional terms as the International Coordinator.

The term of office for the Graduate Student Coordinator is two years. The Graduate Student Coordinator may not serve additional terms as the Graduate Student Coordinator but is eligible to serve as a Director-at-Large or other elected Board member, provided the terms are non- consecutive.

The term of office for each Director-at-Large is three years. Directors-at-Large may not serve additional terms as Directors-at-Large

ByLaws Section 9A: Nomination – Election, Procedures, Nominations
The Election 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.

Note: Any individual who is on the ballot for the same open position in consecutive election cycles will only be required to submit their cv and signed acknowledgement of compliance with the NARST Code of Ethical Conduct (https://narst.org/code-ethical-conduct). They have the option to submit new materials if they choose. If they chose not to, the required supporting documents previously submitted as part of their nomination packet will be "moved forward.". The requirement to submit all materials will be waived for three consecutive years.

How to Complete and Submit a Nomination Packet (differs for Graduate Student Coordinator)**:**
Nomination packets for President-elect, Board of Directors, [Secretary-Treasurer, International Coordinator – if applicable] should include the following items in accordance with the guidelines in the current NARST Handbook.

1. Letter of nomination
2. Record of Research (prepared by the nominee)
3. Past Attendance and Contribution to NARST Annual International Conferences (prepared by the nominee)
4. Record of Leadership Contribution to NARST (prepared by the nominee)

5. Potential Leadership in NARST (prepared by the nominee)
6. Signed acknowledgement of compliance with the NARST Code of Ethical Conduct (https://narst.org/code-ethical-conduct)
7. Curriculum Vita: Nominees for President-Elect are asked to include a current CV. Nominees for positions on the Board of Directors, Secretary-Treasurer, and International Coordinator are asked to include a five-page curriculum vita that includes their education, scholarship record, relevant experience and participation in local, national, and international organizations.
8. Endorsements: Nomination packets must contain written endorsements from 10 NARST members with emails being sufficient. President-Elect nominees who previously served on the Board of Directors are exempt from the ten-endorsement requirement.

All election documents, including evaluation rubrics, are in the NARST Handbook accessible through the NARST website https://narst.org/narst-documents
[If the Graduate Student Coordinator position is on the slate, then insert the Graduate Student Coordinator application process here.]

[If the Graduate Student Coordinator position is on the slate, then insert: The Committee will follow the same procedures used for other Board positions but will use the following criteria to evaluate the packets [insert the evaluation criteria here].

Nominations of potential candidates from the NARST membership must be submitted to the Executive Director by the due date [**11:59 PM Eastern Daylight Time on DATE]**.As packets are received, the Executive Director checks the packets for compliance with guidelines. Packets out of compliance are returned to the nominator with information on what is missing or needs revised. Revised packets are submitted to the Executive Director by a deadline determined by the Executive Director (before the packets must be submitted to the committee). Only fully completed nomination packets will be provided by the Executive Director to the Elections Committee Co-Chairs. Nominees whose nomination packets are not completed by the due date will not be considered by the Committee.

The Elections Committee is charged with assessing all completed nomination packets in order to advance a recommended slate of potential candidates to the NARST Board of Directors for approval (see the NARST Handbook and Policies and Procedures documents for details of the evaluation process and rubrics https://narst.org/narst-documents). The NARST membership will vote for candidates on the Board-approved slate.

Nominators for all positions, please send the completed nomination packet electronically to: NARST Executive Director

XXXX XXXXXX
executivedirector@narst.org

Due date for complete packets: June XX, 20XX, 11:59 PM Eastern Daylight Time

Expectations of Eventual Candidates

Eventual candidates (those included on the elections slate) are expected to adhere to NARST policies and regulations, including the NARST Election Campaign policy (see below), which prohibits campaigning, the NARST Conflict of Interest policy (refer to the NARST Policies and Procedures document), which requires the disclosure of potential conflicts of interests, and the NARST Code of Ethical Conduct https://narst.org/code-ethical-conduct. These policies and others are included in the NARST Policies and Procedures on the NARST website.

NARST Election Campaign Policy

NARST prohibits campaigning for all elections. The NARST publication of each candidate's biographical data, photo, and position statement shall be the total extent to which NARST members are informed about candidates for office. Candidate position statements may not mention by name, or otherwise, any other candidate who is also running for NARST office. Any communication—oral, written, or electronic—sent by the candidate to all or a subset of members may announce only the names of all candidates for each office and the details of how and when to vote. Candidates whom the Board of Directors has determined to have violated this policy will be disqualified with the right to appeal.

20XX-20XX Election Timeline

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

Timeline of Nomination, Review, and Selection Process

(updated April 2023)

Timeline (approximate)	Activity
Early May	Call for Nominations
~6 weeks	Deadline to submit nomination packets to the Executive Director who checks packets for compliance with the guidelines.
Early July	Completed Nomination packet sent to Elections Committee Co-Chairs. Co-Chairs make packets available to the committee and advisor
One month after receipt of packets	Elections Committee meets to review the evaluation criteria and rubrics. The Committee is then provided access to the nomination packets. The Committee reviews packets, discusses, and submits ratings of candidates, with comments.

Mid-August	Elections Committee discussions and vote of final candidates to recommend to Board. See the Policies and Procedures for guidelines in special circumstances (e.g. insufficient numbers of nominees).
One month within Committee vote	All nominees contacted by the Immediate Past President (for the roles of President elect and Secretary Treasurer) and Elections Co-Chairs (for the roles of Directors, International Coordinator, Graduate Student Coordinator) about continued willingness to run for office
Late September	Elections Co-Chairs submit recommendation to Board for approval [included in Elections report]
October NARST Board Meeting	Board votes on recommended slate. See the Policies and Procedures for guidelines in special circumstances.
After October Board meeting	-Executive Director informs individuals on the approved slate of their candidacy and confirms their continued willingness to stand for elections -Executive Director provides an example position statement to candidates and requests the submission of their 200-250 word position statements and a photo for inclusion in the Elections slate information distributed to the membership at the time of the Elections
January	-Executive Director sends the NARST Election Campaign Policy to candidates NARST Elections open [Call with electronic ballot sent to membership by Executive Director]. Elections are open for one month.
February	NARST Elections closed. See the Policies and Procedures for guidelines in event of a tie or incomplete ballot.
Post Election	Executive informs each final candidate only whether he or she was or was not elected. No additional information is provided regarding either the election results or the Elections Committee ratings. The Executive Director confirms with all those elected that they agree to comply with all Board and NARST policies and procedures. Executive Committee informs the NARST membership of who was elected to each open position. A percent of NARST membership who participated in the election can be reported. No additional information is provided regarding either the election results or the Elections Committee ratings.

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 by the due date.

20XX-20XX NARST NOMINATION PACKET GUIDELINES
(except for Graduate Student Coordinator)

(updated April 2023)

Directions: Please limit the submission to the required materials, submit them in the requested sequence, and indicate the item (e.g., item 1) on the appropriate and corresponding documents. Please attend and adhere to nomination packet guidelines. Review the evaluation rubrics for further details of each criterion. Please *submit all documents as one PDF file.*

Item 1: General Information

Please provide your name, position title, institution, address, phone, and email followed by education/ training information (institution and location, degree if applicable, year(s), and field of study). Please begin the education/ training with baccalaureate or other initial professional education (e.g., nursing) and include postdoctoral education.

Item 2. Record of Research

A. Please list citations in APA format for up to 10 relevant **publications** that evidence a record of distinguished scholarship and leadership in the science education community. Nominees for President- elect **must include 10** publication citations. This may include journal articles, books, and other refereed publications.

B. Please list citations for up to 10 relevant **conference presentations** that evidence a record of distinguished scholarship and leadership in the science education community (particularly those presented at the NARST Annual International Conference). Nominees for President-elect **must include 10 conference presentation citations.**

Please list any awards you have received that evidence a record of distinguished scholarship and leadership in the science education community, including major grants. Please include the award name and granting institution or organization.

Evaluation criteria: The nominee's research record will be evaluated based on common indicators including publications and associated quality measures (e.g. citation index, impact factor, readership, etc.), citations by colleagues, research funds raised, positions achieved, and awards received.

Item 3: Past Participation in and Contribution to NARST

Please describe your participation in and contribution to NARST over the course of your membership and particularly in the last 5 years. (**double spaced and limit of 500 words**)

Evaluation criteria: Merely being a NARST member for a long time and attending NARST Annual International Conferences on a regular basis should be a less significant indicator than active participation such as serving on NARST Committees, as Strand Coordinator, and as a Reviewer of NARST Annual International Conference proposals or the NARST Journal JRST

Item 4: Record of Leadership in NARST

Please list **all** leadership roles you have taken within NARST starting with the most recent. Examples include: Committee member and/or leader; Strand Coordinator and/or conference proposal reviewer; NARST Conference Leadership contributions (discussant, workshop organizer, panelist, etc.) JRST reviewer, Associate Editor, Editorial Board, and/or Editor. Nominees for **President-elect must include any leadership roles as a NARST Director-at-Large, if applicable.** Please indicate the calendar years of service, leadership role, and affiliation (strand, committee, etc.).

Evaluation criteria: The nominee's consistent engagement in administrative and executive roles in NARST over the past five years will be evaluated. The committee will consider roles such as productive leadership on the Board and/or committees, within RIGs and Strands, serving as JRST editor or Associate editor, etc. These roles should demonstrate abilities to successfully work with colleagues to plan and carry out actions to meet a goal.

Item 5: Potential Leadership in NARST

Please write a **Statement of Qualification** (**double-spaced and limit of 250 words**)

A. Describe how your professional history prepares you for a leadership position in NARST as an elected member of the Board (President-elect, Secretary-Treasurer, or member of the Board of Directors).
B. Present your **Vision for NARST** if elected to the position in consideration.

Evaluation criteria: The committee will consider how the nominee's ideas, visions, scholarship, and leadership experience will advance the mission of NARST.

Item 6: Other relevant information that supports your nomination for the specific position. (**double spaced and limit of 250 words**)

Evaluation criteria:

For nominees for President-Elect, the Committee will also consider:

- THE NOMINEE'S FACILITIES AND ABILITIES TO ORGANIZE THE LARGE-SCALE ANNUAL NARST INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE AND COMMUNICATE AND COLLABORATE WITH AFFILIATE ORGANIZATIONS

For nominees for Secretary-Treasurer, the Committee will also consider:

- how the nominee demonstrates the ability to translate and communicate budgetary information to laypersons, understand budgets of organizations, and manage minutes according to Robert's Rules of Order.

For nominees for Directors-at-Large, the Committee will also consider:

- the diversity of NARST membership and whether this nominee would contribute to the Board reflecting that diversity, including providing voice and perspective that may not otherwise be present within the current BOD

For the International Coordinator, the nominee can be a member from any country (including the US). The

Committee will also consider:

- how the nominee demonstrates familiarity with the current status and future development of international science education research

An additional criterion of Skills and Dispositions will be evaluated. This criterion includes how the nominee demonstrates skills and dispositions required to fruitfully collaborate with Board members, the Executive Committee, and committee members.

Item 7: Curriculum Vita

Please include a current CV for a President-Elect nominee and a five-page CV for all other positions. The five-page CVs should include their education, scholarship record, relevant experience and participation in local, national, and international organizations.

Item 8: Endorsements

Please include endorsements of ten active members, if required for the nomination.

Item 9: Acknowledgements and Confirmations

Please include a signed statement from the nominee acknowledging (1) willingness to run and serve if elected and (2) awareness of and compliance with the NARST Code of Ethical Conduct. [Include the Signature Form]

<u>Please Note:</u> Below is a brief checklist, for your use, of what is included in a completed nomination packet:

_____Letter of Nomination (written by nominator; not required for a self-nomination)

_____Petition or endorsement by 10 active NARST members, if required (brief emails will suffice)

_____All items (1-9, excluding optional items) of these guidelines, including acknowledgements signature form

GRADUATE STUDENT COORDINATOR NOMINATION PACKET (updated April 2023)
Part A: Please complete the information below.

Candidate's Name	

Candidate's Graduate Institution	
Primary Academic Advisor	

The nominee should provide the following:

(1) information about the nominee's past contribution to the NARST community (**maximum limit 250 words).**

(2) information about how the nominee would contribute to the mission of NARST while serving as the Graduate Student Coordinator **(maximum limit 250 words).**

(3) information about the nominee's plans for leading and representing the diverse community of graduate students in NARST
(maximum limit 250 words).

Part B: Please include a letter of support from the nominee's graduate program advisor. The letter should address the evaluation criteria (see below).

Part C: Please include the nominee's current curriculum vita.

Part D: Please include a copy of the nominee's an up-to-date evidence of academic progress (an unofficial transcript or academic program report will suffice).

Part E: Please include a signed statement from the nominee acknowledging (1) willingness to run and serve if elected and (2) awareness of and compliance with the NARST Code of Ethical Conduct.

The following criteria are used to evaluate the nomination materials for Graduate Student Coordinator:
(1) graduate student's record with respect to the NARST mission,
(2) graduate student's past contributions to NARST,
(3) graduate student's leadership potential and performance,
(4) graduate student's potential future contribution to NARST, and
(5) graduate student's potential to provide voice and perspectives of NARST's diverse graduate student

community.

Acknowledgement Signature Form for all Nominees:

Please confirm that IF you are selected by the Elections Committee and then approved for the elections slate by the NARST Board, you agree to have your name on the slate and you will serve if elected:

- ☐ "I agree to have my name included on the NARST elections slate and to serve NARST if elected."

- ☐ By checking this box and signing this form you are acknowledging awareness of and compliance with the NARST Code of Ethical Conduct:

I hereby represent that (a) I have read, am familiar with and believe that I meet the eligibility requirements for the position or award for which I am under consideration; (b) I have not been finally determined by an appropriate body to have engaged in conduct which would constitute a violation of Sections B. (including without limitation plagiarism and scientific misconduct) or D. (including without limitation unlawful harassment or discrimination) of the NARST Code of Ethical Conduct (NARST website: https://narst.org/code-ethical-conduct); and (c) I have not knowingly violated any aspect of the NARST Code of Ethical Conduct.

Which position are you running for:

- ☐ President-elect
- ☐ Secretary-Treasurer
- ☐ Board of Directors
- ☐ International Coordinator
- ☐ Graduate Student Coordinator

Signature _____

Date_____

Selection of Nominees Procedure

After the applications are received, the members of the Elections Committee will review the applications. The goal is to provide the membership with a minimum of two candidates per available position. There is one exception to this; the Secretary-Treasurer position can have one candidate. The rubrics will be provided to all committee members. Each voting member independently evaluates each candidate. Upon reviewing the candidates and the committee leadership collecting the scores from the Committee members, the committee will discuss all nominees (taking ratings and comments into account) and propose the top candidates to the NARST Board of Directors for approval. See the Policies and Procedures document for situations wherein fewer than the required number of qualified nominations are submitted for one or more position categories.

Assessment Rubrics for Elections

The rubrics below provide the criteria to evaluate and rate the nominees for each position category (President-elect, Board of Directors, Secretary-Treasurer, International Coordinator, Graduate Student Coordinator). In your review of the nominee's application package, please review the application by using the appropriate rubrics and provide comments Only whole-number scores are used (1-3).

Rubrics for President-Elect, Secretary-Treasurer, Board of Directors, & International Coordinator

Rubric Items A-E are used for nominees for President-Elect, Secretary-Treasurer, Board of Directors, and International Coordinator.

Item F rubrics are *position-specific*, with each position having a different Item F rubric. Reviewers use the relevant Item F rubric for the nominee under review.

Each Rubric item is scored a 1, 2, or 3. The maximum total for a nominee is 18 (except 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]. Those nominees who have not served on the Board must provide 10 signatures of endorsement from current NARST members for their nomination.

Item A: Research Record* The nominee's scholarship as indicated by common indicators including publications and associated quality measures (e.g. citation index, impact factor, readership, etc.), citations by colleagues, research funds raised, positions achieved, and awards received should be evaluated here.		
Score 1	***Score 2***	***Score 3***
CV demonstrates a research record that establishes a *history of research* and/or teaching scholarship.	CV demonstrates a research record that establishes a history of publication and research in *the most prominent science education journals* (based on ISI impact factor and/or teacher audience*).*	CV demonstrates a record of *distinguished scholarship* and leadership in the science education community as indicated by awards and citation record.
Notes:		

*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 B: History of Participation* in and contribution to NARST Merely being a NARST member for a long time and attending/presenting NARST Annual International Conferences on a regular basis should be a less significant indicator than active participation such as serving on NARST Committees, as Strand Coordinator, and as a Reviewer of NARST Annual International Conference proposals or the NARST Journal JRST.		
Score 1	***Score 2***	***Score 3***
Record of *participation in* NARST for 1-2 of the past 5 years.	Record of *participation* in NARST for 3- 4 of the past 5 years.	Record of *participation* in NARST for each of the past 5 years.
Notes:		

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

Item C: Record of Leadership* Contribution to NARST The nominee's consistent engagement in administrative and executive roles in NARST over the past five years should be evaluated. These roles should demonstrate abilities to successfully work with colleagues to plan and carry out actions to meet a goal.		
Score 1	***Score 2***	***Score 3***

Record of *some* version of *leadership* in NARST in 1-2 of the past 5 years	Record of *consistent* and *regular* leadership in NARST in 3-4 of the past 5 years	Record of consistent and regular leadership in NARST that includes serving as *Chair, Strand Coordinators, Board Member, JRST editor/Associate Editor or other executive position.* *Some aspect of leadership should have been demonstrated* in each of the past 5 years.
Notes:		

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

Item D: Potential Leadership in NARST How do the nominee's ideas, visions, scholarship, and leadership experience advance the mission of NARST.		
Score 1	***Score 2***	***Score 3***
The nominee's statement of qualification provides a *description* of their potential contribution.	The nominee's statement of qualification provides a *clearly articulated vision* of a potential contribution that is *aligned with the NARST mission** but *not innovative.*	The candidate's statement provides a *clearly articulated vision* of a potential contribution that is both *aligned with the NARST mission** **and** *innovative.*
Notes:		

***NARST Mission Statement**

NARST is a global 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.

Item E: Collaborative Skills and Dispositions How does the nominee demonstrate, and is known to demonstrate, skills and dispositions required to fruitfully collaborate with Board members, the Executive Committee, and members.		
Score 1	***Score 2***	***Score 3***
The nominee's professional experience within and outside of NARST suggest potential collaborative skills and dispositions, but the nominee's statements, record, and/or known activities do not clearly speak to this criterion or there are indicators of weaknesses with respect to required skills and/or dispositions.	The nominee's professional experience within and outside of NARST demonstrate *some productive* collaborative skills and dispositions. There are no evident or known indicators of weaknesses with respect to required skills and/or dispositions. There are no concerns about the nominee's abilities to fruitfully collaborate with NARST Board members, Executive Committee, or members. **some productive*: The nominee has experience collaborating with others in the profession. All indications are that these experiences were positive and productive.	The nominee's professional experience within and outside of NARST demonstrate multiple and fruitful* collaborative skills and dispositions. There are no evident or known indicators of weaknesses with respect to required skills and/or dispositions. There are no concerns about the nominee's abilities to fruitfully collaborate with NARST Board members, Executive Committee, or members. **multiple and fruitful*: The nominee has numerous experiences *collaborating with and leading* others in the profession. All indications are that these experiences were positive and productive.
Notes:		

Item F: Position-specific criteria

Item F: President-Elect

Item F President-elect: Conference planning and affiliate work The nominee for President-elect demonstrates facilities and abilities to organize the large-scale annual NARST International Conference *and* effectively communicate and collaborate with affiliate organizations.		
Score 1	***Score 2***	***Score 3***
The nominee demonstrates some experience organizing professional events. The nominee has limited or no experience with affiliate organizations, such as through professional activities of attending and participating in affiliate conferences, *including* international organizations. The nominee has limited or no professional experiences outside their home country or region (international professional activities).	The nominee demonstrates experience organizing large-scale professional events. The nominee has at least some experience with affiliate organizations, such as through professional activities of attending and participating in affiliate conferences, *including* international organizations. The nominee has engaged in professional experiences outside their home country or region (international professional activities) over the past five years.	The nominee demonstrates experience organizing large-scale professional events for international attendees. The nominee has consistent (over several years) experiences with affiliate organizations, such as through professional activities of attending and participating in affiliate conferences, *including* international organizations. The nominee has *consistently* engaged in professional experiences outside their home country or region (international professional activities) over the past five years.
Notes:		

Item F: Secretary-Treasurer

Item F Secretary-Treasurer*:* Experience and Expertise 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.		
Score 1	***Score 2***	***Score 3***
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.
Notes:		

Item F: Board of Directors

Item F: Board of Directors: Representation The committee must consider the diversity of NARST membership and whether this nominee would contribute to the Board reflecting that diversity, including. providing voice and perspective that may not otherwise be present within the current BOD.		
Score 1	***Score 2***	***Score 3***
The nominee would contribute to the diversity of the Board through their experiences and perspectives.	The nominee would contribute to the diversity of the Board through their experiences and perspectives, as well as through increasing representation of the NARST membership on the Board.	The nominee would contribute to the diversity of the Board through their experiences and perspectives, as well as through adding representation of the NARST membership that is not currently represented on the Board.
Notes:		

Item F: International Coordinator

Item F: International Coordinator The committee must consider how the nominee demonstrates familiarity with the current status and future development of international science education research.		
Score 1	***Score 2***	***Score 3***
The nominee demonstrates some knowledge about the current and future development of international science education research.	The nominee demonstrates knowledge about the current and future development of international science education research and experience working with scholars from outside their home country or region over the past five years.	The nominee demonstrates expertise with current and future development of international science education research and has a variety of experiences working with scholars from outside their home country or region over the past five years.
Notes:		

Tally the ratings:

Position	Nominee	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total (max 18)

Committee discussion to determine the final selection to recommend to the Board should consider the ratings and comments.

Rubric for Graduate Student Coordinator

Assessment Process

Overview

The rubric below provides an overview of the 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.

- The Elections Committee will consider all applications and will assess them according to the following criteria with respect to the Graduate Student's:
  (1) record with respect to the NARST mission,
  (2) past contributions to NARST,
  (3) leadership potential and performance,
  (4) potential future contribution to NARST,
  (5) potential to provide voice and perspectives of NARST's diverse graduate student community
- Whole numbers (1, 2, or 3) are used for the evaluations with 3 being the highest rating, for a total maximum rating of 15. Ratings and comments will be considered to make the final selection.
- The Elections Committee will make elections slate recommendations to the Board of at least two nominees. The process of recommendation, Board approval, communications, and voting is the same as for the other position categories. All ratings, comments, and deliberations are confidential. All materials related to this process are destroyed after the election.

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

Notes:

***NARST Mission Statement**

NARST is a global 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.

Item #2: Past Contributions to NARST		
Score 1	***Score 2***	***Score 3***
The nominee has *attended* NARST in the past.	The nominee has *attended* and *contributed* to NARST.	The nominee has a record of c*onsistent and recent* (within past 2 years) *attendance* and *contribution* to NARST.
Notes:		

Item #3: Leadership Potential and Performance		
Score 1	***Score 2***	***Score 3***
The nominee has a record of *consistent* leadership in some domain. The nominee provided general	The nominee has a record of *consistent* leadership in some domain and *some* version of leadership in NARST.	The nominee has a record of *consistent* leadership in some domain and *consistent* leadership in NARST.

goals *or* future vision in the application about leading NARST graduate students.	The nominee provided general goals *or* future vision and specific, related details (e.g. activities) in the application about leading NARST graduate students.	The nominee provided general goals *or* future vision, specific details (e.g., activities) and strategies related to goals or future vision in the application about leading NARST graduate students.
Notes:		

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

Item #5: Representation		
Score 1	***Score 2***	***Score 3***
The nominee would contribute to the diversity of the Board through their experiences and perspectives within the graduate student community.	The nominee would contribute to the diversity of the Board through their experiences and perspectives within the graduate student community, as well as through increasing representation of the NARST membership on the Board.	The nominee would contribute to the diversity of the Board through their experiences and perspectives within the graduate student community, as well as through adding representation of the NARST membership that is not currently represented on the Board.
Notes:		

Tally the ratings:

Position	Nominee	1	2	3	4	5	Total (max 15)
GSC							

Committee discussion to determine the final selection to recommend to the Board should consider the ratings and comments.

Sample Letters [to be revised as necessary in any given year]

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.
Immediate 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 digital photo and a statement in the ballot that will help NARST members make informed choices in the election. I have attached an example of a past statement for your perusal. Please send the Executive Director, XXX XXX, 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 invited to attend the meeting prior to the Annual International Conference. You will be expected to attend the meeting immediately following the Annual International Conference, and one in October XXXXX. Please plan accordingly. There will be additional meetings called by the leadership as necessary through the year.

Thanks again for agreeing to stand for election.

Sincerely, Executive Director

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.

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 govern the Association, serve on Board committees, and serve as liaisons to NARST Standing Committees. As stated in the NARST Bylaws, "All corporate powers shall be exercised by or under the authority of, and the business of the Association shall be managed under the direction of, the Board…."

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 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AFTER THE OCTOBER BOARD MEETING (updated

December 2021) Name and address of candidate

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 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 an example statement for your perusal. The Executive Director (include email address) should receive an electronic version of your statement and photograph no later than [insert date].

The first spring 20XX Board meeting has been scheduled for XXX and the second meeting for XXX. If elected, you will be invited to attend the meeting prior to the Annual International Conference. You will be expected to attend the meeting immediately following the Annual International Conference, and one in October XXXXX. There will be additional meetings called by the leadership as necessary through the year.

If elected, you will be expected to attend these meetings, so please plan accordingly.
The attached list of Board Member responsibilities should help you understand the expectations, should you be elected. As stated in the NARST Bylaws, "All corporate powers shall be exercised by or under the authority of, and the business of the Association shall be managed under the direction of, the Board…."

Thanks again for agreeing to stand for election.
Sincerely, Executive Director

Enclosure: Board Member

Responsibilities Board

Member Responsibilities

1. Fulfill the fiduciary duties of a Director:

- duty of care: It requires being reasonably informed about the organization. At a minimum, it involves attending Board meetings, understanding the organization's Bylaws, knowing the organization's policies and procedures, and carefully reviewing the organization's financial and other reports.
- duty of loyalty: Identify and remedy conflicts of interest (see NARST Policies and Procedures) and act on behalf of the organization's best interests.
- duty of obedience: Comply with federal, state (NARST incorporated in Minnesota), and regulations as well as organization's Bylaws, policies, and procedures

2. Attend and participate in Board meetings

- Attend entire Board meetings—October (third weekend in October) and Spring (two sessions, one prior to the Annual International Conference and one following the Annual International Conference). It is expected that all Board members will be in attendance for the entirety of the meetings. NOTE: New Board members are invited 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.
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 and virtual meetings
- Respond to email conferences and votes
- Attend NARST Award recognitions and Business Meeting at the Annual International Conference.

3. Act as Liaison to Committees

- Carry out the charge of their Committees as stated in the *NARST Policies and Procedures*.
- Ensure Committee and Sub-Committee leadership understand the responsibilities and related tasks of their Committees and Sub-Committees
- Submit motions from committees to the Board of Directors
- When a motion is submitted that requires a change to the P&P, the Board liaison making that motion must submit the corresponding changes and the motion to enable the Executive Director and Immediate Past President to update the master copy of the P&P for approval.
- Attend two in-person board meetings annually, one in October and one in March or April (connected to the annual conference); Attend called meetings through other modes as needed to discuss NARST business.
- Serve as a facilitator to assist Committee and Sub-Committee leadership in accomplishing their responsibilities.
- Co-author the Committee report with the Committee leadership, who consult as needed with any existing Sub-Committee leadership. Submit Part A and Part B reports prior to the Board meetings. Submit to the Board motions from the Committee leadership and share the results of the motion with the Committee chairs.
- Report Committee activities to the NARST membership at the annual membership meeting during the international conference.

4. Serve on Board Committees

- Several Board Committees exist upon which Directors serve (details provided in NARST Policies and Procedures).

5. Serve on *Ad hoc* Committees

- Chair or serve on ad hoc committees as requested by the President (examples include JRST Editor Search Committee; Executive Director search committee)

1. 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) [strongly encouraged, not required]. During this meeting your role will be as guest and observer. You will be able to listen to the Board proceedings. You may engage in discussion only when invited to do so. You will not yet make, second, or vote on motions.
2. Attend committee meetings for any committee(s) you are assigned as Board Liaison. 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 Recognitions and the Business Meeting
4. Attend the second Board meeting on XXXX from XXXX (meals 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 election 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

LETTER TO NARST MEMBERSHIP: SENT BY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
(updated December 2021) Dear NARST Members:

We thank you for your participation in the XXXX NARST Elections. The votes have been tallied and we are pleased to announce the results.
[insert names and affiliations]

Congratulations to the new leadership of NARST. We look forward to engaging all at the XXXX conference.

Sincerely,

[insert name of President] [insert name of President-Elect]

[insert name of Immediate Past President]

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 reference)
- 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 of 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 (up to 20 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 up to 20 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)

NARST-Graduate Student Committee (GSC) Scholarships XXX

(updated October 2020)

Deadline: January XX, 20XX

The NARST Graduate Student Committee is offering a total of 12 scholarships designed to cover registration fees for graduate students in science and STEM education to attend the NARST Annual Conference 2021 to be held April 7 - April 10 2021 in a virtual format. Scholarships are one-time, need- based. The scholarships will be used to support your registration fees and travel costs.Please keep this in mind as you consider your timeline for registering for the 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: January 15, 20XX, at 11:59 pm EST

Application Form: XXXX

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.

Evaluation Rubric: **NGSCS RUBRIC for NARST 20XX**

Condition of Acceptance
Notification of Awardees: February X, 20XX

After receiving a scholarship, graduate students will be asked to submit a brief biographical statement (up to 200 words) along with a headshot photo before March XX, 20XX for use in future advertising for the scholarship.

NARST GSC Scholarship Application Form

The NARST Graduate Student Committee is offering twelve scholarships designed to cover registration fees for graduate students in science and STEM education to attend the NARST Annual Conference XX to be held XX - XX in a virtual format. Scholarships are one-time, need-based awards. The scholarships will be used to waive your registration fees. The scholarships will be used to support your registration fees and travel costs. Please keep this in mind as you consider your timeline for registering for the 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 receiving any financial support from parent institution not also 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.
Please make sure that you have a recommendation letter from your advisor/graduate coordinator before you start your application. You will be asked to upload your letter at the end of this application form.

Questions? Email us at narstgradcommittee@gmail.com

Application Questions

1. First Name
2. Last Name
3. College/University (do not use abbreviations in your response)

4. Email Address
5. Stage in Program

-Master's

-Pre-Dissertation

-Dissertation Proposal

-Dissertation

-Other

6. Do you attend or work at a US university?

-Yes

-No

7. Are you a current member of NARST?

8. Will you be a first-time attendee at 2021 NARST Annual Conference?

-Yes

-No

9. Has/have your proposal(s) to the 2021 NARST Annual Conference been accepted?

-Yes

-No

10. Please list below the title(s) of the proposal(s) you submitted for the 2021 NARST Annual Conference (If you don't have any accepted work, type "none" below).

11. Will you receive other financial aid to attend the 2021 NARST Annual Conference? (i.e., departmental funding, grant funding, financial support from parent institution)
-Yes

-No

-Maybe

12. If you are receiving other financial aid, how much of your conference expenses do you expect to be covered? (If you have no other aid, please write 'none.') Note that receiving other financial aid does not automatically disqualify you from this award.
13. Are you receiving a scholarship from another NARST committee (i.e., Basu Scholarship, International Committee travel award, etc.)
-Yes

-No

-I've applied for an award from another NARST committee but haven't heard of anything

14. Please describe your financial need to be able to attend the 2021 NARST Annual Conference in 500 words or less.
15. Write the name of your Graduate Coordinator or Advisor and their <email> below.

16. Please upload your recommendation letter from your Graduate Coordinator or Advisor (1 page max., only PDF). Your letter should describe your financial need and academic achievement. Please note that your application is incomplete without this letter. Incomplete applications are subject to removal from the review process.

NARST-Graduate Student Committee Scholarship (NGSCS) Evaluation Rubric

Applicant Name: _____

Scholarships are one-time, need-based awards to be applied toward the cost of attending the annual NARST Conference.

Minimum Criteria for Eligibility

This section is unscored. In order to qualify for the NGSCS, the applicant should meet all the following requirements in the affirmative.

Yes	No	
		The applicant is a current member of NARST.
		The applicant provides evidence of their enrollment in a graduate program (e.g., submitted a recommendation letter from their supervisor/graduate program coordinator/advisor).
		The applicant is NOT receiving a scholarship from another NARST committee (i.e., Jhumki Basu Scholarship, International Committee Travel Award, etc.).
		The applicant is NOT a past recipient of a NARST Graduate Student Committee Award.
		The applicant has an accepted proposal and/or is a first-time NARST conference attendee.
		The applicant submitted a recommendation letter completed by their supervisor/graduate programme coordinator/advisor which also provides evidence of their enrollment in a graduate program.
		The applicant is in good standing within their respective graduate programme.
		The applicant demonstrates a declared financial need (e.g., outlined in the recommendation letter)

SCORED SECTION

#	Evaluation Score	Maximum Score	Score
1	The applicant is enrolled in an institution that is considered under-represented.	1*	
		Total Score	

** Possible score: 0 = external funding > $500; 1 = external funding of $201-$500; 2 = external funding $1-$200; 3 = No external funding*Possible score: 0 = criterion is NOT met; 1 = criterion is met

Rubric Description-- The status of the applicant's institution.

- The applicant is enrolled in a minority-serving institution in the US or an institution outside of the US in a low- or lower-middle- income country (1 point).

NARST Graduate Student Committee Excellence in Mentoring Award Rubric

Score	3 Very strong	2 Moderately strong	1 Less strong
Assisting with knowledge or skills development	Mentor assists with **multiple** opportunities for research, writing, reading, or practitioner-related activities	Mentor assists with **two** opportunities for research, writing, or reading activities	Mentor assists with **one** opportunity for research, writing, or reading activity
Providing opportunities for collaboration on research or teaching	Co-authoring publications, co-presenting at conferences, co-teaching courses, co-leading PD	Mentor provides opportunities for teaching courses/PD or presenting at conferences. Mentee is involved in their advisors' research.	Mentor provides few or limited opportunities for the mentee to lead in classes or engage in research.
Supporting students' social networking	**Goes out of their way** to facilitate networking at conferences, across disciplines, across locations (universities, etc.); pursuing PD opportunities with peers (i.e., Abell, Basu, etc)	Creates connections **when convenient** at conferences, across disciplines, across locations (universities, etc.); pursuing PD opportunities with peers (i.e., Abell, Basu, etc)	**Makes minimal effort** to develop relationships at conferences, across disciplines, across locations (universities, etc.); pursuing PD opportunities with peers (i.e., Abell, Basu, etc)

Supporting emotional well-being	**Always** provides space to vent, be listened to, and consider options to move forward; support for minoritized students; connecting to campus resources for counseling; and supporting a sense of belonging	**Usually** provides space to vent, be listened to, and consider options to move forward; support for minoritized students; connecting to campus resources for counseling; and supporting a sense of belonging	**Rarely** provides space to vent, be listened to, and consider options to move forward; support for minoritized students; connecting to campus resources for counseling; or supporting a sense of belonging
Serving as a professional role model	Models a commitment to inclusion, and diversity and equity; demonstrates a **high level** of productivity in writing (publishing), research (projects), and teaching (years in teaching)	Models moderate level of commitment to EDI issues; demonstrates **moderate level** of productivity in output, i.e., writing, research and teaching	Models some commitment to diversity work; demonstrates **limited output**, i.e., writing, research and teaching, but not consistently.

Graduate Student Coordinator

(updated December 2021)

Graduate Student Coordinator

"The NARST Graduate Student Coordinator serves as chair of the committee and is a voting Board member elected by the members of NARST. The person holding this position will serve a two-year term. The elected Director will assume the position at the Board Meeting immediately following the NARST Annual International Conference in odd calendar years. The Election Committee follows the nomination process utilized for the NARST general elections.

Application Process (see elections)

Applicants for the NARST Board Graduate Student Coordinator should submit (1) an up-to- date curriculum vita, (2) completed application form (see below), (3) copy of most up-to-date transcript, and (4) a letter of support from the graduate program advisor. Applications should be sent by email to the Committee Co-chairs by the stated deadline.

The Committee will use a rubric to evaluate candidates and recommend to the Board candidates for the slate. The following criteria are used to evaluate the packets:

(1) graduate student's record with respect to the NARST mission, (2) graduate student's past contributions to NARST, (3) graduate student's leadership potential and performance, and (4) graduate student's potential future contribution to NARST.

Qualifications (see Elections)

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.

Position Description

The NARST Graduate Student Coordinator is a 2-year elected position to serve on the NARST Board of Directors as a voting member. The graduate student holding this position will serve to ensure graduate student viewpoints are represented in the discussions leading up to decisions being made by the NARST Board. Responsibilities of the position involve 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.

Duties

- Serves as chair of the Graduate Student Committee
- Participates in NARST activities, including Board Meetings at the NARST Annual International Conference, the Fall NARST Board Meeting, and electronic communications with the Board throughout the year.
- Participates in the planning of the Graduate Student Committee activities at the NARST Annual International Conference.
- Serves as a liaison between the NARST Board of Directors and NARST Graduate Student Committee.
- Facilitates communication and interactions among NARST Graduate Student Members, including social media outreach.
- Works on behalf of NARST Graduate Student Members in organizational and NARST Board matters.

Social Media, Communications and 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.

NARST Conference Auxiliary Event Application

Members and/or groups may propose auxiliary events to meet the needs of the membership and/or to benefit NARST as an organization. Auxiliary events may include dinners, outings, retreats, or other related activities that occur in close proximity to or during the dates of the annual conference.

If approved, auxiliary events will be covered by the NARST general liability insurance policy and the NARST Executive Director will sign the contract for the event. Proposed events may not occur on water, violate any elements of NARST's general liability insurance, and a minimum number of paying attendees to cover the cost of the event must commit by set cut-off date. If an event is cancelled before the cut-offdate, members will be refunded the cost of the event. However, if the event is cancelled after the cut- off date, there is no coverage of refunds for the cancellation of the event. Members will not receive refunds if the event is cancelled after the cut-off date or if they decide not to attend the event.

Event Title:

Please describe the event and its purpose. Also include how the event is aligned with the mission and goals of NARST. :

Individual/Group Host:

Proposed Location:
Preferred Day & Time:

Alternate Day & Time:

Duration (Hours):

Expected Attendance:

Primary Type of Auxiliary Event:

- Workshop
- Town Hall
- Working Group
- Meeting
- Social Event (if social, please specify - breakfast, lunch, dinner, cocktail, reception, etc.)
- Early Career Event
- Graduate Student Event
- Education Activity
- Mentoring Activity
- Other

Beverage/Food Service:

- Yes
- No

Funds Available:

- Yes
- No

Participation Fee:

- Yes (if yes, how much is anticipated)
- No

Reoccurrence of Event:

- One-time event
- Annual event
- Biennial event

- Other

More information URL (if needed):

Primary Organizer Information:

- Name
- University/Organization
- Email

Would you like to add a secondary organizer contact?

NARST Virtual Event Application

Members and groups of members may propose virtual events to meet the needs of the membership and/or to benefit NARST as an organization. Virtual events are defined as any event that is offered as either a recorded, synchronous, asynchronous, or hybrid format (e.g. synchronous/asynchronous). These events may include town halls, webinars, workshops, short courses, or other related activities that occur outside of the dates of the annual conference.

Proposed events will be advertised using NARST listservs and social media accounts and proposers are asked to submit a short report to provide information regarding the session following its conclusion.

Event Title:

Please describe the event and its purpose. Please include how the event is aligned with the mission and goals of NARST, especially in terms of issues of equity, and how these needs will be met through the event:
Individual/Group Host:

Proposed Mode of Event (check all that apply):

- Video Recorded
- Synchronous
- Asynchronous
- Hybrid (Synchronous & Asynchronous)
- Other

Preferred Day & Time (please ensure you have already checked the NARST calendar for potential conflicts):
Alternate Day & Time:

Justification for Time Chosen (please consider all members of NARST including international): Duration (Hours):
Expected Attendance:

Targeted Audience (e.g graduate students, thread members, early career, general membership): Event Series:

- President Series – planned by current NARST President
- Committee Series – planned by one or more NARST Committees
- RIG/Strand Series – related to a specific RIG or strand topic

- Research to Practice Series – focused on translating research into practice
- Town Hall – opportunity for membership to discuss and interact around an issue
- Other

Reoccurrence of Event:

- One-time event
- Series (e.g. monthly, three sessions)
- If a series, please describe below:

More information you would like to provide (if needed): Primary Organizer Information:

- Name
- University/Organization
- Email

Would you like to add a secondary organizer contact?

TEMPLATE FOR MINUTES

Commented [GHR1]: I also added the template for minutes

To facilitate the recording of minutes, the Secretary-Treasurer uses the template approved by the Board:

NARST Board of
Directors [Regular or
Called] Meeting Session:
#
Date: Month Date, Year (Day of the Week)

Time: Start XM – End XM, Start XM – End XM, Start XM – End XM Time Zone
Location: [City, State or Zoom]

PARTICIPANT LIST

Executive Board

Voting Members	Role	AM	PM	EVE

Name (Year leaving Board)	President			
Name (Year leaving Board)	President-elect			
Name (Year leaving Board)	Immediate Past President			
Name (Year leaving Board)	Secretary-treasurer			
Name (Year leaving Board)	Board member			
Name (Year leaving Board)	Board member			
Name (Year leaving Board)	Board member			
Name (Year leaving Board)	Board member			
Name (Year leaving Board)	Board member			
Name (Year leaving Board)	Board member			
Name (Year leaving Board)	Board member			
Name (Year leaving Board)	Board member			
Name (Year leaving Board)	International Coordinator			
Name (Year leaving Board)	Graduate Student Coordinator			
Non-Voting Members	**Role**	**AM**	**PM**	**EVE**
Name (Year leaving Board)	NARST Liaison to NSTA			
Name (Year leaving Board)	JRST Editor			
Name (Year leaving Board)	JRST Editor			
Incoming Members	**Role**	**AM**	**PM**	**EVE**
Name (Year leaving Board)	President-Elect			
Name (Year leaving Board)	Board member			
Name (Year leaving Board)	Board member			
Name (Year leaving Board)	Board member			
Name (Year leaving Board)	International Coordinator			
Name (Year leaving Board)	Graduate Student Coordinator			

Others Attending

Name	Executive Director
Name	Management Company Rep
Name	Management Company Rep
Name	Management Company Rep
Name	Guest Presenter, etc.

Approval of Minutes from Previous Meeting(s)

Amendments to Board Book Part A Reports

Page	Item
X	X

AM SESSION Month Date, Year (Day of the Week) Start – End Time Zone

#	Agenda Item	Discussion Topics and/or Action
1.	Call to Order	President X called the meeting to order at Time Zone.
2.	Item Title	Person X presented Y. The Board discussed Z. See X [Link to slides, document, URL, etc.].
		MOTION #: It was moved and properly seconded that…
		Motion Passed: #For-# Against-#Abstain
		ACTION: WHO will do WHAT by WHEN.
	Adjournment	President X adjourned the meeting at Time Zone.

PM SESSION Month Date, Year (Day of the Week) Start – End Time Zone

#	Agenda Item	Discussion Topics and/or Action
1.	Call to Order	President X called the meeting to order at Time Zone.

2.	Item Title	Committee X presented Y. The Board discussed Z. **MOTION #:** Committee X moved that… Motion Failed: #For-# Against-#Abstain **ACTION:** WHO will do WHAT by WHEN.
	Adjournment	President X adjourned the meeting at Time Zone.

EVE SESSION Month Date, Year (Day of the Week) Start – End Time Zone

#	Agenda Item	Discussion Topics and/or Action
1.	Call to Order	See above
2.	Item Title	See above
	Adjournment	See above

Cumulative List of MOTIONS and ACTIONS

#	MOTION	ACTION
1	It was moved and properly seconded that… Motion Passed: For-# Against-#Abstain	WHO will do WHAT by WHEN.
2.	Committee X moved that… Motion Failed: #For-# Against-#Abstain	WHO will do WHAT by WHEN.

Stand-Alone Actions	
A.	WHO will do WHAT by WHEN.
B.	WHO will do WHAT by WHEN.

Respectfully submitted,
[insert signature]
[insert name], Secretary-Treasurer or President