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Proposal Types
Focus of Proposals for D&D

- D&D members promote quality teaching and learning through the application of instructional design to:
  - Design effective and satisfying learning experiences
  - Apply learning theory in innovative ways, advancing theory development,
  - Develop instructional materials and support learning environments that are optimal to support learning,
  - Evaluate the impact of instruction, assessing learning gain, and implementation quality and fidelity,
  - Conduct research on effective design practices, and
  - Plan for and manage implementation of instructional projects and research
Practice Proposals

- Proposals reporting on the practice of instructional design and development should describe effective practice in innovative instructional designs, effective instructional tools, and/or new instructional development approaches. Each should be the result of design-based or development research efforts investigating instructional design approaches or interventions.
The purpose of this study is to develop empirically supported guidelines to help educators and instructional designers design and implement effective scaffolding to promote intended learning outcomes. A framework was developed based on the source, mode, and function of scaffolding. Empirical studies on scaffolding published between 2000 and 2011 were screened, selected, and reviewed based on the proposed framework. Comprehensive guidelines for designing and implementing scaffolding will be discussed in the presentation.
Qualitative, quantitative, or mixed method empirical studies should describe completed research that involved the collection and analysis of data, and/or meta-analyses of existing published research.
This research proposal reports a quantitative study investigating the effectiveness of note-taking and their availability within self-regulated learning. Note-taking is the easiest way to externalize parts of the internal reasoning processes. In our study, 54 participants were asked to take notes while learning through video lectures. Results indicate that creating notes for long-term use may even draw more attention from the learning process and conflict with local learning goals by making them look less efficient.
Theory/Concept Proposals:

- Must address a theoretical construct, analysis of related research, and original recommendations for future research and/or development.
During the last few decades, educational theory has often focused on individual and social constructions of knowledge. What is often missing as we seek to transition face-to-face educational experiences to mobile ones is theory that recognizes the importance of human communication for learning. The goal of this paper is to introduce learning and teaching as communicative actions theory as one theoretical support for using mobile devices and applications to support learning.
13 Principles of Strong Proposals
Principal 1: A strong proposal is one that matches the Call for Proposals and is well matched to program initiatives and themes.

http://www.aect.org/Events/Call/default.asp?P8=true
Principle 2: Proposals that comply with the stated submission requirements are much more likely to be accepted.

- Read over and follow submission procedures
- Be cognizant of the length (don’t go over)
- Too short = not enough info and will most likely be rejected
- Submission Guidelines: http://aectorg.yourwebhosting.com/events/call/guidelines.asp?
Principle 3: Reviewers tend to infer that the properties of the proposal will be the properties of the presenter or presentation.

- Reviewers may assume you won’t be prepared for your presentation
  - Typos
  - Unorganized or “thrown” together

- Proposal should demonstrate that you are:
  - Well-spoken, articulate
  - Organized and thoughtful

http://aectorg.yourwebhosting.com/events/call/ProposalGuide.asp
Principle 4: A strong proposal has few errors and looks polished and professional.

INTRODUCTION
School field trips to museums, zoos, nature parks, and wildlife centers are common throughout the education system. The trips are generally seen as enhancing learning in a variety of subject areas as well as providing a motivating and rewarding experience for students (Griffin & Symington, 1997).

RESEARCH QUESTION
How can an iterative, user-centered approach to design and evaluation help reduce extraneous cognitive load involved in technology-assisted science learning?

REFERENCES

Introduction
School field trips to museums, zoos, nature parks, and wildlife centers are common throughout the education system. The trips are generally seen as enhancing learning in a variety of subject areas as well as providing a motivating and rewarding experience for students (Griffin & Symington, 1997). Research Questions How can an iterative, user-centered approach to design and evaluation help reduce extraneous cognitive load involved in technology-assisted science learning? REFERENCES Marty, P. F., Mendenhall, A., Douglas, I., Southerland, S. A., Sampson, V., Kazmer, M. M., Alemann, N., Clark, A., & Schellinger, J. (2013). The Iterative Design of a Mobile Learning Application to Support Scientific Inquiry. Journal of Learning Design, 6(2).
Principle 5: Strong proposals have the potential to interest more people.

- Consider what would appeal to more people
- Discuss practical application (link theory with practice)
- Incorporate more audience participation
Principle 6: A strong proposal is well organized and logical.

- Bad organization of good content may lead to a rejected proposal
- Some proposal types provide a structure of organization – make sure you follow that structure
- Organize to match proposal type
- Use headers

http://aectorg.yourwebhosting.com/events/call/ProposalGuide.asp
Principle 7: Strong proposals use proper English expression and grammar.

- Even a few written grammatical errors can leave the reviewer with the impression that the person may have difficulty giving an oral presentation.
- Have proposal reviewed by a native English speaker.
- Visit a campus writing center to review and provide feedback.

http://aectorg.yourwebhosting.com/events/call/ProposalGuide.asp
Principle 8: Proposals that make a real contribution are more appealing than ones that do not.

- Reviewers will read 4 – 10 proposals, many on the same topic
- Reviewers look for originality and significance to the field
- Reviewers less likely to accept studies that do not offer a new angle or are merely replications of previous research

http://aectorg.yourwebhosting.com/events/call/ProposalGuide.asp
Principle 9: A strong proposal is well-informed.

- Proposals should indicate you have a good understanding of the topic and are up-to-date with current trends/issues related to the topic.
- Proposals are not literature reviews.
- Find a balance between the literature and your work/contribution to the topic.

http://aectorg.yourwebhosting.com/events/call/ProposalGuide.asp
Principle 10: Strong proposals make clear what their objectives are.

- Make the purpose clear
  - “The purpose of this study…”
  - “Instructional design faculty who attend this session will …”
  - “The aim of this presentation is to…”

- Be explicit with the desired outcome of the session
**Principle 11:** A proposal submitted to the proper division is more likely to be accepted.

http://aectorg.yourwebhosting.com/events/call/ProposalGuide.asp

http://www.aect.org/Events/Call/default.asp?P8=true
Principle 12: A proposal that chooses the right delivery format and requests the appropriate amount of time is more likely to be accepted than one that does not.
Principle 13: Deadlines matter.

- February 2, 2015 11:59 EST
- No extensions

http://aectorg.yourwebhosting.com/events/call/ProposalGuide.asp
Submission of Proposals
Proposal Deadlines
Proposals Open
December 12th, 2014
Proposals Close
February 2, 11:59PM (EST), 2015

http://www.aect.org/Events/Call/default.asp?P8=true
Preparing the Submission

- Presentation title
- A Short Description (Maximum of 75 words)
- An Anonymous Abstract (750-1,000 words)
- Equipment request
- List of presenters
http://convention2.allacademic.com/one/aect/aect15/

AllAcademic System
AllAcademic System

http://convention2.allacademic.com/one/aect/aect15/
http://convention2.allacademic.com/one/aect/aect15/
**Keyword**

Select at least one keyword for this proposal. Use more than one keyword if needed.

**Session Category**

Select the Session Category for the proposed presentation. Choose one.

- Research Proposal
- Practice Proposal
- Theory/Concept Proposal
- Other

**Additional Information**

Please list any special requests regarding potential scheduling conflicts such as religious observances, multiple presentations, and other obligations during the meeting. We will attempt, but do not guarantee, to fill all of these requests. We will make every effort to honor scheduling requests for conference participants with accessibility needs.

**Proposed Session Length**

Please select a duration.
Review Criteria
Review Criteria Overview

- Clarity of the proposal
- Relevance
- Suitability for the division
- Quality of the content
- Appropriate format/session type, organization, length
Review Criteria Overview

- Level of interactivity with the audience
- Comments to association
- Comments for the author
- Reviewer recommendations – accept or reject
## Review Criteria for Practice Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria*</th>
<th>Type of Proposal</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Scale** descriptors (scale used indicates importance of criteria)</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarity (10 pts)</td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Defines a design problem</td>
<td><strong>Scale</strong>&lt;br&gt;Low (1)&lt;br&gt;Medium (5-6)&lt;br&gt;High (10)</td>
<td>Design problem clearly defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance (10 pts)</td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Describes relationship of design problem to instructional solutions</td>
<td><strong>Scale</strong>&lt;br&gt;No problem defined, not design problem&lt;br&gt;R’ship between problem and solution not defined, not an instructional problem&lt;br&gt;Vague description of r’ship, unclear how solution relates to problem</td>
<td>Clearly describes r’ship between problem and instructional solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitability (10 pts)</td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Describes rationale for solutions chosen, changes made</td>
<td><strong>Scale</strong>&lt;br&gt;No rationale provided for solutions/changes&lt;br&gt;Vague description of rationale, not grounded in research/theory&lt;br&gt;Sound rational for solutions and changes, related to research/theory</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality (10 pts)</td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Describes design successes and failures</td>
<td><strong>Scale</strong>&lt;br&gt;No mention of success and failures&lt;br&gt;Vague description, lacks description of either&lt;br&gt;Rich description of both successes and failures</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format (10 pts)</td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Demonstrates r’ship among design problem, solutions, and evaluative measures</td>
<td><strong>Scale</strong>&lt;br&gt;No relationship among problem solution, evaluations included&lt;br&gt;R’ships vague, potentially disconnect among problem, solution, and/or eval&lt;br&gt;Rich description of r’ship among problem, solution, &amp; eval; informs theory</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Review Criteria for Research Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria*</th>
<th>Type of Proposal</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use</strong></td>
<td><strong>Research</strong></td>
<td><strong>Evaluation Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity (10 pts)</td>
<td>Clarity of proposal (how well it is written)</td>
<td>Does not conform to grammatical principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance (10 pts)</td>
<td>Relevance to convention theme, timeliness, and general interest level of topic</td>
<td>Not relevant to conference, will not be of great interest to community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitability (10 pts)</td>
<td>Suitability for division/organization mission and membership</td>
<td>Not suitable to div/org, mission, membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality (10 pts)</td>
<td>Quality of proposed session’s content</td>
<td>Poor description of content, content not supported/relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format (10 pts)</td>
<td>Format, organization, length and session type</td>
<td>Not well organized or formatted for session</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Review Criteria for Theory/Concept Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Type of Proposal</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Scale** descriptors (scale used indicated importance of criteria)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria*</td>
<td>Clarity (10 pts)</td>
<td>Theory/Concept</td>
<td>Defines a conceptual/theoretical problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance (10 pts)</td>
<td>Describes relationship of problem to research/practice</td>
<td>R'ship between problem and research/practice not defined</td>
<td>Vague description of r'ship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitability (10 pts)</td>
<td>Describes theories/concepts of interests to membership</td>
<td>No interest to div/org, mission, membership</td>
<td>May be of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality (10 pts)</td>
<td>Provide scholarly support for ideas</td>
<td>Lacks scholarly support for ideas</td>
<td>Lacks mention of key work in area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format (10 pts)</td>
<td>Demonstrates r'ship among theory, research, and/or practice</td>
<td>No relationship among theory, research, and/or practice</td>
<td>R'ships vague</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D&D Showcase
D&D Showcase

- Exclusive poster session for innovative training and educational programs and projects
- Authors will have a table to display their materials and posters describing the key components of their program
- Authors will receive a certificate from Design & Development Division for their innovative products
- Only programs or projects in their final form will be qualified for this special Convention event. Works in progress (or draft form) do not qualify.
- For additional information contact Jill Stefaniak, jstefaniak17@gmail.com
- http://www.aect.org/Events/Call/DDshowcase.asp?P8=true
PacifiCorp Design Competition
PacifiCorp Design Competition

- Start early
- Review problem statement and guidelines
- Attend a webinar
- Same principles apply
  - Well-written – no grammar/spelling errors
  - Organization and Format
  - Follow guidelines
  - Don’t miss the deadline

http://aectsite-ym.com/group/PacifiCorp
In a nutshell

- Read submission guidelines for AECT & D&D Division at http://aectorg.yourwebhosting.com/events/call/guidelines.asp?

- Carefully read “Creating Stronger AECT Proposals” at http://aectorg.yourwebhosting.com/events/call/ProposalGuide.asp

- Start early; do not try to develop your proposal on the last day. Have your peers/faculty member read your proposal and provide feedback

- Stay in word limits for title, abstract, short description. Also, make sure your proposal is masked (no author information is in the proposal)
Questions?

- Post your questions in the D&D Proposal Writing Forum
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