# SCIENCE EDUCATORS FOR EQUITY, DIVERSITY, & SOCIAL JUSTICE

**SEEDS 2025 Proposal Reviewer Guidelines**

For each proposal you review, please use the rubric below in conjunction with the proposal development guidelines for each session type (below the rubric).

To ensure we are providing substantive, constructive feedback for all SEEDS proposals, please make sure you:

- Explain your numerical ratings below by responding to each section with affirmatively worded comments indicating **existing strengths** and **potential areas for strengthening**.
- Feel free to link resources or readings you think might further support the authors as they refine their work, keeping in mind their stated purpose/approach.

You may choose to either accept a proposal or state that it needs further development or revision. **Please recommend proposals be accepted for presentation if your ratings are in the 9–12 range.** We as a Program Committee will make final decisions for approval, which may include an option for authors to revise and resubmit their work.

**Evaluation of Proposals**

Key Components

- Addresses conference overall theme, explicitly addressing equity, social justice, and/or diversity (25%)
- Well written, clear, well-supported (25%)
- Adheres to the guidelines for the specific session type (25%)
- Pushes boundaries in the field (25%)

**<u>Wondering</u>**

Proposals should address the following in 750 words or less:

1. What are you wondering about?
2. What is your venture (your suggested response to this wondering)?
3. What conceptual or theoretical approaches inform your thinking?
4. Why is your wondering important to equity, diversity and/or social justice in science education?

**Proposal Title:**_____

**Proposal Three-digit Number:**_____

| | Very Strong (3) | Solid (2) | Needs Further Strengthening (1) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Conference theme** | Clearly addresses conference theme and explicitly addresses at least one of the terms: equity, social justice, and/or diversity. | Addresses conference theme; equity, social justice, and/or diversity are mentioned but not fully elaborated. | Addresses conference theme loosely; equity, social justice, and/or diversity are not clearly addressed or are altogether missing. |
| **Constructive feedback** | | | |
| **Well written and supported** | Well written; ideas are clearly articulated and supported by evidence. | Ideas are clear and supported by evidence. | Clarity is compromised, supportive evidence is limited or dated. |
| **Constructive feedback** | | | |
| **Adheres to the guidelines of the specific session type (including word count)** | The proposal addresses all of the required elements of the specific session type: Scholarship Incubator (SI), Wondering, or Workshop. The ideas are well developed. | Most of the required elements of the specific session type are included, but some pieces are missing and/or ideas are somewhat underdeveloped. | Many of the required elements of the session type are missing and/or the ideas are unclear and/or not yet developed. |
| **Constructive feedback** | | | |
| **Boundary pushing** | Very original; this work pushes the boundaries of science education research and/or practice. | Work is promising in terms of offering new ideas and ways of thinking about equity, diversity, and/or social justice. | It is not yet clear how the work is original or boundary-pushing. |
| **Constructive feedback** | | | |
| **Total score** | | | |
| **Recommended proposal decision** | Accept | Needs further development or revision | |

**Session Type Guidelines for Proposal Development**

## Scholarship Incubator

Proposals should not exceed 750 words and must contain the following sections:

1. Subject/problem
2. Design or procedure
3. Analysis and findings
4. Relevance

Each section should address the questions listed below:

*Subject/Problem*

1. What is your study about? Why is it important?
2. What conceptual or theoretical framing guides your study?
3. How are you defining equity, diversity and/or social justice in terms of your literature base and/or experiences?

*Design or Procedure*

1. What is your methodology? Describe how your methodology aligns with your research question(s) or problem.
2. Describe your design, study context, data collection, and analysis.
3. When relevant, describe how your positionality as a researcher is evident in your work.

*Analyses and Findings*

1. What are your findings? (These may be arguments in the case of conceptual papers.)
2. How did you establish reliability, validity, or trustworthiness (as relevant to your methodology)?
3. How well are your findings supported given your methodological approach and/or reference to existing literature?

*Relevance*

1. How does your study support and/or expand understandings and/or practices around equity, diversity and/or social justice in science education?
2. What new knowledge does this work contribute to the field?

## Wondering

Proposals should address the following in 750 words or less:

1. What are you wondering about?
2. What is your venture (your suggested response to this wondering)?
3. What conceptual or theoretical approaches inform your thinking?
4. Why is your wondering important to equity, diversity and/or social justice in science

education?

**Workshop**

Proposals should address the following in 750 words or less:

1. *Learning Goals*
    - What will you do in your workshop?
    - What will participants learn and/or experience?
2. *Design*
    - How will you engage participants? Please be specific.
    - Provide an agenda for your workshop with time allocated to various activities.
3. *Participants*
    - Who should attend and why?
    - How will this workshop further define or address issues of equity, diversity and/or social justice in science education?

*While workshops are generally 60 minutes for scheduling reasons, feel free to indicate a preference for a longer workshop by adding a Longer Workshop Request (<100 words) to your proposal, explaining why 90 minutes would be preferable for your session if our schedule can allow it.