**TNTESOL “Everyone for Igualdad”**

**Call for Proposals**

Presentation Dates: November 7-8, 2024 - Martin Professional Development Center - Nashville, TN

* [Factors affecting proposal selection](#kix.qocteob7441c)
* [Factors disqualifying a proposal](#kix.kfbtdi1k5e4i)
* [Proposal rating rubric](#kix.775bkuth8jc6)
* [Session types](#kix.vanwj7h0tohz)

Professionals and scholars from all English language teaching educational contexts worldwide and all related fields and content areas are invited to submit proposals for the TNTESOL 2024 State Conference.

* All submissions must adhere to the guidelines in this Call for Proposals and support the [mission and values of TNTESOL](https://www.tennesseetesol.org/).
* All session organizers must submit proposals online through this [Google Form](https://forms.gle/ndFoMiGAUfMM5gVE6). Mailed, emailed, or faxed proposals will not be accepted or acknowledged.
* A separate online proposal form must be completed for each proposed session.
* The application form does not allow for changes to entries after August 23, 2024.
* Proposals are evaluated by a pre-selected committee of TNTESOL reviewers.
* To ensure you receive messages about your proposal, please use an email address that will be valid from August - November 2024 and add [tntesol2024@gmail.com](mailto:tntesol2024@gmail.com) to your address book.
* After successfully submitting the proposal, the session lead presenter will receive an email message confirming receipt of the submission.
* Submissions will be reviewed and applicants will be notified of the results by August 30th, 2024.
* If you have any questions, email the conference committee: [tntesol2024@gmail.com](mailto:tntesol2024@gmail.com)

**Factors affecting proposal selection:**

**Program Balance**: TNTESOL leaders strive to make the program relevant to a diverse range of professionals and scholars working with English learners at all ages and stages of language development in different contexts. As a result, they select proposals based, in part, on program balance. They consider the following:

* Range of topics within the English language teaching profession
* Relevance to TNTESOL conference and to the convention theme
* Number of presentations on the same or similar topics and/or subtopics
* Content area coverage
* Presenters’ apparent level of expertise
* Professional and geographic distribution of presenters

**Proposal Rating Rubric:** An important factor in proposal evaluation and scoring by reviewers is attention to all five of the criteria in the [proposal rating rubric](#kix.775bkuth8jc6). Outline and session descriptions should be clearly and concisely written to convey the session’s significance and its appropriateness to the field and intended audience. Carefully written and edited, they should demonstrate evidence of a high quality of research and/or practice, as applicable, as well as clear evidence that the session will be well organized and presented.

**Factors disqualifying a proposal:**

* TNTESOL does not receive the proposal by the deadline August 23, 2024.
* The proposal is not received electronically via the Google Form.
* The proposal is incomplete or not completed according to the guidelines.
* The session title, outline, or description does not include the name(s) or institution(s) of organizers or presenters.
* The presentation promotes commercial interests.

**Proposal Rating Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **Poor (1 Point)** | **Fair (2 Points)** | **Good (3 Points)** | **Very Good (4 Points)** | **Excellent (5 Points)** |
| **1. Currency, importance, and appropriateness of topic to the field** | Topic is not current and/or lacks importance or appropriateness to the field. It does not appear to be a worthwhile session. | Topic is only tangentially related to the field, not current or important to the field and/or to the potential audience. It may not be a worthwhile session. | Topic may not be current or groundbreaking, but it is relevant to the field and potential audience. It might be a worthwhile session. | Topic is current, important, and appropriate to the field and potential audience. It appears to be a worthwhile session. | The topic is cutting- edge, relevant, groundbreaking, or significant to the field and potential audience. It appears to be a very worthwhile session. |
| **2. Purpose, participant outcomes, and session type** | The length and content are inappropriate for the session type, and the delivery methods and/or objectives are not clearly stated or implied. | The proposal may be appropriate for the session type. The length and content are inappropriate for the session type, and the delivery methods and participant outcomes are too general or broad. | The length, content and delivery methods are generally appropriate for the session type. The objectives and participant outcomes are stated or implied but may lack sufficient focus. | The length and content are appropriate for the session type and delivery methods. The objectives and participant outcomes are clear. | The length, content, and delivery methods match the session type. The objectives and participant outcomes are very clear. |
| **3. Theory, practice, and/or research basis** | The proposal does not mention theory, practice, or research, or it is unclear how this session is connected to the field. | The proposal provides background references to theory, practice, and/or research, but the references are not specific or recent, or the proposal does not relate the theory, practice, and/or research to the content. | The proposal refers somewhat to relevant theory, practice, and/or research in an understandable way and relates it to the content. | The proposal refers clearly to the relevant theory, practice, and/or research in a thorough and comprehensible manner (i.e. current citations, terminology, and/or debates in the field) and relates it directly to the content. | The proposal refers specifically to the relevant theory, practice, and/or research in a detailed and comprehensible manner (i.e., current citations, terminology, and/or debates in the field), and relates it directly to the presentation content. |
| **4. Support for practices, conclusions, and/or recommendations** | The proposal does not indicate how it will support its claims. | The proposal states or implies references to support, but it is not clear whether sufficient support will be provided for practices, conclusions, or recommendations. | The proposal gives some indication as to how practices, conclusions, or recommendations will be substantiated. | The proposal provides details indicating that the practices, conclusions, or recommendations will be substantiated. | The proposal provides ample details indicating that the practices, conclusions, or recommendations will be clearly substantiated. |
| **5. Clarity of proposal as indicator of presentation quality** | The writing suggests that the presentation may be poor. | The writing suggests that the presentation may be weak. | The proposal is adequately written but suggests that the presentation may be uneven or of moderate quality. | The proposal is clearly written and suggests that the presentation will be of very good quality. | The proposal is very well written and suggests that the presentation will be of professional quality. |

**Session Types**

**Practice-Oriented Presentation**

*45 min, 1-4 presenters*

Explanation of a teaching or assessment technique focused on implementation with no more than 10 minutes devoted to the underlying theory. Proposals should include a synopsis of the technique and a reference to teaching strategies and their implementation. Practitioners may submit a joint proposal focusing on two related techniques.

**Research-Oriented Presentation**

*45 min, 1-4 presenters*

Oral summary of the researcher’s topic and work in relation to theory and/or practice with only occasional reference to notes or text. Proposal should include a synopsis of the topic, including central research question, results, supporting evidence, and implications. Presentation should be addressed to a general TNTESOL audience, not scholars in a subfield. Researchers may submit a joint proposal focusing on two related research topics.

**Workshop**

*45 min; 1-4 presenters*

Structured, hands-on professional development activity tackling an issue or developing a specific teaching or research technique. Proposals should include session goals, a synopsis of the theoretical framework, and a description of workshop tasks and procedures. It should also provide interactive activities in which participants share information, participate in simulations, and/or create materials and action plans.

**Technology Demonstration**

*45 min, 1-3 presenters*

The focus is on how technology can be used to enhance language instruction. Presenters share materials they have developed and demonstrate how they have used them. Proposals should include a description of the technology and a reference to their implementation and how it enhances language instruction.

Please click [this link](https://forms.gle/ndFoMiGAUfMM5gVE6) to complete your proposal.