1. **Scholarly Foundation of Proposed Session** - 8 Points

Does the proposal include a description and grounding of the scholarly work/research that is central to the presentation? Is a systematic approach and background for the work adequately described? Are the claims made based on “evidence” (which may include impact on practice, research results/findings, conceptual/theoretical development, etc.)?

1. Unacceptable: Proposal has serious challenges or errors.
2. Poor: Proposal has some challenges or errors.
3. Acceptable: Overall positive with minor challenges.
4. Strong: Strong proposal.
5. Excellent: Exceptional proposal.
6. **Timeliness and Context** - 4 Points

Does the proposal explain how the work contributes to our collective responsibility as a field to address the range of pressing issues in mathematics education?

Pressing issues for the field include, but are not limited to [Equity as a Collective Responsibility](https://www.nctm.org/Publications/Journal-for-Research-in-Mathematics-Education/2017/Vol48/Issue2/Equity-Within-Mathematics-Education-Research-as-a-Political-Act_-Moving-From-Choice-to-Intentional-Collective-Professional-Responsibility-2147123856/) (Aguirre et al., 2017), issues raised through [Catalyzing Change](https://www.nctm.org/change/) (e.g., broadening the purposes for learning mathematics, creating equitable structures in mathematics, developing deep mathematical understanding), [Linking Research and Practice](https://www.nctm.org/Research-and-Advocacy/Linking-Research-and-Practice/), and [Mathematics as a component of STEM](https://www.nctm.org/Standards-and-Positions/Position-Statements/Building-STEM-Education-on-a-Sound-Mathematical-Foundation/).

1. Not Addressed: Not addressed
2. Poor: Limited attempt to address timeliness and context.
3. Acceptable: Proposal is connected to a pressing issue.
4. Strong: Proposal is strongly connected to a pressing issue.
5. Excellent: Proposal is grounded in and contributes significantly to one or more pressing issues.
6. **Importance, value, or interest to the community** - 3 Points

To what extent is this scholarship important for the Mathematics Education and/or Mathematics Education Research communities to hear or of significant interest to the community? Does this session add value to, disrupt current thinking, catalyze change, or advance the field of mathematics education?

1. Not Addressed: Not addressed
2. Poor: Limited attempt to address timeliness and context.
3. Acceptable: Proposal is connected to a pressing issue.
4. Strong: Proposal is strongly connected to a pressing issue.
5. Excellent: Proposal is grounded in and contributes significantly to one or more pressing issues.
6. **Attendee Engagement** - 3 Points

Does the proposal provide a description of the engagement with participants? Does the proposal include a specific plan for how time will be allocated and how participants will be involved in learning during the session? Are participants actively engaged for at least 25% of the speaker’s time?

General references to allotting time for participant questions or small group discussions are insufficient. For example, descriptions of small group discussions should include specifics about the questions to be used to engage attendees and how the results of discussions will be shared with the whole group.

1. Not Addressed: Proposal does not address attendee engagement.
2. Partial: Proposal is missing description of the engagement OR time allocation.
3. General: General descriptions of attendee engagement and timing are provided.
4. Strong: Thoughtful approach to how attendees will be engaged, including timing is provided.
5. Excellent: Exceptional involvement of attendees is provided.

**Format Recommendation**

The authors suggested a specific format for this proposal. If accepted, which presentation format do you believe is most appropriate for this submission? (You are not required to agree with the author's preference.)

* Poster
* Research in Progress Report
* Research Report
* Interactive Session
* Research Symposium

**Acceptance**

Should this submission be accepted at this conference in your opinion? Please specify your judgment below.

* Definitely Accept
* Probably Accept
* Borderline Accept/Reject
* Weak Reject
* Reject

Feedback to Authors (Required)

Feedback to Chairs (Optional)